R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2469. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of James E. Barsi, manager, August A. Busch & Co., of Massachusetts, Inc., 222 Arsenal Street, Watertown, Mass., and sundry others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2470. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mrs. Leo A. Mons and others urging the adoption of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2471. Also, petition of Arthur L. Hart and others, urging the adoption of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2472. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Yellowstone Basin Association, Billings, Mont., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Yellowstone River Valley Basin; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2473. Also, petition of Alamo and San Antonio National Farm Loan Association, San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 50; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2474. Also, petition of the Moorish Science Temple, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the great work which the Moorish Divine and National Movement of North America is doing for the benefit of fallen humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2475. Also, petition of the city of Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to utilization of the National Youth Administration material; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Lord and Saviour, in Thee we have a refuge in every time of need. When temptation is nigh and human courage is at the test, Thou art near; when problems perplex and the way is uncertain, Thou dost help us to understand; when the sight is dim and the clouds low, we may be unquestionably sure that we are not alone. In unutterable quiet and as tranquil as sunlight, Thou dost lift the trusting soul beyond the clutch of circumstances.

O God, enlarge the sense of our wonderful privilege and lead us to break through all barriers of misunderstanding and prejudice, giving stimulus to all that is great and good in the being of man. How tremendous is our mission and how noble is our calling; O give us those requisite qualities of strength that will keep us true to the tasks entrusted to us. Bless and qualify us for the very best which lies before us; consider our infirmities and grant us the sweetening grace of Thy forbearance. We pray that we may never lose heaven out of our hearts, but hold us in harmony with Thy holy will and in tune with that music which will resound and reecho forever. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the American Legion of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a speech delivered recently by our distinguished Governor, John W. Bricker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some newspaper and magazine clippings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INSURANCE FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LYNCH. 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. LYNCH] 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 Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Mr. W. M. Carney, chief chemist of the Lion Oil Refining Co. on the subject The Possibilities for Chemical Development of Our Natural Gas and Petroleum.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Mr. James P. Pope, a director of T. V. A., before the meeting of the Cherokee County Farm Bureau at Center, Ala., on August 13, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun, an article from a Washington paper, and a letter answering an inquiry that came to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VICTORY GARDEN BEANS

Mr. GAVIN. 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. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about an agricultural accomplishment which is unique, coming from the great industrial State of Pennsylvania, with its 11,000,000 people, with over a million men in the armed forces of the United States, producing today over 30 percent of all the war materials.

We are also making an amazing contribution to increase the food supply of the Nation in the Victory-garden program. I have listened to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] talk about cheese, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] talk about cattle, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] talk about wheat, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] talk about the tall corn, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] talk about peanuts, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] talk about climate, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] talk about the Irish; and so I want to take this opportunity to say that along with the great industrial accomplishments of my State, our farmers have something to talk about. I produce for you herewith a string bean grown by Win Smathers, of Clarion, Pa., in my district, one of the smaller beans off his vines, which is 41 inches long, weighing 7 pounds, and grown in 6 weeks.

This will give the farm State Representatives something to gasp about. I defy any Member of the House to produce from his district a string bean of this gigantic, monumental size and beauty. It proves to the Members of the House that when Pennsylvania goes all out for production for the war effort, whether mechanized equipment or foodstuffs, we get results.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman is not inferring, is he, that he is a "has bean"?

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked and received unanimous consent to include certain material in the RECORD. The Public Printer informs me that this will exceed by one-third of a page the amount permissible under the rules and that the cost will be $15. I ask that this may be included notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

DEBATE ON FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in opening the debate on the Fulbright resolution, Monday, the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] resorted to some ugly name-calling and invidious charges which apparently were meant to apply to those of us who do not see eye to eye with him on certain matters of foreign policy. He said:

> The scoffers, the demagogs, the false prophets, the dividers, the bigots will operate just as they have in the past. Whether or not they will be successful depends upon an enlightened and aroused public opinion, upon the vision and courage of our people, and the decent people of other nations.

The attitude of mind expressed here is quite characteristic of the gentleman. We have heard it often before. It may not be against the rules of the House for a Member of this body to, by innuendo and without referring specifically to names, call some of his colleagues scoffers, demagogs, false prophets, dividers, and bigots. However, it seems to me it is just as unbecoming for a Member to resort to this means of abuse against those of his colleagues who may not agree with him as it would be for him to do so by forthrightly calling them by name.

I venture to say those of us who may disagree with some of the policies the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] believes in and seeks to promote, still have a right to believe we can do so conscientiously, with dignity, and full maintenance of self-respect.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] takes unto himself a position which no other Member of the House would attribute to any remark I made, and I am sorry if the gentleman has a guilty conscience which prompted him to take the floor today. I want to assure him that so far as I am concerned he need not have that guilty conscience any longer because my remarks were made to the demagogs, the false prophets, and the others, and that means that when a man is a demagog or a false prophet he is not intellectually honest. Certainly men may disagree, and if one has an honest view and expresses that view, even if I disagree with him, I would under no circumstances consider him a demagog or a false prophet. Certainly, the gentleman from Ohio I would never consider to be a demagog or a false prophet or a bigot, and so far as I am concerned the guilty conscience of the gentleman can be thrown out of this application to him.

Chamber, because my remarks had no

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FUTILITY OF ATTACKS ON CORDELL HULL

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the scavenger attacks now being made on Cordell Hull, our distinguished Secretary of State, by a little coterie of radical propagandists are having no more effect upon Mr. Hull's standing with the intelligent, patriotic people of America than the activities of the tiny termites that gnaw at the base of the Washington Monument have on the destiny of the Father of our Country.

The serene dignity with which he has ignored these scurrilous attacks is characteristic of Cordell Hull, one of our greatest living Americans.

On yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] inserted in the RECORD an article by Frank Kent, answering these scurrilous attacks. I offered it for the RECORD before I learned of its insertion by Senator McKELLAR, and I want to commend it to everyone who is interested in seeing that one of our great leaders, who is doing a great job for the American people, receive proper treatment at the hands of every element of the American press.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of the regular business of the day and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three short introductions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WENE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on poultry shows.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WENE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the remarks of one of our own war heroes, including a letter and a document written by Mr. Joseph Leib, and also a letter of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

PRINTING 6,000 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF BIENNIAL REPORT OF CHIEF OF STAFF OF UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I present the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1943, to the Secretary of War, be printed as a public document, and that 6,000 additional copies be printed, of which 4,500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request with respect to insertion in the RECORD of my own remarks and clippings previously made. I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that the article is in excess of the amount allowed, under the rule, and it will cost $112. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer, it may be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. 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. 144]

Allen, Ill.	Hartley	O'Toole
Andrews	Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hill	Philbin
Barden	Hobbs	Phillips
Bell	Holmes, Mass.	Pittenger
Bland	Izac	Poulson
Brehm	Jackson	Pracht
Buckley	Johnson, Anton J.	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rizley
Canfield	Johnson, Ind.	Sasscer
Carter	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Satterfield
Chenoweth	Kee	Scott
Clark	Kelley	Shafer
Costello	Kennedy	Sheppard
Creal	Lane	Sheridan
Cullen	McGehee	Sparkman
Curley	McGranery	Spence
Elliott	McKenzie	Stevenson
Elmer	McMurray	Thomas, N. J.
Fay	Magnuson	Thomas, Tex.
Fish	Marcantonio	Towe
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Treadway
Ford	Miller, Pa.	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Murphy	Wadsworth
Gamble	Norton	West
Goodwin	O'Brien, Mich.	Whelchel, Ga.
Gore	O'Connor	White
Granger	O'Konski	Whitten
Green	O'Leary	Wigglesworth
Gross		Winter
Hancock		Wolverton, N. J.
Hart		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 338 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two addresses of my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR WIVES OF ENLISTED MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159; and pending that motion, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if we can agree on time for debate.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has suggested an hour on a side. I think that would be enough to cover it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from New York, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 159, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have reached a turn of the road in this war, financially as well as strategically. Practically all capital-construction expenditures have now been made. The bulk of our factories, plants, and facilities has been completed. From now on, with few exceptions, it will only be necessary to provide for maintenance, repair, and operation.

The Committee on Appropriations, in preparing the bills which financed the war program, has broken all records not only in amounts carried by the bills but in the efficiency and expedition with which they have been handled. It is an achievement which reflects credit on no one party. All parties have cooperated. We have had upon the part of both the majority and the minority the closest cooperation. As a matter of fact, hardly a dollar has been authorized for appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations on which we have not had in effect the unanimous approval of all members of the committee.

Of course, we cannot expect such unanimity of purpose and action to continue indefinitely. The national conventions convene next June. We are already on the eve of a national political campaign. In view of the fact that there is little difference either in Congress or the country on the progress of the war or on the success of the war program, and—if the vote taken yesterday is a criterion—there is little appreciable difference on the post-war program up to this time—it is to be expected that from now on in the consideration of appropriation bills criticism of minor officials and minor items in the supply bills, will be emphasized and magnified possibly on both sides of the aisle for political purposes. I trust it can be held to a minimum as the war is far from won and there is still need for unity and cooperation.

However, partisanship is inevitable in campaign years—even in the consideration of appropriation bills and if from now on we hear some minor official castigated, excoriated, and denounced on one hand or praised, lauded, and glorified on the other, when we are told in impassioned speeches that the ignorance, stupidity, and inefficiency in the administration of some particular activity is equaled only by the reprehensible duplicity and rascality of the administrator, or that the transcendent benefits accruing from its administration marks the administrator as a statesman and philanthropist of the highest order, we may smile behind our hand and recall that it is campaign year and normal American politics as usual.

There is one such subject, however, under general discussion at this time on which there may be an honest difference of opinion, and that is the impression that there are large amounts of money which have been appropriated which remain uncommitted and unexpended—large reservoirs of money appropriated for the war program but lying useless and unutilized, which should be disbursed before further appropriations are made. It is a familiar charge and one which has been in circulation from time to time practically ever since the war began. In answer to a similar representation in the last Congress I secured from the Bureau of the Budget and inserted into the RECORD on February 5, 1943, a statement from the Director of the Budget showing in full the amounts appropriated, the amounts that had been committed, and the amounts estimated to remain unobligated and those estimated to be unexpended on the 1st day of July 1943. Up to that time we appropriated for the war program, according to the statement of the Bureau of the Budget, including funds made available by Government corporations, $241,000,000,000, and there was estimated to be obligated by July 1, 1943, $233,000,000,000, leaving at that time, on the 1st of July 1943, estimated to be unobligated, only $8,000,000,000. In other words, at that time, of that huge appropriation of $241,000,000,000, something like only 3⅓ percent was estimated to remain uncommitted at the end of the fiscal year, and you must take into consideration the fact that the departments cannot enter into contracts to expend money until the money has been appropriated, and for us not to have some small reservoir, some slight latitude, means that in cases of emergency there would be unnecessary, unwarranted, and dangerous delay in providing needed facilities if there was not at least some amount available for allocation.

The figures I have given were the estimated situation on June 30, 1943, as made of February last. I do not have the data as to the actual situation on June 30 as to unobligated funds, but do recall that because of changes in War Department programs due to change in emphasis in the war abroad there was unobligated in War Department funds at the end of the fiscal year 1943 something over $12,000,000,000 instead of about $6,500,000,000, as had been estimated in the previous February. Probably the actual situation at the end of the fiscal year was something double the $8,000,000,000 estimated figure, or 6 percent. The unobligated funds of the War Department were reappropriated for the fiscal year 1944 instead of providing new money, and it is a tribute to the Department that these funds did remain unobligated and were reported to Congress for reassignment.

Since December 31, 1942, we have appropriated, in round numbers, an additional approximate $97,000,000,000 for the war program, so that up to the present time we have appropriated for the

war program something over $330,000,000,000. Our allocations have pretty well kept pace with our appropriations as the fiscal year goes ahead.

Of course, we cannot at this time tell what the unobligated balances will be at the end of the fiscal year 1944, which is June 30 next. Obligations are being incurred every day and will be so incurred all during the fiscal year, and I believe from our past experience and with better organization and systemization of our armed forces, that improvement is constantly occurring in handling the fiscal affairs of the war. One thing must be made plain to Congress and to the American people. The authorities conducting the military, naval, and other war operations cannot turn a hand or a wheel until they have in hand the funds with which to pay for all of the programs which they must undertake in advance. They cannot run deficits for these things and then come in with a bill and present it and ask for the money. They are subject to the provisions of our penal statutes if they do so. Vast as these sums are, they are assigned to planned programs; programs that are studied and arranged far ahead; programs that support a war that is world-wide in proportions; programs that seek to give to our men the arms and weapons that are the best in the quantities and at the times that they need them; programs that will give our men the best of food, clothing, medical attention, and other care, no matter where they may be required to go. To plan, contract for, execute, and administer these war operations require appropriation of the funds far in advance. We review the obligation status of these funds from time to time in connection with our hearings and will continue to do so. Congress and the American people want everything possible done to safeguard war funds, but they do not want our war programs hampered by constantly digging up the garden to see if the seed has sprouted.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman speaks of appropriations and allocations. What amount has not been expended of the amounts that have been allocated? Is the gentleman able to advise the Committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of the total of $241,000,000,000 that had been made available as of December 31, 1942, for the war program it was estimated as of July 1, 1943, that one hundred and one billion would be unexpended, but there are no data available to me right now which would indicate what the actual figure was as of that date. Our daily rate of expenditure has jumped up considerably since that time. In January 1943, for war purposes we expended approximately $6,000,000,000, while in August this has risen to a monthly rate of about seven and one-fourth billion, and it looks as though September will run close to eight billion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What was the date of the figures the gentleman gave when there had not been expended—up to what date?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is merely an approximate estimate as of February 5 for the reason that no definite figures were available.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. An approximate estimate up to the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. To June 30, 1943.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. If we spent $330,000,000,000 in appropriations in 1940, and the tax income has been only some $85,000,000,000, have we not approached or passed the legal debt limit?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No, we have not yet passed the legal debt limit figures, but we have reached a position where it is highly important that we take into consideration the amount of money that can be raised by taxation and by loans.

Mr. Chairman, returning to the point of interruption, this war has been fought with less waste in proportion to the number of men engaged and the amounts involved than any war in the history of the Nation. Of course, economy and war do not go together. As a matter of fact war and sound business practices have little in common. When the house is afire we cannot take time to negotiate with the firemen the cost of putting out the fire. Our house was afire; it was in imminent danger of being burned down over our heads, and we could not always take the time to follow normal business practices, with resourceful enemies liable at any moment to be over our heads destroying the factories in which we were producing indispensable materials of war. But we have lost no time reaching sound business practices at the first opportunity. Contrary to the practice in every previous war, we have not waited until the war is over to investigate and remedy. Heretofore at the close of every war we have appointed committees of investigation which have gone into the conduct of the war long after the horse was stolen and long after it was too late to lock the barn door.

In this war, from the first, our committees of investigation, both in the House and in the Senate, and in joint committees, have been searching every field and phase of the war to uncover irregularities or maladministrations—to discover errors either of judgment or action. As a result we have weeded out and are continuing to weed out as rapidly as possible, all preventable waste. As soon as we find a leak we stop it.

And we are including in every contract a clause providing for renegotiation. Of course, the making of much of this war material was without precedent. Much of the war machinery had never been manufactured before. It required new plants; new machinery; new tools. It required the training of new workmen. There was no data upon which we could base a reasonable estimate as to the cost of producing these strange engines of war. But they had to be provided, and provided immediately. Consequently it was necessary to enter into contracts under which production would start, but with the understanding that after production was underway we would send auditors and inspectors into the factories to determine the cost of production and the amount of profit. Wherever the profit was unreasonable or more than the normal profit would have been under similar circumstances in time of peace, we renegotiated. We took from the contractor any surplus profit to which he was not entitled and covered it back into the Federal Treasury, and adjusted the price paid him on future production under the same contract.

As a result you will notice in releases by the Associated Press last month, that up until July 30, 1943, we had saved the Government $4,333,000,000 which would otherwise have gone into the pockets of the contractors. It might be said that even where we were in a position to make a somewhat accurate estimate of the cost of production, new methods were introduced, and through mass production, and the installation of assembly lines, production was so speeded up that there was a marked decrease in the unit cost and in the daily output.

In every war, especially in recent wars, in the Civil War, in the Spanish-American War, and in the First World War, we created multimillionaires overnight. Men grew fat upon the profits of war contracts; but in this war, through renegotiation, we take from the contractor any profit to which he is not entitled and return it to the Federal Treasury. No one in this war is making unconscionable millions out of the blood of American soldiers.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Please notify me when I have consumed 10 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

There has been some considerable discussion recently relative to the repeal of the renegotiation clause in war contracts. Let me say to those interests which are so industriously agitating the question of repeal that they might just as well forget it. This House will not vote repeal. The people of the country will not permit the repeal or material readjustment of renegotiation of contracts. It has demonstrated its value too conclusively.

When this war closes it is estimated that the public debt, to which my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] just referred, will approximate $300,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I did not get the full statement as to the date fixed when in the gentleman's opinion the debt will be $300,000,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. At the close of the war—provided, of course, that the war does not last too long.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman stated that the Government had recovered something over $4,000,000,000 from contractors.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Part of that is recovery which has been made by reduction of profits, which have been returned to the Treasury, and part of it has been saved on the price of future deliveries. It is about half and half. But it totals approximately $4,333,000,000.

Mr. BUFFETT. None of that $4,000,000,000 represents money transferred from the tax department back to the War Department or the Navy Department?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It represents money which has been saved by the Government through the renegotiation of contracts for war materials.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Where the Government recovers, through renegotiation, sums of money, that money is covered directly into the Treasury?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. But where the renegotiation results in a reduction in the net cost or price of the commodity or thing being manufactured, that has the effect and result of increasing the appropriation to the department, because they may purchase more of those articles for the amount of money which had actually been appropriated. Is that not true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is right both as to method and effect.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned $4,000,000,000 as the amount of savings, of which about $2,000,000,000 represents actual recovery. Is that true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, approximately.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Of that $2,000,000,000 recovered, a great deal would have come in otherwise through excess-profits taxes? For instance, I have an example in my district of where the recovery ran into hundreds of thousands of dollars and the difference between that and the excess-profits tax was only $10,000. Could the gentleman give us any idea of the actual saving beyond the taxes, caused by renegotiation of contracts?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right along the line of the point raised by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, which have now been in progress for 2 weeks, it is shown that an investigation and survey was made by the National City Bank of New York, certainly not a governmental agency, and that showed that only 70 percent of the excess profits would be collected through the application of the excess-profits-tax law, leaving 30 percent, or nearly one-third not reached by the present excess-profits-tax law.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Information has come to me on that subject that through negotiation with the Government the amount has varied from four-tenths of 1 percent on some corporations to as high as 22 percent on others. Does the gentleman from Missouri think the Congress should step in and fix a limitation within which the renegotiations between the Government could not go in order to leave private industry and business with a sufficient amount of surplus, seed money, so to speak, to undertake peacetime production?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Government pays amply and generously for services rendered. It pays a legitimate and substantial profit on all contracts, taking into consideration every cost of production. But it provides under the renegotiation clause for the recovery of every penny above a normal and reasonable profit. The Government has been enforcing that clause and ought to enforce it, and will continue to enforce it.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that at the close of the war, we will have a public debt of approximately $300,000,000,000. That is so large a sum, its purchasing power is so great, that we cannot even approximate its size, its value, or its purchasing power. But we can reach some faint comprehension of what it means when we are told that it is more than twice the assessed valuation of all the property in the United States; and, while assessed value may be only an index of actual value, it is at least a pertinent figure.

