for towage or salvage services to such vessels, when the Secretary of the Navy certifies that the prosecution of such proceedings would endanger the security of naval operations or interfere therewith, and to authorize the settlement and payment of such claims, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1894. An act to provide for the transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the naval service because of under age at time of enlistment; with amendment (Rept. No. 1682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4968. A bill to amend section 511 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, relative to deposit of vessel proceeds received from the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 593. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4901, a bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore Air Field; without amendment (Rept. No. 1679). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims, H. R. 2150. A bill for the relief of Diemer Adison Coulter and Frances Andrews Coulter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 5055. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss STANLEY:

H. R. 5056. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, so as to make it an unfair labor practice to discriminate against any employee, in the rate of compensation paid, on account of sex; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5057. A bill to authorize the continued operation of certain airport traffic-control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 5058. A bill to provide for the issuance of grazing permits for livestock in the national parks and national monuments; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 599. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4991, a bill to remove restrictions on transfers of small craft to other American republics in furtherance of the war effort; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 600. Resolution urging on behalf of the United States House of Representatives a diplomatic break with Franco (Fascist) Spain, and extension of lend-lease to the guerrilla armies of the Spanish Republic underground; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 601. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4405, a bill to amend the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), as amended, so as to more specifically provide for pay, allotments, and administration pertaining to war casualties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 602. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1173, a bill to provide for staying judicial proceedings against the United States in time of war, on claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy, or for towage or salvage services to such vessels, when the Secretary of the Navy certifies that the prosecution of such proceedings would endanger the security of naval operations or interfere therewith, and to authorize the settlement and payment of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 603. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 5059. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zelma Inez Cheek; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of Clyde H. Palmer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 5061. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keaton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5871. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution, adopted by the Bailey-Delavan Businessmen and Taxpayers Association, Inc., protesting against the enactment of legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5872. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers Union, Local No. 816, New York City, urging the passage of the Fay bill (H. R. 4319) and Weiss bill (H. R. 4501) which measures provide time and a half overtime for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5873. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Pomona Grange, No. 65, of Lawrence County, Pa., favoring the removal of sugar from the rationing list; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5874. Also, petition of the Economy Grange, No. 2013, of Beaver County, Pa., urging the enactment of Senate bill 1882 and House bill 4715, to advance postal salaries to conform to the increased cost of living; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5875. By Mrs. NORTON: New Jersey State Senate resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5876. By Mr. ROLPH: California Senate Resolution No. 4, urging that the Colorado River treaty be not ratified by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5877. Also, California Senate Resolution No. 5, in reference to access road to Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5878. Also, California Senate Resolution No. 7, in reference to, and urging passage of, House bill 4184, land-grant railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5879. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Central Labor Union of Orange County, Santa Ana, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the renewal of the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5880. Also, petition of the secretary, Potomac Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to repeal of the Asiatic Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5881. Also, petition of various real-estate owners, banks, and agents of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the inequities in the rent-control section of the present Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5882. Also, petition of the fifty-third continental congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enforcement of immigration and naturalization qualifications, etc., to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

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

Rev. Edward Hughes Pruden, D. D., pastor, First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Heavenly Father, God of our fathers and our God, we thank Thee that from one generation to another Thou hast been revealing Thy power and love to all the sons of men, and that as we stand today confronted by all the uncertainty and tragedy of this hour we do not stand alone, for we have put our trust in Thee.

We are grateful that the Presiding Officer of this body has landed safely at his destination in China, and we would pray Thy richest blessings upon him as he engages in his important mission. Wilt Thou give the leadership and wisdom of Thy Holy Spirit to this body today as they face the significant issues before them. Bless our Nation and all the nations of the earth, that in due season every heart and every mind may be brought into subjection to the will of Jesus Christ, our Lord, through whom we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 19, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GILLETTE) laid before the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE TEXTILE FOUNDATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Textile Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the board of directors of the Textile Foundation for the year ended December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth bimonthly report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the period April 1, 1944, through May 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War (6), Justice (2), Navy (2), Interior (2), and Agriculture (7); Selective Service System (2), Civil Service Commission, and Administrative Office of United States Courts (United States District Court, District of Maryland) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations;

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relating to the statutory compact between the United States and the State of California, evidenced by the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the California Water Limitation Act, and opposing ratification of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, and pending before the Senate of the United States, on the ground that such treaty would constitute a breach of the said compact.

"Whereas the United States of America and the State of California heretofore entered into a certain statutory compact, which compact was made in the manner following:

"The Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) provided that if, in consideration of the passage of said act, California should within 6 months adopt an act limiting her use of Colorado River water to certain quantities, and if California and certain other States should ratify the Colorado River Compact, then said Project Act and all the provisions thereof should become effective, but otherwise should not become effective.

"California did, within said time, expressly in consideration of the passage of said Project Act, adopt such a Limitation Act (Calif. Stats. 1929, 38), and did ratify the Interstate Compact, known as the Colorado River Compact (Calif. Stats. 1929, 37), all in precise conformity to the requirements of the Project Act. The President thereupon proclaimed the Project Act effective; and

"Whereas California by the adoption of said Limitation Act did subject herself, her lands and people to a drastic reduction of the amount of water of the Colorado River otherwise available for use in California, and did by the adoption of said Ratifying Act subject herself, her lands and people to the burdens imposed by the Colorado River Compact; and

"Whereas said Boulder Canyon Project Act contains the following provisions, a part of said statutory compact, which were intended to protect and safeguard the availability to California of the quantity of water to which California limited herself, to wit, provisions: (1) That the water of the Colorado River to be conserved by Boulder Dam should be used "exclusively within the United States"; (2) that no person should have the use of the water conserved by Boulder Dam, except by contract made by the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States; and (3) that such contracts should be for permanent service; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, has entered into contracts authorized by said Project Act with public agencies of the State of California for the delivery to them, for domestic and irrigation uses, of large quantities of water of the Colorado River conserved by Boulder Dam and for other rights and benefits authorized by the Project Act; and

"Whereas said Limitation Act and said Ratifying Act were adopted by California and said contracts were entered into by California's public agencies in absolute reliance upon the full performance and observance by the United States of the above-mentioned protective provisions of the Project Act and this legislature declares that it would not have adopted said Limitation Act nor said Ratifying Act, nor would said contracts have been executed by said public agencies, had not said Project Act contained said protective provisions; and

"Whereas there is pending before the Senate of the United States a treaty, signed February 3, 1944, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, whereby the United States would guarantee to Mexico delivery annually and in a certain prescribed manner of a quantity of the water of the Colorado River, which quantity cannot be delivered to Mexico in such manner without delivering to her water conserved by Boulder Dam; and

"Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would impair the ability of the United States to render permanent service of water under said California contracts and otherwise perform said contracts; and

"Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would create a right in water conserved by Boulder Dam, by means other than by contract with the Secretary of the Interior; and

"Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would make it impossible for the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill the contracts which he has executed on behalf of the United States under the authority of the Project Act and would make it impossible for the United States to observe and perform its obligations under said statutory compact, to wit, the above-mentioned protective provisions of said Project Act; and

"Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would cause the consideration for the adoption by California of said statutory compact to fail and said statutory compact would be thereby breached by the United States: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California urgently represents to the President and the Senate of the United States that the ratification of the pending treaty would constitute a breach of the solemn statutory compact entered into between the United States of America and the State of California and evidenced by the above-mentioned statutes, to the great and irreparable damage of California; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That said legislature urges that the pending treaty be not ratified; and further urges that in any treaty that may be entered into between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, the rights of the State of California under said statutory compact and the contractual rights of her public agencies be fully protected; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Governor is hereby requested to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate, the chairman and each member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, also to each of the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Fredonia (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1161, to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1947. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 996).

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

H. R. 702. A bill to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 997).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 3976. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Kee; without amendment (Rept. No. 998).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2004. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes", approved June 11, 1942; with an amendment (Rept. No. 999).

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

S. Res. 309. Resolution to investigate conditions prevailing in the production, processing, distribution, and marketing of agricultural commodities; with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DANAHER:

S. 2020. A bill for the relief of Capt. Francis Scott Bradford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2021 (by request). A bill to create a board to be known as the National Symphony Orchestra Trust Fund Board, to define the duties of said board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 2022. A bill to safeguard the activities of the Office of Censorship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2023. A bill to permit Federal employees to serve as election officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2024. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to J. W. Mulligan;

S. 2025. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Bull Shows and Horse; and

S. 2026. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Pickett; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2027. A bill authorizing conveyance of the Seger Indian School to Colony Union Graded School District No. 1, Colony, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 2028. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOLIC-BEVERAGE INDUSTRY—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. McCARRAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 315), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 206, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to November 16, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the alcoholic-beverage industry), is hereby increased by $25,000.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH—EDITORIAL FROM THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are all aware of the great advances which have occurred in the health of the American people since the beginning of this century. Life has been made more secure. Living has been freed from many of the ailments which used to harm and cripple. A vast amount of human suffering has been prevented. Premature deaths have been greatly reduced, and the security of American families has been vastly increased.

Much remains yet to be done. With wise leadership and strong support from government and the public, our health leaders can bring even greater blessings for the future.

It is a source of great pride to all who have had responsibilities for the public welfare and the public health that they have helped to make this a healthier country than it used to be. A small group, however, has incorrectly and mistakenly claimed that the credit for these accomplishments belongs wholly or largely to the individual physician or to the private practice of medicine on a fee-for-service basis. Such extravagant claims have been repeatedly made by certain medical spokesmen, more interested in attacking and vilifying the social security bill (S. 1161) introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself than in correctly stating the facts for public education.

A brief analysis of this subject, stating the facts authoritatively, has just appeared in the American Journal of Public Health, the official publication of the American Public Health Association. It is in the form of an editorial entitled "Who Killed Cock Robin?"

I ask unanimous consent to have this revealing editorial printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From American Journal of Public Health for June 1944]

WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN?

The reduction of the death rate by approximately 40 percent during the first 4 decades of the present century is one of the most significant events in human history. In such an achievement, there is glory enough for all. Health officers, public-spirited private practitioners, engineers, nurses, laboratory investigators, social workers, educators, have all participated in the task.

To claim the fruits of victory for one individual professional group is therefore unwarranted. To associate them with a particular sector of one profession operating on a particular economic plan is still more unjustifiable. Yet this is what has been attempted in the flood of propaganda literature issued by the publicity staff of the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service and distributed on a vast scale through the medium of certain agencies in the drug trade. The committee states that it has printed 20,000,000 copies of one of these leaflets, which claims that the achievements of the past years have been accomplished by American doctors operating under the American system; and it is obvious that, by the American system, is meant the private practice by individual physicians on a fee-for-service basis—since the entire flood of this propaganda is directed against any further participation by Government in the development of more adequate medical care. Such an argument obviously raises the question whether American doctors practicing on the particular system which the national committee prefers, or on the equally American plan of official public service, deserve a major share of credit for our reduced death rates. As Governor Smith used to say: "Let's look at the record." The pertinent points of this record are indicated in the following table:

Changes in mortality, 1900–40

	Death rate per 100,000		Percent reduction	Actual deaths, 1940	Deaths which would have occurred in 1940 at 1900 rates	Number of lives saved per year
	1900	1940				
Typhoid and paratyphoid fevers	35.9	1.1	97	1,443	47,173	45,736
Diphtheria	43.3	1.1	97	1,457	56,896	55,439
Diarrhea and enteritis	133.2	10.3	92	13,573	175,025	161,452
Measles, scarlet fever, and whooping cough	34.8	3.2	91	4,300	45,727	41,427
Tuberculosis	201.2	45.9	77	60,428	264,377	203,949
Pneumonia and influenza	180.5	70.3	61	92,525	237,177	144,652
All other causes	1,126.1	944.5	16	1,243,543	1,479,695	236,152

In this table are shown the actual results accomplished between 1900 and 1940 in the reduction of mortality from the five causes of death with which the organized health forces of the community have been concerned, and also the corresponding reduction in pneumonia and influenza, where responsibility has been shared between the public-health officer and the private physician. The last line of the table includes the changes in mortality from all other causes taken together. Many of these have also come within the scope of the public-health program.

It will be noted that typhoid fever and diphtheria mortality rates have been reduced by 97 percent. The results accomplished in the case of typhoid fever have been due to the work of the engineer, to purification of the public water supplies, improvement in sanitary conditions, and to epidemiological control and immunization programs, conducted by health officers. In the case of diphtheria, administrative control, and the use of antitoxin and later toxoid, are responsible for the accomplishment. The basic discoveries in these fields were made by men like W. H. Park working in public-health laboratories, and introduced by health officers like Hermann M. Biggs, often in face of vigorous opposition from the practitioner.

Diarrhea and enteritis of infants have been reduced by 92 percent through the pasteurization of milk supplies, under the leadership of public-health authorities, and through the establishment by boards of health and visiting-nurse associations of well-baby clinics for the instruction of mothers. Here again the initiative came primarily from the organized health forces representing the public interest.

The group of infectious diseases of childhood, measles, scarlet fever, and whooping cough, have shown a 91-percent reduction in mortality, due in large part to vigorous and energetic epidemiological control on the part of public-health authorities. Tuberculosis, which has been cut down by 77 percent, represents the result of a program carried on in nearly all its phases through the leadership of public-health departments, public-health clinics, and publicly maintained sanatoria. Here again, it should be, recalled that the introduction of the first program for the reporting of tuberculosis was strenuously opposed by the medical profession.

In the case of pneumonia and influenza the practicing physician deserves a lion's share of the credit. Even here, however, it should be pointed out that the basic discoveries in regard to serum treatment and the use of sulfa drugs were made by salaried physicians in the employ of public-health laboratories and foundations and universities, rather than by private practitioners.

It seems certain that the organized public-health profession rather than the private medical practitioner is responsible for a major part of the gains which have been made during the past 40 years.

It is no doubt true that the "Other causes" of death listed in the last line of the table are much more difficult to control than those which the Public Health Administrator has so successfully attacked; but it may be hoped that a sound system of prepayment which will make good medical care available to the lower economic half of the population, now woefully lacking in such services, would produce notable results in the reduction of many other causes of death than those which have so far been successfully attacked.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by

Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, at a luncheon meeting June 19, at the Department of Agriculture, of Extension Service workers who have been with the Service for a period of 10 years or more, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMITTANCE OF EUROPEAN REFUGEES—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Westbrook Pegler Remarks: 'Roosevelt's "Thousand Refugees" Mere Sample,'" which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BONDS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM—ADDRESS BY M. E. BATHURST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the bonds between the United States and the United Kingdom, delivered by Mr. M. E. Bathurst, legal adviser to the British Embassy, before Kappa Beta Pi, Women's International League Honor Sorority, on June 17, 1944, at Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL LAW—ADDRESS BY H. S. HALLO

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by H. S. Hallo, first secretary of the Nertherlands Embassy, delivered before Kappa Beta Pi, Women's International League Honor Sorority, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive, on page 10, as amended. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has the floor.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Wagner
Cordon	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Murdock	Weeks
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wherry
George	Overton	White
Gerry	Pepper	Willis
Gillette	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent attending the wedding of his daughter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Mississippi in yielding to me while the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is on the floor.

Yesterday, in the course of the remarks of the Senator from New York, he inserted in the RECORD a great deal of written material. A few minutes ago I happened to read some of this material inserted in the RECORD by the Senator during his address. In this matter the Senator took occasion to reflect upon my sincerity and my integrity. He did not make the statement openly on the floor—I was present and listened to his remarks—but he reserved it for the matter which he inserted in the RECORD and which was not read or discussed publicly.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish now to read from page 6244 of the daily RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. MEAD. May I ask for the page number again?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I shall read now. It is page 6244. In a long and rather elaborate brief on the constitutionality of the creation of the agency which is under discussion the Senator made this statement:

> This entire constitutional argument is a smoke screen to hide the real issue. The real issue is the race issue, as all of us know. For, if the Senator from Georgia is so perturbed about Executive order agencies, why has he kept silent about other agencies similarly created?

And on page 6245 I read the following sentence:

> This demonstrates the insincerity of the so-called constitutional opposition to the F. E. P. C.

I shall not, Mr. President, discuss the ethics of the action of a Member of this body in referring in such terms to another Member of the body by insertion in the RECORD rather than a statement on the floor. The decency of such procedure must be decided by each Member for himself.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, not being a lawyer——

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish the Senator would let me proceed for a few minutes. I do not wish to become involved in a legal discussion.

Mr. MEAD. I do not think it will be necessary for us to proceed with this discussion if the Senator will allow me the privilege of explaining just how that matter got into the RECORD and also give me the opportunity to withdraw it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from New York was asked on the floor yesterday who prepared that statement, and he stated that he prepared it himself.

Mr. MEAD. I said it was compiled at my instance, from hearings, debates, and discussions upon this subject, and I am sure the Senator from Georgia will agree with me that if he finds anything objectionable, and I do now from the very slight——

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not only objectionable to me, but I assert that it is absolutely untrue and without any basis in fact, and I shall proceed to show that the accusation is absolutely false.

Mr. MEAD. I assure the Senator that it is absolutely agreeable to me to have it removed from the permanent RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall proceed because the Senator was asked yesterday to give the author of the memorandum, and he made this statement:

> This is my own statement.

That was the Senator's statement on the floor yesterday, that it was his own statement.

Mr. MEAD. In further explanation I want to say to my distinguished colleague, whom I never meant in the slightest to injure in any way, that I had a complete review of all the RECORD debates and discussions made, and of course in doing so one should take out a large number of words and a large amount of data that have been compiled, and I must agree that I did not go over it all very carefully, or would never have left anything in the RECORD that would have disturbed my colleague, and I assure him that I shall take it out of the permanent RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not care what the Senator does about taking it out of the permanent RECORD. I intend to show for the permanent RECORD that the statement is absolutely without foundation in fact.

Mr. MEAD. I join my colleague in saying that. It was not my intention to say anything to disturb my colleague.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not a question of the Senator's colleague being disturbed. It is a question of the fact. I shall undertake to show that I have been interested in bringing many Executive agencies under the control of the Congress. It is not any new movement with me, and this statement which the Senator vouched for yesterday is absolutely without any foundation in fact.