So, taking the estimate at its face value, we will owe at the conclusion of the war, under present prospects, something like twice what we are worth.

Any individual or corporation which owed twice as much as it was worth would be considered to be in a rather precarious financial position, but there is this difference between the position of the Government and the position of such an individual. The individual might possibly, through operations of business and trade, make that sum; but the only way the Government of the United States can reduce its obligation is by taking it from the pockets of the taxpayers.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will require 10 additional minutes.

The United States Government does not repudiate its obligations; it pays its debts and pays them in full. So, all of this enormous sum which has been borrowed must be paid back. And it must be paid from taxes, and for that reason, may we ask the Members of the House to scrutinize carefully from this time forward all proposals for appropriations which are not imperatively essential to the conduct of the war.

Already there are influences asking for appropriations in the annual supply bills, on which we shortly begin hearings. Many of these requests for appropriations are in themselves worthy, and that should not be the consideration governing their disposition. The Committee on Ways and Means is now endeavoring to develop plans for securing additional income—over and above the heavy taxes already levied.

The real question in the consideration of all requests for nonwar appropriations is not whether the money will be well spent, but whether it will be better spent than in the prosecution of the war and the payment of the national debt. A dollar saved is a dollar made, and every dollar unappropriated is a dollar the Treasury will not have to borrow, and a dollar the taxpayers will not have to pay back.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I should like to proceed just a little further, if the gentleman will permit. I shall then be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we initiated the program for infant care and maternity care for the wives of servicemen last March. We provided $1,200,000 for the fiscal year 1943, which was to serve from March until the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1943. For the fiscal year 1944, we provided $4,400,000, which was expected to meet all requirements from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944.

But so great have been the demands upon the States to which the funds were allocated that we are at this early date confronted with an extraordinary deficit of 400 or 500 percent of the amount originally estimated for the entire year. Instead of $4,400,000 taking care of the needs of the program for the fiscal year, we now find we shall require something like $25,000,000 for the year. The estimate, submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, is specifically $18,600,000 for grants to States, and $33,000 for administrative expenses.

This money is to be used to provide prenatal care, obstetrical care, and postpartum care. It involves payment for the services of the physician and the nurse, and hospitalization.

Mr. BOREN and Mr. LANHAM rose.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will yield in just a minute.

Whereas the original law provided for grades 4 to 7 of enlisted men, and the present law provides for all seven grades, an amendment to the pending bill adopted in committee again limits the provisions of the law to grades 4 to 7. According to statistics submitted by the Children's Bureau, the average cost per case is $84.50. The $18,600,000 in addition to the $4,400,000 will take care of a total of 220,000 cases at $84.50 each; but according to the estimates of the Children's Bureau we shall have during the year 238,631 cases; so even appropriating the amount asked for in this estimate will leave a deficit of 18,631 unfinanced cases at the end of the year. It is a new program, however, one in which we have very little data on which to make an

accurate estimate and as it involves factors beyond the range of accurate planning, the committee approves the estimate of $18,600,000 for grants to the States, as submitted by the Bureau. Inasmuch as we have previously made no provision at all for administrative expenses we recommend a cut in the estimate for administrative expenses from $33,000 to $20,000; that is the elimination of two medical consultants requested and provision for the accounting services only to the amount of $20,000.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman give us the assurance that all of the money appropriated through this measure will be used for the purposes enumerated and that none of it is to be used for new services or new facilities? Will the entire expenditure be devoted to looking after these women and children, the wives and children of soldiers in the service and not diverted to any other purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. In the first place the money to be appropriated is to be spent for services only. None will be spent for buildings or capital investments of any kind; it is to be used for services exclusively and will be expended as the gentleman has indicated in accordance with the plan heretofore followed and the law heretofore enacted, with the exception that the committee amendment restricts beneficiaries to wives of enlisted men of grades 4 to 7. Otherwise there will be no changes in the character of service rendered. None of the funds will be diverted to other purposes.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure we all appreciate the distinguished gentleman's discussion this afternoon, although we may differ with him on other matters discussed this afternoon. When we get back to House Joint Resolution 159, we accept the interpretation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and approve the bill and the program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman does not differ with me on the importance of exercising drastic economy at this time in order to take care of heavy obligations already incurred and in order to avoid incurring future nonessential obligations. I hope the gentleman agrees with me on that program.

Mr. McGREGOR. I believe my record in Congress approves that program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the important matter.

Mr. McGREGOR. We are to understand that this bill simply carries an appropriation continuing the existing facilities required to take care of the present program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; as explained to the gentleman from Texas, the joint resolution merely continues the present program and existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I note on page 2 that the bill provides "hospital, maternity, and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States." That excludes the wives and children of officers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Wives and children of commissioned officers are not included.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. The lower commissioned ranks, I would say up to captain, while carrying more money than that paid to an enlisted man, yet these officers have to buy their uniforms and pay for their living expenses. My experience is that from a financial standpoint there is very little difference in pay between an enlisted man and a commissioned officer, especially in the lower brackets.

As the gentleman knows, it was my amendment that raised the pay of the enlisted men in the armed forces to $50 a month. I am rather of the opinion that a discrimination is here being made against the wives and children of the lower grade commissioned officers, especially the lieutenants. As a rule they are the ones to whom these children are being born.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The enlisted man receives $50 a month and whereas the lowest commissioned officer receives $1,800 per annum. He also receives an allowance for quarters for himself and family, and a dependency allowance which the enlisted man does not receive.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. When I was back home during the congressional recess several physicians and doctors approached me regarding this important measure and asked me if there was any danger of the various States stepping in and controlling the persons to whom these funds would be paid. In other words, they feared a tendency toward socialized medicine and that certain doctors would enjoy the privilege of this income and others would be excluded. Can the gentleman enlighten me as to what policy will be followed?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The answer to the gentleman's question should be found in the act itself, in the Labor Social Security Act passed during the last session. There is this provision in that act:

> *Provided*, 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 out of this fund so long as State laws are complied with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 5 additional minutes to answer inquiries.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I have two questions. First, is there anything in the law that requires that application must be made before the child is born? As I understood the law, we put in a fixed date at which time this care would be given. The reason I raise this question is on account of lack of information. So far there are many mothers whose bills have not been paid because, while the child was born within the period of time, yet they did not make application before the child was born, and they are not paid.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For the lowest grades, 4 to 7, inclusive, it is only necessary to make application and care will be authorized. In the first three grades under the law it must be shown that assistance is necesasry.

Mr. BOREN. Of course, I am for this bill. I think this is an obligation that we ought to meet but I want it clearly brought out here, and I hope it is the Committee's opinion, that merely because some individual mother of a private soldier might not know enough about the red-tape procedure to get her application in on time or know where to get an application or how to get an application, that lack of information will not militate against her in the care she will receive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not at all. She may apply at any time.

Mr. BOREN. Suppose she did not know this until a week before the child was born and she wrote to the bureau and they sent back word that she could not be taken care of.

That happens and we ought to make a record right here that will show the departments downtown that we do not intend for that to happen. Now, I have one other question.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. It may not be approved. If the child is first born, then an application made, I do not know what the policy of the Bureau is, I do not know what the law is. As I understand it, an application shall be made before the birth of a child.

Mr. BOREN. We have set an arbitrary date. After that time we intend to pay for the maternal and infant care of every child of a soldier in certain classes that was born after that time. In some of the States at this juncture, because some mother did not know how to go about applying, or on account of lack of information, she is being penalized. I understand also there are at least two States that are not taking advantage of this. Another thing, we do not have anything in here about guaranteeing that this money will not be paid to a midwife. I believe that we need to have some legislation on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say that all of the States have been taken in except the States of Colorado, Louisiana, and North Dakota. Pennsylvania has just recently been approved.

Mr. CELLER. Massachusetts, also.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Colorado made application on the 7th of September and will be shortly approved. North Dakota has given indication she will apply. The only State remaining is Louisiana, and as soon as it applies it will be included. When the wife of any soldier in classes from 4 to 7, makes application, care will be authorized automatically. Above that it will be authorized under the provisions of the law if it is indicated that there is a necessity, in other words that there is need.

Mr. BOREN. I understand that in the bill before us it is contemplated that it will be amended to take care of the cases committed before the date of October 1. Would the Chairman have any objection to removing that word "committed"?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am quite sure we all wish to compliment the members of the Committee on Appropriations on bringing in this very praiseworthy bill, which is a step in the right direction. However, I notice that New York, my State, has a total of authorized cases of but 644. Would that be due, perchance, to the fact that the allotment of $84.50 is woefully inadequate when you consider the standards in New York?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; these grants are made monthly. At the first of every month an allocation is made to the State in proportion to the number of cases which it reports.

In answer to the gentleman's second question, I may say there has been no indication that the amount is inadequate to provide the nursing, medical, and hospital service. The fees vary. As reported to the committee the minimum fee for the physician is $35 and the maximum is $50. There is no information to the effect that any physician has ever failed or refused to serve because of inadequacy of the fee.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. In further answer to the gentleman from New York, I believe that the gentleman will find that, according to the testimony before the committee, New York State has just qualified for this service, consequently the number of cases up to now would be limited.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice that the joint resolution provides for wives and infants of enlisted men. What about the inductees under the draft? They are not excluded?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The terms are synonymous.

Mr. DONDERO. It is meant to include the inductees or draftees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The term "enlisted men" includes inductees.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri, referring again to the question I raised about excluding officers in the lower brackets, that, as I said, it is true that an officer of the rank of second or first lieutenant or captain gets more money than an enlisted man, but these officers have to pay for their uniforms and laundry, and for their own subsistence. There is very little difference in the money they receive at last.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am in warmest accord with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Veterans' Legislation, in his desire to extend the provisions of this bill to benefit every member of the armed forces in need of the service which it affords.

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

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to make any observations whatever on the bill before us. Had not my distinguished colleague from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, indulged in a lengthy laudation of the New Deal and had he not made the observation that he did with reference to political sharpshooting from here on in, I would have refrained from detaining the House at this time.

So that the RECORD may be kept straight, it does seem to me that some observation should be made about the matter of political sharpshooting. It seems to me a coincidence that the gentleman from Missouri should have taken a maternity bill for his purposes. After all, the related subject of birth control could very easily have to do with this maternity problem, but I am afraid that my distinguished friend from Missouri was thinking of "berth" control rather than "birth" control as he spoke of the political sharpshooting from here on in.

I take this occasion to remind my distinguished chairman that it was not necessary for some of us on the minority side to wait until public opinion had crystallized and until public opinion had become vehement in its denunciation of the extravagances of the New Deal to take an economy position. Those of us on the minority side of the aisle had contended for economy in government long before the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to sound his warning of today. I make the claim today that the minority was opposed to the extravagances which had their birth—and that is b-i-r-t-h—in the days when Harry Hopkins felt that the Treasury of the United States should be ladled out for political purposes. We cannot dismiss from our minds Harry's words "spend and spend and tax and tax and elect and elect."

Many of us are exceedingly apprehensive that the leopard has not changed his spots very much. Many of us are of the opinion that while the administration in power may be putting on a front at the present time, while the administration may be assuming a cloak of righteousness to cover the sins of omission and commission, which it now seems willing to admit, nevertheless we still believe that Harry's philosophy dominates and motivates the administration in power.

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

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Due to the fact that my friend Hopkins' name has been brought into this debate, I think the RECORD should show that he has served notice that he is giving up his bed and board at the White House where he has been domiciled at public expense for 4 years.

Mr. DITTER. I had not intended to bring in a personality.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not want to have my motives impugned. I merely want to whitewash Harry Hopkins, and God knows he needs it.

Mr. DITTER. Of course, I would be the last one to impugn the motives of my distinguished and brilliant friend from Minnesota. I was pleading my own cause and acknowledging that inadvertently I might have brought in a personality. I had not intended to do that.

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

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will admit that Harry Hopkins certainly is showing us the way to economy at a great personal sacrifice?

Mr. DITTER. I think that is commendable. After all it is the very thing I have in mind. If berths and boards are to be paid for in the future that have been free in the past, then I say I am for it, and I think that he is to be commended if the gentleman quotes him correctly. But again, to revert to my own plea, I acknowledge that I had not intended to indulge in personalities.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DITTER. Again I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. To say that I am not making that statement as a positive fact, because he has not yet moved.

Mr. DITTER. Then I assume that my friend suggests that it is a hope deferred but not yet fulfilled.

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly.

Mr. DITTER. The New Deal has been guilty in many instances in not performing according to promise, so I suggest, lest my friend have the unhappy experience of not realizing his hopes and ambitions with reference to Harry, that he hold his ultimate decision in abeyance.

Mr. KNUTSON. It may be that this is a case where the pleasure of anticipation is greater than that of realization.

Mr. DITTER. It may be.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, absolutely.

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

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps my colleague from Pennsylvania overlooked one

thing that our mutual friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] wanted to call to the attention of the House, which was that in moving out Harry may be going on his own, striking out for himself, as a person perhaps traveling the unfamiliar road of private enterprise.

Mr. KNUTSON. And certainly no one can object to that.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the debate has taken a turn that I confess I had not intended.

Mr. KNUTSON. And I regret it.

Mr. DITTER. To get back, I had not intended any personal observation. My purpose was to emphasize the point that the philosophy of the New Deal, the philosophy of extravagance and wastefulness is now being rejected by those who entertained it in the past. My purpose in taking the floor was to say to my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that we on the Republican side, the minority group, have not waited for an election year to start sharp-shooting toward economy in government and against extravagance and waste. We are where we were when the extravagance of the New Deal started—opposed to it, and we will continue that opposition down to the end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a very, very happy circumstance permits me today to draw into a close embrace the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. To find him as a kindred spirit today makes this a most happy privilege for me. I tell him that we welcome him to the economy fold. We shall look forward to his support in our efforts to make substantial savings for the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am certain all of us have enjoyed this delightful colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, has never been known to neglect his duties in that capacity or to fail to take advantage of any opportunity to discuss politics and in this instance has not waited for an opportunity. No mention was made in the debate of the New Deal, political sharp shooting, and there was no reference to the minority side, the Republican side, or any other side. In other words, the eloquent observations of our colleague from Pennsylvania, a very affable Member of the House, carries out fully the prophecy made in my opening remarks. I suggested that the credit for the remarkable record made in the Seventy-seventh and the Seventy-eighth Congresses by the Committee on Appropriations was shared equally by all members of that committee, on both sides of the aisle. No differentiation was made. Also that now that a political campaign was in the offing, opportunity would be taken by Members on both sides to make political capital out of minor and unimportant items in, or out, of the supply bills, and criticism of individuals in no way concerned.

Fulfilling this prediction the gentleman has had much to say about Harry Hopkins, as far away from the bill and as far away from the statements made in discussion of the bill as anything could possibly be.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. DITTER. Could the gentleman suggest any closer relativity between renegotiation and maternity needs?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman rises in the name of Harry Hopkins, as far from the subject under discussion as the Antipodes.

Mr. DITTER. But I am speaking of the relativity of the two subject matters. The gentleman from Missouri seems to take exception to the use of the name I mentioned.

Is there any relativity between renegotiation of contracts and birth control or maternity, more than there is this matter we have discussed relating to Harry Hopkins? The gentleman indulged himself at great length on the subject of renegotiation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman define what he had in mind when he spoke?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Into a preliminary discussion reviewing the record of the Committee on Appropriations and urging economy in the coming supply bills, my very good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] seeks to inject politics——

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to make the observation, in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] that in connection with the consideration of this bill it took the power of the public press, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars to compel the Republican Governor of Pennsylvania to make these benefits eligible to the servicemen of our State.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My time has expired. The gentleman is recognized in his own time.

Mr. DITTER. I had hoped the gentleman would take a little more time that I might ask him a question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My time has expired. I shall be glad to answer the gentleman in his own time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let us have harmony, anyway.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed this congressional horseplay this afternoon. It adds a little levity to the situation. It seems to me though, that we are getting at it mighty early in the deliberations of the Congress. In view of the character of the questions that have been asked with reference to the pending resolution and in view of the evident misgivings as to what is contained in this resolution, while I do not criticize at all the things that have transpired, I do feel that we ought to get down to this bill and dispose of it. This bill contains an appropriation of $18,600,000, and most Members here would like to know specifically what there is in this bill; what it does; what the program is; and how the program which we inaugurated some time ago has operated.

If I may say so, I have been exceedingly interested in this program and participated to some extent in its inauguration. I have watched the progress of the work under this bill. I am rather amazed that some of the statements which have been made indicate that there is a definite lack of information in certain parts of the country with reference to the bill.

Now, let us understand right from the start this is a proposal to give to the States allotments of funds, without matching provisions. The funds are to be administered by the States themselves through their State boards of health, under programs set up by the States, subject to the approval f the Children's Bureau. Those regulations set up, which must be complied with in order to secure approval, have been limited by provisions which were inserted, as you recall, in the appropriation bill which was a part of the regular Labor Department and Social Security appropriation bill. Those two provisions were those which were the subject of debate, as you will recall, which prohibited discrimination on the part of the Children's Bureau in setting up regulations which the States are compelled to comply with, which would permit discrimination in the expenditure of these funds as between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics.

The other one was that provision which provided, as I read to the House a few moments ago, that there should be no construction of the act that would prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choosing paid out of this fund, so long as the State laws were complied with.

All the Federal Government says to the States in this program is this:

> Here is a sum of money that Uncle Sam has allotted to your State to be disbursed by officers of your State to the wives of servicemen of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades who are expectant mothers.

That is all there is to it. Now, a mother has a right, under this law, to go to a physician of her own choosing and ask to be taken care of. There are very few mothers, I think, who do not do that. They make their own arrangements. They go to the doctor and there is no physician or person licensed to practice obstetrics in the United States who is not today thoroughly familiar with the provisions of this law. The practitioner must make application in my State to the State board of health for the compensation to be paid for the pre-natal and the post-natal care of the mother

and child. He is then paid along with the hospital bill out of these funds when his claim is approved by the State board of health.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If the physician makes application in your State for these funds, is that physician limited to the amount granted by the State?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, he is limited, of course, to the amount that is set up as the maximum by the provisions of the Children's Bureau. Necessarily so. They have limited the fees that can be paid for the services rendered. Otherwise the sky would be the limit. There would be no limitation on it at all.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As the gentleman states, of course, the amount paid by the Children's Bureau is limited, but as I understand the Children's Bureau also forbids any further amounts being paid for the woman by her friends or relatives, so that she has to go to a ward, even though her friends or her parents could help her get a private bed, and no matter how serious her case is, she cannot do so, because if she takes this amount, she does not comply with the requirements under which she is given this assistance.

As I understand it, that is the thing the medical profession has objected to very strenuously in the operation of this law.

Mr. KEEFE. I have not known of any such objections so far as I have been able to observe in my State. I do not know whether that is the situation that exists in the State of Ohio, but I may say that if the situation does exist in the State of Ohio, it is my opinion that it is due to the action of the State authorities of the State of Ohio and not due to the action of the Federal Government. I will investigate the matter this afternoon, however, and will try and advise the House later in the debate.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know of any valid reason why the medical profession should be opposed to this bill?