Mr. MEAD. I assume the responsibility for it, Mr. President, because I ordered a compilation of everything available on this question since it arose, and I put it all together, and I am sorry that I did not read it over more carefully. But I want to assure the Senator that so far as I am concerned, I shall take the whole speech out if it hurts him in the slightest. I can see where that reference does him an injustice, and I want to assure him that it will come out of the permanent RECORD at my instigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The statement does not hurt me, because it is not true. I shall try to place facts in the RECORD. The record of the Congress and of the Committee on Appropriations for some years will show that this is no new movement on my part to combat agencies that have been created by Executive order.

Mr. MEAD. I realize that, and I want to assure the Senator now that he has my fullest cooperation in the revision of anything in that statement that in any way does him an injustice. I will go as far as I possibly can to right any wrong that he may decide has been caused by that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not asked and I shall not ask that anything that the Senator has incorporated in the RECORD be revised or withdrawn. I merely wish to point out, Mr. President——

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield further, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BILBO. I yield, Mr. President, until the Senators settle the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the question of congressional control over executive agencies is not a new one. This is not the first time it has arisen in the Senate. I have before me the journal and the permanent records of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which I have just sent for. At the meeting of the Committee on Appropriations which was held on May 26, 1943, the following appears from the permanent journal of the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

Emergency fund for the President: Senator MCKELLAR called attention to the proviso under this item. Senator RUSSELL moved that the proviso be deleted, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof a new proviso. The language deleted and inserted on the adopted of Senator RUSSELL's motion is as follows:

Then follows the language deleted as follows:

Provided, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration, or for any of the functions of either said Board or said Administration.

The language inserted is as follows:

Provided, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for any of the functions of any agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by the Congress, or for the functions of any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Budget and for which Congress has failed to make appropriations: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to allotments or allocations made to the War Department or the Navy Department.

I might recite some of the history of that amendment. It had appeared in the hearings before the committee that Budget estimates had been submitted for the operation of an agency of government that had been created by Executive order. Congress had refused to appropriate for the maintenance of that agency. The agency had been continued in existence by the allocation of moneys from the President's emergency fund, and that fund was the subject of consideration in the Committee on Appropriations. It had seemed to me, Mr. President, that it was in violation of the fundamental rights of the Congress to undertake to carry on an agency with funds appropriated for emergency purposes when the Congress had refused to appropriate after request had been duly submitted for funds for the support of such an agency. That amendment was somewhat altered, but in final form it prevented the allocation of funds for any function or project. I may read, so as to make the record complete, the amendment as it came from the conference and was enacted into law.

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

Mr. President, that was the language of the final enactment of the deficiency bill which was passed by Congress in 1943 and approved by the President. The amendment was considered before the issuance of the last Executive order of the President creating the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

Mr. President, the record of the Congress for this year shows that I was the author of an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill which sought to go further in curtailing the action of the executive department in assuming functions which I regard as belonging to and being inherent in the right of the legislative body. This bill was reported by the committee in March of this year. I shall not read all of the proceedings in the committee, but I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD section 213 of the independent offices appropriation bill, an amendment which related not only to the F. E. P. C. but to any number of executive agencies of Government. This amendment prohibited the transfer of any funds by the Executive for the maintenance of any agency created by Executive order which had been in existence for more than 1 year and for which the Congress had never made appropriations or had not specifically approved by legislative action. That amendment was the subject of some debate. It was finally approved by the Senate. It was approved by the House, and is in the independent offices appropriation bill which has gone to the President.

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

SEC. 213. After January 1, 1945, no part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be allotted or made available to, or used to pay the expenses of, any agency or instrumentality including those established by Executive order after such agency or instrumentality has been in existence for more than 1 year, if the Congress has not appropriated any money specifically for such agency or instrumentality or specifically authorized the expenditure of funds by it. For the purposes of this section, any agency or instrumentality including those established by Executive order shall be deemed to have been in existence during the existence of any other agency or instrumentality, established by a prior Executive order, if the principal functions of both of such agencies or instrumentalities are substantially the same or similar. When any agency or instrumentality is or has been prevented from using appropriations by reason of this section, no part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be used to pay the expenses of the performance by any other agency or instrumentality of functions which are substantially the same as or similar to the principal functions of the agency or instrumentality so prevented from using appropriations, unless the Congress has specifically authorized the expenditure of funds for performing such functions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no Member of the Congress has been more diligent in his attempt to assert the right of the Congress to legislate in creating agencies than has the Senator from Georgia.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States to a Member of the House of Representatives listing 40 or 50 executive agencies which the Comptroller General says may be affected by this amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill, of which amendment I was the author.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 31, 1944.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: Reference is made to your informal request for the following information:

1. A list of the Government agencies operating at present under Presidential Executive order.

2. A list of the Government agencies operating on funds set aside by the President—such as the Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

It is understood that this information is desired in connection with consideration of the possible effect of Senate amendment No. 68 to the independent offices appropriation bill, 1945, H. R. 4070. Said amendment, in

the bill as passed by the Senate, is as follows:

"SEC. 213. After July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be allotted or made available to, or used to pay the expenses of, any agency or instrumentality including those established by Executive order after such agency or instrumentality has been in existence for more than 1 year, if the Congress has not appropriated any money specifically for such agency or instrumentality or specifically authorized the expenditure of funds by it. For the purposes of this section, any agency or instrumentality including those established by Executive order shall be deemed to have been in existence during the existence of any other agency or instrumentality, established by a prior Executive order, if the principal functions of both of such agencies or instrumentalities are substantially the same or similar. When any agency or instrumentality is or has been prevented from using appropriations by reason of this section, no part of any appropriation or fund made available by this or any other act shall be used to pay the expenses of the performance by any other agency or instrumentality of functions which are substantially the same as or similar to the principal functions of the agency or instrumentality so prevented from using appropriations, unless the Congress has specifically authorized the expenditure of funds for performing such functions."

I have been unable, in the time available for the compilation of the information you desire, to have an exhaustive search made. However, there appears in the Senate hearings on the bill referred to above, H. R. 4070, commencing on page 509, a letter dated February 28, 1944, from the Bureau of the Budget, furnishing, in response to a request of Senator RUSSELL, information as to agencies established by Executive order or in any other manner than by specific legislation, and as to the method by which the expenses of those agencies were financed. The two lists which follow were obtained from that source, to which reference may be made for further details. Said letter included data with respect to a considerable number of agencies originally established by Executive order, but now financed mainly by direct appropriation. In view of the purpose of your inquiry, and of the fact that these agencies are operating at this time not only under Presidential authority, but pursuant to specific annual appropriations, such agencies are not included in the lists below.

The following list shows those Government agencies operating at present under Executive orders or letters of the President, or pursuant to direction or approval of the President:

Agencies in the Executive Office of the President: Committee for Congested Production Areas; Liaison Office for Personnel Management; agencies in the Office for Emergency Management: Board of War Communications, Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Foreign Economic Administration (some constituent agencies), Office of Alien Property Custodian; agencies in the Office of War Mobilization: Retraining and Reemployment Administration, Surplus War Property Administration.

American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas.

Committee to Investigate Racial Discriminations in Certain Fields of Railroad Employment.

Federal Interdepartmental Safety Council.

Federal Real Estate Board.

Agency in Federal Works Agency: Federal Fire Council.

Interdepartmental Committee to Consider Cases of Subversive Activities on the Part of Federal Employees.

Interdepartmental War Savings Bond Committee.

President's Committee for Education of Men Demobilized From the Armed Forces.

President's War Relief Control Board.

War Refugee Board.

Agency under Department of Commerce: National Patent Planning Commission.

Agencies under Department of the Interior: Coal Mines Administration, Puerto Rico Legislative Committee.

Agency under Department of Labor: Wage Adjustment Board.

The following list shows those Government agencies operating on funds allocated by the President:

Liaison Office for Personnel Management.

Committee for Congested Production Areas.

Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

Foreign Economic Administration (some constituent agencies).

American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas.

Committee to Investigate Racial Discriminations in Certain Fields of Railroad Employment.

President's Committee for Education of Men Demobilized From the Armed Forces.

President's War Relief Control Board.

War Refugee Board.

Coal Mines Administration.

Puerto Rico Legislative Committee.

Wage Adjustment Board (in part).

Of these agencies, now financed by funds allocated by the President, appropriations for the following are included in pending bills:

Committee on Fair Employment Practice (National War Agency appropriation bill, 1945, H. R. 4879).

President's War Relief Control Board (State Department appropriation bill, 1945, H. R. 4204).

In addition, estimates for appropriations for the following agencies have been submitted to the Congress:

Committee for Congested Production Areas (H. Doc. No. 488).

American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas (H. Doc. No. 568).

Foreign Economic Administration (H. Doc. No. 566).

While the full effect of the amendment in question may not be determined definitely from the facts now of record in this office, the following corporations, as instrumentalities of the Government, might be affected in some manner by the provision as passed by the Senate:

American President Lines, Ltd.

Cargoes, Inc.

Colonial Mica Corporation.

Defense Homes Corporation.

Federal National Mortgage Association.

Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation.

Panama Railroad Company.

Puerto Rico Cement Corporation.

Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

United States Spruce Production Corporation.

War Emergency Pipelines, Inc.

War Hemp Industries, Inc.

War Materials, Inc.

Warrior River Terminal Company.

Defense Supplies Corporation.

Metals Reserve Company.

Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

Rubber Development Corporation.

Rubber Reserve Company.

United States Commercial Company.

Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

Institute of Inter-American Transportation.

Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.

Inter-American Navigation Corporation.

Prencinradio.

I trust that the foregoing will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, not only is the charge which has been made unfair and untrue, but it is directly controverted by the records of the Congress. I have only this to say: If all the matter which was inserted at such great length by the Senator from New York has no more basis in fact than the charge printed in the RECORD, but not stated on the floor, which questions my sincerity in attempting to recapture all the powers of Congress which may have been assumed by the other coordinate branches of this Government, it is not worthy of the Senator. Neither is it worth while for any person to read or credit.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I have noted the brief references to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia, and I am taking them out of the permanent RECORD. I agree that in the past he has indicated an opposition to agencies of this character, and I wish to say so publicly in the Senate.

I also wish to have it understood that I gathered together all the information I could bearing upon the constitutional question, and because I did not wish to take the time of the Senate, I, therefore, asked the Senate to allow me to have it made a part of the RECORD. In the hurry of last evening I did not read it all over as carefully as I might have done. I assure the Senator that I am interested now only in a vote on this question and in making sure that there is nothing in the RECORD which would be in the slightest degree objectionable to the Senator, because I do not believe such a charge is warranted, and I wish to be as fair as I possibly can under the circumstances. It is only just that I should treat my colleague fairly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the desire of the Senator from New York to be fair. I assumed, on reading this matter, which I saw only about 30 or 40 minutes ago, that the Senator from New York had not prepared the brief. It presents a very able constitutional argument for this unconstitutional—from my viewpoint—agency. Certainly the man who prepared it exhausted every recourse in an attempt to find some scintilla of authority for it. But when the Senator from New York stated, in response to a question from the Senator from Mississippi, that the remarks were his own, I could only assume that the Senator had deliberately stated in the RECORD something that was not based on fact.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1157) to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916,

as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1232. An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior;

S. 1634. An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States; and

S. 1669. An act to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1432) to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. LEA, Mr. BECKWORTH, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, and Mr. HOLMES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. WALTER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. GWYNNE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; agreed to the still further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KERR, Mr. HARE, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1475. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 3891. An act to provide night differential for certain employees.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4320) relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to the bill (H. R. 4292) to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2969. An act to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of United States courts and United States marshals;

H. R. 3345. An act to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4405. An act to amend the act approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended (56 Stat. 1092; 50 App. U. S. C., Supp. III, 1001–1017, inclusive), so as to more specifically provide for pay, allotments, and administration pertaining to war casualties, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4615. An act to establish, for the investigation and control of tuberculosis, a division in the Public Health Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4625. An act to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years;

H. R. 4728. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 4780. An act to fix the fees for domestic-insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4935. An act to provide for a study of multiple taxation of air commerce, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4949. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942;

H. R. 4991. An act to remove restrictions on transfers of small craft to other American republics in furtherance of the war effort;

H. R. 4999. An act to increase the service-connected disability rates of pension for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3345. An act to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2969. An act to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of United States courts and United States marshals; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 4405. An act to amend the act approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 153), as amended (56 Stat. 1092; 50 App. U. S. C., Supp. III, 1001–1017, inclusive), so as to more specifically provide for pay, allotments, and administration pertaining to war casualties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4991. An act to remove restrictions on transfers of small craft to other American republics in furtherance of the war effort; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4615. An act to establish, for the investigation and control of tuberculosis, a division in the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4728. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4625. An act to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 4780. An act to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4949. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 4935. An act to provide for a study of multiple taxation of air commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 4999. An act to increase the service-connected disability rates of pension for certain Regular Establishment veterans and veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

CLAIMS ARISING FROM TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a message has just been received from the House, relating to Senate bill 1718, the war contract termination bill. The House has requested a conference. I should like to have the message laid before the Senate at this time, because the conferees on the part of the House are here in the corridor, waiting to hold a conference on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives insisting on its amendment to the bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MURRAY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives insisting upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1432) to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. BREWSTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, which were, on page 4, line 2, to strike out "full and", and on page 4, line 6, after "authorized", to insert "after proclaiming that constitutional processes and normal function of government have been restored in the Philippine Islands and."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say that the joint resolution which has for its purpose the possible acceleration of the date of ultimate Philippine independence is one of the measures which we have just considered, to which the House made minor amendments. At the time the joint resolution was introduced in the Senate by me it was as a result of a conference with various members of the President's Cabinet, members of the Army and Navy, and members of the Filipino Cabinet, in which the President of the Philippines, President Manuel Quezon, took a leading part, as did the Vice President, Mr. Osmeña.

However, in order that, so far as the joint resolution is concerned, there may be no misunderstanding of it, its intention was not to postpone, in the face of any contingency, the date for independence as set forth in the Tydings-McDuffie Act, but only if circumstances permitted it to come before that ultimate date this joint resolution would be effective insofar as that feature of the act is concerned.

In order that my own position in that respect may be clear, let me quote just one paragraph from a letter I wrote to President Manuel Quezon attempting to clarify what I thought was the situation. It is as follows:

> Delegate ELIZALDE also spoke to me in reference to Senate Joint Resolution 93, which I personally feel should be passed by the House. I have been informed of your misgivings concerning this legislation, but I can assure you that it is my personal opinion that Senate Joint Resolution 93 does not authorize the postponement of independence beyond July 4, 1946.

Which was the date fixed in the Tydings-McDuffie Act—

> The passage of this resolution will put you in a most favorable position. If the United States forces should recapture the Philippines before 1946, independence would be advanced. If the occupation should be retarded beyond July 4, 1946, independence would nevertheless be a reality on the date provided by the Tydings-McDuffie law. Such was my understanding in the conferences held in connection with and prior to the introduction of this resolution.

Thus it will be seen from the letter, as I am sure it will appear from the law, that in no case would Philippine independence come later than July 4, 1946, and if our military ventures in the Philippines make it possible to give the Filipinos independence prior to that date, it will be accorded to them prior to that date, but in neither event does the law have in mind postponing ultimate independence beyond July 4, 1946.

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

The motion was agreed to.

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, to strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert "That section 13 of the act of March 24, 1934, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following"; on page 1, line 5, to strike out "SEC. 13"; on page 2, line 4, after "Philippines", to insert "each appointee shall serve at the pleasure of his appropriate appointing authority"; on page 2, line 24, after "present", to insert "or heretofore agreed upon"; on page 2, line 25, to strike out "replace" and insert "make adjustments for"; on page 3, line 1, to strike out all after "Japanese", down to and including "of", in line 4, and insert "in order to reestablish"; on page 3, line 23, after "be", to insert "on a per diem basis at the date of", and to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend section 13 of Philippine Independence Act, as amended, establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes."

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

NAVAL PLANTATIONS OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill from the Senate (S. 1634) to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That hereafter the appropriations for the subsistence of naval personnel shall be available for any and all expenditures necessary in the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any plantation or farm, on land subject to naval jurisdiction outside of the continental United States, for the purpose of furnishing food and food products to the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That equipment, material, and supplies required therein may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and other laws applicable to purchases by governmental agencies: *Provided further*, That only American nationals, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws, and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, benefits, or obligations of civilian employees of the United States: *Provided further*, That surplus production over the amount furnished or sold to the armed forces of the United States and to civilians serving with the armed forces may only be sold outside the continental limits of the United States: *And provided further*, That no land shall be acquired under this authorization.
>
> SEC. 2. This act shall remain in effect until the termination of the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

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

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to strike out on page 10, lines 3 to 16, inclusive, as amended.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I am glad to have yielded to my colleagues for this discussion. I promise the Senate not to consume much time. I had seriously considered the advisability of not speaking at all, because I discovered, in association with my colleagues, that the die had already been cast. Their minds seemed to me to have been made up, and it seemed to me that we might as well proceed to a vote. However, in order to keep the record straight, I have decided to make a few observations.

I wish to begin by referring to the June 13 issue of the Washington Post. Senators know this newspaper. They know who owns it and who fixes its policies. It is our good friend Eugene Meyer, together with his good wife. We are not surprised at the things we sometimes see in this newspaper. In fact, whatever I see in it does not disturb me.

The Washington Post for June 13 contains an editorial under the heading

"Fair practices." It reads in part as follows:

Unfortunately, however, the issue has been distorted and obscured—imbued with wholly irrelevant emotional overtones and linked with complex questions of interracial relations.

In conclusion the editorial says:

The House has voted an appropriation of half a million dollars to carry on the F. E. P. C.'s work. The Senate Appropriations Committee, despite an unfavorable subcommittee report, has recommended the approval of this sum. Today the Senate as a whole will begin discussion of it. We hope that the discussion will be concerned with the real issue—not with bugbears conjured up to obfuscate it. We cannot deny to citizens of the United States equality of economic opportunity.

With this introduction I wish to state that I am convinced that a great many of my colleagues have not stopped to analyze the real meaning of this piece of legislation. There has been no attempt to "obfuscate" the issue, as the Post says. The line of discussion up to date has dealt with the legal and constitutional aspects. I think it is pretty well agreed that there is no constitutional ground upon which this appropriation could be made; that the President has exceeded his authority and powers under the Constitution; and that this agency cannot be constitutionally approved. The reason it is going to be approved is that it was conceived and brought forth in the political mind. The purpose of it is political, from beginning to end, as I propose to show.

A few years ago a Member of the House facetiously remarked that many times we vote for bills, and the next day we buy the newspapers to see what we voted for. That remark was only facetious, but there may be a suggestion of truth in it. For example, the other day we voted $909,500 for the support of Howard University, in the city of Washington. The only ground upon which we could appropriate that much of the taxpayers' money would be on the general ground of public welfare. There is certainly no authority for it, unless we stretch the Constitution, as Thomas Jefferson did when he purchased the Louisiana Territory. The appropriation cannot be justified. In the reconstruction days following the Civil War, under the leadership of Thaddeus Stevens, Charles Sumner, and others of their kind who were embittered against the South and were trying to rejuvenate the black race, the idea of establishing Howard University for the higher education of the Negro was conceived, and Congress has continued from year to year to make appropriations for the support of this institution, spending nearly $1,000,000 a year for it.

Nearly all the States in the Union in which there is a Negro population have established educational institutions for the Negroes. In Mississippi we have a very fine Negro college, supported by the State. That is all right; it should be done. But the Congress of the United States spends the taxpayers' money for only one university in America, and that is Howard University. It is exclusively for the Negro race, not for the members of the white race. That cannot be justified. It must be excused simply on the broad ground that it is good for the public welfare. But when we voted for that appropriation the other day I dare say not many Senators knew what is being done at Howard University.

I wish to read to the Senate a write-up on some of the things which are happening there:

Speaking on a program which included remarks by Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York—

All Members of the Senate know him—

Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota—

He is well known—

Representative WILLIAM A. ROWAN, Edgar G. Brown—

Of local fame—

Rev. Walter H. Brooks, Benjamin Crowson, and a splendid address by Dr. Charles R. Drew, Spingarn Medal winner and the first director of the American Blood Bank, who in giving the story of blood and blood plasma said that there is no difference between colored and white peoples' blood, Prof. William Leo Hansberry—

Note that name, please—

famous anthropologist of Howard University presented interesting discoveries to a thrilled interracial audience at the monthly banquet-forum of the Institute on Race Relations held at the Asbury Methodist Church, 11th and K Streets NW, Washington, D. C., last Thursday, April 27, 1944.

The Asbury Methodist Church is the same place at which was held a mass meeting during which there was adopted a resolution asking me to resign as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. I imagine about the same kind of crowd was present there when the meeting I am now referring to was held.

I read further from the résumé:

Professor Hansberry, who was introduced by Tomlinson D. Todd, the President of the Institute on Race Relations, gave a vivid picture of early African civilizations. He also presented in a clear style the migration of the population in the Sahara region of Africa (and now the Sahara desert) to Europe and Asia, when this region started drying up and turning into a huge desert. As a result of climatic conditions, Negro-type people bleached out in Europe and became the white people. To substantiate this early migration he stated, "skeletons of the Negroid type have been found in several European and Asiatic countries."

In his discourse, the speaker enumerated 3 reasons for the collapse of the African civilizations. This collapse, "which occurred in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, was caused by (1) the slave trade carried on by the Arabs; (2) the continuous drying up of the Sahara region; (3) the European slave trade which lasted 250 years.

"Since a race of people is judged by its past achievements," he stated, "it is important that information about Africa's contribution to civilization be assembled and put into the language of the layman or average man."

In other words, the Congress of the United States is paying the taxpayers' money for the support of a university at which the professor of anthropology is teaching American Negro youth that the white man descended from the Negro. I do not know whether Senators like that idea or not. It is news to me. Senators may wish to know why so many outbreaks have been occurring—and I shall deal with them directly—among the younger generation of Negroes. It is because of the dissemination into their minds of this kind of doctrine or teaching. Dr. Hansberry demonstrates and proves to a class of young Negroes that, because a Negro-type skeleton was found somewhere in northern Europe, all the white people have migrated from Africa or have descended from the Negroes, and that the reason they are white is that they went north and bleached out. Mr. President, certainly such teaching makes the young Negro feel he is the beginning and the end of all races and of all things. The outbreaks which I shall mention in a few minutes have been occurring as a follow-up on the question of discrimination.

Mr. President, I have brought to the attention of the Senate the matter of the teaching of anthropology at Howard University by Dr. Hansberry to prove that frequently when we are doing things we do not know what we are doing. I do not think any Senator on the floor would relish the idea that he was paying out the taxpayers' money to support a university which was permitting the professor of anthropology at that university to teach this kind of doctrine, namely, that the white man descended from the Negro, merely because an African skeleton happened to be found in northern Europe. Dr. Hansberry does not let his mind go free, or he would at once understand that the white man had gone down to Africa and gotten an African, carried him back into Europe, and used him there as a slave, as we did in this country before the Civil War. I cannot help it if that Negro died in northern Europe. All reputable anthropologists and ethnologists agree that the human race is divided into three classes, namely, the white, black, and brown. This is the first time I have known of any professor in a university advancing the idea that the white race ascended from the black race.

It is true that prejudices exist here and there between the races. We do not like the Japs, and we are not infatuated with the Chinese. When I say "we," I do not mean to include Miss Pearl Buck, but I am referring to the rest of us. The Chinese belong to an entirely different race. I have no hatred against the Negro. I can make that statement truthfully, and I think my personal record will prove that I have no hatred for him. For 8 years I was Governor of the only State in the Union in which there were more Negroes than whites. I had no trouble with them. I treated them fairly and squarely. I tried to give them a break in life, and afford them opportunities for education. When I thought that a job had been "put up" on a Negro in the courts I was free in my use of the pardoning power in order to adjust the situation. There were only a few cases of lynching during my tenure of office. Once in awhile a rape occurred, and no

power of any Governor could have stopped the administration of immediate justice—liquidating the rapist. However, I can say that there were fewer cases involving the breaking down of law in Mississippi than in New York State. It is a matter of official record that there is, on an average, a killing of at least one Negro every night in Harlem, New York. Yet, that locality is the source of a great deal of the clamor with reference to race prejudice and race discrimination.

Behind the bill under consideration is the fundamental idea advanced by A. Philip Randolph, Judge Hastie, Judge Wilkins, of the N. A. A. C. P., and Walter White, of the N. A. A. C. P., that any form or type of segregation is a discrimination. The committee for which we are asked to appropriate $500,000 of the people's money is married to the one idea that segregation of any sort is discrimination. The Supreme Court has held repeatedly that segregation wherein both parties are given equal treatment is not discrimination. But in the midst of the war the persons to whom I have referred are determined to carry on and prosecute their campaign to eliminate all types of segregation.

Many persons in this country are coddling and playing up to the Negro in order to secure his vote. Personally, or in any other way, I am not interested in the Negro voting. The Negro does not vote in my State, and he is not going to vote within a long, long time. Congress may pass all the anti-poll-tax legislation it wishes to pass, but the Negro is not going to vote in my State at this time. I suggest that if any of them wish to vote they can move to New York or Pennsylvania, in either of which States they will possibly find a more congenial atmosphere.

I hold in my hand a signed statement of A. Philip Randolph. He takes credit for bringing about the appointment of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and points to it as an achievement in connection with his famous "On to Washington" movement, which took place in 1941, when he organized 200,000 Negroes, and proposed to march on the city of Washington and demand all the things which the Negro, through the N. A. A. C. P. and other organizations, are demanding today. It has been freely charged that the President made a trade with Randolph in order to prevent his march on Washington, and that he issued for Randolph the famous Executive Order No. 8802.

Mr. President, I shall take the time of the Senate to read into the RECORD what Randolph says about this proposition. It is headed "Why Should We March?" and reads as follows:

Though I have found no Negroes who want to see the United Nations lose the war, I have found many who, before the war ends, want to see the stuffing knocked out of white supremacy and of empire over subject peoples. American Negroes, involved as we are in the general issues of the conflict, are confronted not with a choice but with the challenge both to win democracy for ourselves at home and to help win the war for democracy the world over.

There is no escape from the horns of this dilemma. There ought not to be escape. For if the war for democracy is not won abroad, the fight for democracy cannot be won at home. If this war cannot be won for the white peoples, it will not be won for the darker races.

Conversely, if freedom and equality are not vouchsafed the peoples of color, the war for democracy will not be won. Unless this double-barreled thesis is accepted and applied, the darker races will never wholeheartedly fight for the victory of the United Nations. That is why those familiar with the thinking of the American Negro have sensed his lack of enthusiasm, whether among the educated or uneducated, rich or poor, professional or nonprofessional, religious or secular, rural or urban, north, south, east, or west.

That is why questions are being raised by Negroes in church, labor union, and fraternal society; in poolroom, barbershop, schoolroom, hospital, hair-dressing parlor; on college campus, railroad, and bus. One can hear such questions asked as these: What have Negroes to fight for? What's the difference between Hitler and that "cracker" Talmadge of Georgia? Why has a man got to be Jim Crowed to die for democracy? If you haven't got democracy yourself, how can you carry it to somebody else?

What are the reasons for this state of mind? The answer is: Discrimination, segregation, Jim Crow. Witness the Navy, the Army, the Air Corps; and also Government services at Washington. In many parts of the South, Negroes in Uncle Sam's uniform are being put upon, mobbed, sometimes even shot down by civilian and military police, and on occasion lynched. Vested political interests in race prejudice are so deeply entrenched that to them winning the war against Hitler is secondary to preventing Negroes from winning democracy for themselves. This is worth many divisions to Hitler and Hirohito. While labor, business, and farm are subjected to ceilings and floors and not allowed to carry on as usual, these interests trade in the dangerous business of race hate as usual.

When the defense program began and billions of the taxpayers' money were appropriated for guns, ships, tanks, and bombs, Negroes presented themselves for work only to be given the cold shoulder. North as well as South, and despite their qualifications, Negroes were denied skilled employment. Not until their wrath and indignation took the form of a proposed protest march on Washington, scheduled for July 1, 1941, did things begin to move in the form of defense jobs for Negroes. The march was postponed by the timely issuance, June 25, 1941, of the famous Executive Order No. 8802, by President Roosevelt. But this order and the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, established thereunder, have as yet only scratched the surface by way of eliminating discriminations on account of race or color in war industry. Both management and labor unions in too many places and in too many ways are still drawing the color line.

If we read the record of proceedings under Dr. Ross, it will be found that the Committee is delving into every department of the Government. Today Mrs. NORTON, in the other House, is working hour after hour in an attempt to have passed through the House a bill to make the Committee permanent, and to include within its jurisdiction every organization and every business activity in the country which, under the definition of the Supreme Court, comes under interstate commerce. Then, as Randolph says, he will begin to scratch the surface and more than scratch the surface.

I wish to say to some Senators who are planning to vote for this appropriation and to give life to this movement they had just as well get ready to select one of these mulattoes or high-brown or yellow girls as their stenographer, because Dr. Ross and his organization will be serving notice on them, when he becomes fixed and permanent in his position, that Senators are discriminating against the colored girls of the Nation; that Senators ought to have Negro girls in their offices, and they had just as well get ready for it. It is coming, and I assure them that when they get one all the B. O. powders on earth will not dissipate the odoriferous aroma they will find permeating their offices day by day.

When A. Philip Randolph got his Order No. 8802 in a trade with the President not to bring his Negroes on to Washington, what did they do? What has this Committee done for the District of Columbia? Go down into the departments and it will be made plain. Before this took place there was some semblance of segregation in all the departments. But what did they do? They proceeded at once to visit all the departments of the Government in Washington, tear out the partitions that separated the eating places of the whites and the blacks, and throw them all together at the same table. Then they tore out the partitions separating the closets, the rest rooms, and the wash rooms in all departments, and forced all employees to use the same rest rooms. That is what has been taking place as the result of this order, of this Committee, of this movement.

Some of my colleagues may have schooled themselves to tolerate or endorse forcing the white women in the departments to use the same toilet facilities used by the colored employees, but I have not yet reached the point where I think it is proper for the United States Congress to support legislation and appropriate the tax money to foster and perpetuate an organization that is engaged in this kind of business, of forcing white girls from all over the Nation—I am not speaking solely of white girls from the South—not only to eat with the Negro, in violation of all their conceptions and ideals of the relationship between the two races but forcing them to use the same toilets. There are all sorts of disorders taking place between the whites and the blacks in the departments because of the enforcement of the order doing away with the segregation of the races insofar as the eating places and the toilet facilities in the departments are concerned.

It is to meet this situation squarely with direct action that the March on Washington Movement launched its present program of protest mass meetings. Twenty thousand were in attendance at Madison Square Garden, June 26; 9,000 in the City Auditorium of St. Louis, August 14. Meetings of such magnitude were unprecedented among Negroes. The vast throngs were drawn from all walks and levels of Negro life—businessmen, teachers, laundry workers, Pullman porters, waiters, and red caps; preachers, crapshooters, and social workers; jitterbugs and Ph. D.'s. They came and sat in silence, thinking, applauding only when they considered the truth was told, when

they felt strongly that something was going to be done about it.

The March on Washington Movement is essentially a movement of the people. It is all Negro and pro-Negro, but not for that reason anti-white or anti-Semitic, or anti-Catholic, or anti-foreign, or anti-labor. Its major weapon is the nonviolent demonstration of Negro mass power. Negro leadership has united back of its drive for jobs and justice. "Whether Negroes should march on Washington, and if so, when?" will be the focus of a forthcoming national conference. For the plan of a protest march has not been abandoned. Its purpose would be to demonstrate that American Negroes are in deadly earnest, and all out for their full rights. No power on earth can cause them today to abandon their fight to wipe out every vestige of second class citizenship and the dual standards that plague them.

A community is democratic only when the humblest and weakest person can enjoy the highest civil, economic, and social rights that the biggest and most powerful possess. To trample on these rights of both Negroes and poor whites is such a commonplace in the South that it takes readily to anti-social, anti-labor, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic propaganda It was because of laxness in enforcing the Weimar Constitution in republican Germany that nazi-ism made headway. Oppression of the Negroes in the United States, like suppression of the Jews in Germany, may open the way for a Fascist dict torship.

By fighting for their rights now, American Negroes are helping to make America a moral and spiritual arsenal of democracy. Their fight against the poll tax, against lynch law, segregation, and Jim Crow, their fight for economic, political, and social equality, thus becomes part of the Global War for freedom.

In other words, A. Philip Randolph, the organizer and the head of the on-to-Washington movement, which gave birth to the Fair Employment Practice Committee, which is under discussion—and he takes full credit for getting it as a result of his efforts to invade Washington with 200,000 Negroes en masse—does not hesitate. He says very frankly that one of the things the Negro is fighting for in this war and in this campaign and this Committee is social equality between the whites and the blacks. It will be found that some of the Negro agitators and some of the Negro speakers and preachers say, "Oh, no; we do not want social equality; we want our economic rights; we want our political rights." They lie. Back in the heart of every Negro in America who is behind movements of this kind is the dream of social equality and intermarriage between whites and blacks. They boast of the fact. Dr. Franz Boas, the great anthropologist of Columbia University, boasts of the fact that the intermarriage and the mingling of the two bloods would bring about a better race. On that theory there have been books written—The Yellow Race. That is their dream; that is their hope; that is what they are fighting for.

The Negro gets an economic square deal as much as could be expected. He is given a chance to work, unless he fails to join a union. Of course, now, if he does not pay his lodge "poll tax" and his monthly dues and his initiation fee, he can starve and go to hell so far as the C. I. O. and the other unions are concerned, because they demand payment of the poll tax before a man can work—and work is a greater right than is voting.

Members of the Senate ought to know where the Fair Employment Practice Committee came from. It was born through the activity of A. Philip Randolph, who organized the movement "On to Washington," and the President made a trade with him, I am informed, and issued the famous Executive Order 8802.

Things were not getting along very well, and they organized a committee headed by Mr. Mark Etheridge, who is now connected with the old Louisville Courier in Louisville, Ky. Then they had Dr. McLean as head of it, and finally they reorganized again and made Dr. Ross the head of it, and it is the present organization we are now considering.

Mr. President, it has been charged freely many times that instead of this Committee being of real benefit to the war effort and unity, it is sowing the seeds of discord, and bringing about disruptions, bringing on strikes and conditions of that kind. I wish to read a paragraph from PM, the issue of Sunday, June 18, last Sunday. From New Orleans, La., comes this special:

New Iberia authorities conceal story of worst anti-Negro flare-up in years.

Four leading Negroes of New Iberia were sorely beaten and forced to leave that part of Louisiana.

Let me read the background of this:

The seeds of this instance of race persecution were planted, according to the victims, when a committee of Negroes, led by Hardy as representatives of the N. A. A. C. P.—

That is Walter White's organization. By the way, I presume all Senators have read in the New York Times and other newspapers that Walter White celebrated his twenty-fifth anniversary in the Roosevelt Hotel a few nights ago, and the leading actors at the celebration were Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Wendell L. Willkie. A collection was taken up, and Mr. Willkie gave the N. A. A. C. P. a nice little check for $5,000. There is no record of Mrs. Roosevelt making any contribution, except what she had to say.

I continue reading from the dispatch:

The seeds of this instance of race persecution were planted, according to the victims, when a committee of Negroes, led by Hardy as representatives of the N. A. A. C. P., asked that a welding school for Negroes be established, shortly after the opening of a similar school for whites by the War Manpower Commission and the United States Department of Education.

Listen to this:

Local efforts of the Negro committee met with failure, it is said, and the committee then contacted the F. E. P. C. office in Dallas, Tex.

And the next Monday morning they opened a welding school for the Negroes, the riot broke out, and the Negroes had to leave town.

Mr. President, that indicates exactly what this organization is doing. They are so extreme, they are so radical, that instead of letting the white man and the black man work out their own salvation when they are forced to live side by side, as they have been doing, agitators and long-haired social workers, like Dr. Ross, are sowing the seeds of discord throughout the country, and they are using this instrument of government to bring about trouble.

Now let us see about some more trouble that has been happening as a result of all this coddling and these political appeals to the Negroes. I read from the New York Times:

PASSENGER ON B. M. T. TRAIN SHOT FOR OBJECTING TO ROWDY ACTS OF EIGHT YOUNG NEGRO HOODLUMS

Eight Negro hoodlums, 15 to 17 years old, terrorized more than a hundred passengers on a Brighton Beach Line B. M. T. subway train bound from Coney Island to Franklin Avenue, Brooklyn, last night, and when one of the passengers objected they felled him with a blow and, while he was lying prostrated, shot him twice.

The youths escaped at the Park Place Station before police radio cars reached the scene. Their victim, John Montero, 29 years old, of 1683 University Avenue, the Bronx, was taken to Jewish Hospital, suffering from bullet wounds of the left wrist and the left hip. His condition was not dangerous, it was said at the hospital.