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

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceivably see why the medical profession should be opposed to any provision of this bill, because it guarantees to a doctor a fee for the delivery of the child and for caring for the mother and child subsequent and prior to delivery, when he might not otherwise be paid. It also guarantees the hospital that takes care of the child that it will be paid, and thus insures to the wife of the serviceman the decent care that that wife and that child is entitled to. That is all there is to it, and why there should be any medical man who should be in any way objecting to the bill is beyond me. I have never heard any medical man object, but I know that there is a movement on now among medical men to remove the limitations that are imposed on the question of fees. Certain medical men seek to establish a lump sum to cover the whole transaction, and to pay this sum directly to the wife, to be spent as she pleases. Under that proposal she could go to a doctor if she pleased, perhaps go to a hospital if she pleased, or have her baby at home.

I cannot agree with that sort of practice at this time, because in the experiences as I have been able to observe them up to date in my own State, at least, it is working splendidly and has the full and complete approval of the recognized men in the profession in my State and is also serving to meet the condition that was pathetic prior to the time the Government of the United States stepped into this picture.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that in addition to what he has already said about the States, the hospital also must be approved by the State authorities.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. The point that I wanted to make in this matter is this: The Children's Bureau has diligently tried to take this situation out into the States and they have allowed the States to set up their procedure. And I think that is a very commendable thing.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The benefits provided under this act are payable only to enlisted men's wives and not to those of officers? Is that correct?

Mr. KEEFE. That is correct.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin tell us, if he knows, in what way the amounts are allocated generally to the States; is there some measure or formula set up by which that amount is determined?

Mr. KEEFE. The amount is allowed to prospective mothers.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Of enlisted men?

Mr. KEEFE. Of enlisted men, so they take into consideration the prospective number of births that are to take place in the various States.

Mr. Chairman, so that the Members of the House will understand the two amendments that are to be offered to this proposed resolution which have not as yet been discussed, I shall try to explain them so we may know what we are doing when we are voting on a measure that contains an appropriation of $18,600,000. As the bill was originally passed—rather, when the original estimate was presented to the Appropriations Committee—it only provided aid to wives of enlisted men in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades.

As the bill finally came out of the subcommittee it provided for the next three upper grades—that is, to wives of men in the next upper three grades—and some difficulties have been found to exist in that situation which I do not have the time to discuss here now. At least, it was thought sufficient by the full committee, in discussing this matter this morning, to adopt an amendment submitted by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is also a member of the subcommittee that put in the original amendment, including these three upper grades. The amendment now limits the application of this appropriation to wives of enlisted men only in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. Those are the people who cannot afford to provide their own care. There have been some serious advantages taken of this fund that make it necessary to bring this bill back to the proposal as it originally came to the Congress.

Another amendment will be offered that provides that the appropriation may be used in the payment of commitments made prior to October 1, 1943, in the case of wives or infants of enlisted men of grades 1, 2, and 3.

As a matter of fact, allotments have been made by the Children's Bureau to the various States so as to take care of the wives of enlisted men in grades 1, 2, and 3. We could not cut this off sharply; so the amendment that will be offered by the committee provides that after October 1, 1943, there shall be no more commitments by the Children's Bureau to the States to take care of the wives of enlisted men in grades 1, 2, and 3. If this bill passes, amended as I have indicated, it will provide $18,600,000 to be allocated to the States by the Children's Bureau under the provisions of the present law, and thus provide aid to the wives of enlisted men in the lower four grades——

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is designed to take care of the need that has grown out of our war situation, a need that was not being met before the Federal Government stepped into the picture—at least that seemed to be the general impression. Allotments from this $18,600,000 are supposed to be made by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor according to what the need may be expected to be. Births are running at a very high rate; for 1943 they are expected to be 3,000,000 as against a normal of 2,200,000. Of these 3,000,000 it is estimated that 600,000 will be children of men in the armed forces. Within this calendar year probably 25 to 30 percent will have been helped by this type of appropriation. The number who are asking for it is increasing. This perhaps is something to be expected with the tremendous increase in the armed forces at the present time. The program has been established and undoubtedly we must carry it on.

There are, however, some things I think I should say.

I believe the Children's Bureau is reaching out too far in this situation; I think they are attempting too much to hold the control of this situation in Washington. There must, of course, be some checking up and some auditing, but there should not be any more annoyance or interference with the operation of the State health authorities in working out this problem than is necessary. There should be fewer questionnaires than have been required to be filled in by doctors. In some cases they have come to be such a burden that the doctors are thinking they must not become involved in this service. The number of questionnaires they are asked to make out takes too much of their time and energy.

The success of this program is going to rest in the attitude the Children's Bureau takes. If it intends to reach out and make this thing as difficult as possible to administer and as cumbersome as possible with as much overhead as possible it is going to make a failure of the job. If it administers this fund fairly and squarely with as little interference as possible it will be better. I hope that as they approach this problem the Children's Bureau will contract its own administrative operations just as much as possible. They asked for a lot of extra consultants which the committee refused to give them—they have too many already passing on things and we ought to get rid of that sort of incubus.

I had hoped we might have some definite information for the House as to what was being asked. I have in front of me a questionnaire that is required by the Ohio Department of Health which does not seem to be bad. On the other hand I understand that some questionnaires prepared and used in other States are very bad and that they bother the doctors. I understand also that restrictions are being placed on the type of hospital that may be used. I am sure you realize that the success of a job of this kind depends upon the doctors more than upon the hospital if the hospital facilities are clean. It is much better to take these cases to small local hospitals than to try to carry the patient 40 or 50 miles to some other place that is too far to travel. This load should not be thrown upon certain hospitals if others with adequate equipment and facilities are available nearby.

Mr. Chairman, I am going along with this program. I feel, however, they are being provided with a great plenty of money. On the other hand it is much better that we do this than that these people be permitted to become public charges.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask two questions that were raised in my mind by the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin. Do I understand that under the present law if a mother becomes very seriously ill after being confined to the hospital that she cannot be moved from a ward to a private room? Does the law prohibit this?

Mr. TABER. The law does not and I do not believe any regulation does. The law is very specific. If the gentleman will look at the bottom of page 1 and the top of page 2 he will see that it provides as follows:

> To provide, in addition to medical, nursing, and hospital, maternity care, etc., similar services otherwise available.

This indicates very clearly that it means to permit the family of the wife to be properly taken care of under any circumstances.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My other question is this: Does the present law permit the expectant mother to engage any physician she desires, whether he be an M. D., an osteopath, or some other type of practitioner provided the law of the State in which the case occurs licenses that party to practice in this profession?

Mr. TABER. It does. I do not know what the State laws provide, but the law itself, contained in the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill does so provide.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Federal law goes along with the State law, does it?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as one of those who was admonished and reproved by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for deriving a little enjoyment from a discussion which might not have been strictly pertinent to this bill, permit me to say in extenuation that a little relaxation is not harmful at times. Day after day, and sometimes far into the evening, some of us are engaged in the pleasurable task of trying to do something for our constituents by consulting various departments and sometimes some of us grow a little downhearted, may it be said, even discouraged, we feel a little depressed, because this department or that—one or the other—is taking away from our constituents their means of livelihood or the help which they need in storing or shipping, or on the farm, or their opportunity to get priorities for machinery or the tools which they must have if they are to carry on their business and pay their taxes. Grape, onion, celery, and apple growers are all finding it difficult to get the cost of production or to market their crops.

So I hope the gentleman will pardon some of us if sometimes we, in his opinion, lose dignity, if at times we seem to stray away for a moment from the business of the House, because we realize that we will be called back again and our noses put on the grindstone, and when the gentleman explains these bills so clearly, so completely, as he always does when he takes the floor, no harm is really done because we can follow his leadership without question and be sure that we are right.

There is no real opposition to this bill. Even one who has voted for economy so consistently as has the Member from the Fourth District, not the Fifth, the Fourth District of Michigan, I can go along with this bill and with the appropriation because it seeks to do something for the wives and for the children of our soldiers.

No one in the House would fail of the opportunity, especially, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, in a campaign year to vote so as to help most anyone in his district. Certainly we cannot go back on the soldiers or their wives or their offspring. For myself, it is indeed a pleasure to be able to vote once for the expenditure of some Federal funds which will go for the benefit of American citizens.

We have been giving away hundreds of millions of dollars, yes, billions of dollars, not only to those who came and asked for it but to those who by invitation and by the request of men like Hopkins and others are asked to come and get it or to sit still, and we will take it to them. Hence it is that today I am glad to be able to vote for the expenditure of American taxpayers' money for the benefit of American citizens. That is somewhat unusual for the New Deal; it is something that does not happen very often, and when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] seems to feel concerned about the chairman of the Republican congressional committee, let me say that I, too, feel for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. He has done a magnificent job.

The expert on figures, the chairman of this great Appropriations Committee, has evidently forgotten the figures which came up during the last election, and if our chairman has failed to do all that should be done, let us bear in mind that he has not had the Federal Treasury at his disposal; he has not had hundreds of thousands of official positions in which he could place political hack writers; he has not had the Federal Treasury where, if he wanted to sell a bond, he could put on a billboard the likeness of the candidate for the fourth term and so receive all of that political aid which the present administration gets. So do not criticize our chairman. He is doing a good job. If the new dealers will just continue to cut away, to cut out from under our home folks, the foundation upon which our whole war effort rests, the next election will produce the result we want.

That is an exorbitant price to pay; it is a ruinous price, and my fear is that, if they continue along the present lines, the country will be completely ruined, our citizens impoverished.

The objective of this bill is good. The purpose is to aid the serviceman's wife who is about to become a mother. No one will vote to deny that aid.

It does seem to me, however, that the bill should be broader, more comprehensive; that the WAVES, the WAC's, and other women in the various branches of the service should be given the opportunity for similar benefits.

Just as the soldiers and the sailors and the marines, thousands of them, will marry after going into the service, so, too, the WAVES, the WAC's, and other servicewomen will fulfill the destiny which is theirs and marry. Some of them will marry civilians, and eventually thousands of them will become mothers.

Is there any reason why the benefits carried in this bill should not be extended to those women? They, too, are in the service of their country. It is a little surprising to me that those who drafted this bill forgot that WAVES and WAC's and other servicewomen marry and have children by fathers who are not in the service.

Let us include them in this bill or let the committee send in additional legislation to remedy the oversight.

Mr. TABER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the proposed legislation we have before us—House Joint Resolution 159—is very important, badly needed, and I intend to vote for it. However, there are some wrongs in this legislation which I should like to see corrected.

The way the present program is set up and administered is not working in the best interests of the expectant mothers and wives of the soldiers.

The Children's Bureau here in Washington must give final approval to all State plans to take care of these cases. This means virtually that the Children's Bureau sets up the whole program. This program should be completely divorced from the Federal bureaucracy. It should be entirely under the jurisdiction of the States themselves.

Furthermore, the amounts allotted for maternal and infant care should be paid to the expectant mothers directly. They should then be allowed to use the funds in the manner they think best and employ a physician of their own choice. They should be permitted to select their own hospital, so long as it is a hospital licensed to do obstetrical work, or they should be permitted to have their babies in their own homes, should they elect to do so.

The argument will be made that under conditions like this the money allotted for their care might not be so used properly—might be spent on other objects. The answer to this is we should place more trust in these women than that.

I practiced medicine for many years and I am quite sure this would work out satisfactorily and would be more practical.

Just now, when Congress is confronted with an attempt to socialize medicine and a lot of other things which the Wagner-Murray bill provides for, we should be especially careful and not grant any more powers to the Children's Bureau, or to any other Federal bureau that might use them to extend Federal control over the practice of medicine.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, the Federal Government does not attempt to regulate and supervise a man as to the way he spends his uniform allowance or some other allowance given him by the Government. Does the gentleman know of any reason why the Federal Government has to come into Ohio and interfere with the way Ohio supervises grants for infant and maternity care?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There is no answer to that except this: It simply provides an opportunity for a group of people to set up more bureaucratic control over our people.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JEFFREY. Is it not true that under the existing law a mother, no matter whether or not her condition may be unusually severe, is precluded from paying anything extra and thereby getting the extra care and attention she needs?

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, the resolution before us provides for an appropriation of $18,620,000 to help take care of the wives of our soldiers and sailors in maternity cases in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades; that would give aid to the wives of buck privates, privates first class, technicians fifth grade, corporals, technicians fourth grade, and line sergeants of the Army, and similar grades in the Navy and Marine Corps, where this aid is necessary and desired.

This program was initiated in March 1943. It was believed at that time that 52,000 wives of servicemen would take advantage of this law before June 30, 1944, and it was further estimated that there would be 300,000 wives of soldiers and sailors in these grades who would give birth to children during the fiscal year June 30, 1944, and that 25 percent of these wives would apply for this care. A later checking shows that the number of pregnant wives would be 645,000, and that about 50 percent would apply for this care, and, therefore, instead of having 75,000 in a single year, there would be approximately 300,000, and this corrected estimate makes it necessary to provide for 300,000, instead of 75,000, for the present fiscal year which accounts for the additional $18,620,000 carried in this resolution. This law will take care of the doctor bills, hospital and nurse charges, and average about $84.50 per case for both prenatal and postpartum care. This service is supervised by the State board of health of each of the respective States. Each wife has the right to select her own physician and hospital. The Federal Government merely provides the State authorities with the funds to pay the reasonable and usual charges for such services, and as heretofore pointed out the average cost for medical, nurse, and hospital care is $84.50 per case. There may be some who would criticize this expenditure. I am glad to give this resolution my wholehearted support. In my service in the House and in the Senate, I have always placed the defenders of our country and their dependents as a group of Americans first. We owe those who are now defending us on the 5 continents, the 7 seas, and the islands of the seas of the world, a debt of gratitude that we cannot fully repay. Our soldiers and sailors everywhere throughout the earth are doing a wonderful job. They have all of our enemies on the run. Their patriotic zeal, their heroism, and their skill in battle on land, sea, and in the air, have not been surpassed by the soldiers or sailors of any nation in the history of the world. They are upholding the finest and best traditions of our Army and Navy. They are far removed from their families and friends. They have given up the opportunities to make money or to advance their education and training in civil life. Millions of them are offering to give, and hundreds of thousands of them have and will give, their lives and health and their limbs for us. They should have no worries that their wives and offspring are not receiving tender and the very best scientific care in this great adventure in the lives of their wives and their new-born offspring.

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. That was the fundamental ground submitted when this program was initiated last year. The Congress was sold on the idea that we were taking two, three, four, or five million soldiers across the seas; so, in order to relieve them of any anxiety as to what would happen to their wives who were expectant mothers, the appropriation was made originally of $1,200,000. It was thought that 30,000 or 40,000 needy cases would be covered by that fund.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We want them to know that they are fighting for a grateful Republic, a country worthy of their courage and patriotism. I wish to repeat that I am happy to have an opportunity to speak and vote for this most worthy measure.

CUT DOWN WASTE AND INEFFICIENCY

The debate on the resolution before us has been most heartening. Mr. CANNON, Democrat of Missouri, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, told us a few minutes ago that the records show, and this is a fact, that Congress has appropriated approximately $330,000,000,000 for war purposes for the present World War No. 2, and that it was his opinion that when this war ends our national debt will have reached the astronomical sum of at least $300,000,000,000, and he further stated that the assessed value of all of the property of every kind and character in the United States is approximately $150,000,000,000. This statement is borne out by the records of the United States Census Bureau.

In other words, the records of the United States Census Bureau show the

assessed value in all the counties, in every State of the Union, is approximately $150,000,000,000. This includes property of every kind and character whatsoever owned and possessed by the American people—real, personal, mixed property, also all tangible and intangible property. This, of course, includes real estate, buildings of all kinds, railroads, factories, shops, mines, dwelling houses, farms, livestock, poultry, money, stocks, bonds, securities, notes, in fact, everything that the citizens, partnerships, and corporations are required under the laws of the various States of the United States to list for taxation, and these lists include exemptions of all taxpayers. The laws of the several States require that these assessment lists be sworn to, and, therefore, the distinguished Chairman points out that our national debt at the close of the war will be twice as much as the assessed value of all the property in the United States of every kind and character. The report of the Treasury Department yesterday showed that the deficit for 1 year next preceding September 20th is approximately $70,000,000,000. In other words, after deducting all the enormous taxes collected by the Government and its other sources of revenues and income during the past year, our Government spent $70,000,000,000 more than it took in. The records of the Treasury Department show that the total cost of World War No. 1 from the time it began on April 6, 1917, up to and including November 11, 1918, the date of the Armistice, was $21,000,000,000. The deficit of this Nation for the last year is nearly two and one-half times the total cost of World War No. 1 up to the armistice. This Seventy-eighth Congress met on January 6, 1943; when it recessed on July 8, 1943, after 6 months and 2 days, the Congress had appropriated more than $130,000,000,000, and we are still adding to that sum. This Congress appropriated in 6 months and 2 days nearly six and one-half times the cost of World War No. 1 up to and including the date of the Armistice, November 11, 1918.

At the close of World War No. 1, which included the debt at the time we entered the war, and the debt created for a year or more after the war, our national debt was approximately $26,000,000,000. If Chairman CANNON and others are correct in their predictions that our national debt at the end of the war will be at least $300,000,000,000 then our national debt will be nearly 12 times what it was after World War No. 1. Chairman CANNON urges the Congress to economize whenever, and wherever, possible to do so. The Republican Members of the House applaud the high purpose of the chairman. We have been urging the Congress and this administration to economize for the last 10½ years. Of course, the Republicans favor the appropriation and expenditure of every dollar necessary to win the war at the earliest moment possible. That must be the first objective of the Congress and the administration and the American people. The tax and bond money of the American people should not be wasted or spent for nonessentials, and appropriations for the civil functions of our Government should be pared to the bone This policy must be adhered to rigidly if we would preserve a sound financial policy and the credit of the Nation. We must bear in mind always the tremendous burden that is now being borne by the taxpayers of the Nation. All of our people are now paying taxes in some form. The administration is constantly seeking to find ways to impose new taxes and increase taxes. They should give more attention to find ways to cut out nonessentials, frauds, waste, inefficiency, and cut down instead of consistently increase the number of Federal officeholders which now exceeds 3,200,000, as compared to approximately 950,000 in World War No. 1, and as urged by Mr. Baruch, a high authority in the administration, to cut out the cost-plus contracts, conserve manpower, and reduce the cost of government.

Among the criticisms that I found in my district and in the State of Kentucky during the recess were the waste of the people's tax and bond money, the waste of manpower, the excessive number of persons employed by the Government, and these cost-plus Government war contracts. The cost-plus contract was found in World War No. 1 to be a fertile field for waste, fraud, and inefficiency, and the hope was expressed that this Nation would never indulge in a policy of that kind again, but we find it more prevalent in this war than in the other war. The more the contractor spends, the bigger his profits. I have heretofore denounced, and I denounce again, such a policy, and it is heartening that Mr. Bernard Baruch, this high administration official, after investigation, makes this fearless denunciation of this policy and the waste of manpower and money by the administration to the President. I have received reports from timekeepers and others in the munitions plants and other governmental agencies, and they pointed out how these wasteful and fraudulent practices were being carried on. The Truman committee and other committees of the House and the Senate rendered a splendid service in exposing the cost-plus contracts and the waste of manpower and money by the Government itself.

Another general complaint I found was the unnecessary and useless regimentation of private business and the daily lives of the people themselves. There was a general feeling that the policies of this administration and the bureaucrats were hampering free private enterprise in such a way as to put out of business hundreds of thousands of small business concerns, and to add greatly costs of operation to all others. The American people are almost a unit in their desire to do everything within their power to win the war, but they do resent bitterly the squandering of their tax and bond money, and the unnecessary, and in many cases unconstitutional interference with the conduct of their business activities and individual actions. This tremendous national debt causes many of them to inquire if these bonds will ever be paid.