Listen to this:

The Negro youths boarded the eight-car train, some sections of which were crowded, at the Prospect Park Station, shortly before 9 p. m. They began running through the cars yelling:

"This is D-day for the colored folks, white trash get off."

Pushing passengers about and rough-housing them, the boys made themselves obnoxious, and when the train stopped at the Botanical Gardens Station a number of the passengers got off, to wait for the next train. The gang continued its rowdyism, seeking to annoy the passengers.

As the train approached the Park Place Station, Mr. Montero told the boys to quiet down, that their conduct was beyond endurance. One of the boys took a swing at him, hitting him in the jaw. He fell to the floor. Before the other passengers could see what was happening, two revolver shots rang out, the bullets finding a mark in Mr. Montero's prone body.

Police of the Grand Avenue Station are investigating.

I read an article entitled "Editorials of Note," which quotes from the Columbus Commercial-Dispatch, as follows:

EDITORIALS OF NOTE

From the Columbus Commercial-Dispatch the following incident where the races are mixed in New York City shows the dangers of such a system even in northern communities:

NEW YORK, May 11.—Police reported that 25 white and 25 Negro girls fought for almost half an hour in the cafeteria of Brooklyn Girls High School today and that 4 pupils were injured, 1 seriously.

Rose Gallop, 16, Negro, was arrested on a charge of third-degree assault on complaint of Albert Levine, a white teacher, who said she assaulted him when he told her to stay in line just prior to the disturbance.

Police told this story:

"White girls defending the teacher's action, and Negro pupils, taking the side of the Gallop girl, argued and then fought with chairs, dishes, fists, and fingernails as weapons.

"Edna Farnsworth, principal, and Alice Garvey, her assistant, attempted unsuccessfully to restore order, then called police.

"Fifteen uniformed policemen and 10 detectives responded and quelled the disturbance."

This is just one instance of the consequences of the violation of the basic, fundamental system of race segregation.

Segregation is the only basis on which the two races can live in peace and harmony and it is inescapable.

No right-thinking person wants to deny Negroes their economic and civil rights.

They are entitled to fair and just treatment.

They are entitled to live in peace and to enjoy the economic and civil rights of free people.

But racial differences must be recognized and wise and just and reasonable segregation is the only solution of the problem.

This is fundamentally true and inescapable, all the agitation of troublemakers to the contrary notwithstanding.

That, Mr. President, is another instance of LaGuardia government and coddling from Washington of the young promising American Negro.

I read from another newspaper article, as follows:

BOY TELLS HOW 10 YOUTHS BEAT WOMAN ON TROLLEY

An eyewitness related today that at least 10 Negro boys and girls kicked and punched a woman passenger into unconsciousness in a wild purse-snatching melee aboard a Brooklyn trolley last night and escaped by leaping through the windows of the car, leaving behind razors and knives.

The incident, which occurred in a Tompkins Avenue trolley shortly after the car left its terminal at Empire Boulevard and Prospect Park, was described by a 16-year-old boy, also a passenger, who asked that his identity be withheld because he feared attempts at reprisal.

Fifteen Negro youths were rounded up by police with guns drawn after the disturbance.

Police said one open razor and seven knives were found in the car.

Principal victim of the attack was Ruth Upham, 25, of 1096 Park Avenue, Brooklyn, an insurance broker and student at Columbia University Teachers College.

"Miss Upham was standing in front of me," the eyewitness told a reporter. "I was seated. First, they started to shout and push. Purse snatching came next. She was knocked onto me, and I tried to shield her face from punches.

SAW RAZOR, KNIVES

"They jabbed and kicked and punched her. There must have been 10 or more. As the trolley car neared the station (the Empire Boulevard police station, where the motorman halted the car and summoned police), Negroes in the rear started to jump out of the windows, apparently afraid to be caught with weapons.

"When the trolley was cleared I saw at least one open straight-edge razor and two knives on the floor. Other articles were everywhere."

Miss Upham, who had a laceration over the left eye and was limping from what, she said, was a severe back injury, she said: "I was knocked out before we got to the station house and when I woke up I was on a bench in the police station."

Miss Upham said she lost count of the blows rained on her after receiving between 40 and 50.

She said she had attended the baseball game with a group of friends at Ebbets Field and was on her way to Manhattan for dinner when the disturbance broke out. She said a $5 bill was missing from her purse when she recovered it.

The facts set forth in this article are too disgusting to read further.

Mr. President, this is some of the fruit of the plantings by certain race coddlers in the minds of the Negro. A doctor at Howard University said that the white man descended from the Negro. This is only an example of what is taking place and what is going to take place. Right here in Washington we are headed for trouble. Practically two or three times a day I have callers from among the citizens of the District who think I can give them relief, who complain about the methods being pursued by a number of Negro real-estate agents and some unethical and unprofessional white real-estate agents who do not belong to the real-estate board in the District of Columbia—they are too sorry specimens to be licensed—who are engaged in an assiduous campaign of trying to break up the white districts in the city of Washington. Their scheme is to manipulate until they can buy one house or one lot in the center of a white block, and the minute that is done—sometimes they move the Negroes in after night—then the value of the real estate in that block at once drops from 10 to 15 or 20 percent under the market. The people who have spent their lives trying to accumulate money to build a home in which to live in the Capital of the Nation are now face to face with this menace because of the preaching that segregation is discrimination, and there is a concerted move on to break up white sections throughout Washington.

I listen to these cases day after day, and the situation is very regrettable. I wish there was something I could do about it. But unless there is a covenant in the deed, there is no law by which a Negro can be prevented from buying a lot or a home in the middle of a white block. I do not know of any way to reach the situation. Of course if this were done in the South I would know how to handle it. But Washington, as Senators know, while sometimes called a southern city, is on the borderline, and I am convinced, as I have said, and that is one of the reasons why I am opposing suffrage for the District, that there is a concerted movement to drive the white people out of Washington into Virginia and Maryland, and to flood the town with Negroes, so in case the citizens of Washington are given the right to vote there will be a Negro administration in the Nation's Capital. That is the dream of the black cabinet here in Washington.

Mr. President, I now want to read an open letter written by a man who is in the publishing business in Washington, a very fine gentleman whom I have had the pleasure of meeting. The letter is addressed to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, to Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, to the president of Howard University, to the Secretary of the Washington Real Estate Board, to the secretary of the District of Columbia Real Estate Commission, to the secretary, Federation of Citizens Associations, to the secretary, Federation of Civic Associations, to Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, to the editor, Afro-American, the editor of the Evening Star, the editor of the Times-Herald, the editor of the Washington Post, the editor of the Washington Daily News, and the editor of the Bulletin. I do not know what newspaper the last one is. The letter is as follows:

PARK VIEW CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM AND SIRS: This is an open letter to the people of Washington, inspired by what is without question a definite injustice being done colored people by certain unscrupulous, unethical white and colored real estate dealers operating in what is known as Park View.

The observations I am about to bring to the attention of the people of Washington have been gathered by me as chairman of the housing commitee of the Park View Citizens' Association through close contact with the residents of my community and conversations with certain real-estate operators of our city.

We—and when I say we, I mean the reasonable-thinking members of my association—hold no grudge against the colored people, nor do we feel that the time is too soon that the right-thinking, properly prepared colored person should not enjoy equal opportunity—let this be a matter of record. We do object, however, to being forced to vacate our homes in favor of colored people who are being promoted by selfish real estate dealers. Dealers who have no other motive but to enrich their own treasuries at the expense of the colored man by—

1. Selling him old houses at two and three times their original price. Houses that sold for $3,800 when brand new 30 years ago have been recently resold to colored for $9,000 and more. Houses that were patched up to look completely renovated but that very shortly will need new roofs, new porches, new plumbing, and many other expensive repairs.

2. By encouraging a colored man to locate in a block solidly inhabited by white and then alarming the rest of the white inhabitants by telling them the whole block is going colored and that they had better sell while the prices are high. The white residents are becoming irritated, cussing the Negro because of this unscrupulous promotion, when, in fact, the trouble lies with the unethical real-estate man, and we mean unethical real-estate man—for not one known real-estate man who is a member of the Real Estate Board is taking advantage of the colored man by selling houses to him in our community at unfair prices.

(We are glad, however, to report that there are a number of real-estate dealers, not members of the board, who have not exploited the colored man, and have told us that they have no intention of operating in our community as long as such transaction would create any ill will among the races.)

3. By moving these colored people into these homes under the cover of darkness and destroying self-respect, they would have if they wait a very little while longer when a more propitious time comes for the whites to turn over this neighborhood through ethical real-estate men who will bring them in by the front door in broad daylight with the full sanction of their white fellow citizens.

4. By causing us to have to conduct court litigation to hold our homes. This we regret, for this move is not against the colored man, but is our only valid defense against this unethical, antisocial promotion of which both races are victims.

There are a number of elderly couples who have owned houses in Park View for many years, as well as many mothers and wives of servicemen who are overseas. When your sons and husbands and brothers and sisters—and our sons and husbands and brothers and sisters—settle this conflict of wrong thinking overseas and our families can return to normal conditions, the community development for the colored man can be made without cheating the Negroes and without unnecessary racial antagonism.

Now, as at no other time, let us reasonable-thinking people bind ourselves together against those who would interfere with our progress and our economic welfare. It is not the race to which we belong that counts—but the important thing is how we conduct ourselves.

Sincerely,

A. WALTER COLLIER.

This abuse is going on throughout the city. I receive many reports every day. These Negroes are willing to pay $2,000 or $3,000 in excess of the market value of the property in order to carry out their scheme to drive the white people from the white sections of Washington so that they may take possession of them. I know of no way for those people to get any relief except by taking the proposition into their own hands and giving the matter their personal attention.

Mr. President, we have already voted to support a university which is teaching the Negroes of the country that the white man descended from the Negro. Now we are face to face with voting for a proposal to permit an organization which is not practicing what it is preaching to go into every business establishment and industry in America and say who is to be employed and who is to be dismissed. It is even going into the unions themselves. This is only the beginning of this character of legislation. This is only the entering wedge. Behind it all is the drive of A. Philip Randolph to force social equality, to force the intermingling of the races, and do away with segregation in Washington and throughout the entire Nation. I am sure the good people of Washington are not in favor of doing away with segregation, because they are opposed to having white children and black children attend the same schools, and having the white children taught by Negro teachers, as is done in Pennsylvania. I know the people of Washington do not want that. The people of Washington have always stood for the dual system of public schools, and I think they will continue to stand for it. I do not believe that the public wish to see their hotels, restaurants, and cafes shared by whites and Negroes. The poor white girls in the departments, who must work for a living, are compelled to use the same toilet facilities, the same cafeterias, and the same dining rooms with Negroes. They cannot help themselves. The only way out is for them to make their department white or to catch a train and go home.

This situation cannot continue. There will be an end to such conditions in Washington. There will be an end to unscrupulous Negro real-estate agents, with some influence behind them, trying to break up white sections in the District of Columbia. The people are not going to stand for this kind of "monkey business" always. They cannot be blamed.

The Committee which we are asked to support is a great political asset. I was amused at the Senator from New York yesterday when I asked him to explain why it is, if the Committee is to do away with discrimination, that, with 12,800,000 Negroes in the United States out of a population of 134,000,000, in the personnel of this organization there are 113 employees, about 80 percent of them Negroes, and the remainder whites. He explained it by saying that so many cases of complaints were arising because of discrimination against the Negro that Negroes were employed to make the investigations. Then he was quietly reminded that the next largest list of complaints related to discriminations against the Jews. Upon examination I find that there is not a Jew in the whole list of 113 employees. This is the only Government organization with which I am familiar which has no Jews in its personnel.

I found my good old friend, Rabbi Wise, trying to persuade the House to perpetuate this damnable Committee. He was pleading for its permanent establishment to protect minority races. Rabbi Wise is the last man in the world who should complain about discrimination against minority races under the Roosevelt administration. Mr. Morgenthau operates the financial part of the Government. A very splendid Jew from New York, Barney Baruch, is shaping all the policies of the administration, especially the post-war policies. Jimmy Byrnes was appointed Director of War Mobilization, and yet he sends for Barney Baruch to come down and fix things up. A Committee on Post-war Planning was created in the House. It sends to New York for Barney Baruch to come down and tell it what to do. He is running the show. We are now being urged to enact legislation which he has fathered and suggested.

When it comes to the departments, there is no lack of the Jewish nationality in the departments. I think Rabbi Wise is the last man in the world who ought to be complaining against discrimination against minority races, when his nationality has received more consideration at the hands of the present administration than any other nationality in the United States.

Many persons fail to distinguish between division of races and division of nationalities. The Pole, the Jew, the Italian, and the German all belong to the white race. The Negro belongs to the black race, and the Chinese and Japanese belong to the Mongolian race.

I do not think I shall ever make another speech on the floor of the Senate without closing with the statement that there is only one way to save the country from disturbing influences, disunity, and mob violence such as that to which I referred in New York, which resulted from the coddling of the Negro in New York by Mayor LaGuardia and the politicians, who have led the Negro to believe that D-day for the Negro in New York has arrived, and that he is coming into his own. The only solution is to follow the suggestion, the wish, and the prayer of 2½ million Negroes whose names and addresses I have in my office, asking Congress to provide a way for their resettlement in their fatherland, West Africa. That is the only permanent solution. So long as we continue the present arrangement, and so long as the Negro is a political factor, we shall continue to have bloodshed, riots, race troubles, and other disturbances, and we shall have this kind of damn-fool legislation. The only solution to all of it is to give the Negroes an opportunity to be resettled in the richest country on earth.

The other day I noticed that my good friend Mrs. Roosevelt took a shot at my proposal—not by name—but indirectly. She said she did not understand how these things could be done. In other words, she is opposed to the plan. We are continually passing resolutions looking to the creation of a home for the Jews in Palestine.

I do not claim any credit for the campaign to resettle the Negroes in West Africa. President Monroe started it, Jefferson encouraged it, Madison and Abraham Lincoln and President Grant were for it. When 2½ million persons—Negroes—request the Congress to give them that relief, that opportunity, and that break, I do not see why Mrs. Roosevelt or anyone else should object to it. Of course, she did not understand my ultimate plan. If I can succeed eventually in resettling the great majority of the Negroes in West Africa—and I propose to do it—I might entertain the proposition of crowning Eleanor queen of Greater Liberia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], striking out, on page 10, lines 3 to 16, as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Wagner
Cordon	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Murdock	Weeks
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wherry
George	Overton	White
Gerry	Pepper	Willis
Gillette	Radcliffe	

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the debate with reference to the amendment to strike from the pending appropriation bill the item for the support of the Fair Practice Committee—a term which I shall use for the sake of brevity—has been exhaustive. In a comprehensible speech my colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] covered the ground and the arguments in this matter in a very forceful and effective manner. So, from the standpoint of the presentation of facts, the issue has been very

clearly presented to the Senate. Other Senators have discussed the issue, and have added much by way of information to the arguments which have been submitted against the amendment.

With all due respect to those who oppose the amendment, I wish to say that the creation of this committee, or its continuation, is as wholly inexcusable as any piece of legislation could be. It is true that we are asked to appropriate only $500,000—a half million dollars—in order to continue the agency in existence for another year. Five hundred thousand dollars is not a large sum, but it seems to me that we have arrived at a time when every Member of this body should feel bound to ask himself whether he is justified in throwing away a half million dollars. At the very best it would be a waste of public moneys, because the Committee has done no good and will accomplish no good. It has created disturbances. We know that it is in existence, but its actual constructive contribution to the peace, happiness, and welfare of the people of this country is negligible. No one can put his hand upon any of the Committee's work and say that it has been a constructive contribution, either to the war effort or to the peace effort of the American people.

Mr. President, allow me to preface what I am about to say with the broad statement that I should be entirely ashamed of myself if I were willing to deny to any man, whether he be white or black, or of any national origin, full, fair, and equal compensation for work similarly performed. I should also be ashamed of myself if I were willing to deny to a woman equal compensation for equal and similar work done by her. In other words, I do not think there can be or should be any discrimination in the employment, or in the compensation, of men because of their race, creed, condition, or previous condition. The question is solely one of the competency of the workman. That statement applies as between men and women who are in competitive enterprise, and who are seeking employment anywhere within this Government, or anywhere within our society.

Allow me to ask this question: Do the conditions to which I have referred represent the objectives of this Committee? Was it organized for the purpose of procuring equal pay for the same work performed, without regard to race, color, or creed? That is the ostensible statement of the purposes of the Committee. Is it true? During the debate Senators heard statements made by those who fathered the Committee, those who promoted it, and those who fostered it. Those statements clearly showed that a far different purpose was involved in the establishment of the Committee.

During the past several years a number of somewhat similar legislative proposals have been made in this body. There were antilynching bills and anti-poll-tax bills. We have seen the Fair Practice Committee brought into existence by Executive order. Has the relationship between the Negro and his white fellow citizens in America improved during the past 10 years? Has it improved in the last 5 years? Where is there an honest man who can say on his conscience that racial relationships have improved as the result of the repeated effort here to legislate on different phases of the relationships existing between the Negro or other minorities and the white people of this country?

We have heard a great deal about the good-neighbor policy. I think the good-neighbor policy, properly interpreted, has been a great achievement of the present Secretary of State and of the President of the United States, but it would be a blessing if the good-neighbor policy could be translated and applied within these United States so as to establish the right relationship between business and Government and between all classes of our society.

Within the last 5 or 10 years a deeper schism has been driven into American life than during any comparable period in the history of this Republic. Deeper racial prejudices, deeper class prejudices, wider divisions of our people into classes have taken place before our eyes day by day, week by week, and month by month. There is no more certain way to destroy this Republic, there is no more certain way to destroy free government than to divide the American people into classes.

Has such a process been going on? Mr. President, you know and I know that it has. It is easy enough to say that it has not been going on, but it has been. It is not necessary to discuss the motive or the reason why it has been going on. There are in America today class divisions deeper than they have ever been before. Are we contributing anything to the permanency of this Republic or to American civilization by such a course as that? The legalization of the Fair Practice Committee is on a level with various other interferences with race and class relationships that have occurred in this body during the last several years. Either we will call a halt to that movement, or we will register the rapid downfall of free government in America.