I had that question propounded to me many times by patriotic citizens who have given sons and daughters in the service of our country and who are paying taxes and buying bonds to the limit. The only response I could make to them was that our Nation had never repudiated its obligations. I further urged them that I was buying bonds, and that I was sure that many of them who were buying bonds had sons and daughters in some branch of our armed forces, and that their sons and daughters, as well as my son and millions of others must have food, clothing, shelter, arms, planes, bombers, bombs, ships, and other war supplies with which to fight and win the war, and I believe that the American people as a whole who are paying taxes and buying bonds are not buying them as a matter of profit and investment but as a matter of patriotic duty, and will continue to do so provided their taxes and bond money are not squandered and wasted, but that this money is necessary and will be used in an efficient and honest way to win the war, and their activities in industry and on the farm and in their private life will not be restrained or interfered with, only to the extent that it is necessary to promote the war effort; and, furthermore, that the Government will not be the chief hoarder and waster of the manpower of this Nation. As pointed out by Chairman McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, over 300,000 single men and married men without children within the draft age and in good health are on the pay roll of the Government as civilian employees, and at the same time the administration is insisting on drafting more fathers. Our war effort, the farms, and industry, need these able-bodied young men, especially when it is clear to everyone who has studied the situation that the Government has at least a million more Federal officeholders than necessary to carry on efficiently the activities of this Government and these defense plants. It has been asserted by persons who ought to know, and those who have made a careful investigation of the subject, that there are more than 3,000,000 unnecessary persons on the pay rolls of the Government and in these defense plants where they are operating on the cost-plus contracts, and under the policy that the more they spend in producing these war materials the more profit they make.

Let us give the taxpayers and the bond and stamp buyers a break. Our war effort should be streamlined. Production on the farms and in our factories and in the mines should be increased, and final victory hastened. Millions of servicemen whose lives have been interrupted by the war want to get the war over and be returned to their homes and loved ones, and millions of fathers, mothers, wives, and children are hoping and praying for their return.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I think I am one of the last men in the House eligible to have any

aspersions cast at him for having failed to back up every measure that has gone through for the defense of our allies and the defense of this Nation. In fact I have voted for every dollar ever appropriated for the United Nations since this war began. For that reason, I feel particularly qualified at this time to be able to support and vote for a measure which takes care of the dependent wives and children of our men in the service.

Ever since the Selective Service Act of 1940 was passed, this Congress—and I think this can be said to its credit—has stood for doing everything possible to aid and succor and abet those persons who are engaged in defending this great Nation against the aggressor.

I know of no measure which has come before the Congress more important to the lives of the servicemen and to the welfare of those who have been left behind. I for one am glad that the day has come when this House approves a measure which will take care of those dependent wives who are expectant mothers. I thank God I am here to vote for this aid to those wives of servicemen who are doing everything they can, while their husbands are away, to maintain their American homes which are the backbone of our country. All praise to those patriotic women working for the victory which is just as certain to come as that the sun rose this morning.

Doubtless, our armed forces will soon be augmented by the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Already countless other fathers have been taken. Many of the wives who have been left behind are already expecting further additions to their families. It seems to me that those fathers who are departing for the fighting fronts all over the world will leave for the front in a much happier state of mind and have their morale greatly strengthened if they know that their wives are assured of maternity care and that their loved ones will be looked after.

I have heard several statements this afternoon by various Members expressing concern over the expenditures of a great many dollars for the war effort and for the Federal Government. Personally, I feel that during the consideration of a measure of this kind is a poor time to raise that question. I think the sky is the limit for the men in the service and for their families. If we can vote eighteen billions to foreign countries in the twinkling of an eye, it seems to me we can afford to vote eighteen millions for maternity and infant care of those wives and families of our soldiers, sailors, and marines.

I hope the Congress will continue to do its best for the great Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States. Their morale will be buoyed up if they know their families and loved ones are being cared for in their absence. In the future I cannot back the other measures that will come before the House from time to time which provide the sending of billions of dollars to nations across the sea half as enthusiastically as I have backed them unless this measure is passed today. I hope Congress will give approval to this measure, and I am sure that we will all be very glad when it has been passed, for we will be doing our duty to our men in service, their wives, and children.

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

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to give my support to this resolution, which has for its purpose the making of additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces. The resolution carries an appropriation for this purpose of $18,600,000, $20,000 of which is allocated to salaries and expenses in administration. When this matter was up before us last year, there was no experience available upon which to base an estimate as to the amount that would be required for this worthy purpose. The armed forces have been growing by leaps and bounds and from day to day increased numbers are going overseas, and the wives of enlisted men are left here at home, without the protection of their husbands and in many cases without financial resources with which to meet emergency cases such as those covered by this bill. It has now been found that the appropriation provided for this emergency, which was in the sum of $1,200,000 for the months of April, May, and June of the fiscal year 1943, is wholly insufficient. During these three months approximately 16,300 cases were authorized to receive this care. The appropriation for the present fiscal year of 1944, commencing July 1 of this year and ending June 30, 1944, was granted in the Labor Department Appropriation Act in the sum of $4,400,000. It has been determined that the average cost per case for the entire United States is $84.50. This appropriation of $4,400,000, on this basis, would take care of 52,000 cases, and with the 33,000 cases already allowed, the funds available for September are not likely to be sufficient. The Children's Bureau estimates that when all States which have approved plans can place them in operation the number of applications per month will approximate 25,000. The committee, after having given this matter careful consideration, is of the opinion that the amount carried in this resolution will be sufficient with sums heretofore appropriated to meet the expenses to be incurred under the program.

As shown by the committee report, there are a number of States which had not yet perfected their programs by August 31, 1943, so as to bring themselves within the provisions of the act, notably my own State of Oregon, as well as Georgia, Louisiana, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Texas, as well as Puerto Rico. I have a number of communications from veterans' organizations in my own State, advising that the program has now been arranged and is all ready for putting into effect, but the State officials are advised that by reason of the exhaustion of the appropriation there will be no funds available with which to carry out the program within the State of Oregon. Under leave granted, I include the following correspondence I have received from Mr. Fritz Nissen, adjutant, American Legion, Department of Oregon, and from June W. Valiant, executive secretary of the War Veterans' Service Committee for Oregon:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
September 17, 1943.

Congressman HOMER ANGELL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are interested in the hearing before Congressman CANNON asking for appropriations for maternity and infant care, wives and infants of enlisted men. Oregon State Board of Health has just completed arrangements for handling these cases beginning October 1. If funds are denied for this purpose it will create a bad situation in Oregon because of advanced publicity given. We are already receiving many calls and many of the young wives are desperate. Please do what you can for us.

AMERICAN LEGION DEPARTMENT
OF OREGON,
FRITZ NISSEN, *Adjutant.*

WAR VETERANS SERVICE COMMITTEE,
Portland 4, Oreg., September 17, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANGELL: The State of Oregon, through the State board of health, has completed a plan for maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces which has been approved by the Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, and the board of Health has just completed arrangements for handling these cases beginning October 1.

The State board of health has estimated the sum of $400,000 of these Federal funds will be necessary to carry out this program in Oregon for the next 9 months. Such estimates are based upon the number of childbirths to the wives of those in the service and the number of applications for assistance on hand.

This morning the State board of health received a wire from Washington, D. C., to the effect that funds for this purpose are exhausted, so we of Oregon are to be denied this service because of the lack of funds, and I also understand the State of California will have to suspend this service after October 1 because of the failure to have funds available beyond that period.

This morning a press release indicates Congressman CANNON has before his committee a bill asking for additional appropriations and that public hearings will be held on this bill September 27. Congressman CANNON indicated every effort will be made to secure additional appropriations prior to October 1 so there would be no cessation of this service after that date.

I am writing you at this time to urge you to give serious consideration to this very worthy cause, and ask you to not only support the bill to appropriate these funds, but to urge its early enactment and seriously consider a larger appropriation. If action is not taken immediately many of the wives of these enlisted men in the service will be deprived of proper medical attention during prenatal period and will have to look to charity for funds necessary for the birth of their children.

This office is being besieged with calls for information on what is going to be done, any many of these wives are desperate.

Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JUNE W. VALIANT,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of appearing before the Appropriations Committee hearing this matter, urging the approval of this appropriation, and I want to commend the committee for its wisdom in giving its approval to this appropriation and bringing the matter before us with the dispatch that it has, in order that these funds may be made available for this most worthy purpose, and I trust that the resolution will pass by the unanimous vote of this body.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, every conceivable type of red herring, from Harry Hopkins' residence in the White House to matters concerning the farm problem, has been brought into this argument. The one question before this House today is, How will you use your judgment? Are you more interested in the purse strings around the American pocketbook, or are you interested in maternity care, particularly of the wives of the soldiers carrying the battle for us today? Do you want the men at the front worried about the condition of their wives at home, or do you want to talk about what the cost of this program will be? For my part, I think this is one of the most progressive and one of the most understanding steps that we have taken in this body in a long time. We had just better get down to business and vote the appropriation.

Later, when we go back into the House, I am going to ask permission to put into the RECORD a little pamphlet that was given to the committee yesterday when this matter was very ably presented to us, The Emergency Maternity and Infant Care for Wives and Infants of Enlisted Men in the Armed Forces.

Looking after our own. Here we are with a manpower shortage all over the Nation and still giving the wink and the bypass to the birth controllers, those people who tear at the very roots of America. We hear the cry today from every housetop, we hear it from the mountains, and it rumbles in the valleys, "Give us men; give us men." Like the sentiment expressed in Joyce Kilmer's poem:

You cannot build a tree in a day:
Neither can you build a man.

The following is quoted from a pamphlet issued by the United States Department of Labor entitled "Emergency Maternity and Infant Care for Wives and Infants of Enlisted Men in the Armed Forces":

Maternity care for wives of enlisted men in military service, and medical and nursing care for their babies can now be provided without cost to the family through State health departments under plans approved by the Children's Bureau.

Under this program a pregnant woman may receive prenatal care. At childbirth she may receive obstetric and nursing care whether she stays at home or goes to a hospital. Complete maternity care may be provided, including a final physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. The baby may receive medical and hospital care during the first year of life.

WHO CAN RECEIVE CARE

In States providing these services, the wife and infant of any enlisted man serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard are eligible for care as long as similar services are not readily available through medical or hospital facilities of the Army or Navy. How long the wife has lived in the State does not matter. No period of residence is required. Race or color does not matter.

In expending the funds the State health agencies will make the service available to families of all men in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades who request it.

HOW TO APPLY

Forms for requesting care are made available by the State health departments through local health and welfare agencies, local American Red Cross chapters, prenatal clinics, military posts, and through local practicing physicians.

The wife fills out and signs her part of the application, including her husband's serial number. Her doctor completes and signs the application and forwards it to the State director of maternal and child health or his authorized deputy. The form includes a statement by the doctor (or hospital) that the services authorized will be rendered for the amount paid by the State health department without payment from the patient or the family.

In an emergency, care may be given by a physician or in a hospital before an application is sent in. However, the application should be completed as soon as possible and forwarded to the State health agency.

The State director of maternal and child health promptly notifies the patient and attending physician or clinic and the hospital (if the patient is going to a hospital) whether or not the care is authorized.

WHAT SERVICES THE PATIENT CAN EXPECT

In States providing these services:

Complete maternity service during the prenatal period, childbirth, and 6 weeks thereafter—including care of complications, operations, postpartum examination—and medical care for the newborn infant.

Health supervision for infants, usually provided in child-health conferences.

Nursing care, in the home, through the local health department, including bedside nursing care as necessary—for the mother, before, during, and after childbirth, and for the baby during the first year of life.

Hospital care for maternity patients and infants, paid for by the State health agency at ward rates. The funds cannot be used in part payment for more expensive hospital accommodations. A minimum stay in the hospital of 10 days after childbirth is arranged if possible. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospital, including Army and Navy hospitals, whose maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State health agency.

Aviation cadets in both the Army and the Navy are considered enlisted men and hence are eligible for services under the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program. In the Army they are not in the regular pay grades and are not eligible for dependency benefits or allowances. In the Army students in training to become cadets are as a rule in the seventh pay grade; they are eligible for services under the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program. In the Navy aviation cadets are considered to be in the fourth pay grade for the purpose of allowances. The Marine Corps does not have aviation cadets and students. The Coast Guard does not have air cadets; it has a flight-training program and men in training are in the various pay grades.

For information about the program, write to your director of maternal and child health, State health department.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, under the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, namely:

Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): For an additional amount for grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States, under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, $18,600,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "men", insert "of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, instead of striking out some of the men in the lower grades I propose, if this amendment is voted down, to offer an amendment to include officers.

There is very little financial difference in the income of the enlisted man, especially the noncommissioned officer, and a first or second lieutenant, when you take into consideration the fact that the enlisted man gets all of his clothes, all of his board and other necessary expenses paid, while the commissioned officer has to pay for his own uniforms, his own laundry, and has to pay his own board.

I know of my own knowledge of numbers of these young officers who have gone into the service, especially young aviators, without a thing in the world. They do not have much if any more left at the end of the month than one of the enlisted men. Their wives should not be excluded from the provisions of this bill.

I think my record here will show that the enlisted men have not had a better friend in this House than I have been and am now. As I said a moment ago, it was my amendment that raised their base pay up to $50 a month. I had to fight that amendment through this House twice and then through a conference and then assist our friends in the Senate in order to get it adopted. But I think when you cut off these young officers merely because they have commissions, you are doing them a grave injustice.

Remember the commissioned officers are doing more of the real fighting in this war than they ever have before, and especially in the Air Force.

I know that some men will say that if you are going to include lieutenants and captains you ought to include majors, colonels, and generals. But those officers as a rule in the higher ranks are able to take care of this expense, and besides very few of them have children born to them because as a rule they are older men. But if you strike out these noncommissioned officers—that is what this amendment does—I think you will make a serious mistake, and if you leave out the commissioned officers in the lower ranks I think you will be making a serious mistake.

I submit that this amendment should be voted down, and then we should adopt the amendment which I shall offer to include the word "officers," in order that we may make no unjust discrimination against these young men, many of whom have wives at home who are struggling along with all the worries and difficulties that they have, trying to rear their children on the meager allowance and incomes they now receive.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be voted down and my amendment to include the commissioned officers should be adopted.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I proposed this amendment to the Appropriations Committee this morning only because when we were having hearings on this particular point before the Department of Labor and Federal Security subcommittee, the question arose as to how far we should go in making these provisions for wives of enlisted men, and it was upon the earnest representations of the Children's Bureau that we included the first, second, and third grades.

The first grade would be master sergeant; the second, the first and technical sergeant; and in the third, the staff sergeant. They assured us that those cases involving these three grades would be dealt with only in cases of extreme emergency and necessity.

I was not too happy with that solution. This summer I spent some time trying to find out how it was working. If other Members have made investigations, well and good, but I assure you that I investigated a number of cases and in not one single case was there any showing of necessity. This was just something handed out again to many individuals in the armed services in direct violation of congressional intent.

I want to say to you that when a man is receiving, as a master sergeant, $150 a month, plus uniform and plus quarters, that he ought to go to a doctor and pay the bill himself. The very thing that we have been hearing about the medical profession and about the cases where we try to assist is that the men should go to a doctor and make the proper arrangements for the birth of the child when he is getting that much money. We were supposedly trying to take care of the hardship cases.

As the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, the original legislation was based on the fact that men might be sent out of the country and might be worrying about what is going to happen to their wives at the time of the birth of the child. It was to relieve their minds of that worry that this legislation was passed. It has worked completely differently in many instances from what was intended by the committee. People have come in and tried to take advantage of this situation. It has resulted in some chaos.

I cannot argue against what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has said, because the pay of a second lieutenant and even that of a first lieutenant and the pay of a master sergeant are not really very different. But there is a problem that needs to be met. Something the Appropriations Committee and this Congress tried to do has been distorted out of what Congress wanted done, and in trying to correct that situation I have offered an amendment to put it back where it was.

I assure you it was only done after an investigation of the situation; it was only done after conferences with Red Cross representatives and discussions with them; it was only done after a full discussion with the medical profession concerning the problem we are trying to take care of, a situation that I find is being abused and which should be stopped.

The only way to safeguard the rights of the servicemen, and to make it possible for them during time of war to meet unusual demands, is to take care of the emergencies and difficulties when they arise. What I had in mind by this amendment was to bring the situation back to the true intent of Congress.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that the men who are able to pay their own bills, as a rule, do not resort to the benefits provided in this legislation?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to say from personal investigation, that has not always been the case. I found cases where men have substantial means of their own, master sergeants, and were able to provide their own doctors who did not, but who took advantage of the provisions of this law. I think that is a bad situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that from a monetary standpoint a man might be better off financially to be a master sergeant than if he were a first or second lieutenant?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I just admitted that; but he is no better off to be a private, and the ones we are trying to help at this time are the privates and the corporals.

Mr. RANKIN. In my opinion, there is not very much difference in the amount of money that ultimately comes to either a private soldier or the officers in the lowest brackets in the commissioned grade at the end of the month when clothes and subsistence are taken out of the officer's pay; especially is this so in the case of the first and second lieutenants.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That may be; but what I was trying to do was to get this bill back to the way we originally presented it. It came to the Congress and certain representations were made to the Congress; certain things were done by the Congress in the furtherance of that, and I think it is now our duty to put it back where we once had it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request to limit debate?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman's request include all debate on the entire bill? I do not know which paragraph we are considering.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The second paragraph.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that pertains only to the first paragraph and not the whole resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The second paragraph.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. How many paragraphs are there?

Mr. TABER. Three.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DAIRY SITUATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is a desperate situation in the dairy business and something must be done to adjust it, but let us get our definitions straight as to where the responsibility is in regard to that matter. If the President—executive department—should increase the price of milk, the law of October 2, 1942, could be read and the Executive accused of violating a mandate of the Congress, because in that second Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, we said that it was the duty of the President to hold the line and to stabilize the cost of living, wages, salaries, and prices as of September 15, 1942. This we are told the President is trying to do; so now if he were to take the power and authority to raise prices in individual cases critics could accuse him of violating a mandate of the Congress.

The President, through Mr. Marvin Jones, the Food Administrator, in whom we have great confidence, has offered a solution to this dairy problem, and that is to pay subsidies to take care of the dairy farmers so that the price of milk would be kept down and the mandate of Congress carried out as we expressed it in that law. I do not like subsidies,

ordinarily I am opposed to them, but in this particular case in this emergency I am willing to accept them. We must save the dairy business; we cannot afford to let these dairies go out of business, and since the executive department has offered this subsidy as a remedy those of us who do not agree that the subsidy is the right remedy but that we should have a price increase should just get together and offer a bill to increase the price of milk; then if the legislative department of our Government goes on record as being in favor of an individual price increase that is a matter for us to do. So I suggest if that is the solution that you either accept the subsidies and say that they will save the dairy business or those who are not willing to do it get together and offer a bill to increase the price of milk that would take care of it. The only other way would be to reduce and stabilize the price of cattle feed, which no one to my knowledge is advocating.