I do not need to discuss with the Senate or in its hearing what has happened in every other country of the globe within the last 10 or 15 years; that is, any country that laid any claim to anything like free government. In every one of them there can be noted the division of the people into classes; in every one of them there can be found the separation of the people into classes and groups, whether racial minorities or what not. There has been the same effort to divide into classes free peoples or those people struggling for freedom. Hitler is not the only man who has preached the doctrine of divide and conquer and destroy. Free government in America can be destroyed by dividing the people into classes. Not only can it be done, but we have made great progress toward the destruction of the homogeneity of the people of this country, which has meant so much for our liberty.

Has any antilynching bill, has any anti-poll-tax bill, has any fair-employment-practice bill promoted better race relationships in this country? To ask the question is to answer it. We can give away the $500,000, throw away half a million dollars to continue a group of people in a useless office. But that is not half the story and it is not the bad part of the story.

Oh, it may be said, this Committee has not occasioned any trouble. It has not occasioned any trouble? When this Committee announced its purpose to open offices in Georgia, in the city of Atlanta, the mayor and council of that great city solemnly petitioned the President of the United States not to permit them to come there. Do you think, Mr. President, that the people of the city of Atlanta did not know what they were doing? Do you think there was not a reason for that official act? Are we going to set ourselves up here and say we know what is better for the people of Denver, of Atlanta, or St. Louis, or any other American city than the people of those cities know? If the American Congress does not cease the pernicious meddling into local and racial problems, a meddling that never can accomplish any good, there will be created far worse race relationships than now exist.

I am telling the Senate the truth, Mr. President. I am saying that the members of this Fair Practice Committee who have haunted these galleries like vultures to watch our action and to compel our votes to give them a half million dollars of money of the American taxpayer, have done nothing to promote better relations between the whites and the black people. Let me repeat, I would be ashamed of myself as an American citizen and as a Member of this body if I did not positively favor the payment of equal wages and salaries for equal work by whites and blacks alike, by men and women alike. But the Fair Practice Committee is not going to bring that about, and that is not its main purpose. Its main purpose is to attempt to establish something like social and economic equality.

Why do they tear down the partitions between lavatories, equal facilities for the whites and the blacks? Why do they remove partitions in the restaurants and cafes in every Government office and place of business in the country? Why, if the economic equality of the races is at stake, is that done?

The very fact that the Committee is more concerned about partitions in lavatories and facilities, forcing white men and white women and Negro men and Negro women to eat together shows that it is not the desire to obtain fair compensation for the Negroes for the same kind, quality, and character of work that is the primary motive and purpose of this Fair Practice Committee.

Mr. President, I am trying to state the facts as they are, and not theory. Think of responsible officials of a great city in the South, a city whose leaders have tried to promote proper relations between the Negroes and the whites, and have done fairly well with the job over a long period of time, who are experienced in handling the problems we have to face and have to handle, solemnly petitioning an agency of this Government and the President of the United States not to establish an office in the city of Atlanta.

Those are facts. They cannot be argued away, they cannot be rubbed out. And what happens? The Committee employs its great ability, its energies, in removing partitions between the facilities already erected for the accommodation and use of the whites and blacks alike.

If anyone desires to go to the trouble of examining some things which are going on now in America among the maritime laborers, among the crews on our merchant vessels, I think he would understand a little better what this proposal means. There must not be separate quarters in the ship, but all minorities and all races must live together in the ship. The ship is the home of the merchant seaman, it is where he eats, it is where he sleeps. It is his home as he sails the high seas. Yet the Fair Practice Committee stands guard above the ship, the home of the merchant seamen of America, and says, "You must sleep together in bunks one above the other. You cannot occupy separate quarters in your own home."

Will anyone tell me that is done for the economic betterment and improvement of the Negro race? There may be a political motive, but there is not behind it any real desire to obtain equal compensation for equal work, not at all. That is not the driving force back of it.

I do not know how long I shall remain a Member of the Senate; I have grown old in public service; but I say now to gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, that they will never advance the cause of America by lending their sympathy or their votes to anything that drives a wedge between groups of American citizens, or anything which attempts to regulate the intimate affairs of people in communities far removed from Washington.

Oh, but it is said the Fair Practice Committee is limited to activities within governmental agencies. Yes; under the Executive order, in a general way; but the Committee has been quick to declare its purpose to extend its jurisdiction into private enterprise. We do not have to resort to conjecture; we do not have to resort to speculation, to find out what the meaning back of the Fair Practice Committee and of this effort to retain it is. If we go over to the other House, we find bills there now to create it as a permanent agency. The distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], a Senator whose character and ability I hold in the highest esteem, left nothing to conjecture, nothing to supposition, nothing to speculation. When the pending amendment was first taken up for consideration, he offered here an amendment to put the Fair Practice Committee on a permanent basis.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. A few minutes ago the distinguished Senator addressed his remarks to Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle. As one of the Senators on this side of the aisle I am very much in sympathy with the viewpoint the Senator is taking, but I do wish to remonstrate, and to say that the genesis of all this racial and class distinction originates in the White House, not on this side of the aisle.

Mr. GEORGE. I appreciate the Senator's personal attitude. I did not mean to exonerate this side of the aisle at all. With profound regret I am obliged to confess that many of these matters to which I have adverted had their origin on the Democratic side of the Chamber.

I was saying that we do not have to resort to speculation; we do not have to go to conjecture. One of the leading Members of the Senate offered an amendment—now happily withdrawn, but only temporarily withdrawn—to make permanent the Fair Practice Committee. What did he propose to do? I am not criticizing the Senator from Connecticut. I am merely saying that that is precisely the ultimate purpose back of the particular proposal now pending. He proposed to extend the jurisdiction of the Fair Practice Committee to every labor union which has five members, and to every employer engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and under the elastic definition of the Supreme Court of the United States at this hour, that means everybody who is doing anything.

Did not the Supreme Court hold that the farmer in his field was engaged in interstate commerce if he was producing, not something to be shipped outside his State but something to be consumed within his State, because the consumption of the supply of the commodity or product within his State took something away from the general supply of that product in the United States?

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Since the able Senator has referred to the amendment which, when the pending bill was first taken up, the Senator from Connecticut announced he intended to offer, which would make this Committee a permanent agency, that amendment being the bill now pending in the House of Representatives, I call the Senator's attention to section 2 of that amendment. According to my interpretation—and I wonder if the interpretation of section 2 by the Senator from Georgia is the same as mine—if it were adopted and should become law we would have the Fair Employment Practice Committee set up permanently and it would have jurisdiction over the States of the Nation to tell them whom they should employ, whom they should promote, and whom they should discharge. My interpretation is that it would extend the jurisdiction that far. I ask the Senator from Georgia if that is not his interpretation of section 2 of the proposed amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. I am inclined to think that in certain instances at least it would be extended to a political subdivision, whether a State or a city, but I was not referring to that proposal for the purpose of discussing its merits or demerits. I was referring to it as positive proof of the ultimate purpose of those who favor the appropriation to continue the Fair Practice Committee, because already legislation has been offered to convert the Fair Practice Committee into a permanent agency of the Government.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. REED. I interrupt the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have a profound admiration, only for the purpose of keeping the record straight. I may remind the Senator from Georgia that the Supreme Court decision to which he referred not only held that goods consumed within the State went into interstate commerce, but that opinion went so far as to apply that finding to goods and agricultural commodities consumed on the farm where they were raised.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Kansas is quite right. That was on the theory that they subtracted somewhat from the total supply, and did affect perhaps the flow of the product across State lines.

Mr. REED. And I may remind the Senator from Georgia that the Supreme Court which so held is a court, seven members of which belong to the party of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and were named by the present occupant of the White House.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe the statement to be historically true, but I hold no brief for the Supreme Court as now constituted. I am saying very frankly that the ultimate purpose of those who drive to make the Fair Practice Committee a permanent agency of government is disclosed by the very legislation which they are offering in both Houses of the Congress at this time, and that purpose, unquestionably, as disclosed by the language which they have employed, is to give the Fair Practice Committee jurisdiction over every employer who engages and uses the services of five persons in any enterprise within any State in the Union, under the construction given to interstate commerce by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to interrupt him again?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that if the doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court is followed to its logical and ultimate conclusion, it will destroy every possible distinction between State and interstate commerce in this country, and result in absolute destruction of every form of local government.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think there is any question about that; I have never been in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Kansas on that point.

Mr. President, I do not want to repeat, and I do not want to delay the Senate unduly on this vote. So far as I know the Fair Practice Committee has not promoted better relations between whites and blacks anywhere in this country.

The Fair Practice Committee has not confined itself nor has it directed its energies to the equalization of compensation for like work in point of quantity and quality by members of the different races or by minorities. I know that the agitation here and the things which have been said here have not promoted better feeling and harmony in the country. I know that they have done nothing to make us a better and stronger America. I know, Mr. President, that they will not.

But now I come to what I believe to be the most important part of this discussion. The motivating force back of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, of those who want to create it, of those who want to make it permanent, of those who want to use it, is to do what? It is to take one more important step toward the control of private industry, private business, big or little, in the United States.

What is ownership of business? Ownership of business consists of the exercise of certain rights and powers over business. What is ownership of property? It consists primarily of certain rights and power over the property, the power to handle it, the power to dispose of it, the power to control it. What do the bills which have been introduced to make the Fair Practice Committee permanent propose to do? They propose to say, not merely to the Government, not merely to Federal agencies, but in the field of private business that the employer cannot say whom he shall employ, whom he shall promote, or how long he wants the employee to work for him. What is that but communism? What is that but a long step toward communism, at least the stripping of the private owner of the elemental rights over his own property and over his own business? That is the serious aspect of this proposal. And some of the organizations back of the Fair Practice Committee are not at all disturbed or confused. They know precisely where they want to go and how to get there.

Mr. President, if the Fair Practice Committee should regulate the hiring and firing of people in Government agencies that would be a different story. If the business which they propose to regulate was a business affected with a public interest, that might be another story; but the legislative proposals to make it permanent do not distinguish between business affected with a public interest and purely private business, such as the operation of a small business college, the operation of a local telephone exchange, or even the operations of a farm where the farmer employs more than five persons. Everything is included. The ultimate aim and the driving power behind the Fair Practice Committee is to strip owners of private rights in private property, and to convert the present economic system into a communistic or national socialistic system.

Mr. President, I am not trying to use nice language or pleasing words. I am trying to tell the truth. We have made great progress in the past few years toward national socialism or communism. This provision would be a major step toward the destruction of our present system of economy, a step toward the denial of the rights of property in the private holdings of the American citizen.

Many persons in this country believe that this proposal, if supported, will gain many votes in the November election. Perhaps it will. I would not say that it would not result in gaining votes in the November election; but I will say that it will not get many votes in the elections in 1946 or 1948, or thereafter, if America abandons the strong downward drift toward national socialism. I believe that the American people will abandon it. Mark my words.

The poor colored man, who is loved and respected by decent white men in the South, has been made a political football before. He has been promised many things before and he has received only crusts of bread. He can be made a political football again, and perhaps the proposal now before the Senate will get votes. Perhaps Members of Congress who vote to continue the Fair Practice Committee will add to the votes which they will receive in November; but it will not be for long, because the little American businessman, the little man who operates a small shop, the little man who operate a farm, the little man who has his herd of cattle on the western plains, every little merchant, every little manufacturer, every little miner, and the owner of every little private enterprise will have a fair practice committee, made up of God only knows whom, saying to him, "You cannot hire that man; you must employ this man. You cannot promote that man. You must promote the other man, because he belongs to a minority."

What is the essence of freedom in America? Under the American system of government, under the concept of our Constitution, and under the living language in the old Declaration of Independence, every man is the center of a circle in which he is supreme, so long as that circle does not infringe upon the like rights, privileges, powers, and prerogatives of his fellow citizens. In these latter days it is proposed to say, "Oh, no; you are not supreme with regard to your own little business. You may not hire and fire in your private business, in your store, or your meat market, if you employ five persons or more." Next year it will be three persons, two persons, or perhaps even one. We say to the little businessman, "You may not hire or fire. You may not control your own business enterprise. The Fair Practice Committee will tell you whom you may hire and whom you may fire, what you may do with your own business, and how to manage and conduct it." That is denying the right of private property by taking away one of the elemental attributes of ownership of property.

There will be some who will say that southern Democrats—the term "southern Democrats" has become an odious term in many places and to many persons—ought not to be making such speeches as we have been making with regard to the Fair Practice Committee. Mr. President, the time has come when we in the South, who have had long, bitter, and painful experience in trying to solve our own problems, must insist upon the right to say, when it is proposed that the Federal Government invade a field which it ought never to attempt to invade, "That is going too far. We will be critical of it, and we will stubbornly resist it."

It is not the purpose of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to see to it that a colored man in Georgia who receives $5 for the same job for which a white man is paid $10 is protected. Not at all. That is not it. If that is the purpose, why is it necessary to have a staff of carpenters to tear out the partitions which we, as a result of our painful experience, have found to be conducive to better and more stable relations between the races?

If the Senate were to say to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, "This day we will vote not to continue an organization the avowed and announced purpose of which is to extend its intermeddling into the private business of the citizens, into business that never has been thought of as being affected with a public interest, but which is purely private," the Senate would render the Nation a great service.

I love my country. I would give my life for it. But this country cannot survive if the class hatreds, class distinctions, and class divisions which have made such remarkable progress in the past several years are hurried along to their final conclusion. Remember this: Long after I have left this desk, if America lives, it will because we will not be afraid of any organization but will be willing to stand up and be counted against any proposal to do what this proposal is ultimately intended to do, to wit, communize America by taking away the elemental, primary rights of owners in the management and control of their private property, and vesting that authority in a Federal bureau in Washington. When Senators return home the businessmen in their States are not going to think they have done a very remarkable job by voting for this proposal. Do not think so for a moment. I have already conceded that it may affect the results in the November election. But the businessmen, from the farmers and merchants and sawmill operators and turpentine producers all the way up through the processors, large and small, are going to understand what this thing means. They know how far management has been liquidated and how far private control over business has been taken away. They know who is responsible. It will not get anyone any votes after the November election.

Do Senators wish to liquidate management wholly? Do they wish to liquidate the private owner wholly? Do they wish to say to him, "I do not care what you think about it. We say whom you must hire, whom you must fire, and whom you must promote."

Do not let anyone argue with you that, "the bill does not go that far, and none of the proposals go that far." They do go just that far. Whenever a Federal instrumentality can say that an employer cannot refuse a certain man a job, they necessarily say that another man cannot have the job. If they say the employer

cannot refuse promotion for a certain group, they necessarily say that the other group cannot have the promotion.

Treat the Negro right. Give him equal pay for equal work. Give the women equal pay for equal work. Do that in a proper way. Do not now take a long step in the liquidation of private property, in the liquidation of our economy, by saying that we will through Government exercise the right and power to say who shall be employed in private business.

COMPENSATION FOR USEFUL SUGGESTIONS OR INVENTIONS BY INTERIOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1232) to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior, which was, on page 2, line 8, after "public," to insert "Nothing in this act shall be taken or construed as amending or modifying the present patent and trade-mark laws as they now exist or may hereafter be amended."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in explanation I may briefly say that the House amendment provides that nothing in the Senate bill shall be construed as repealing or modifying the patent or trademark laws. Nothing is contained in the bill which would do anything of that nature. Therefore, the House amendment would not change or affect the purpose or the meaning of the Senate bill. It would do no good and it would do no harm.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico was good enough to speak to me about the amendment, and I can see no objection to it.

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

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to strike out, on page 10, the paragraph relating to the F. E. P. C., being lines 3 to 16 of the bill, as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Chavez	Guffey
Ball	Connally	Gurney
Bankhead	Cordon	Hatch
Barkley	Danaher	Hill
Bilbo	Davis	Holman
Brewster	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Burton	Ellender	Kilgore
Bushfield	Ferguson	Lucas
Butler	George	McClellan
Byrd	Gerry	McFarland
Capper	Gillette	McKellar
Maloney	Revercomb	Wagner
Maybank	Robertson	Wallgren
Mead	Russell	Walsh, Mass.
Millikin	Shipstead	Walsh, N. J.
Murdock	Stewart	Weeks
Murray	Taft	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Overton	Thomas, Utah	White
Pepper	Tunnell	Willis
Radcliffe	Tydings	
Reed	Vandenberg	

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday Hon. Edward J. Kelly, mayor of the city of Chicago, proclaimed June 25, 1944, as F. E. P. C. Day in that great metropolitan center.

Among other things, the proclamation called upon management and labor in all segments of the population to strive, out of respect to the members of the American fighting forces, to establish in factories and other places of business the principle of equality of opportunity to all races and creeds.

Mr. President, I concur in the noble sentiments expressed by the mayor of Chicago in his forthright proclamation. I submit that during a period when manpower bottlenecks are constantly impeding the war effort job discrimination is indefensible. The Senator from Illinois maintains that if industry is interested in finding the right men for the right jobs there must exist an equal opportunity for all, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In conclusion, I may say that at no time in the history of America has it been so necessary to carry on the fight for the principles to which I have referred as it is at this very moment while we battle the totalitarian forces around the world.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have debated in my own mind the advisability of making any remarks regarding the pending amendment. Practically all phases of the issue raised by the proposed legislation have been substantially covered in very able addresses made by other Members of this body. Certainly, if the very forceful presentation made in the able addresses of the Senators from Georgia and in the addresses of other Senators who have spoken is not persuasive and cannot influence the Members of this body, I could neither hope nor expect by anything I might say to cause any Senator to change his opinion regarding this proposed legislation. But, Mr. President, I am unwilling to remain silent and let the permanent records of this body show that, in an hour of danger to my country and to its Government and to every liberty guaranteed to the citizenship of this Nation and to the individual under the Constitution, I failed to rise and express myself in protest against legislation of this character.

Mr. President, it is not necessary to reiterate the discussion that has been had here regarding the practices of this Committee and the procedures it has pursued in the past as disclosed by the hearings; but I think someone ought to name this Committee for what it is. In the Executive order creating it, it is called a Fair Employment Practice Committee. That is a misnomer. It ought to be called the "Unfair Employment Practice Committee." I say that on its record. Whatever was intended to be accomplished by the creation of the thing in the beginning I do not know; but certainly the record of its conduct discloses the most flagrant example of race discrimination this Nation has ever witnessed. The very instrumentality that is given the name of being "fair" proceeds in the selection of its own personnel in a more discriminatory manner than any other agency of the Government, so far as I know, and more discriminatory than the the industries and businesses it expects to reform.