The situation is so desperate that we must do something now. The first price-control bill was based upon the theory that we could select certain commodities and keep prices down. That did not work. The next Price Control Act, that of October 2, 1942, was across the board to include wages, salaries, prices, and especially prices relating to the cost of living, and we told the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942. If that line is not held, Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen in this country? If we let prices go up then, of course, wages and salaries must go up, and if we increase wages and salaries 10 percent that means a $10,000,000,000 annual increase. We already have $45,000,000,000 excess purchasing power floating around over the country now for this year looking for something to buy. If we increase it by $10,000,000,000 that would make the situation relative to curbing inflation a much more difficult one. We can, I suggest, if we do not hold the line in some way, but let prices go up, let wages and salaries go up, we can have ruinous inflation today in America. We know that in countries like China and Russia a half pint of milk costs $7.50, if you can buy it at all; a suit of clothes costs $400 or $500; a loaf of bread $1.25. It can happen here the same as it happened there, and then our middle class, the people who built this country in time of peace and the people who furnish the manpower to save it in time of war, will be entirely wiped out. So, in order to protect the people who really represent the backbone of this country, we have got to stop and prevent runaway or ruinous inflation. There is only one way to do it, and that is to hold the line against price and wage increases as well as wage and salary increases, and prevent this type of inflation that will be hurtful to this country. At the same time we must give the farmers a good price as a matter of justice to the farmer and to encourage production, but at the same time we must prevent inflation.

I suggest those who are not willing to agree to a subsidy present a bill for a price increase or a feed-price decrease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have been reading what I think is the unpublished hearings on this bill, the testimony of Miss Lenroot and Dr. Eliott. In connection with what they had to say and what our colleague from New Mexico has said, I wish to ask the gentleman from New Mexico one or two questions and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] some questions.

If I understood the gentleman from New Mexico correctly, he is offering the amendment for this service to cover the wives and infants of enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then do I understand the gentleman also to say that he feels this amendment should be adopted so as to remove from present practices that which in his mind runs contrary to the intent of the law in that this class of servicemen are receiving aid in the form of, we will say, special cases?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I simply said that the original intent of Congress was to cover four, five, six, and seven, but that limitation has been taken off in the last Labor-Federal Security bill on the assurance they would be used only in hardship cases, but every case now is a hardship case. The only alternative is to remove the permission.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That clears up a big question in my mind. I was going on the assumption this amendment broadened the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No. It restricts, and puts it back where Congress really wants it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that is true I am certainly in favor of the amendment. May I ask the gentleman from New York this question with respect to the benefits which go to men who are commissioned officers: What do they receive in the way of family allowances which help to bring their effective pay in line where they can afford to take care of such expenses?

Mr. TABER. Of course, enlisted men are not officers. Officers receive subsistence and rental allowances which are very substantial, and while it may not be enough to pay their living expenses entirely it helps very materially along that line. I cannot offhand give the figures, but I know that those figures are very substantial.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is a military operation with which I am not too familiar, but can the gentleman tell me whether or not these officers receive those allowances in addition to the cash pay they receive?

Mr. TABER. They do. It is paid in cash. The allowances are paid in cash and they are in addition to the regular salary and longevity pay.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question? He spoke of the pay of the enlisted men being so much and the pay of the officers being so much. Did he have in mind allowing the officers these additional allowances which are granted in the total pay?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think the gentleman from New York is wrong. Under certain circumstances, they allow that rental pay, but when an officer is in the field, away from home, he pays his own board. I know that was the case during the last war, and I think it is the case now. Therefore, at the end of the month the average officer from the grade of captain down, I will say, has very little, if any, more money left than the average noncommissioned officer, and in a great many instances not more than the enlisted man.

Mr. TABER. They receive a subsistence allowance anyway and a rental allowance unless they are provided with quarters, and on top of that there is an additional allowance for dependents of officers, so that in the case of some officers I know, those figures run quite high, in the case of one officer exceeding $300 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For the benefit of the House, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] will be informally reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence: "The care provided under the foregoing appropriation shall be provided in the form of a cash allotment made directly to the wives and to the mothers of the infants who are entitled to such care."

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will we take up this amendment now before the committee amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. No; after the committee amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. I suggest this amendment will be subject to a point of order on the ground it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, that might well be raised when the amendment is actually offered. The amendment is not before the House at this time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it improper for me to offer this amendment at the

present time? If so, I will withdraw it now and offer it at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wishes to do so he may.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That will permit me to have 5 minutes on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard on the committee amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are 5 minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take issue with my good friend from Mississippi in his statement on the relative compensation of enlisted men and commissioned officers. I always agree with him. But if I may, I should like to insert here for the information of the Committee and the House data showing the relative pay of enlisted men and commissioned officers. For example, let us take the pay of a second lieutenant, the lowest commissioned rank, and the pay of the enlisted men in grades 1 and 7.

The second lieutenant draws a base pay of $1,800. In addition, he receives a rental allowance of $720, and a subsistence allowance of $511. That is the minimum. It comprises a total of $3,031 annually. He also receives an exemption of $1,500 on income tax, which means that the entire pay and allowance of a second lieutenant is exempt from all taxation.

The enlisted man of grade 7 receives $50 a month, $600 a year. In other words, there is a difference of $2,431 between the officer who receives $3,031 a year and the enlisted man who receives $600.

But here is the item that has been overlooked. While the wife of the enlisted man has never received obstetrical care at Government expense until the enactment of this law, the wife of the commissioned officer has always received such service at Government hospitals. The wife of any commissioned officer may go to any service hospital and receive free prenatal care, obstetrical care, and post-partum care. The physician's service is free. The only thing she is required to pay in the way of hospitalization is daily subsistence, which, of course, is comparatively small. In the Navy the only charge is a flat rate of $3.65 per day. In effect, therefore, the wives of the commissioned men receive free already the service we propose under this bill to give to the wives of enlisted men. In providing this appropriation, we are putting the service provided for the wife of the enlisted man on a par with the service already given the wife of the commissioned officer. So it is, of course, unnecessary to amend this resolution by including commissioned officers.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In enumerating the benefits an officer in the lower ranks receives, the gentleman overlooks the fact that an officer is required to buy his own uniform and his own paraphernalia, and also to pay his own board. My recollection is that we had this fight up here on the emergency officers' retirement bill, and it was brought out then that the differences in pay for these officers, especially in the lower ranks, are to make up the difference between what the officer would have to pay for his uniform and other clothes, his board, and so forth, his subsistence, and the fact that these things are furnished the enlisted man free of charge.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Is it not true that any commissioned officer gets a uniform allowance of $250?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am so informed.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say again to the gentleman that I do not believe any soldier, whether a commissioned officer or a buck private, will take advantage of this allowance unless it is needed, but if it is needed, I submit that the commissioned officer in the lower ranks ought not to be excluded.

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

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 6, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That this appropriation may be used for payment of commitments made prior to October 1, 1943, in the cases of wives and infants of enlisted men in grades 1, 2, and 3."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out commitments already made. Under existing law there are numerous instances in which wives of men in these grades have already been authorized to receive help. We propose in this amendment to carry out such agreements already entered into under existing law.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the gentleman correctly, this amendment simply takes care of those special cases which were obligated prior to October 1, 1943?

This applies to grades 1, 2 and 3, the so-called special cases?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It applies to all cases in which commitments have been made.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does this appropriation cover the children of WAC's, of WAVES, of other women in the service who may be married to or who may marry civilians? As I understood from the debate here, this resolution covers wives of soldiers who have children. What about the women in the service who marry civilians. Are not they covered, too?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not if they marry civilians.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe they should be covered?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The law applies to wives of soldiers only and does not apply to wives of civilians.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the women who are soldiers, as the WAC's are now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All personnel in the armed forces are entitled to medical treatment and hospitalization including women serving in the auxiliaries. But this particular service is by virtue of a statute providing exclusively for the wives of soldiers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is discrimination.

Mr. RABAUT. It covers them if they are married to soldiers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am referring to a woman who is in the service and who is married to or marries a man in the service.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This merely provides for the wives of men in the armed forces.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some are laughing, but I am not joking about this. In all seriousness, I can see no reason why the women who are in the service, who are soldiers now, as I understand the last regulations, should not be taken care of if they marry civilians and then become mothers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If their husbands are in the service they would be entitled to the benefits of the law, but if they are the wives of civilians, of course, civilians are supposed to care for such family expenses. At least they cannot be paid out of these funds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Suppose the husbands cannot care for them? Suppose they become widows. Suppose their husbands die while they are in the service and before the child is born?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They are entitled to every benefit provided for the wives of soldiers under the language of the bill.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of the present amendment I rise to make a very brief statement on information that I have received, and to have the especial attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, so that he may answer the observation and point out wherein perhaps I have been ill-advised.

I am told that all enlisted men in the detached enlisted men's list in the upper three grades lose money. In explanation of that comment I point out that the D. E. M. L. men who reside in Washington, since they are not living in barracks, and are not eating, of course, in any organized mess, are paid $2.75 per day in lieu of quarters and rations. Enlisted men in the upper three grades are entitled to quarters for their dependents. When by reason of orders by competent authority, their dependents are prevented from living with them, or no Government quarters are made available to those men, such enlisted personnel are entitled to $37.50 a month to pay for dependents' quarters.

However, I am told that by an Army ruling, when an enlisted man in any of those top three grades is on the so-called D. E. M. L. list, he is not entitled to this amount of $37.50 for dependents' quarters, upon the theory that he is getting a daily allowance, in lieu of quarters.

The reason I ask the question of the distinguished chairman at this time is to say that a case in point has been brought to my attention, wherein men in the three upper grades actually lose their allotment, and a staff sergeant would get $22.50 less per month if he had a wife and children than he would have if he were strictly a buck sergeant. Would the gentleman tell me whether I am correct or in error?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from West Virginia is discussing a matter foreign to this bill. It relates to military pay, and I would be glad to yield to any member of the Committee on Military Affairs to answer the question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have used this opportunity to bring the situation to the attention of the House during the consideration of this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The loss in money to which the gentleman refers, as I understand it, is due to the classification of men and pay at $2.75 per diem, and the amount he would get in monthly pay. The loss of the difference between those two figures?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It could be stated in that way. I think the House in the consideration of this general subject should have its attention directed to the matter.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman will take that matter to the proper committee, which is the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall bring it to the attention of the House and also to the committee he suggests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. I hope the House adopts this amendment. It is of particular importance to my own State, because it will make available funds for commitments prior to October 1, 1943. This, as I say, is of particular importance to Pennsylvania. I do not know whether the House is aware of the situation which prevailed in the great State of Pennsylvania, but for months our State administration and our Governor refused to make these benefits available to the wives of service men in Pennsylvania. With an attitude that was so callous it was difficult to understand, our Governor and his advisers persistently refused to take action to help the wives of our fighting men and their infant children, many of them born while their fathers were fighting and bleeding on Guadalcanal, in north Africa, and in the Sicilian campaign.

Only after a great newspaper campaign, initiated by one of our metropolitan dailies, the Philadelphia Record, focused the attention of the people of our State upon what was taking place, did our Governor become aroused, and then only after the American Legion in convention, the V. F. W. and other service organizations insisted that our State administration change its attitude, stop its negligence and make these benefits possible for the soldiers and sailors of Pennsylvania.

When I look over the list of the States and see the number of cases that have received benefits I am startled to compare it with the fact that up until August 31, 1943, not a single service man's wife in the State of Pennsylvania had been able to participate in the appropriation made available by Congress. The State of Illinois had 4,900 cases; the State of Kansas, 2,200 cases; the State of Kentucky, 2,200 cases; the State of Michigan, 2,800 cases; the State of Mississippi, 1,900 cases; North Dakota, 2,800 cases; Wisconsin, 2,700 cases, and so on; Pennsylvania, not one single case.

The wives of servicemen in the State of Illinois received from this fund $111,000. In Connecticut, $45,000; Massachusetts, $88,000; New Jersey, $55,000; Michigan, $88,000; Wisconsin, $57,000; Oklahoma; $83,000. Every one of those States has a population which is far less than that of Pennsylvania, and consequently they have fewer men in the armed forces, and yet Pennsylvania received out of the appropriation for the last quarter of the fiscal year not one penny. Practically every State secured an allotment except Pennsylvania. That means that the wives of servicemen in Pennsylvania to whom babies were born, because the Governor of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was not very much interested, were not able to participate in the appropriation made available by the Federal Government.

I hope that now that the Governor and the Republican administration in Pennsylvania have seen the light, through the pressure of public opinion, that they will take advantage of the new appropriation and that they will make up for lost time, and the soldiers and sailors of our State who are fighting in all quarters of the globe will know that their wives and new-born children will be taken care of through the foresight and wisdom of the Federal Government.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with this resolution. On the contrary, I am happy to be permitted to vote for it. I think it is little enough that we might do, as has been so ably said, for the wives of those in the armed services. However, I want to call the attention of the House to something of the manner in which this legislation has been administered, at least to date. I am assured by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the committee, that there is no restriction in the legislation, which provides that the attending physician shall receive no fund and no promise of any fund other than that allotted by the Government. Yet I know that that is the way it works in practice, at least in the district which I happen to represent in Ohio, a part which is very crowded by reason of war industries, and incidentally very short of physicians. So within the hour I have talked with Miss Katharine Lenroot, head of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, and she informs me that the restriction does exist; that it is not a matter of legislation and it is not a restriction placed there by the respective States, but rather that it is an inhibiting restriction written in by that Bureau. Just how does this work in practice? During the recent congressional recess, I had this matter brought to my attention not once but a dozen times. In at least one case that I took the trouble to investigate the wife of a soldier had a complicating kidney condition that occurred during the pregnancy, which required particular medical attention and special care. The physician was unable to receive any sum except that which was stipulated by the regulation—not a regulation of the Congress but of the Children's Bureau.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would yield——

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. That regulation is entirely in violation of the specific provisions of this act.

Mr. JEFFREY. I am glad to have the gentleman say that, but in practice it still exists and is working. At least very recently it was. It seems to me that this House should have some control over the administration of the money which it votes for a cause which is as important as the cases which this appropriation is intended to cover. I rise at this time simply to draw attention to the regulation which the head of the Bureau in Washington has placed on the law which has been passed by the Congress, which is restraining and inhibiting the functioning of that act in the relief it was intended to afford at least in one State.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman's check-up was made within the last hour as to whether the regulation was still being enforced?

Mr. JEFFREY. Yes; and with the head of the Children's Bureau, Miss Katharine Lenroot. According to her information, it is in force this afternoon.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. In line 10 on the first page it says "in addition to similar services otherwise available," indicating a direct intention on the part of the legislature to permit other services than those paid for under the regulations to be provided.

Mr. JEFFREY. But it is not working that way in practice.

Mr. TABER. The regulation is illegal.

Mr. JEFFREY. I agree.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFREY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand the gentleman's argument to be that in approving this law we should leave open the gate so that where a situation did exist negotiations could be made and the Federal Government would have to pay the difference, whatever fee was agreed upon?

Mr. JEFFREY. Not necessarily, because in the particular case to which I refer, while the woman herself was unable to pay, some of her relatives were, but she was precluded from getting that help.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman think the Federal Government should pay whatever the fee agreed upon is?

Mr. JEFFREY. Perhaps we should not go that far, but certainly the present restriction is too rigid, and the soldier's widow, through relatives and friends, should not be prohibited from paying for and receiving special care.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me if we do that we will open up the very kind of a situation we are just now attempting to close, where you remove the so-called special cases. In other words, you will have special cases from almost everyone.

Mr. JEFFREY. I do not think we need to go that far. I think all we need to do is to say that notwithstanding the Children's Bureau has placed a regulation on the administration of this fund, which is not intended by the Congress, in the event that relatives or friends of the particular individual are willing, they shall be permitted to pay for special care.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let them pay whatever they see fit?

Mr. JEFFREY. That is the general thought.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence: "The care provided under the foregoing appropriation shall be provided in the form of cash allotments made directly to the wife and to the mother of the infants who are entitled to such care."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not need very much explanation; it is self-explanatory; it merely provides for the payment directly to the expectant mothers and wives of the soldiers the money that is allotted under this act in cash.

There is no more reason why the Federal Government should supervise the expenditure of that money than there is for the Federal Government to supervise the expenditure of the money which goes for allotments to these women, or which goes to soldiers in the form of pensions. Having practiced medicine I know that there are practical situations where provisions like we have in the law at the present time do work a hardship or at least do prevent the woman from using this money in the most expeditious and best manner.

Ask the women who have had more than one baby and they will tell you that the second baby or the third baby comes more easily than the first. That woman may feel she does not need hospital care; she may be able to save at least part of the $84 or $85, or whatever the amount is, to buy shoes for some of the children that have already been born, or to buy meat and clothing, and if she should be able to save some of that money and still take care of her confinement, why should she not be allowed to do that?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. In these days when the hospitals are so crowded, and there is such a scarcity of help in the hospitals, it seems to me that the gentleman's amendment is a very wise one and should be adopted. For that particular reason, it seems to me, the amendment of the gentleman should be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I just want to repeat what I said a moment ago; why should we not put more trust in the soldiers' wives? The soldiers are out fighting this war, and we are leaving it to them to fight the war. Why not put a little confidence in these women who are staying at home and going through the valley of the shadow of death?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman practiced medicine in a State that has a workmen's compensation law. May I ask him if he has ever gotten a check directly for that service, or did he get an allowance?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any further. I do not think the gentleman's question apropos at all to what I am trying to explain. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to put my confidence in these women in the expenditure of these Federal funds. I have faith they would spend this money in the proper manner.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say again, there is no reason why the Federal Government, or any State government, should exercise such paternalistic care over the expenditure of these funds as now is the case.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to recognition.

Mr. KEEFE. I understood that I had been recognized before the gentleman from Missouri got on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin had already been recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I am always glad to yield to my friend from Wisconsin, who always occupies the floor to far better advantage than I, but in this case the gentleman from Missouri was standing seeking recognition.

Mr. KEEFE. I am exceedingly sorry that I have been placed in the unfortunate position of causing the chairman of the committee to defer to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I, too, have taken up with Miss Lenroot this afternoon the very question which he has raised, and I discussed with her the regulation which the Children's Bureau has invoked which applies not only to the State of Ohio but to the entire Nation. She explained that regulation to me, and I want to say to the Members of the House that while the magnificent statement made by the gentleman has a direct appeal I think you would be convinced that the Children's Bureau has taken a very wise and sensible precaution.

What was the genesis of this legislation? Was it to afford an opportunity for a grab from all directions on the Treasury of the United States? Or did this resolution have its genesis in the desire of the Congress to relieve the wives of servicemen of the United States from worry incident perhaps to inability to receive proper obstetrical care because they did not have any money?

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

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield at this time.

The Children's Bureau recognizing that to be the attitude of the Congress when this resolution was adopted provided in their regulations, with which the State must comply in order to receive these Federal funds, that the doctors who are to be paid out of these funds must certify when they make application for payment that the payment which the doctor is receiving out of this fund is the only amount that he is going to charge this patient. If you allowed a doctor to take the amount permitted out of this fund and then send a bill for any amount he saw fit to the woman after she has come out of the hospital how in the world would you be accomplishing the purpose we had in mind when this bill first came before the Congress?

The principal purpose of this legislation and the real reason why I supported it was to relieve these mothers of worry that they would have a great big bill to pay and no money with which to pay it. The experience is that the great rank and file of the doctors of the country have accepted this legislation and are receiving the benefits from it in the very spirit in which it was enacted. There may be special cases such as the one the gentleman indicated where there may have been some tremendous amount of other service required, but if the case is a case of luxury where the people have money, they do not have to make application to this fund; they can hire their own doctor, get any room they want in the hospital and pay it themselves. The only requirement is that they shall not make application for this money. This money is reserved for the wives of soldiers who are in a situation where they need the assistance which is provided under this law and I will say that the amount that has been set up, at least so far as the doctors tell me in my community, is in line with the general fees which they receive in this type of service and they are pretty well satisfied with the situation. If you are going to turn this money over and give it to every soldier's wife who is expecting a child, she could spend it as she pleased; then you would be no longer in line with the spirit and purpose of this act and you are just passing a bill to provide a sort of gratuitous pension to pay the wife of every soldier a stipulated amount to spend as she pleases. I have confidence in most of them, but I remember back in the days before we passed the illegitimacy statute in my State, which principle became a general law throughout the country, that case after case was settled by the mother where she got $200, $300, $500, or whatever the father would pay and she took that money and bought a fur coat, or went out and spent it, and the child became the ward of the parent, the grandparents, or a public charge; so we had to pass a law that required that before the settlement would be approved payments made in those cases would have to be turned over to a trustee to see to it that the doctor's bill was paid, that the hospital bill was paid, and that the money went for the child for which it was intended.

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

Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio has considerable merit. While I was home this summer during the recess of Congress I was confronted with the very question presented by that amendment. It so happens that in one of the cities of my district the hospital is conducted by the municipality. If this law or the regulation that has been promulgated by the Children's Bureau remains on the books, it means that many soldiers' wives are not going to have the benefit of hospital care. In my State, they granted $50 at the rate of $5 a day for 10 days for hospitalization in maternity cases. The average daily cost in a hospital in my section of the country is $7.50. The municipality has no funds with which to subsidize the balance of the cost, or $2.50 per day, in these cases. What is the result? It is that the soldiers' wives may not be able to obtain a room in that hospital. That regulation works against rather than to the advantage of the wife of a soldier.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask whether the hospitals of the gentleman's State make any allowances? In my State they do a great deal of free work for these women and I am sure they must do the same thing in Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Perhaps they do, but I do know in this particular case that was not true.

The municipality has no funds on hand or in its budget with which to subsidize hospital costs, with the result it works a hardship on the very people that we are trying to aid by this bill and appropriation.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman is speaking of a municipal hospital?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. It is operated by the municipality.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman states that the charge in the case to which he refers was $7.50 a day? The provision in this bill is for ward care only. It is not customary to charge $7.50 a day for ward care.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not familiar with the details. I do know the actual average cost is as stated by me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If they wish a private room, they must themselves bear the additional expense. The provision in this bill is for ward service only. In the case to which the gentleman refers they evidently desired better accommodations and if so must provide that themselves.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not so sure about that. I am inclined to believe it is the reverse of what the gentleman says.

It is my understanding that when the application for the Federal funds is signed by the expectant mother and the physician that the amount provided by the regulation is all that the hospital can charge and all the physician may receive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I never heard of a hospital charging $7.50 a day for ward care.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just assume that the soldier's wife goes along in the usual way and the fee allowed is sufficient. That ends that. But suppose she has some complications set in, then she is not permitted to pay the doctor. Is the doctor to render the service without charge for this extra, unforeseen complication or is she to go without the care?

Mr. DONDERO. I believe he would be precluded from asking any more pay when he signs the application for the fund provided in this bill.

Mr. JEFFREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JEFFREY. That is true according to the statement given to me by Miss Lenroot this afternoon. His entire charge for the prenatal care and the care of the mother after the baby comes is included in this charge. For how long I do not know.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think there is a Member on this floor who is against this legislation, but we want to provide legislation to really relieve the soldier from anxiety for the care of his wife. Let us place no obstacles in the way of that aid.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The testimony submitted to the committee was to the effect that no ironclad regulation had been made as to the amount. Thirty-five dollars was suggested, not to exceed $50, perhaps, but in the case of complications, in the case of operations and in a case where expert surgery is needed, as I understand from the testimony, there is no limitation on that and it will be left with whoever is in charge of the State department of public health.

Mr. DONDERO. I am strongly in favor of trusting the honesty and good judgment of the expectant mother and the medical profession of the country to take care of this situation without putting any unnecessary restrictions around this fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be said that we are probably going a little far afield in the discussion of the original purpose of this appropriation. As it was originally submitted the idea

was there would be a considerable number of men who would be going overseas, leaving wives who would be expectant mothers. Many of these would be without parents, they would have no one at home to advise or look after them; and it was thought that the Federal Government—in order to keep up the morale of these young men—they should be given to understand that their wives would be furnished with the necessary medical care and hospitalization at the time of the birth of the child, thereby relieving the father of much anxiety.

It was estimated there would not be over 72,000, and it was further estimated the cost would be $4,800,000, and that amount was recommended; but since that time it has developed there will be 600,000 children born to wives of soldiers next year and that 300,000 of these wives will avail themselves of the privileges under the law. That is just 50 percent, the additional cost now estimated being $18,600,000.

Now, the proposal suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, has been discussed before. The feeling was that under his proposal the wives of the 600,000 soldiers would ask for their part of the appropriation regardless whether they needed it or not. If his amendment passes you will have to fix a definite amount and if it is fixed at $100 that means the program will cost $30,000,000 a year more than now indicated. He does not state how much he would pay each wife. The final cost may be two or three times that much. Who knows? It is the thought that this appropriation of $18,600,000 will take care of the wife and the child of every soldier who needs it and will request it. There will be many who will not make this request. There will be many who will pay their own hospital bill and there will be many who will pay their own physicians officiating at the time of the birth. If the amendment is agreed to I suggest it will be necessary to increase the appropriation unless you are willing to discriminate against the wives of soldiers who are not going to be expectant mothers within this year. Their husbands will say: "I am in the same Army, I am in the same Navy, I am making the same sacrifice the fathers are making; why does not the Federal Government pay my wife a little money to spend as she pleases?"

That is one of the difficulties we have in this proposal. It is one that has been given a great deal of thought and a great deal of study, probably not as much as it deserves. The present appropriation will not be a compensation to the soldier himself; it was not intended to increase his salary; it was not intended to increase his compensation, but was intended merely to stimulate the morale of the father away from home by making him feel that his wife would have proper attention at the birth of his child, which is a very trying moment in the life of every young father; he would not have to lie awake at night, he would not have to worry about the need of medical care and hospitalization of his wife; and that he could look forward to the time he could return home and find a child to greet him. No doubt some of the money will be spent undeservedly, but we cannot pass upon each case here.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It was never intended by the Congress that this should be the occasion for the Children's Bureau to attempt to regulate the standard for child care and childbirth all over the United States?

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman is correct in that. It was intended that the State public health service would submit rules and regulations to the Children's Bureau for approval and that the State agency would administer the law. My personal view of this matter is the proper legislative committee should conduct hearings and submit a proposal stating definitely and clearly the functions of the State Public Health Service in the administration of the law and just what the powers and functions of the Children's Bureau will be; then there should be no misunderstanding or friction in the administration of the law, if approved by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would double the cost of this bill, and it would unquestionably require an even larger deficiency bill later in the fiscal year.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have gone into this matter very carefully. I think it would be very unfortunate if this amendment were adopted. I feel that the State health authorities, with this money that is granted to them, should pay these bills direct to the doctors. The doctor is chosen by the expectant mother in advance. After that is done she should not have to be bothered with the payment of these bills.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is exactly right. According to the statistics submitted to the committee by the Children's Bureau, based upon their experience beginning in March 1943, only half of the wives of the enlisted men in the lowest grades—grades 4 to 7—apply for these benefits, and only one-fourth of the wives of the men in the first three grades apply. If this grant were made as a cash payment, the result would be that everybody would automatically receive it. At the start it would cost twice the amount here estimated. In addition, the present system protects both the mother and the physician. The mother is certain of being taken care of at an approved hospital and for a medical cost of from $35 and $50, and at the same time the physician is certain of receiving a stated fee.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I may say to the gentleman that the committee thought that probably the estimate of the cost would be a little high. The physician in charge of State welfare in my own State advised me yesterday that the cost, when all bills have been paid, has averaged $55.56 per person for children delivered so far.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In addition, Mr. Chairman, any such proposition as this to pay the cash directly to the beneficiary is in contravention of the principle followed in every other governmental agency of this character. For instance, under the Workmen's Compensation Act money is not paid directly to the beneficiary, the patient, but to the physician. Under social security the money is not paid to the beneficiary but is handled by the department. Always the principle followed in agencies and activities of this kind is for the Government to make payment to the person to whom it is due.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman believe the expectant mother ought to be precluded from acquiring extra service if she desires to have it, paying for it out of her own funds if she has the funds to do so?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not, and this would not preclude her from doing so.

Mr. DONDERO. But would not the application forbid her doing that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under this bill she is allowed to select her own physician and the physician is paid by the Government. This does not in any way interfere with her using her own funds to supplement the amount paid here or provide additional comforts.

Mr. Chairman, because this amendment would more than double the cost of this service and because it would positively and inevitably necessitate the passage of another appropriation bill even larger than this for the current fiscal year, I submit that the amendment ought to be voted down.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. May I suggest to the chairman that the families of the soldiers are the last groups in the world with whom we should be parsimonious because we have been very, very careless in our appropriations and in the expenditure of money, and if we could tip the scales in favor of the family without bankrupting the country we should do it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are anything but parsimonious here. We are generous beyond all precedent. The reason we did not receive applications from the other half of those who are entitled to this grant is that they prefer better accommodations; they prefer individual rooms instead of the ward service provided here. Of course, if we merely

presented a lump sum in cash acceptance would be 100 percent.

Mr. Chairman, because of the exorbitant additional cost proposed by the amendment and because of the necessity of passing another deficiency bill this fiscal year if the amendment is agreed to, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 8, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): For all necessary expenses of the Children's Bureau in performing the duties imposed upon it in carrying out the program for emergency maternity and infant care, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and other items otherwise chargeable to the appropriations of the Department of Labor for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, $20,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for the wives of enlisted men in the armed forces, had directed him to report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am opposed to the joint resolution in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Ohio moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 159 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith to the House with the following amendment: On page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence: "The care provided under the foregoing appropriation shall be provided in the form of cash allotments made directly to the wives, and to the mothers of the infants, who are entitled to such care."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 143, noes 0.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, nays 0, not voting 103.

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—327

Abernethy	Coffee	Gillie
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Mo.	Gordon
Allen, La.	Cole, N. Y.	Gore
Andersen, H. Carl	Compton	Gorski
Anderson, Calif.	Cooley	Gossett
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cooper	Graham
Andresen, August H.	Costello	Grant, Ala.
Angell	Courtney	Grant, Ind.
Arnold	Cox	Gregory
Auchincloss	Cravens	Griffiths
Baldwin, Md.	Crawford	Gwynne
Barrett	Crosser	Hagen
Barry	Cunningham	Hale
Bates, Ky.	Curtis	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bates, Mass.	D'Alesandro	Hall, Leonard W.
Beall	Davis	Halleck
Beckworth	Dawson	Hancock
Bennett, Mich.	Day	Hare
Bennett, Mo.	Delaney	Harless, Ariz.
Bishop	Dewey	Harris, Ark.
Blackney	Dies	Harris, Va.
Bland	Dilweg	Hays
Bloom	Dingell	Hébert
Bolton	Dirksen	Heidinger
Bonner	Ditter	Hendricks
Boren	Domengeaux	Herter
Boykin	Dondero	Hess
Bradley, Pa.	Doughton	Hinshaw
Brehm	Douglas	Hoch
Brooks	Drewry	Hoeven
Brown, Ga.	Dworshak	Hoffman
Brown, Ohio	Eberharter	Holifield
Bryson	Ellis	Holmes, Wash.
Burch, Va.	Ellison, Md.	Hope
Burchill, N. Y.	Elsworth	Horan
Burdick	Elston, Ohio	Howell
Burgin	Engel	Hull
Busbey	Feighan	Jarman
Butler	Fellows	Jeffrey
Byrne	Fenton	Jenkins
Camp	Fernandez	Jensen
Cannon, Fla.	Fisher	Johnson, Anton J.
Cannon, Mo.	Flannagan	Johnson, J. Leroy
Capozzoli	Fogarty	Johnson, Luther A.
Carlson, Kans.	Forand	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Carson, Ohio	Fulbright	Johnson, Okla.
Celler	Fulmer	Johnson, Ward
Chapman	Gale	Jones
Church	Gathings	Jonkman
Clason	Gavin	Judd
Clevenger	Gearhart	Kean
Cochran	Gibson	Kearney
	Gifford	Keefe
	Gilchrist	Kefauver
	Gillette	Kelley
		Kerr
		Kilburn
		Kilday
		King
		Kinzer
		Kirwan
		Kleberg
		Knutson
		Kunkel
		LaFollette
		Landis
		Lanham
		Larcade
		Lea
		LeCompte
		LeFevre
		Lemke
		Lesinski
		Lewis, Colo.
		Lewis, Ohio
		Luce
		Ludlow
		Lynch
		McCord
		McCormack
		McCowen
		McGehee
		McGranery
		McGregor
		McLean
		McMillan
		McMurray
		McWilliams
		Maas
		Madden
		Maloney
		Manasco
		Mansfield, Mont.
		Mansfield, Tex.
		Marcantonio
		Martin, Iowa
		Martin, Mass.
		Mason
		May
		Merrow
		Michener
		Miller, Conn.
		Miller, Mo.
		Miller, Nebr.
		Mills
		Monkiewicz
		Monroney
		Morrison, La.
		Morrison, N. C.
		Mott
		Mruk
		Mundt
		Murdock
		Murray, Tenn.
		Murray, Wis.
		Myers
		Newsome
		Norman
		Norrell
		O'Brien, Ill.
		O'Brien, Mich.
		O'Hara
		Outland
		Patman
		Patton
		Peterson, Ga.
		Pfeifer
		Phillips
		Ploeser
		Plumley
		Poage
		Poulson
		Powers
		Price
		Priest
		Rabaut
		Ramey
		Ramspeck
		Randolph
		Rankin
		Reece, Tenn.
		Reed, Ill.
		Reed, N. Y.
		Rees, Kans.
		Richards
		Rivers
		Rizley
		Robertson
		Robsion, Ky.
		Rockwell
		Rodgers, Pa.
		Rogers, Calif.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rohrbough
		Rolph
		Rowan
		Rowe
		Russell
		Sabath
		Sadowski
		Sasscer
		Sauthoff
		Scanlon
		Schiffler
		Schuetz
		Schwabe
		Shafer
		Short
		Sikes
		Simpson, Ill.
		Simpson, Pa.
		Slaughter
		Smith, Maine
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, Va.
		Smith, W. Va.
		Smith, Wis.
		Somers, N. Y.
		Springer
		Stanley
		Starnes, Ala.
		Steagall
		Stearns, N. H.
		Stefan
		Stewart
		Stockman
		Sullivan
		Sumner, Ill.
		Sundstrom
		Taber
		Talbot
		Talle
		Taylor
		Thomas, Tex.
		Thomason
		Tibbott
		Tolan
		Troutman
		Vincent, Ky.
		Voorhis, Calif.
		Vorys, Ohio
		Vursell
		Wadsworth
		Walter
		Ward
		Wasielewski
		Weaver
		Weiss
		Welch
		Wheat
		Whittington
		Wickersham
		Willey
		Wilson
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Woodruff, Mich.
		Woodrum, Va.
		Worley
		Wright

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—103

Andrews	Gerlach	O'Neal
Arends	Goodwin	O'Toole
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Pace
Barden	Green	Peterson, Fla.
Bell	Gross	Philbin
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Pittenger
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Pracht
Buckley	Hartley	Robinson, Utah
Buffett	Heffernan	Satterfield
Bulwinkle	Hill	Scott
Canfield	Hobbs	Sheppard
Carter	Holmes, Mass.	Sheridan
Case	Izac	Snyder
Chenoweth	Jackson	Sparkman
Chiperfield	Jennings	Spence
Clark	Johnson, Calvin D.	Stevenson
Colmer	Johnson, Ind.	Sumners, Tex.
Creal	Kee	Tarver
Cullen	Kennedy	Thomas, N. J.
Curley	Keogh	Towe
Dickstein	Klein	Treadway
Disney	Lambertson	Van Zandt
Durham	Lane	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	McKenzie	Weichel, Ohio
Elliott	Magnuson	Wene
Elmer	Mahon	West
Fay	Merritt	Whelchel, Ga.
Fish	Miller Pa.	White
Fitzpatrick	Murphy	Whitten
Folger	Norton	Wigglesworth
Ford	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Furlong	O'Connor	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	O'Konski	Wolverton, N. J.
Gamble	O'Leary	Zimmerman
Gavagan		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Curley with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Hill.
Mr. West with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Case.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr Bender.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Green with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do this because I understand that legislation is to be brought up tomorrow, and I think the Members of the House should be informed of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency has reported out the bill H. R. 3291 unanimously. The purpose of the bill is to increase the authorization, to the amount of $400,000,000, for construction under title VI of the National Housing Act and also extend the time for which loans may be extended under title I. The bill has been reported out unanimously. Consent will be asked tomorrow to consider the bill. I am told that the bill is noncontroversial, but I want it understood that if there is any controversy about it that the unanimous-consent request for the consideration of the bill will be withdrawn.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that the bill then probably will not come up until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is, if there are objections.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Did I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that this increases the authorization $400,000,000 or $300,000,000?

Mr. McCORMACK. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], is present, but I understand it to be $400,000,000.

Mr. SABATH. That was originally asked for, and we have appropriated already authorization for $100,000,000.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not appropriate anything. The bill provides for the insurance of loans and would increase the authorization in the amount of $400,000,000. There is no appropriation. This is a matter that is more or less urgent, because there is now a waiting list of applications for insurance. It is under title VI of the National Housing Act. Title VI provides for the insurance of loans for residential construction in defense areas, where it may be done by private investment, simply by insuring the loans, rather than by direct appropriations from the Treasury, as must be done under the Lanham Act, except where it is done by private investment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan an area where there are not enough defense workers. They are short of manpower. They can get the men, but the authority which would transfer those men refuses to do so until we provide housing facilities. This is just a little matter, but it does have to do with this matter of war production. They have authorized the Cleveland office to give us 100 trailers, while we are waiting to build these other houses. Is there anything that we can do about that?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know the situation to which the gentleman refers. It may be that what he has in mind is construction under the Lanham Act. That is emergency construction, where the money is appropriated directly out of the Treasury. Of course, I am sure the gentleman feels as I think everybody else does that where this construction can be done by private investment, it is preferable. There is a large amount of this construction. They have granted insurance in the amount of $1,200,000,000 under title VI, and this further authorization is to continue that kind of service.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman suppose if I gave him the name of a gentleman in the department down town he could call him up and ask him to do a little something so that we can get the housing facilities for these workers?

Mr. STEAGALL. The National Housing Administrator is not leaving any of this work undone where it can be justified by showing the element of permanency, which takes it out of the category of housing which must be done temporarily by direct appropriation out of the Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if I could enlist the aid of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] on that proposition? It is right across the lake from Chicago and we need those trailers to house the workers.

Mr. SABATH. This act will encourage private construction. We have many contractors and real estate operators who are willing to build. They are simply waiting to have these loans guaranteed as it is proposed in this bill. The moment that is done it will enable the contractors to go forward and build the necessary buildings that are needed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you will bear with me, that building takes time. Those trailers are available in Cleveland and we need them.