The statements I have heard made in justification of the action of this Committee in employing a far greater number of Negroes than whites to conduct its affairs, namely that it is because it gets most of its complaints from the Negroes is very significant to me.

Mr. President, every complaint that comes from the Negro is also a complaint against a white man. Yet their conception of being fair is to load the Committee and all of its divisions and its regional offices throughout the Nation with more colored employees than white employees, notwithstanding that the Negro population of the Nation is only about 10 percent of the total population.

Mr. President, let no one ever again refer to this Committee as fair. It is not fair; it is prejudiced. It is not useful; it is a public nuisance. It has no asset or value; it is a public liability to race relationships and unity here at home.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator referred to the discrimination against the white race by the F. E. P. C. Is it not a fact that in all the Government departments in the city of Washington the white race is discriminated against and that we have in fact today a Government of minority groups, who control this country, who control both major political parties, and who are trying to destroy our system of government and to communize the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In answer to the able Senator from Mississippi, I would say that a good many of us are reluctantly coming to that conclusion.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, a white person, a member of the Caucasian race is today discriminated against, imposed on, and humiliated in the Government departments in the city of Washington.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the personnel of all the governmental agencies, but I do say that when in any governmental agency white women and Negro women are compelled to sit side by side, to use the same toilet facilities, to use the same accommodations, and are compelled to such association even to the extent of eating at

the same table, it is an encroachment upon the constitutional liberty of both the races when they desire or when either desires to be segregated.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield further to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The conditions the distinguished Senator from Arkansas mentions of course are obnoxious to white people, but is it not much worse that white girls should be forced to work and take dictation from a group of burr-headed Negroes and Negro supervisors in the departments?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be exceedingly bad if my daughter were requested to do it, but I do not think she will ever have to.

Mr. President, after all, personal liberty if it has any meaning at all, gives a man the right of choice—the choice of association, the choice of affiliation in organizations, the choice of places to work, the choice of political opinions and convictions. Liberty grants the choice to pursue happiness according to the dictates of conscience.

Yesterday when I heard an able Senator, in discussing this matter, refer to the Declaration of Independence, to the unalienable rights guaranteed to the individual, to the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, I could not help wondering, since when was it not the right for the individual citizen in a government of free men to make a choice of who his associates shall be, or since when has it ceased to be an unalienable right of American employers to choose who shall work for him, who is entitled to promotion, who is worth what he pays for the services rendered to him?

Mr. President, in these unalienable rights there are reciprocal benefits and reciprocal privileges. The right to work, the right to seek work, the right to contract for wages, and the right to strive for merited promotion, are among the unalienable rights referred to in the Declaration of Independence. But there is also involved and embraced the right and privilege of the other party to make a decision as to whom he shall employ, what the services are worth, and when the employee is entitled to promotion.

It was stated here yesterday by the able Senator from New York that we should be consistent as we vote on this proposal. He pointed out that Congress has approved other agencies created by Executive order, and has made appropriations to finance the carrying on of their duties. I intend to remain consistent, and I desire to call the attention of my colleagues now to the fact that if they intend to remain consistent, if they intend to vote for the pending appropriation and expect to remain consistent, then in a few days, or at some date not far in the future, we are going to be asked to consider one of these bills, particularly House bill 3986, which the Senator from Connecticut a few days ago gave notice he intended to offer as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Georgia, who preceded me, pointed out that such permanent legislation was going to be sought. Those who vote for this appropriation in my judgment place themselves under a measure of obligation to consider favorably and to vote for permanent legislation of this character.

It is definitely shown by the hearings, by the testimony of the Chairman, and of members of the Committee now under discussion, that it is their intent to carry this authority far beyond anything connected with the war effort. They do not intend that this operation shall be only temporary. The objective is not merely to aid the war effort. That is not what is involved here, and I say, Mr. President, there has not been enough trouble in the way of discrimination in the Nation anywhere in the war effort, because of the shortage of manpower, to justify the existence of any such agency, and there will not be in the future.

Let us see if we are to go all the way with this proposal. I intend to remain consistent. I shall vote against the proposal now, tomorrow, and every other time this measure or any other bill comes before the Senate which in my judgment is unconstitutional. But waving that aside, assuming it to be constitutional, any bill which I think seeks to destroy the liberty to which every man is entitled I shall oppose.

I am not particularly concerned about business, any more than I am concerned about the laboring man or about the farmer, but I do want the farmer to have the right to employ whom he desires to employ, I want the businessman to have the right to employ whom he wishes to employ. I want him to retain the right of judgment and decision as to who merits promotion. Do Senators desire to surrender that right? Are they ready today to abolish that right and let this agency, or any other agency so constituted and having like authority, whether by Presidential order or directive, or through permanent legislation, say to them as United States Senators what the color of their employees shall be, which one they will make their secretary, which one shall be a clerk? Are you ready to go that far? Do you want this Committee to tell you, Mr. Senator, you must employ a Negro secretary? Are Senators ready to have the Federal Government say to their States, and to the taxpayers of their States, "As you tax your people and as you collect the money, we set up an agency in Washington, D. C., to tell you whom you shall employ in your State government to administer the business of State government"?

While the able Senator from Georgia was discussing this matter, I asked for his interpretation of section 2 of House bill 3986, which is intended to be made permanent legislation if its enactment can be brought about. I wish to call attention to this, not that it is the pending measure, but it casts a shadow of approaching events. It is an indication to us, it is a warning to everyone as we vote on the proposed appropriation, as to what is yet to come.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has the Senator had an opportunity to read the section referring to Government employees in the Territories, in the agencies connected with the Federal Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have read the bill, and I shall read the section to which the Senator from South Carolina refers.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to have the Senator's comment on that section.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall show what the effects of the proposed legislation would be. Of course, it is said, "We are not considering it now. We can amend it and revise it." Of course we can, but the safest thing to do is to act now. If we kill this appropriation, we will not have to deal with permanent legislation on this subject. We can end the matter now.

Let me point out what is proposed. First I shall read section 1:

> The Congress finds——

Are Senators ready to make a finding; are they ready to sit in judgment?

> The Congress finds that the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, foments domestic strife and unrest deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

Are we ready to make that decision here and now? As has been ably stated by the senior Senator from Georgia today, whenever a measure is introduced which undertakes to deal with this problem it causes greater dissension, greater unrest, and greater disturbance between the races. Such legislation serves to agitate and breed race troubles. If this matter was left alone, if our people were allowed to have their liberty and to exercise it, we would not have the tenseness which today exists over the racial question. The question will solve itself if left alone. The intelligent peoples of both races will be able to work to a solution.

Let me remind Senators that when an effort is made to inject into the discussion of racial problems or into proposed legislation the issue which some are now trying to inject, when an effort is made to legislate so as to compel—and that is what they are leading to and this is the beginning of the drive to compel the intermingling of the races, to compel amalgamation of the races, you are going to destroy something mighty fine in this country, and the day will come when you will regret the action. I do not think, however, it is going to happen. I think Americans will wake up in time, and when we get past this approaching campaign in which some few individuals hope to gain political advantage by reason of this sort of legislation, I think we will take a more sober view of the question, and that our better judgment will prevail.

Mr. President, I read further from the bill that is intended to make the committee a permanent one by legislation. I read from House bill 3986:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate such discrimination in all employment relations which fall within the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government as hereinafter set forth.

And it is set forth aplenty. Listen to section 2. The section does not miss anyone except an employer who employs less than five individuals. It covers the whole field. I read section 2:

SEC. 2. The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of any State.

Listen to this language:

Which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of any State.

What about an agency of State government, Mr. President? It is proposed that we pass a law which would say that the sovereign States of this Nation cannot have any policy with respect to whom they shall employ and whom they shall promote and whom they shall discharge unless it comes under the jurisdiction and subject to the final decision of the Fair Employment Practice Committee created by the Congress of the United States. Are we ready to set up and create agencies of that character to pass judgment on the activities of the States? It can be said, and sometimes it can be justified, that when the Federal Government is making an appropriation or contributing part of the cost to any activity carried on by a State, then it is appropriate for the Government to have something to say about it. But the proposed legislation goes beyond that. The State itself could not employ anyone if the Committee decided such employment was unfair or discriminated in any way, it would have the power to issue orders against the States.

The Senator from South Carolina asked a question concerning another section of the bill. I think he referred to subsection (c) of section 4, and I now read it:

(c) This act shall apply to the employment practices in the United States and of every Territory, insular possession, agency, or instrumentality thereof, except that paragraphs (3) and (f) of section 10, providing for petitions for enforcement and review, shall not apply in any case in which an order has been issued against any department or independent agency of the United States; but in any such case the Fair Employment Practice Committee established by section 5 of this act may petition the Attorney General of the United States for the enforcement of such order, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the Attorney General to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order. Every official who willfully violates any such order shall be summarily discharged from the Government employ.

Section 4 (a) and (b) of the bill, referring to the scope of it, is as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) This act shall apply to any employer having in his employ more than five persons, who is (1) engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; (2) under contract with the United States or any agency thereof; or (3) performing work, under subcontract or otherwise, called for by a contract to which the United States or any agency thereof is a party.

(b) This act shall apply to any labor union which has five or more members in the employ of one or more employers covered by the preceding paragraph.

Mr. President, when did a citizen of our country lose his right to determine which society he shall join, which organization he shall affiliate with, and whether he may choose to keep that organization confined to those possessing certain qualities or certain qualifications of eligibility? Are we ready in this country to take the position that white people can no longer have a society or an organization of their own? Are we ready to surrender and throw away the right to keep segregated, if we want segregation? I have no dislike, I have no hatred, and no prejudice against the Negro race. We have lots of Negroes in my State. I have never had any cause to build up a feeling of hatred or resentment against the Negro. But, Mr. President, I do claim the right for myself, and I want that right retained for my people, for my State, and for my family, to organize into a society, if we may, or to have churches if we may, or to have schools if we may, for white people only, and to give the same rights to Negroes.

If the bill to which I refer should pass in its present form, Mr. President, this Unfair Practice Committee in Washington could tell the school boards of my State that they must, if employing more than five teachers, employ at least one Negro, or two Negroes, as the case may be. If it can do that, Mr. President, it will not only be an encroachment upon the rights of the States, but it will be one of the most damnable things that ever happened to this country, and I am speaking mildly of it when I use that term.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas stated that he thought the white people should be permitted to have an organization of their own. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator in that statement.

The Senator further stated that he had no prejudice against any race. Again I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. I have no prejudice in my heart against any man because of his race, creed, or color. But, Mr. President, I go further than does the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I am of the opinion that we should have segregation in all the States of the United States by law. What the people of this country must realize is that the white race is a superior race, and the Negro race is an inferior race. Social equality is growing in this country, and in addition to teaching the white race the importance of racial purity, we must prevent racial intermingling by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. It is not necessary to establish the fact that the white race is a superior race. That is not the question. Every right I claim for the white race, every right I claim for my own people, I gladly and willingly accord to the Negro race. I think the Negro, as well as the white man, should have the right to have his own church and his own school, and to exclude others if he so desires. Can we not do that in this country and be left alone? Why this agitation?

The truth is that the freedom and constitutional rights of the people of America are being sold down the river for a mess of political pottage. That is what is happening. Somebody will rue this day. By such legislation they are heading this Government toward communism. We cannot keep freedom if we continually grant authority to some board to regulate the inalienable rights of the people themselves, rights which the people have retained; they have not delegated the power to the President of the United States or to the Congress to change or abolish.

This is serious. It does not involve merely an appropriation of $500,000. No one would ever miss that. The public debt will be so great that $500,000 will not be worth mentioning in comparison. But, Mr. President, we can destroy the liberties of the people by the appropriation of far less money, or without the appropriation of a dollar.

Under the Executive order of the President, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice is authorized to accept the services of volunteer workers. To begin with, those who volunteer for such service are usually prejudiced. They have a motive. They volunteer their services with designs. They try to find a victim for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to harass and intimidate. Let no one say that this Committee does not intimidate. We are in the midst of a war. Everyone knows that the Chief Executive has been given by the Congress greater powers than any other President was ever given in the history of this Nation. The people know, from the operations of agencies which the Congress has authorized, the strength of the Government, and its power to invoke sanctions and reprisals when directives and Executive orders are not obeyed.

Imagine one of the volunteers going out to investigate a situation. He would say, "If you do not do as you are directed, we will make certain recommendations." That is what is being done today. There is a veiled threat and intimidation. The one whose activities are under investigation is told, "If you do not do what the Committee in Washington decides is fair and nondiscriminatory, we will make a recommendation to the War Manpower Commission." In the Executive order the Committee is directed to make such recommendations.

What is the effect of such recommendations? What sort of recommendation would be made to the War Manpower Commission? The Committee would recommend to the War Manpower Commission that the employer be sent no

more employees. The War Manpower Commission would send an order to the United States Employment Service, and the employer would get no more employees.

A representative of the Committee might go to the War Production Board and say, "This man has a Negro working for him, but he will not promote him. We have decided that that Negro ought to be promoted. So, until he promotes him, we recommend that you take away the employer's priorities. We will compel him to do it." The man in business is helpless. A man against whom that sort of a recommendation is made, and against whom a Government agency operates in that fashion, is defenseless. He must either submit or cease operations.

When the able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was discussing this question yesterday I asked him what the effect of the Executive order was. When the directive was issued by the President creating this Committee, the Comptroller General ruled that the order was directive and not mandatory. That was his interpretation of it, and he wrote an opinion to that effect. Then what occurred? The Attorney General took the question up with the President of the United States, who wrote a letter in reply stating that the order was mandatory. With that letter from the President of the United States staring every Government agency in the face, when this Committee recommends to any other agency that it take certain steps against one of its victims who, in the opinion of the Committee, is discriminating or failing to obey some of its orders or mandates, that recommendation becomes mandatory, and the other Government agencies must carry it out.

That is the way this Committee is now operating. It is operating by intimidation, coercion, and threat. Such fear is instilled into employers that it is said that many complaints are adjusted before they reach the Committee. That is possibly true, because of the threats which are made. Any small businessman knows that he must yield or suffer the consequences of injury.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hesitate to interrupt the distinguished Senator because I am enjoying very much his most excellent remarks on private employment and intimidation by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. With his permission, I should like to read a portion of House bill 3986, which it is hoped will eventually be enacted into law. This language relates to violation of the law by any Government official, agency, or instrumentality thereof. It reads as follows:

> But in any such case the Fair Employment Practice Commission established by section 5 of this act may petition the Attorney General of the United States for the enforcement of such order, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the Attorney General to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order. Every official who willfully violates any such order shall be summarily discharged from the Government employ.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if he will comment a little more on the details of the legal complications of this section.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that I have already commented on that. Possibly he was temporarily absent from the Chamber at the time. I have expressed my belief that this legislation, with this section in it, together with others I have read, simply sets up a dictatorship committee in Washington to control the affairs of business throughout this Nation.

Mr. President, we have either one or another of two things: Either we have free private enterprise or we have a totalitarian government. Make no mistake about that. People talk about the sacredness of property, and say we stress that to the extent of magnifying property rights above human rights.

Let me tell you that they are equal; they are the same. We cannot destroy property rights without destroying human rights—the right to the pursuit of happiness, the right to life, the right to liberty. We cannot take man's property away from them, except by due process of law, without destroying human rights. There is no country in the world today, there never has been, and there never will be, in which men who are denied the right of ownership and enjoyment in the use of property are not also denied the liberties of which we of America have boasted and been proud.

Mr. President, I know there are those who are ready to say and who will say—in fact, I would not be surprised to read such statements in some publication tomorrow—that I have made a pro-Fascist speech today in the Senate. But let me say to you that if what I am trying to defend and what the able Senators from Georgia and other Senators have been trying to defend on this floor, in connection with this fight, is fascism, it has been fascism ever since the days of the Declaration of Independence, and those who wrote that document were Fascist. If that is fascism, then make the most of it. I do not care what smear terms some publications may use. I shall not be deterred in doing my duty to my country because some Communist wants to becloud the issue by yelling fascism.

But I say to you, Mr. President, it is not fascism. However, the very thing being done here in the attempt to take away the liberties of our people, liberties guaranteed to them under the Constitution, is a long step in the direction of dictatorship and fascism.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure the Senator does not imply that any of his colleagues sitting here listening to his very eloquent speech would classify it as a pro-Fascist speech or anything of that kind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the Senator is justified in inferring such from my remarks, because in my statement I especially referred to some publications.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very glad to have the Senator make that statement. I may disagree with the Senator, as I frequently do; but I always accord him credit for the sincerity which I am sure he accords me. If I did not have the greatest respect and admiration for the able Senator in the presentation of his views, I would not sit here as I do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator simply failed to hear me say that I would not be surprised if certain publications would charge, tomorrow, that I had made a pro-Fascist speech today. Of course, I know the Senator. I served with him in the House of Representatives, and I have served with him here. Although we sometimes disagree on legislation we always are respectful to each other.

Mr. President, in this connection I say that I wish to see the Negroes, the Jews, the Mexicans, and people of any other races which might be considered have the same rights and the same equal opportunities that I have and you have. But in doing that I do not wish to be compelled to surrender the right of liberty which is mine. It is not necessary that I surrender that right. By legislation of this character an attempt is being made to destroy a multitude of privileges, rights, and liberties of the American people, in order to grant one little benefit here and there, as some may think, to some Negro, or to someone else who has not been promoted as fast as this Committee may think he should have been. But, in my judgment, that is simply straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

I say to the Senate that legislation of this sort is destroying America. America has had something to be proud of. All the liberties we have enjoyed have made their contribution to the building of the greatest country in the world. Think of this war. Where would the cause of freedom be if it were not for America? It would already be trailing in the dust and in defeat. No one would dare deny that. Why has America been of such great aid to the cause of freedom in this war? It is because of her power, because of her productive capacity.

What gave us that productive capacity? It was not legislation of this character. Such legislation never on earth would make a contribution to the power and productive capacity of America. We never before have had such legislation.

What gave America her power and productive capacity? They came about as a result of the right of men in America to be free, to have the right of choice, the right of decision, the right of free, untrammeled, uncoerced judgment, the right to pursue life and liberty as we choose.

Legislation of the character proposed will destroy some of those rights and privileges. It will harm America. The young men who today are giving their lives on the fields of battle are not dying to preserve America so that it can be made over again. They are not dying for that reason. Any man, no matter who he may be—I do not care whether

he is a United States Senator, President of the United States, a member of an unfair practice committee, or the head of any organization—who attempts to take advantage of the war in order to try to drive through these harmful policies, who attempts to force such legislation at this time, in the name of the war, in my humble judgment does a disservice to and commits injury to those who are fighting on the fields of battle.