Mr. SABATH. You make your request and they will do it. They have the trailers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include therein an extract from a pamphlet that was presented to the Committee yesterday on the subject under discussion today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include

therein a report of a livestock meeting at Kansas City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain short correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the legislative business tomorrow and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders that may be entered I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Journal of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address which I delivered recently to the American Bar Association at Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CRUDE OIL SITUATION IS CRITICAL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to supplies of crude oil and gasoline in this country is, in my opinion, reaching a most serious stage. So far as I am able to ascertain, nothing constructive is being done regarding it. Unless steps are taken to correct the problem, in my judgment, it will become critical very soon.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress last Friday, said, and I quote:

> Since the outbreak of war in Europe we have increased our output of petroleum by 66 percent.

I have tried to secure the authority for these figures. Up to the present time I have been unable to find the source of information to confirm them. Immediately after the speech was delivered I asked the White House for this information. Up to date I have not received a reply.

If we take September 1, 1939, as being the date of "the outbreak of the war," the daily average production of crude oil in the United States during this month, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, was 3,608,000 barrels. For June 1943 the average was 3,977,000 barrels. The increase, comparing these 2 months, was about 10 percent. The most liberal figure I have been able to secure from any source is an increase of 16 percent. The small increase is caused by unusual and extra pressure on the producing wells. Even though there is a small increase in the production of crude oil over this period, this does not compare with the extra and tremendous demand of gasoline for our armed forces amounting, according to Mr. Ickes, to approximately 600,000 barrels per day, and this demand is increasing every day. Mr. Ickes also calls attention to the fact that by next year military requirements alone will be more than 37.5 percent of our present output east of the Rocky Mountains. The necessary demand for gasoline is several times what it was at the beginning of the war.

Since we entered the war in December 1941 our petroleum-production capacity has constantly been on the decline, statements to the contrary notwithstanding. We are discovering much less oil than we are using even under present restrictions, so our above-ground reserves are diminishing rapidly, and since Pearl Harbor our new production has fallen off sharply. The small recent improvement in total production showing an increase of about 6 to 10 percent will be reduced by the end of the year because it is made possible by drawing on reserves made available by our pre-war activities and will be temporary at the very best.

The Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ickes, has issued a number of warnings on the critical condition of petroleum supplies and calls attention to the fact that production effort is going down and above-ground stocks of petroleum have been reduced by 13 percent since Pearl Harbor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to some statistics from the Bureau of Mines. Since 1937, and even since 1941, new production on account of new well completions in the United States has dropped approximately 50 percent of what it was in 1937, and about 25 percent of the 1941 production.

Mr. Sumner Pike, Chief of Office of Price Administration, Petroleum Division, told a Senate committee investigating foreign gasoline shortage, that indications according to recent figures were that there was little decline in the number of new discovery wells during the last 4 years. He did not continue his statement by explaining to the committee the amount of new production from these wells. I believe it is fair that I should call attention to some further figures from the Bureau of Mines showing the number of total initial production barrels from these wells during the years mentioned in his statement. I quote from the Division of Reserves, Office Petroleum Administration for War:

1937	10,185,780
1938	8,795,660
1939	6,644,300
1940	7,076,250
1941	7,284,100
1942	2,781,540
1943 (6 months)	776,700

Replacement costs for drilling per well in 1943 is three times the cost in 1941.

Labor costs in June 1943 in the oil-production branch of the petroleum industry compared with all industries is 74 percent higher than in 1937. The average daily production of crude in the United States for the first 6 months in 1942 was 3,919,000 barrels per day. The average production from new wells computed during that period was 126,683 barrels. Producing crude petroleum at an average rate of 4,000,000 barrels and replacing it with wells having an average production capacity of about 127,000 barrels would indicate a definite shortage. This shortage is not a lack of oil reserve in the ground but a lack of oil wells from which to recover sufficient production to supply our military, industrial and necessary civilian requirements.

Mr. William B. Heroy, Director of Reserves, Petroleum Administration for War, in an address before the Interstate Oil Company Commission in April 1943 stated:

> Commencing with 1938 there was * * * a decisive change in the results of new development. In each year since 1937 the total of the initial daily production has greatly decreased * * *. When it is considered that it is the relatively young wells which yield the flush production and that we are dependent on such wells for 85 percent of our production, the decline in initial production becomes cause for serious concern.

To meet the needs of consumers of petroleum production there has been a steady decline in the stocks on hand since the latter part of 1941. This of course means more rationing of gasoline and many more cold homes this winter than last winter. There will also be a definite shortage in the supply of gasoline. I am informed the Office of Price Administration has suggested these difficulties might be solved by importing crude oil and petroleum products. One of the large companies who might import oil made the following statement:

> It is naively suggested that all our troubles will vanish if we simply "import more oil from South American countries". This suggestion ignores one sinister fact; the submarine. We are a nation at war. Our very life depends on oil; oil here on the home front as well as on the battle front. We all know that the flow of imported oil can be paralyzed over night; it has been paralyzed for months on end within the last year. Our company owns extensive oil-producing properties in South America and for many years we have brought into this country substantial imports of oil from South America. We believe this policy on our part serves the best interests of our own country as well as of our neighbors in South America. But we would never advocate that our country, in time of war, should depend on imports over enemy-infested waters for oil, a veritable "sinew of war."

While the oil producers of the United States are frozen to pre-war prices by the O. P. A. and by restrictions of the Petroleum Administration for War and material limitations by the War Production Board as well as the depleting regulations by the Treasury Department, the growing shortage of production of

crude petroleum continues to become more serious every day.

According to the Bureau of Mines, there were 22,143 oil wells completed in 1937 with a capacity of 10,185,000 barrels. In the first 6 months of 1943, 4,315 oil wells were completed with a total capacity of 776,700 barrels. On an annual basis it would be 1,551,000 barrels, which is 15 percent of the productive capacity of the wells drilled in 1937. The average daily production of crude petroleum for the first 6 months of 1943 was 3,919,017 barrels. Initial productive capacity of oil-well completions in the same period was less than 40 percent of production so our drilling operations are not sufficient to maintain current rate of production and no reserve is being maintained to offset the sharp decline in older wells that will soon drop from the flush stage and become stripper wells and be subjected to secondary recovery methods. In 1937 the average cost per barrel for each new oil well was $56.92. In 1941 it was $72.48. In 1943 the replacement cost is $207.69, which is 3 times as much as that of 1941. Mr. Speaker, the present price of oil, $1.17 per barrel, is just about the same as it was in 1937. It has not increased with other commodities. It is approximately 60-percent parity. If the price of crude oil were increased 50 cents per barrel it would still be below parity, but it would be sufficient to induce and encourage independent producers to proceed to drill new wells and discover additional oil supplies. This increase in price would increase the price of gasoline not more than 1 cent per gallon. It is my considered judgment that if the Office of Price Administration would permit an increase of 50 cents per barrel and if the War Production Board would give a little encouragement by relaxing some of its regulations on necessary equipment and machinery there would be a definite increase in the production of oil in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to plead for the oil producer. He can take care of himself, but I am here to tell this House that in view of the tremendous increased demand for gasoline for the prosecution of the war that something must be done immediately to increase our oil reserves. We are told that it takes 600,000 barrels of gasoline every day to supply our armed forces. Under present conditions, regardless of our domestic restrictions, we are bound to be short of gasoline unless something is done in the immediate future to alleviate the situation. If there is anyone in the administration who can really justify the manner in which this situation is being handled, I wish he would do it.

Two alternatives seem to be offered by our Government advisors: One is to import gasoline from foreign countries and take the chances of sinkings by submarines. That is not practical, reasonable, or fair. Another suggestion is that we reach into the Federal Treasury and pay subsidies to encourage the drilling of new wells. This is not practical or right. The fair, reasonable, and common sense way to handle the problem is to increase the price of crude oil 50 cents per barrel which should be enough to encourage our independent producers to proceed immediately to drill additional wells so we may have a sufficient supply of oil to take care of demands of our armed forces as well as the necessary requirements for our domestic uses. With the increase I have mentioned, the price of crude oil will then be only about one-half of what it was at the close of the First World War. The point is that just as we need other critical war materials, we must have a supply of oil, and we must have it before it is too late. Let me quote from an address delivered by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes over the National Broadcasting Co. network on September 1. I quote Secretary Ickes:

> In the face of this huge war demand, crude oil productive capacity is falling off seriously throughout the important midwestern oil-producing States, and is susceptible of a substantial increase only in west Texas. On the basis of known military requirements—let alone whatever unexpected demands may develop—we will not be able, by next year, to produce enough oil in the United States to meet the needs of the military, of war industry, of agriculture, and for essential civilian purposes unless we cut down on consumption now. That is not my opinion. It is a fact, recognized by the practical oil men who have formally endorsed the gasoline curtailment in the Middle West and Southwest.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, this is not a matter of protecting the independent oil producers. They can take care of themselves by curtailment of drilling operations. They do not want to do that. They are just as patriotic as any other group of our citizens. All they need is a sufficient increase to partly offset the increased cost of drilling wells and making new discoveries.

Mr. Speaker, oil is one of the vital elements by which the war may be won. Oil is scarce and growing scarcer because the tremendous demand is depleting our reserves. Billions of barrels remain to be found right here in the United States. If we continue as we are now going, we will soon be on the verge of an oil crisis.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's opinion, do you think there is plenty of gasoline in the Midwest to take care of the needs of the Midwest?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will simply give my own opinion regarding that question. We could perhaps provide more gasoline than we are at the present time. We could produce more presently, but we cannot do it very long unless we discover new crude oil. The only practical way by which that can be done, in my opinion, is by increasing the price of crude oil in order to discover new wells and bring in new and additional production.

Going back to the gentleman's question. We could so much nearer take care of the demands of our own area if we further curtailed our supplies of gasoline going to the eastern seaboard.

Mr. STEFAN. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield is because we have had several mass meetings in my district among traveling men who have been reduced in their mileage to 480 miles per month. The average travel is 1,000 miles a month. This shortage of gasoline is also affecting our sales arrangements where farmers have livestock to sell. The O. P. A. tells me that Mr. Ickes says we do not have the gasoline in the Midwest and for that reason he has asked O. P. A. to put quotas on those traveling men, who will be put out of business, because 480 miles a month is not sufficient for them to cover their territory.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the observation of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. He is always diligent and industrious in looking after the affairs of his people. We have a similar situation in my section of the country. It is my opinion that a much better job could be done than is being done in providing gasoline for our local people and the salesmen who need gas to carry on necessary business. But what concerns me today is the fact that our supplies of crude oil are getting lower and lower, and so very little, practically nothing, is being done about it.

And the demand for the armed forces is growing day by day. Mr. Ickes says that at the beginning of next year 37½ percent of the crude output east of the Rocky Mountains will be required for the armed forces. They are now using more than 30 percent.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that the situation he speaks of in his area, district 2, has been very much worse in district 1 for months and months and when Mr. Ickes stated he would cut the value of the amount of gasoline issued to district 2, he did, and the O. P. A. issued more coupons so as a result we got no additional gasoline in district 1. We had a great deal of suffering last winter and had a great deal of illness as the result of the shortage of oil. District 1 has had gas rationing for a long time.

I am wondering if the gentleman has any suggestions as to how we can secure a raise in the price of oil so we can get an increase in the output? I am so tired of excuses and excuses and excuses by those in charge of the problem. And we now have the coal situation on the east coast, which is a duplicate of the oil situation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We were told last year to advise the people to convert to coal. Thank heavens I did not tell the people to convert to coal.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The only reply I can make to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is this: That unless the Office of Price Administration approves an increase in the price of crude oil the only other alternative I see is to do it by legislation—it is my candid opinion that we are not going to get more crude any other way. I do not think the subsidy

method is practical, and will not do the job.

The only effective practical method of handling it is to increase the price of crude oil, in my judgment, about 50 cents per barrel. That will result in increasing the price of gasoline less than 1 cent per gallon, but in my judgment it will stimulate the drilling of discovery wells and the development of new fields. Even then the price of crude oil would not be out of the way.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the American people would be perfectly willing to have that done in order to secure oil and gasoline?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, I feel they would be more than willing if they understood the situation.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to concur in what the gentleman from Kansas says about the necessity for raising the price of crude oil if we are going to meet the situation that is now becoming serious and emergent.

Like the gentleman from Kansas I represent an oil-producing section. I visited the oil fields of west Texas only recently. As the gentleman knows, new fields are nearly always brought in by wildcatters, or what might be called independents.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct; nearly all of them are brought in by the independent operators.

Mr. THOMASON. The price of crude oil as now fixed was set at the price of some 3 years ago, and that is entirely too low.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. But, in the meantime, there has been a constant rise in the price of labor, machinery, and tools necessary in the drilling of these wells, especially in the deep-test country such as I represent.

As the gentleman so well pointed out, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, after an exhaustive study, has found that there is a shortage of oil and has recommended a reasonable increase in the price of crude and the matter seems to be tied up now with the Office of Price Administration. But in my judgment there is no solution of the matter at present except to grant a reasonable increase in the price of crude and I hope that some such step will be taken and be taken immediately, not only to provide the necessary oil and gas that this country and our armed forces and allies must have, but also to encourage production, particularly in the case of the independents. The major companies have not much to worry about because they make their big money out of byproducts. They can gamble, but independent operators of limited means cannot do that. Some relief must be provided to the independents and that very soon.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Texas, and as I indicate in my general statement, the price of crude oil now is only 60 percent of parity and if the price is increased by 50 cents per barrel, it will not be at parity.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might say that when Secretary Ickes appeared before a meeting at Chicago the burden of his thesis was that there is a shortage of crude oil.

I have been given a memorandum from the chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission stating that they could pick up an additional 350,000 barrels in Texas without impairment of legal reserves; and the memorandum also stated that they could find an additional 50,000 barrels in Louisiana. That would have made 400,000 barrels.

I do not vouch for the accuracy of those figures except that I know the Secretary of the Interior stated that there doubtless was some crude oil that was available, the use of which would not impair the crude reserves.

If that were the case it seems to me it was scarcely necessary to decrease the value of coupons in the Middle West where such decrease has greatly reduced the amount of permissible driving, and does impair the carrying on of retail business, and that is the reason the salesmen have been complaining and emphasizing the matter so forcefully.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution. I just did not extend my discussion to that last point. The situation with respect to the use of gasoline in the Middle West and in the West and Southwest is so much different from what it is in the New England States and along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Because, as the gentleman has well pointed out, for instance, distances are greater for one thing, transportation facilities are so much different from what they are along the eastern seaboard, and then we have a great difference in occupation. We are largely farmers out there, a great many are ranchers, and salesmen have to travel greater distances.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I gladly yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. The statement of the gentleman from Illinois is true, but even with 400,000 barrels that will not take the place of the depletion that is going on in the oil that is in storage today, nor will it take care of the situation as we go along. There is a tremendous sag in the amount of oil that is above the ground now; inroads are being made on that every day, and even though this 400,000 extra barrels of oil a day are produced it is going to put a strain on these wells that a great many of the producers do not want to put on their wells. As the gentleman from Kansas well knows, coming from the oil section—and the gentleman from Oklahoma, my colleague from Texas, and others—there is a certain amount of oil that can be taken out of a well per day to preserve the longest life of the well. If the well is strained the oil left in the ground is likely to be lost because salt water will come in and then your well is gone.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. What we need is new discoveries to keep up the oil reserves that we have above ground. The prospect is that the oil we have in the ground is not going to carry us many years. We need to encourage discovery; we need this injection of a 35-cent-per-barrel increase in the price of oil in order to increase drilling to find new fields and deep fields. Let me cite an instance to show what effect a small increase in the price of oil will have on new drilling. In one place in California in some way they raised the price of crude oil 25 cents a barrel. This within itself increased exploration by 50 percent.

We have got to find new fields if we are to have enough oil to serve us. Also, we have got to go deeper in the fields we have discovered, and also we may have to stop at some of the higher levels that are above the level of profitable production. I do not think we are going to have enough oil in this country unless we make new discoveries. With the price of oil static as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], said, or with the price at what it has been for about 3 years—

Mr. REES of Kansas. In fact, since 1937.

Mr. RAYBURN. And the costs of taking oil out of the ground having gone up from 30 to 40 percent, the little man is just going to disappear from the field; that is all there is to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I make an observation?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That question was explored in the Chicago meeting with the Secretary, may I say to the Speaker. I raised the question as to what it would cost the country if this 35 cents a barrel was allowed. The best estimate at that time was that it would cost about $600,000,000.

I raised this further question: I inquired whether we could differentiate as between established companies that were operating on a profitable basis and companies that were wildcatting so that we could get the benefit of the wildcatting and exploration at the same time. There was no practical answer for it at the time. Some thought it might very seriously interrupt the free flow of industry, and we came to no conclusion.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is exactly correct.

A subsidy has been proposed. I am not one of these fellows who run from subsidies. I think there has been a lot of nonsense uttered about subsidies with reference to farm products; but if you put on a subsidy then many who never drilled a well in their lives will go out and drill for the subsidy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Many of them who know nothing about the business.

Mr. RAYBURN. That would be one difficulty with the subsidy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not sure you can by means of a subsidy.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that we face many practical problems with the little fellow, the so-called independents, and the larger and major companies. I just do not know where we are going to get the relief. I cannot figure it out.

I seriously fear that unless some kind of an incentive in the way of an increased price is granted, we are going to find ourselves in this country in 5 years even, not alone 10 or 15 years, very short of the supply of oil that we need.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me direct this observation to the gentleman from Kansas. Perhaps the Speaker may have an observation also. It seems rather singular this recommendation has been made by the Petroleum Administrator to the O. P. A. on two different occasions and evidently there has been no conclusive action.

Mr. RAYBURN. There has been conclusive action by the O. P. A. because it has disproved the recommendation. It is in another division.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, there was action; but I have never ascertained the reason for the cleavage between the two responsible Government agencies dealing with the same commodity, which is a very interesting thing.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to reply to the gentleman from Illinois in this way: Mr. Ickes, I believe, is in favor of an increase in the price of crude oil. I think he has so expressed that view.

Mr. RAYBURN. He has made the recommendation. He has recommended 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That has gone to the Office of Price Administration for consideration.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has and is out of there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the representation was made the second time, as I understand it.

Mr. RAYBURN. That has been disproved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is rather singular.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is in another jurisdiction right now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And that jurisdiction has done nothing about it.

Mr. RAYBURN. There has been no decision made there.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the distinguished Speaker. I am in accord with his views and I appreciate his constructive and forthright statement.

Somehow, somewhere, somebody in high places in the Government ought to either remedy this situation or give a reason why it is not being done. If a member of the Cabinet, who is also in charge of this particular matter, is in favor of it and has so stated and recommends it, then there ought to be some reason given him why it is not being done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a case where two responsible agencies take the same set of facts and wind up with an entirely diverse conclusion.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have called attention to the fact Mr. Pike, in his testimony yesterday before the Senate committee, mentioned the number of wells that have been drilled during the last 5 or 6 years, but did not give the amount of crude oil produced during that period. He did not go on and discuss the problem of the need for increased supplies of oil by reason of the tremendous increased demand.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Kansas, our distinguished Speaker and the gentleman from Texas spoke from the viewpoint of the producer and they have given us a very good picture of the lack of supplies of gasoline. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Illinois and myself speak from the viewpoint of the consumers, representing people who are holding mass meetings wondering what they are going to do to produce food, to cover their territory and transact a normal business in wartime a business that has a connection with the war effort. They are liable to be wiped out. A solution has been suggested by the distinguished Speaker. Something certainly ought to be done about it because the consumer is not so much interested in price as getting this bottleneck broken. I think the gentleman from Kansas has certainly brought up a very important subject before the House today, a subject in which millions of people are interested and which must be solved if it can be solved.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I am speaking on the question of our being short of crude oil and telling you that the situation is critical. It is not only the producer, everybody is interested in this problem. We must have increased production of crude oil to carry on this war and take care of absolute domestic needs. When you realize, as Secretary Ickes has said in a recent statement, it requires 600,000 barrels of high octane gasoline every day for the armed forces, add this to the additional necessary use of gasoline, you can begin to imagine that the demand is terrific.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman from Kansas has called to the attention of the House one of the most important problems we have before the country, and it demands immediate solution, as I see it. Secretary Ickes has pointed out and has shown by substantial evidence that there is a threatened shortage. Referring again to the independent producers, I happen to know that out in my district they are anxious to drill some wells in proven territory. The Permian Basin in west Texas is ready to be developed but you cannot expect the independent operators to drill at tremendous expense and then sell their oil at a loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. In my district they want to drill deep wells or deepen existing ones. They go to a deeper strata, they go down now eight or ten thousand feet and it costs $250,000 or $300,000 to drill a well. That is a very expensive and speculative operation and those who take the gamble cannot and will not undertake it on a fixed price of 90 cents per barrel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct and extremely important.