We all know there is room for improvement in many respects. But if reform is needed so badly, let me state whom I wish to see have a part in it. I want to see the boys who are saving this country have something to say about it. Let us put off these wild schemes of reform and so-called social gains until they get back home. Then let us see if those who have faced the shot and shell, those who have seen their buddies die in battle, want to change America.

I am not going to change it and take the responsibility for trying to reform and make over this Government while they are dying to preserve it. They love it well enough now, as it is, and as it has been. They go beyond the call of duty hour after hour, and give their lives for something that is precious to them; namely, their way of life. Are we going to change it while they are away? Does any Senator wish to tell them when they come home that if he employs more than five persons he must come to Washington and get a Negro to sanction and approve his employment policies. I am not going to vote to turn this country over to the Negroes, who are less than 10 percent of our population nor to Communists.

I have never had any trouble with the Negroes. I have represented them in the courts, and I have prosecuted them in the courts. I have seen a white jury turn a Negro defendant loose, and convict a white man as an accessory because they gave the colored man the benefit of the doubt that possibly he was influenced by the white man who should have protected him.

No condition exists in my State, Mr. President, which would warrant this unjust encroachment on my people. It cannot be justified.

I conclude with the statement that in order to be consistent, Senators who will vote for this appropriation should vote for permanent legislation of this character. No condition has been shown to exist which would justify the proposal merely as a war measure. If Senators vote to appropriate money to continue the activities of the present Committee, which seeks to expand its jurisdiction and tenure of life beyond what it possesses today under an Executive order, in order to be consistent, they should vote for legislation making the Committee permanent. I shall remain consistent and vote against this and any similar measure. Other measures of this nature may be proposed in the future, and I may not be able to learn of them in time to inform myself of their consequences if enacted into law. But I shall vote against this measure and against every other measure, Mr. President, which undertakes to sabotage the Constitution, and destroy the liberty of our citizens. That is what the proposed measure would do, and that is what it is designed to do. In its ultimate consequences and goal, the hope and ambition of its sponsors is eventually to force an amalgamation of the races. That is the goal toward which it is headed. We are asked to take a step in that direction, and if we take one step we will later take another, and go on down the road. The conditions which will result in America will not be wholesome or healthy for black or white, North or South, East or West.

Today is the day on which a final vote will be taken on the amendment. This is D-day and the H-hour for us.

We must make the decision as to whether we are ready now to give our sanction to the procedure and unfair practice which is now being followed in our Government. Mr. President, I shall vote to strike the appropriation for this Committee from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive, as amended, on page 10 of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the proposed amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been extensively debated, but I do not wish a vote to be taken upon the amendment before I speak briefly in urging its adoption.

I am opposed to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. In the first place, we all know that its establishment was never authorized by the Congress of the United States. The Congress not only never authorized or established the Committee, but it never had any intention that any money appropriated out of the Federal Treasury should be used for the operation or maintenance of such an agency of the Government as the Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

On previous occasions no opposition was voiced to the appropriations, out of which funds were used by this agency, because no Senator ever dreamed that any part of such funds would be used for the establishment of such an agency as this Committee. Congress in no way ever gave consent or approval to the establishment of this particular agency. It has no foundation in law. There is no basis for it in any statute, and the powers of the agency are indefinite. No limit has been placed upon its powers. From a reading of the testimony before the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations it would seem that the members of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice have arrogated unto themselves unlimited power, and believe that they can do anything which they desire to do under the Executive order bringing the Committee into being.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator take the position that in the creation of this Committee the President of the United States acted unlawfully, and without a basis in law?

Mr. HILL. I certainly take the position that he had no power to establish the Committee, and that the Committee now has no lawful place in our Government. The Senator knows that the way in which the Committee should have been established was by the enactment of a statute by the Congress of the United States. I know of nothing in the War Powers Act which in any way comprehended, anticipated, or looked toward the creation of such an agency as the Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. HILL. Of course, I realize that the President could create a committee under the War Powers Act, but he has no power to delegate to it such powers as have been exercised by this Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. The thing which is so astounding to me is that Senators take the position on this floor that the President of the United States acted unlawfully in the establishment and creation of this Committee. I have no quarrel with statements which have been made in criticism of the actions of the Committee. But when Senators rise on the floor of the Senate in time of war such as now and when by a declaration of war Congress has placed upon the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the responsibility of prosecuting the war to a successful conclusion, and take the position that the President has acted unlawfully in the creation of this Committee more effectively to mobilize the manpower of the country, I am unable to understand their attitude.

Before they make a declaration on the floor of the Senate that the President has acted unlawfully in this matter I ask Senators to examine the grant of power under the Constitution to the executive department and compare it to the grant of power to the legislative department. What will they find? They will find that the grant of executive power is substantially in the following language: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States." That is very broad and comprehensive language.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I wish to yield to him for a question, but not for a speech. When I shall have finished my remarks, which will not be very lengthy, the Senator may make a speech.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish merely to say that we must look to the Constitution as well as to statutory law in determining the powers of the Executive. Now as to the grant of legislative power in the Constitution we find it to be in most restrictive language, to wit: "All legislative powers herein granted should be vested in a Congress of the United States." I call particularly to the Senator's attention the words "herein granted."

In my opinion especially in time of war, this distinction between those two grants of power under the Constitution, should be taken cognizance of in the debate. To me in a national emergency and crisis such as this when the President has devolved upon him the very

preservation of the Nation Congress should proceed very cautiously in denying or curtailing his functions and powers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in war or not in war, the President has power only which the Constitution gives him, and which the Congress by the enactment of statutory legislation gives to him. I know of no provision of the Constitution of the United States which gives to the President the power to set up this Committee and to attempt to give to the Committee the authority which it is now seeking to exercise. I know of no provision in any statute passed by the Congress which gives such power to the President of the United States. There are definite inhibitions and definite limitations on the power of the President in time of war as well as in time of peace. As I have said, the only power the President can exercise is the power that is given to him by the Constitution or by statutes passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, if the Fair Employment Practice Committee had been created by an act of Congress, as it should have been, if it was going to be set up at all, no doubt its powers would have been defined; no doubt there would have been some limit on the field within which the Committee could act. But, as the matter now stands, the power of the Committee is not defined, there is no limit on its power, no inhibition established. As I have said, the Committee seems to arrogate unto itself whatever power it sees fit to take.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there lies no appeal from a decision by the Committee. This question has been discussed by other Members of the Senate; but if there is any one thing that is fundamental in our American system of government it is the right of appeal, and if there is any one case where such right should exist and be safeguarded, it is where the powers sought to be exercised are not clearly defined. In this instance we find an agency seeking to exercise power which is in no way defined and from the decisions of which there is no right of appeal.

This Committee was established, Mr. President, on the basis that it would help promote the war effort. Instead of helping the war effort, certainly, so far as the section of the country from which I come is concerned, it has proved definitely harmful. It has caused irritation; it has bred resentments; it has created bitterness. Instead of making for unity, instead of making for all-out effort on the part of our people, it has divided them. That which should be our first consideration is the war effort, the production of the things needed for the war effort, the production of iron and steel, of aluminum, of sulfur, and all the other many materials which go into the implements our soldiers across the seas need and must have for the winning of this war. Our first thought should be the production of the guns, the tanks, the planes, and other implements of warfare. If they are to be produced in the best possible way, in the most efficient way, and in the shortest possible time, then we must have team play—the best possible team play, the best possible cooperation and harmony among those charged with the responsibility of carrying on the work of production.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask the Senator to yield because I wish to refer to an interruption that came from the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] when he mentioned the provision of the Constitution which reposed the legislative power in the Congress and referred to the phrase "the legislative power herein granted." I hope the Senator from Alabama will bear with me while I refer to the section of the Constitution referring to "legislative power herein granted." It is section 8, article I of the Constitution, and reads:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers—
>
> Which are listed—
>
> and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

That is the legislative power.

Mr. HILL. I want to thank the Senator for his contribution. The language of the Constitution is clear, specific, and definite; there can be no question about the fact that the Congress alone can legislate, and that the President cannot, because he happens to be the Chief Executive, create agencies and set up instrumentalities of the Government except as he is authorized to do so by the Congress of the United States. There can be no question about that.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator take the position that the war powers of the President come exclusively and must come exclusively from statutory law?

Mr. HILL. They come either from the Constitution of the United States or from the statutes. The President has no power at all except the power which may be given him by the Constitution or by statutes passed by the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the point I desired to make in calling the matter to the attention of the Senate. Inasmuch as the able Senator from Iowa, as I understand him, has taken some issue with the statement I made, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me to read from a decision by Chief Justice Taft on this very question? It is very brief and right to the point.

Mr. HILL. How late is the decision? I imagine the decision is 20 years old and it may have been set aside by this time. However, I yield; I want to be courteous to my friend, the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. In my opinion, the part of the decision which I shall read is very pertinent to the present discussion. I quote from the decision in Myers versus the United States, written by Chief Justice Taft:

> The difference between the grant of legislative power under Article I to Congress, which is limited to powers therein enumerated, and the more general grant of the executive power to the President under Article II, is significant.

That is the language of Chief Justice Taft in the Myers case. That is the point I want to make when Senators challenge a right of the President such as he has exercised in the creation of this Committee in time of war when we have devolved upon him the responsibility of carrying it on to successful conclusion. My point is that before we accuse him of acting unlawfully in setting up, as he has done in this case, a committee for the better mobilization of the manpower of the country, we must have in mind not only the constitutional grant of power to the Executive but also any statutory law that may be enacted to implement the broad grant of executive power in the Constitution. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. HILL. I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Utah. I know of no grant either in the Constitution or in the statutes giving to the President the power to set up such an agency as the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

Mr. President, as I stated, our first consideration at this time, our paramount consideration, should be to do that which will contribute most to our war effort. As I have said on many occasions, it will not be enough to win the war; we must win it in the shortest possible time, and save every life we possibly can.

Time and again we have been reminded by those responsible for our war production and by those responsible for our military operations that our battle front rests squarely on the home front, that what we can do in carrying war to our enemies and in bringing about their destruction and their defeat depends upon what we do here on the home front, how well we supply our men, with what rapidity we send them the implements of warfare which they must have in order to do the job assigned them.

Mr. President, as I have said, this agency, instead of contributing to the war effort, instead of being helpful to it, instead of stimulating it, instead of doing something constructive for the war effort, brings about the irritations, the resentments, the bitterness to which I have referred, and therefore it has proved definitely harmful to our war effort. As an agency harmful to the war effort, as an agency breeding discontent and resentment among our people I hope the Congress will not put an end to it, refuse this appropriation and let us be done with a bad committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few moments. The pending amendment has been very thoroughly debated, and I know it would be difficult to add anything to the information of the Senate on the subject. I shall vote against the provision providing for the F. E. P. C.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the very spirit of this provision is wholly out of line with what we have always heretofore conceived to be the relation as between our people with respect to matters of employment. It is said the desire is to prevent discrimination. After all, who is to decide whether discrimination is being practiced—this agency, or the man who does the employing, whose money is used to pay for the employment, and who is to be served by the particular character of the services of the employee? Or is the question of discrimination to be determined by some outsider, some governmental functionary on a Government salary? How is he better advised as to the qualifications of a particular applicant to fit the requirements of the position which he seeks, than the man who owns the business, the man who offers the position, the man who wants the services of the employee in a business with which he is entirely familiar?

It seems to me that the freedom and the liberty of action of the employer is as much to be consulted as that of the employee. My own experience is that the best way to instill confidence as between the employee and the employer is to let these forces have their natural play, and not have an employee who feels that his tenure is not dependent upon his employer, but is dependent upon the exercise of some governmental force or some governmental compulsion to put him and keep him in his job.

Mr. President, the experience of every Government department, and of Senators and others, shows that if we employ someone under pressure from outside sources, the relationship between us and the employees is never good. The employee feels that he can go around us, and may appeal to some higher authority.

Like most governmental agencies, the agency here concerned wants to spread its jurisdiction. In my own State of Texas the F. E. P. C. had an experience which I shall briefly call to the attention of the Senate. The Dallas News, one of the great newspapers of the State, inserted in one of its advertising columns an advertisement that the newspaper itself wanted an employee, a colored man, for some sort of work in the press room, folding papers, or something of the kind. The F. E. P. C. communicated with the Dallas News and, on the ground that the newspaper was discriminating, said, "You cannot use that kind of an advertisement. You cannot specify whether you want colored or white." Probably they kept some good colored man out of a job for which he was suited.

The Dallas News resisted, and such a hubbub was created over the incident that the Committee finally withdrew its interference, and admitted that it was in error and that a newspaper was not such an essential industry in the war situation as to justify invoking the jurisdiction of the F. E. P. C. So it withdrew. But it did not want to withdraw. It wanted to stretch its jurisdiction into every avenue of life and of industry. It wanted to exercise governmental compulsion and governmental power as to the employment terms affecting everyone, everywhere, in every industry throughout the land.

Mr. President, I am not so much concerned about discrimination on the color line. We in the South have never discriminated against the colored race as to employment. There are certain types of employment for which they are superior, and for which we would prefer them to white employees. On the other hand, there are other kinds of employment in which we prefer the whites. If we leave the matter to the employees and to the employers themselves, we will never have serious difficulty in the South. But if we intrude the arm of the Government, the mailed fist, into these relationships, we shall breed dissession, we shall breed trouble.

I wish to say to some of those who today wear the cloak of purity, and express high interest in others, that by the enactment of legislation of the character now proposed they are going to cause the very thing they are pretending to want to prevent.

Mr. President, I know of no law of Congress which ever authorized the establishment of the organization under discussion. I wrote to a man in my State in April, before all the disturbance and noise about this matter arose, that I knew of no law authorizing the establishment of the agency. He wanted my advice; he did not follow it after he got it, but he wanted it. I told him that if I were in his position I would go right on running my business as I always had, and would ignore this concern. But under the threat of Government penalties and Government compulsion, he wrote them a note, "I will not run any more advertisements like this." That man had a small manufacturing plant, and he placed an advertisement in a newspaper saying that he wanted six white women to do certain kinds of work. This agency went after him like a swarm of bees and forbade the use of such an advertisement, and thereby probably kept several women out of employment who perhaps needed employment and who could perform the duties and would better than others suit the requirements of the position to the employer.

Mr. President, no law existed which authorized the establishment of this agency when it was created, and the best proof of that is that we now have before us a proposal to make the Committee legal. If it were legally constituted all the time why would there be need for a new law respecting it? It is proposed to enact a law providing for the legalizing of something which was contended to be legal and legally authorized all the time. Of course, nothing in the Constitution authorizes the establishment of this Committee. There is no statute providing for it.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote "nay" on the proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas means that he favors the motion to strike from the bill the language dealing with the Committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean I shall vote against the appropriation. So, Mr. President, I shall vote to strike out of the bill the proposal with respect to the Committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Cordon	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Ellender	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Ferguson	Murray	Weeks
George	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Gerry	Overton	White
Gillette	Pepper	Willis

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] proposing to strike out the paragraph relating to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, as amended, being lines 3 to 16, inclusive, on page 10.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] who, if present, would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who, if present, would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). I have been requested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to announce that he is unavoidably absent on Federal business, and that if present he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from

Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

I also announce the following pairs: the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]; the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]; and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] would vote "yea," and the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]; and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Virgina [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent. These Senators would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent attending the marriage of his daughter. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bankhead	George	Maybank
Bilbo	Gurney	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bushfield	Holman	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Connally	McClellan	Stewart
Eastland	McKellar	White

NAYS—39

Aiken	Hatch	Shipstead
Ball	Kilgore	Taft
Barkley	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Maloney	Tunnell
Capper	Mead	Vandenberg
Chavez	Murdock	Wagner
Cordon	Murray	Wallgren
Davis	O'Mahoney	Walsh, Mass.
Ferguson	Pepper	Walsh, N. J.
Gerry	Radcliffe	Weeks
Gillette	Reed	Wherry
Guffey	Revercomb	Willis

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews	Downey	Nye
Austin	Ellender	O'Daniel
Bailey	Glass	Reynolds
Bone	Green	Scrugham
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Jackson	Tobey
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Chandler	La Follette	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Wiley
Danaher	Moore	Wilson

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 31, 41, 43, 48, 52, 59, 66, and 71 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 40, 53, and 63 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 to the bill and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 to the bill, asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H. R. 1475. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service;

H. R. 4659. An act to authorize the Soil Conservation Service to lend certain equipment; and

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution making appropriations for grants to States under the Social Security Act.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, at the end of line 16, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any complaint against any defendant where such defendant does not have the same right to appeal an adverse decision of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to the President of the United States, or to refer said complaint to the President of the United States for final disposition, as is asserted by or allowed the said Committee on Fair Employment Practice in cases where persons complained against refuse to abide by its orders."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the nature of this agency is transformed by the vote which has just been taken. Heretofore the organization has been the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice. By the majority vote which has just been had in this Chamber it now becomes the Congress' Committee on Fair Employment Practice. Up until this hour it has been the child of the executive branch of Government. The legislative branch has now adopted it, and has undertaken to give it legality.

Certainly, Mr. President, if we are going to confirm in this manner all the acts of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice and all the rules and all the regulations which have been promulgated by it, the least we can do is to preserve an essential right of every American citizen, namely, the right to appeal from an adverse decision which may destroy such citizen.

Under the regulations which now are in force, which provide for the procedure in the Committee, the Committee has the right to refer or to cite to the President of the United States any defendant who refuses to carry out its orders. The amendment merely would allow a defendant who has been cited before the Com-

mittee—without, as I still insist, any authority of law—to have the same right of appeal which is allowed to the Committee.

Of course, Senators can vote against providing any right of appeal. They can vote to give the Committee all the powers it has asserted are vested in it by the Executive order. But I shall ask that we have a yea-and-nay vote on the question whether an individual who has been cited before the Committee shall be denied the right of appeal, shall have his contracts canceled, and shall have other sanctions imposed against him, although the Committee itself, if that person refuses to act, has a right to appeal to the President of the United States.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which provides that right.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to have a clear understanding of the amendment, before the vote is taken. The Committee on Fair Employment Practice has no right to cancel contracts. The Senator has said contracts can be canceled only through some other agency of Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator contend that if the War Department cancels a contract, the man who had the contract has a right to appeal to the President of the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I am seeking. I say that if the War Department is to cancel a man's contract because he does not conform to a ruling or order which has been issued by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, certainly that man, the defendant, should have the right to appeal.