Mr. THOMASON. He would certainly operate at a loss if he does not get a higher price for his crude. Since the Secretary of the Interior has recommended an increase in price of 35 cents and the O. P. A. has refused to adopt his recommendation, it seems to me that there is nothing left for the Congress but to take action, which I think it should do.

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I add to what the gentleman from Texas has said with reference to the question of the cost of drilling wells. I have these figures from the Bureau of Mines, which should be authoritative, that in 1937 the average cost per barrel for drilling new oil wells in this country was $56.92; in 1941, $72.48; and in 1943, $207.69. The price of crude oil has been practically the same all the way along.

Mr. THOMASON. That price was frozen as of 3 years ago, whereas there has been a tremendous increase, as I pointed out a little while ago, in the price of labor and all the tools and machinery necessary to drill a well, especially one of these deep-test wells, which is very expensive. The independent operator just cannot do that at the present price and produce the oil that the country and our armed forces must have. It is an emergency situation that must have prompt and favorable action of some kind.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. There are several sets of machinery in my part of the country which are lying idle awaiting a rise in the price of crude oil. I am sure they would start acting at once with such an increase.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my friend from Texas that it was rather interesting to me that the Secretary in making his proposal in Chicago predicated the whole thing upon the fact that there was a depletion of oil reserves and a depletion of visible crude above

the ground, so he felt that something had to be done about it on that basis. That was on the 4th of August. It was so amazing to hear a letter read in that meeting by the gentleman from Indiana, Representative HALLECK, dated July 31, only a few days before, signed by the head of the Fuel Rationing Board of O. P. A., to the effect that rationing had to go on and this program had to be readjusted from time to time for the sake of rubber conservation. So they were proceeding on two entirely separate lines of thought. To me, that is one of the most amazing things. In response to that divergence of opinion Mr. Ickes said, "Well, I neither affirm nor deny." That is the only answer you could get. It seems to me agencies of Government ought to get together.

Mr. THOMASON. I still think that does not go to the heart of the problem, which is the production of more crude oil, and that cannot be done unless those who produce the oil receive a reasonable price that will permit the independents to go ahead with their exploration, and make a fair margin of profit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Again, as the Speaker has so well pointed out, the only way we can increase the amount of crude oil to amount to very much is by the drilling of new wells and bringing in new production, because the wells now producing will stand only a certain amount of pressure. Too much pressure for too long a time will cause water to mix with the oil and may even cause oil producing wells to go entirely to water. They even spoil some of our good wells by pressing them too hard.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that it is a case of not being willing to pay the larger oil companies a higher rate for drilling, companies which perhaps would not drill anyway, than they would be willing to pay the so-called wildcatters? Does that factor enter into the question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentlewoman from Massachusetts were familiar with the problem she would find that most new production is brought in by independent companies, so-called wildcatters.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am familiar with it. I have made a great study of the subject for months.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not so much of it is brought in by the big companies. For that reason, in all probability the larger companies are not so much concerned from that viewpoint.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; but I suppose they would expect the same increase in price?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How long would it take to get enough oil from the drilling of new wells?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This would be pretty difficult to determine. Does the gentlewoman want to know how long it takes to drill an oil well? Is that the point?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No. I know you do not always find oil when you drill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. However, I suppose the gentleman has an approximate idea.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Very likely it would have to cover a period of several months. The length of time required for drilling oil wells differs in different localities. They are required to drill deeper in some areas, than in others. Some fields are more accessible than others. Many factors enter into the situation. I believe if the price of crude were increased 50 cents per barrel, and the W. P. B. would cooperate in allowing materials absolutely needed—and that would not be very great—there would be a marked improvement in a few months.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe we could get oil from Tampico, Mexico, and from Aruba at the present time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not familiar with that situation. I had not heard it suggested. Tampico is a long way off, and way over in old Mexico.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We could get it immediately.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not sure that could be done. Offhand, the plan would seem to be pretty full of complications. In any event, it hardly seems practical for us to import oil from Mexico, when we can have it in our own country if we will drill for it and produce it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the O. P. A. Act, and certain newspaper articles, also a copy of an amendment I have introduced to restore jurisdiction of the Federal courts in review of O. P. A. regulations and restrictions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] for 15 minutes.

THE ISLANDS IN LAKE ERIE AND THEIR INHABITANTS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber we listen to many speeches—to some with enthusiasm and interest and to others, be it admitted, rather reluctantly; often we are amused, frequently informed, and sometimes bored. We have heard it said that the press and radio do not do an entirely thorough job of reporting the proceedings of Congress. That may be because each day there is too much to cover and also because many of the solemn and weighty problems with which the Congress must deal are tedious, colorless, and technical, but nevertheless matters of great pith and moment are ably and intelligently discussed here. Frequently speeches are made in both Houses of Congress that reveal carefully gathered facts and important data, representing long, laborious hours of study and work, for which reason in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we have a vast and valuable mine of information compiled from the speeches delivered here and the pertinent material inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, which is the work of earnest men and women seeking to illuminate and solve the problems with which we as a nation are confronted in this period of peril at home and abroad.

Recently we all have been at home—we have had opportunity to come into personal contact again with those who sent us here to represent them; all of us have received some bouquets and most of us some brickbats, too. We have heard Washington bureaucrats condemned and we have listened to justifiable denouncements of unnecessary and conflicting bureaucratic restrictions and regimentation, but we have returned to our labors here fresh from our contacts with those we are here to serve. All of us realize that we are the duly elected representatives of the people; that we are directly responsible to them; and that they look to us, and not to the appointed bureaucrats, to safeguard their inherent rights and interests.

But today I have no ponderous theme, no involved or intricate matter to discuss; rather, I want to relate the trying situation of several hundred people who are residents of the district I have the honor to represent. These people are hardy Americans, loyal to their country and its traditions, giving freely the services and lives of their sons as well as of their fortunes to the war effort.

Most of you know the Lake Erie Islands. They are located northeast of Toledo and directly north of Port Clinton and Sandusky, picturesquely dotting a great inland sea and richly endowed by a generous Creator.

On one of these islands at Put in Bay is the majestic memorial to Oliver H. Perry, who 130 years ago broke the power of the British Fleet and won for this then young Nation of ours one of its great victories. We are all familiar with this vibrant and glorious message: "We have met the enemy and they are ours." That message came to General Harrison, later President Harrison, and it eventually re-echoed throughout all parts of the young Republic, and in the 130 years since it has gone resounding down the halls of time, a symbolic battle cry, part of the warp and woof of our patriotism and a proud chapter in the saga of our country, strengthening the heart, hand, and will of the generations that have come and gone since that historic September day. Indeed, the memory of Perry's immortal victory on Lake Erie is enshrined and kept aglow in the pres-

ence of a great painting that graces the walls of this very Capitol Building.

On a map I like to look at can be seen just tiny flecks of deep blue which represent these islands that mean so much to many people, including myself. They mean the world and all the good that is in it—hope, surcease from weariness, care and sorrow, friendships, bright and sunny mornings, delightfully cool afternoons, and starlit nights. These islands were the fishing retreats of Presidents Cleveland, Taft, Hayes, and Garfield, and they were the home ports of many of the bold and colorful lake captains of sailing days, including Captains Peterson, Dodge, Schiele, Magle, and Jay Fox Tulin.

While countless thousands of people have visited these islands of Lake Erie, for generations they have been the home of fishermen and workers in the vineyard who permanently occupy them. These two callings, if you please, were the vocations from which the Saviour took his first recruits. There is something unusually substantial and enduring about a fisherman and a vineyard—lasting civilizations have been built by and on them, and so has faith and love and charity and abiding peace.

It was on one of these islands—Middle Bass Isle—that I began my career as a country school teacher and it was during those happy years that I was afforded opportunity to learn the real merit and worth of the people who occupy them—their sincerity, resourcefulness, independence, faith and patriotism that never waver; those who give the most and demand the least in return are the mainstay and backbone of our Nation, and by this measuring rod these wholesome island folk can be identified as among our most valuable and substantial citizens. While these islands have always served as a delightful recreational center for their numerous visitors, the staunch and self-sacrificing qualities of the people who permanently inhabit them can be explained by the conditions they encounter in their daily lives; deprived as they are of the comforts, diversion, and opportunities afforded those who live in more populous communities, isolated from the mainland, icebound during the winter months, these are the conditions that have made them a strong, hardy, and self-reliant people, who never complain except under the duress of justifiable cause.

The recent recess period afforded me the opportunity to visit my friends and former neighbors on these islands, and I can tell you that many of these sturdy, upstanding people are vigorously and bitterly complaining and, I can assure you, for good and sufficient reasons. These people have always stood on their own feet and made their own way—never have they looked to the Federal Government at Washington to solve their problems; never has a demand come from them for Federal aid—"give us," "we want," "how much do we get out of this or that Federal appropriation," has not become a part of their vocabulary or their thinking processes, but the long arm of Washington bureaucracy, with its interferences and restrictions, has come to them and is definitely hindering them from coping with and solving their problems. They have no complaint that practically every one of their sons eligible for military service has gone into active service—that situation they would not change if they could—but now that the fathers and mothers of these boys are left alone to shoulder the full responsibilities of their little farms and small fisheries, willing though they be to work from sunup to sundown, they do resent the ever-increasing handicaps and restrictions imposed on them from Washington. Because of the acute shortage of manpower, these people are hard pressed for additional farm machinery and for repair parts for their fishing equipment which now, when they need those supplies most, they are unable to get. Washington bureaucracy, hewing to the line and letter of restrictive regulations and directives, permits no leeway by which these island folk could continue to make their own way and at least partially solve the problems that war has created for them; instead they have reached a stalemate and economically are rapidly approaching a paralyzed condition.

Nor do they find any solace in the fact that just a few miles north of them there are other islands in Canadian waters whose inhabitants have comparatively greater cooperation and privileges; on these neighboring Canadian islands there is no drastic shortage of manpower; American-made farm machinery is available for purchase; repair parts for boats are obtainable; nor are the boats running in and out of the ports of these Canadian islands hampered by unnecessary restrictions and inspections. Comparing their own plight with the advantages of their Canadian neighbors, these heirs of Commodore Perry are ruefully contemplating the advantages of getting whipped 130 years ago in a war fought for the protection of American freedom and individual economic enterprise. Indeed, in these times the resounding proclamation of Perry—"We have met the enemy and they are ours"—is beginning to have a hollow and confusing ring to these island people of ours.

That the master planners here in Washington are hamstringing 130,000,000 Americans and working on them downright injustices is no longer any secret, but when we see a group of earnest, hard-working people, such as these island folk of mine, made the victims of artificial and unnecessary restrictions, which are rapidly crowding them to the wall economically, as their friend and Representative, I feel that it is high time to make a public protest in their behalf.

The people on these islands of ours in Lake Erie represent the highest type of Americanism—patriotic and self-sacrificing, patient and enduring, self-sustaining and unafraid—it is their kind who, unregulated, uninspected, and unregimented, have made our country great by doing well the great and small tasks which have been thrust upon them. I plead, in God's name, give them a reasonable chance.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Speaker of the House is interested in this very vital oil situation and has taken the floor to speak about it gives me hope that we can secure some legislation, which we have not been able to do heretofore. The urgent need for oil is generally admitted. The public is not so much interested in how we secure oil and gasoline as they are in getting it. The people have been treated badly in this matter—especially persons living in district 1. Recommendations have been made by Secretary Ickes for a raise in the price of oil. O. P. A. promptly turns it down. It then has gone to a higher authority on appeal, and it has been turned down there several times. It has been referred to our former distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Judge Vinson, several times.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1318. An act authorizing the appointment of additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

738. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the Navy Department (including separate estimates for the United States Coast Guard and United States Marine Corps) estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

739. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the complete annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

740. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter with regard to the withdrawal from the list of recommended suspension of deportation in the case of Ruby Keyes or Ruby Amelia Moriarty Keyes, now known as Ruby Amelia Norton, C. R. 1334; 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. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the Army forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3291. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 709). 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. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3307. A bill relating to court review of certain orders and regulations of the Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3308. A bill extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3309. A bill to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3310. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the following streams, Warroad River, both branches, and Bull Dog Run, in the State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3311 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment of children employed in the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3312. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for an annuity for total and permanent disability after 10 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3313. A bill to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3314. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds collected by District of Columbia examining, licensing, and other boards and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3315. A bill relative to certain annuities; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3316. A bill amending the provisions of law relating to the renegotiation of war contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3317. A bill to repeal Public, No. 252, an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 160 (by request). Joint resolution to permit members of the armed forces of other United Nations to import alcoholic beverages into the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WENE:

H. Res. 305. Resolution authorizing an investigation and study by the Committee on Agriculture with respect to poultry shows and expositions in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2476. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition of sundry residents of Erie County, N. Y., urging favorable consideration of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2477. Also, resolution adopted by the Missionary Society of the Church of God at Niagara Falls, N. Y., having to do with the manufacture, sale, and distribution of all alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2478. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of 103 citizens of Greene County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2479. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Clark County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2480. Also, petition of 53 citizens of Champaign County, Ohio, 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 by the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2481. Also, petition of 87 citizens of Fayette County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2482. Also, petition of 32 citizens of Clinton County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2483. Also, petition of 39 citizens of Washington Court House, Ohio, and vicinity, urging the early consideration and a favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2484. Also, petition of 19 citizens of South Charleston, Ohio, for the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2485. Also, petition of 60 citizens of Madison County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2486. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Harry P. Roy, of St. Louis, Mo., and 139 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2487. Also, petition of Fred Hauser and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2488. Also, petition of A. J. Batz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2489. Also, petition of Arthur Binz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the pasasge of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2490. Also, petition of Al. Prenavo and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2491. Also, petition of Peter Schneider, of St. Louis, Mo., and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2492. Also, petition of Harvey William Christensen and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2493. Also, petition of Harry H. Molkenbur, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2494. Also, petition of Casper Kovarik, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2495. Also, petition of the Baltmar Buffet, St. Louis, Mo., signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2496. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of Col. H. E. Whitledge Chapter, No. 9, Disabled American Veterans, of Outwood, Ky., on the subject of veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2497. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the members of American Legion Post, No. 2, of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2498. Also, petition of the members of the American Legion Post, No. 48, of Benwood, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2499. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 3592, passed by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, urging re-

peal of Chinese Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2500. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of members of Charleston (W. Va.) Building Trades Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, favoring the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act and requesting that the prices of food be rolled back to May 1942 level; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2501. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of John McKinley and 103 others, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation during the war emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2502. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Osceola, Iowa, in the interest of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O brooding spirit of God, in the midst of tragedies, beset by threatening perils, give us strength to cast into the chalice of comfort those compelling ingredients of a conquering faith. O put it to the quivering lips of weeping mothers with the task of emancipating themselves when the outlook is barren and joys droop. Dear Lord, it is so easy to be overtaken by desolating calamity through a false step; do Thou help when staggered by some strange trial and when we fail to gage some situation. We pray that the sufferings of others may challenge us to greater diligence and sacrifice as we tread our smooth, though oftentimes uncertain, ways.

Grant that duty may be our watchword as these days tremble with responsibilities; teach us the wise thing to do and the right way to go that its performance may command approval and support throughout our country. O Thou who dost clothe the lily and inspire the songbird, encourage us to grow in the beauty and strength of Christian manhood and womanhood, thereby justifying our place in the service of our democracy. For life and light, Heavenly Father, and for all this great world with its infinite source of truth and hope, accept our grateful praise. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, the barefoot boy from Wall Street, who is recommending himself as candidate for President on the Republican ticket.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a radio speech given by the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you that I have submitted my resignation as a Member of Congress from the Twenty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania to Gov. Edward W. Martin, effective 6 p. m., September 24, 1943.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the many courtesies you have extended me.

Very sincerely,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. 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. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted my resignation as a Member of Congress effective 6 p. m., tomorrow, September 24. My resignation is the result of my intense desire to serve my country in the armed forces as a member of the United States Navy.

I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues for the many courtesies shown me during the past 5 years. I shall think often of you and the multitude of important issues you will be called upon to decide. Believe me when I tell you it has been a distinct honor to serve in this distinguished body, the Congress of the United States; yet I feel it is an equal honor to be blessed with good health and able to serve in the armed forces.

Naturally it shall be my ambition, when the war clouds have been dispersed, to return to Congress, richer in experience and with a broader outlook.

Until we meet again, good luck and godspeed to all of you.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the wishes of every Member of the House when I say we regret very much the loss of our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. While he has always been a loyal Republican, yet Democrats and Republicans alike appreciate his many admirable qualities and the fine service he has rendered in Congress for his district and his country. He has always zealously promoted that which he believed was for the best welfare of his country. He has been outstanding in his affection for the veterans of the country and he has always been their ready champion. A veteran of the First World War himself, interested as he has been in many patriotic organizations, he knew their needs and vigorously urged legislation which would contribute to their welfare and that of their dependents. We in the House have cherished his judgment in veteran legislation. I might say that in urging legislation he has never waited for others to take the lead. Much of the legislation which he urged was enacted into law and more of it will be in the next few months.

So, Jim, we regret to see you go, although we admire the warm patriotic urge which prompts you to serve your country on the field of battle in this critical time. We are certain your new career will bring to you even richer honors than you have won in the past. May you have the fullest measure of success; may you escape unharmed the ravages of war and may you return to this great body at some future date. When you do return with new honors and with the satisfaction of having contributed to the victory your country will win we will welcome you with outstretched arms.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. 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. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, patriotism plus courage are component factors in the make-up of one who will resign a seat in Congress at this time to enter the armed forces. These factors are common denominators in JIMMIE VAN ZANDT. While we all regret exceedingly to see him go, yet we applaud his choice and wish him good luck. His path in the days immediately ahead will be over a rugged and dangerous course. He served with honor in the Navy during World War No. 1. He has had considerable active duty on the high seas during the present war. He knows the danger which confronts him and I am sure that his decision is not prompted by emotion or overpersuasion. It is just plain, natural JIMMIE VAN ZANDT, responding to what I am convinced he feels sure is his duty.

Many of us have been acquainted with this unusual man since shortly after the First World War. We came to know him well because of his interest in veterans' legislation and his association with veteran organizations. More recently, as legislative representative and national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he has been well known to all Members of Congress. Few veterans have a Nation-wide acquaintance equal to his.

He came to Congress equipped for the work and has done a splendid, worthwhile job. JIMMIE VAN ZANDT is always most interested in the common man. It will be difficult for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania to fill his place