Under the procedure which now obtains, the Executive order provides that if a person refuses to conform, before sanctions are employed the Committee has a right to cite the defendant to the President of the United States. In two cases the Committee has cited defendants to the President.

The amendment provides that if the Committee arbitrarily and without good reason proposes to cancel a contract, a party to the contract shall have a right to appeal.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am inclined to be in accord with what I think is the Senator's purpose. But I am wondering whether by the amendment he would not direct that a party to almost any canceled war contract might have the right to appeal to the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so. The amendment provides that if the committee arbitrarily attempts to impose some unfair order or regulation upon a party to such a contract, he may have the right of appeal to the President. At the present time such a person is absolutely without any recourse. He cannot go into the courts. Of course, it would be a futile thing to give him the right to come to the Congress, inasmuch as the Congress has already vested these powers in the Committee on Employment by the vote just had. There should be a right of appeal somewhere before a citizen suffers loss due to arbitrary action.

As I have said before, the matter of the cancelation of contracts is a question of life and death with American business today. The Committee on Fair Employment Practice, having been given congressional sanction, can practically eliminate an industry if it wishes to do so, and a party to a contract has absolutely no right of appeal from the Committee's decision.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator think his amendment makes it clear that persons engaged in war work, and subject to the cancelation of contracts, can appeal only if the difficulty arises as the result of action taken by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. Such persons could appeal only when a government department or agency has canceled a contract, and when the party to the canceled contract, or the defendant, contends that some action on the part of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice has been arbitrarily directed against him.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has made that point clear; has he?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure it is clear. Of course, the effect of the amendment is that some rules to provide for an appeal must be established. That is its effect. The only way we can bring that about is by way of a limitation upon the appropriation. With this limitation imposed I am sure the F. E. P. C. will provide some method of appeal to those who contest its powers and orders.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the present practice, as I understand it, if a person or corporation proceeded against refuses to carry out an order of the Committee, the Committee may appeal to the President. Is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Committee itself cannot cancel contracts, and does not do so, under the regulations. But the War Department or some other department which has a contract may do so, as I understand the situation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the department which has the contract which has been recommended for cancelation by the Committee—I suppose the Committee can do that—itself refuses to cancel the contract, then the Committee can take that matter to the President; is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator is seeking to accomplish, as I understand the amendment, is that when the department involved has canceled the contract, a party to the contract can appeal to the President, if the department canceled the contract as a result of a recommendation of the Committee, but not of any other agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, unless the amendment involves something which does not appear on the surface, I personally do not believe any injustice would result to the Government by reason of allowing a person whose contract is canceled as a result of action by the Committee to take up the matter with the President. I would object to providing the right of appeal to the President in the case of a contract which was canceled as a result of action by some other agency. But in a case in which the contract is canceled as a result of some regulation of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, I am inclined to think such a provision might be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the amendment, as it is worded, provides for an appeal to the President, such as the appeal the Committee would have, I do not believe anyone would object to it at all.

May the amendment be read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read again.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, at the end of line 16, it is proposed to insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any complaint against any defendant where such defendant does not have the same right to appeal an adverse decision of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to the President of the United States, or to refer said complaint to the President of the United States for final disposition, as is asserted by or allowed the said Committee on Fair Employment Practice in cases where persons complained against refuse to abide by its orders."

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is unfortunate that the amendment has to be offered by way of a limitation on an appropriation. But it cannot be offered otherwise except by a suspension of the rule, which would require a favorable vote of two-thirds of the Senate.

The language in the amendment, "to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any complaint," in cases in which the right of mutual appeal does not exist, in order to be effective would result, I suppose, in an amendment or a modification of the rules of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I stated frankly to the Senator from Connecticut, that the effect of the amendment would be to force the establishment of some method of appeal. If the members of the committee do not do that, they cannot draw their salaries.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, none of the appropriation could be used for the purpose for which it was intended, otherwise.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself would prefer to vote straight out on the question of providing for an appeal to the President, rather than to vote for it in this way. But I realize that we could do that

only by a two-thirds vote on the question of suspension of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, adding certain language on page 10, at the end of line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. After line 16, on page 10 of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any proceeding against any person, firm, or corporation which may result in seizure or operation of any plant or other property of such person, firm, or corporation by Federal authority for the failure to abide by any rule or regulation of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, or for failure to abide by any order passed by the Committee on Fair Employment."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment speaks for itself. During the course of the debate it developed that the chairman of this Committee had asserted the right of the Committee to cause the taking over of any plant when the owners thereof did not comply with an order of the Committee. The amendment makes it clear that no industry, or any person having business with the Government, shall have its plant taken over for failure to conform to any rule of the Committee. The Government would still have the right to cancel the man's contract. But certainly neither this Committee nor any other agency of the Government should have the authority to order a plant to be seized merely because the owner had not carried out the Committee's rules in the absence of any legislative standards imposed by the Congress upon the Committee.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not aware of any case in which the Committee itself has attempted to take over any plant. I had not been apprised of the fact that it had asserted such right. I have been absent in an attempt to help write an O. P. A. bill and have not been present during all the debate.

Allow me to ask the Senator a question. Suppose that as the result of an order issued by the Committee to cease and desist in the case of any discrimination which it has the right to consider, the plant which was involved refused to carry out the order of the Committee, and as a result a strike took place involving the production of war material. Would the proposed amendment deprive the President of the right to take over the plant under laws already enacted?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not deprive the President of any right conferred by existing law. If such plant were closed by a strike he is authorized by substantive law to seize the plant.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not certain about it, because the language of the amendment includes, I believe, the phrase "resulting from any order," and so forth, of this Committee. I certainly do not feel that we should deprive the President of the right to seize a plant for any reason which ourselves have specified in the laws which we have enacted.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that all the amendment would do would be to provide a penalty for not observing the rules of the Committee, but that confiscation would not take place?

The case cited by the Senator from Kentucky would involve a different proposition. After certain things took place if a strike should result in a war plant, the strike law would apply.

Mr. BARKLEY. I can very well visualize a case in which the Committee itself had ordered a plant to cease a discrimination which it had found to exist. If the plant refused to obey the order of the Committee, the Committee could then appeal to the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to be candid with Senators. I do not want any Senator to be misled in voting on the proposal. I did not have time to have the amendment printed. It occurred to me very early this morning while I was thinking of some safeguards to suggest in connection with this provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. The hour intimated by the Senator from Georgia is a very late one for a Member of this body to be out. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. The purpose of the amendment, whether the language would accomplish it or not, is completely to divest this Committee of the right to set any machinery in action which would take over any industrial plant.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the amendment reread. When it was read by the clerk I caught some language which made me believe that if anything should happen which was the result of an order of the Committee the plant might not be taken over even if what had occurred should result in a strike by the employees, or a refusal to carry out the orders of the Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be restated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After line 16, on page 10 of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any proceeding against any person, firm, or corporation which may result in seizure or operation of any plant or other property of such person, firm, or corporation by Federal authority for the failure to abide by any rule or regulation of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, or for failure to abide by any order passed by the Committee on Fair Employment."

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there could be no doubt about the interpretation of the amendment that even the President himself could not, under present law, take over a plant because of a strike resulting from the nonobservance of an order issued by the Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that a statute cannot be repealed by limitation of an appropriation. Only the power may be limited of the organization for which the appropriation is made. The language in the proposed amendment could not in any way repeal the powers of the President to take over any plant.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment refers to the taking over of a plant by the Federal authority.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President has Federal authority.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course he has.

Mr. BARKLEY. The language seems to me, although the Senator may not have so intended it, to be broad enough to be interpreted as meaning that none of the money may be used to investigate, initiate, or otherwise to proceed against any plant which would result in taking over a plant by Federal authority. I can very well understand how there could arise a situation in which a war plant might be involved in a strike growing out of activities of this committee, or the failure of the company involved to carry out the recommendations or orders of the committee. If war production were involved I certainly would not wish to vote for an amendment which would take away from the Federal authority which now exists the right to take over a plant in the event that a strike should result from the controversy.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can see no basis whatever for the assertion——

Mr. BARKLEY. Even if there were a likelihood of the occurrence which I have stated, the money could not be spent under the amendment for the purpose referred to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to submit that the construction which the Senator from Kentucky fears would not be possible under the language of the amendment. The amendment says in part:

> Any proceeding against any person, firm, or corporation which may result in seizure or operation of any plant or other property of such person, firm, or corporation—

That language is followed by an assertion, which is not necessary, of the words "by Federal authority."

For what?

> For failure to abide by any order passed by the Committee on Fair Employment.

In other words, the amendment applies to a seizure, not because of a strike, not because of something that happens later on; the amendment herely prohibits the seizure of a plant as a penalty for violating some rule of the committee. That is what it is intended to do, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I intended, that is the purpose of the amendment, and I thought it was perfectly clear.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not see how any other construction can be placed upon it, because it says "which may result in the seizure or operation of any plant or other property of such person." For what? For failure to abide by the committee's rule. If it is for something else, for a strike later on, that is a wholly different matter, and has no relation whatever to this particular amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me analyze the language of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia a little further. It reads:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any proceeding against any person, firm, or corporation which may result in the seizure or operation of any plant or other property of such person, firm, or corporation.

How can anyone who starts out to investigate one of these cases know in advance whether it might result in the seizure of property, and if he starts out innocently, under the orders of the Committee, to investigate a complaint, and later on the plant should be taken over, how could he be stopped from proceeding merely on the fear that it might result in the seizure of the plant? I do not see how anyone, under this language, would feel justified in making any kind of an investigation, because he could not project his mind far enough into the future to see what some other agency might do. It applies to every person who would undertake anywhere to investigate a complaint. If the Senator is going to try to limit the taking over of any plant, it seems to me it should be by the Committee itself, not by any other Federal agency, because the complaint the Senator makes against the Committee is that it asserts the right; not that it has ever taken over a plant.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think the Committee has made a formal declaration that it had the right to take over a plant. According to a newspaper account read in the course of the debate—though not by me—the chairman asserted that if the 14 railroads which had been cited to the President did not conform to their order, the President of the United States was going to take the railroads over. I think that when we legislate in this haphazard fashion and impose upon American industry or business the penalty of losing contracts with the Government in this time, when that is certainly a very extreme penalty, we should not go further and say, "We not only are going to take your contract away from you, but are going to take your plant away from you, if you do not come in and conform to the orders of this agency," which has no legislative standards, the powers of which Congress has never defined, other than by the unlimited grant of power the Senate approved by the vote a few moments ago. I do not believe it is fair, from what I know of the Committee and some of its actions in the past, that the Committee should have the right to set in motion action which would eventuate in the seizure and operation of private business in this country. The penalty of losing a contract is certainly a very stiff penalty.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I do not know the basis upon which the Chairman of the Committee made the assertion, if he did make it, that the President would take over 14 railroads simply because they did not obey the orders of the Committee. That would be a matter up to the President, even if he had the power to do it. It is inconceivable to me that anyone could predict that the President would take over the railroads under any circumstances except those already outlined in the law, under which he took them over a few months ago because of a threatened strike, not because of the disobedience of an order of somebody which had been issued, but as a war measure, because a strike threatened to interfere with transportation. Fortunately, that matter was settled, and the railroads were operated by the Government but a few days.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that the question of a strike is not involved in the railroad case originated by F. E. P. C. There has been no strike as the result of the President's order. There has been an absolute refusal on the part of the railroad brotherhoods and the railroads, which have an existing contract, to conform to the order of the F. E. P. C., that they cancel their contract. The labor union said, "We are not going to cancel the contract," and the railroads said, "We are not going to cancel the contract," and the matter has now been referred to the President of the United States.

Certainly, Mr. President, the power to take away from those railroads any Government business should be a sufficient penalty, when it is asserted by as nebulous an organization as the one under consideration.

There is nothing in the amendment which would repeal any substantive law, and the Senator from Kentucky is familiar with the rule which has been uniformly followed, that a limitation on an appropriation applies only to that appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I appreciate that.

Mr. RUSSELL. And not to any other law. We cannot by a limitation on an appropriation bill repeal the Smith-Connally Act, we cannot repeal the Second War Powers Act, or any other act, we cannot repeal the amendment I offered to the selective-service law, giving the President power to take over businesses in certain cases. The President could still take over the railroads in the event there was any strike, but I do not think we should turn this agency loose to go around threatening to take over private business if such business or industry refuses to submit to its dictates. The penalty of cancelation of their contracts is certainly severe enough. This should be made perfectly clear in the rules and regulations promulgated by this organization. The President has given them unlimited power to promulgate all rules and regulations they think necessary, and I think the Congress, in passing on this matter, should say, "You cannot promulgate a rule that is going to result in taking over private industry in this country for failure to conform to any order the F. E. P. C. may issue as to employment policies of any individual or corporation that is engaged in business in his country."

Mr. BARKLEY. The difficulty which confronts me is that we might create a fear in the mind of some of the employees of this committee, in going out and starting an investigation, lest later on, if the controversy they were investigating, or the discrimination, if one were found to exist, resulted in a strike in a plant, the committee itself, or the person involved, might be charged with having expended money unlawfully, because later on something happened which could not be foreseen, and therefore the law was violated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this committee can promulgate any rule or regulation it sees fit to promulgate, under the terms of the President's Executive order. I shall read the last provision of the order. After ordering that the F. E. P. C. may do this, that and the other, try cases, and so forth, it then says:

The Committee shall have power to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of this order.

Let them promulgate a rule which will make it absolutely clear that they are not asserting the right to take over plants or to be the motivaing factor behind the action of any other agency of the Federal Government in taking over private industry in this country for refusing to obey their decrees, and they will have absolved themselves from this limitation. Is it asking too much, when they claim the power to take a man's contract away from him, to say that this committee shall adopt a rule that they are not going to take away his plant, too, unless he subjects himself to their whim and fancy?

We all know it would have to be a very extreme case before the President would interfere with the action of the Committee in reaching a decision, but when we say they man take a man's contract away from him, we should not go further and say they can take his business away unless he is willing to conform to any rule or regulation which this Committee might promulgate, or any order which might be issued.

I certainly think that business in this country is entitled to the protection at least of not having physical properties taken away at the behest of this agency. We have approved the claim of right to take a contract away from business, and I am not offering any amendment which would deny the right to have contracts canceled and I do not propose to do so, but I do think the Senate should approve an amendment which would prevent this Committee from setting in motion any power which would result in taking away the private property of any person, firm, or corporation in the United States.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I hesitate to prolong the discussion. I am not sure what the consequences of the adoption of the pending amendment would be. It occurs to me however that its adoption would be taking somewhat hasty action at this late moment. It occurs to me also that the amendment would limit and restrict the power of the Chief Executive. The amendment therefore ought to be considered later on in connection with the bill which has already been introduced in the House and in the Senate dealing with this subject. I hope, Mr. President, that we will set aside the amendment at this time.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It seems to me the Senator from Georgia has quite as much right to offer an amendment to the proposed $500,000 appropriation for the committee and to have it acted upon at this time in connection with the pending measure, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] had to propose an amendment to the pending legislation in the form of the bill now in the House, but which he withdrew a day or so ago.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we are merely dealing with an appropriation for an agency which is already in existence. The legislation introduced by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has been referred or will be referred to a Senate committee dealing with such legislative matters, and not to the Committee on Appropriations. It can be considered by such a committee, and we will have ample opportunity to present our views. So I hope the amendment will be passed over until we consider the proposed legislation introduced by the junior Senator from Connecticut or some similar bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I think we have taken rather hasty action here in approving of all the rules and regulations that have been issued without any of the Members of this body being apprised as to what they were. If the Senate does not wish to adopt my amendment, which merely provides that the Committee on Fair Employment Practice cannot put in motion the machinery to take over a man's enterprise, without in any way curtailing the right to cancel his contract, it has the right to do so. I feel that I have some responsibility to offer these amendments and to try to see that there is some kind of safeguard or some legislative standard, and any that we may impose will be mild enough because I know how Senators feel about the matter. I certainly think the very least the Congress can do is to make a declaration that we do not believe that any person should be deprived of his private property, his mill, or his factory or his store simply because he refuses to obey an order issued by this agency. Certainly such a penalty would be too extreme.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the amendment. I simply rose to urge Senators to remain a little later than usual, if necessary, in order to dispose of the pending bill. A number of appropriation bills are as yet undisposed of. There is important legislation which it is necessary to be disposed of, and I hope Senators will not be in a hurry to leave the Chamber until we have disposed of the pending bill and other matters that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is anxious to bring before the Senate and have disposed of. I do not care to delay a vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is detained in a committee meeting.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]; and the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]; and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] has a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—27

Bilbo	Gerry	Maybank
Butler	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Gurney	Overton
Connally	Hatch	Reed
Cordon	Hill	Revercomb
Eastland	Holman	Russell
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Ferguson	McClellan	Wherry
George	McKellar	White

NAYS—25

Aiken	Lucas	Tunnell
Ball	McFarland	Vandenberg
Barkley	Maloney	Wagner
Burton	Mead	Wallgren
Capper	Murdock	Walsh, Mass.
Chavez	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Pepper	Willis
Guffey	Thomas, Okla.	
Kilgore	Thomas, Utah	

NOT VOTING—44

Andrews	Downey	Reynolds
Austin	Glass	Robertson
Bailey	Green	Scrugham
Bankhead	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Smith
Brewster	Jackson	Taft
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	La Follette	Tobey
Buck	Langer	Truman
Bushfield	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	Millikin	Weeks
Chandler	Moore	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Nye	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	Wilson
Danaher	Radcliffe	

So Mr. RUSSELL'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any person employed by said Committee on Fair Employment Practice who issues or attempts to enforce any rule, regulation, or order which repeals, amends, or modifies any law enacted by Congress."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure there can be no controversy over this amendment. At the very least there should be a limitation on the powers of the Committee prohibiting it from asserting the power to modify, amend, or repeal any act of Congress. That is all this amendment provides. No person shall be paid from this appropriation if he attempts to pursue any proceeding which would amend, modify, or repeal any act of Congress.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator know of any case in which the Committee has asserted such authority?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment, it asserts that authority when it undertakes to compel the low bidder on a contract required to be let in accordance with statutory law to conform to requirements other than those imposed by the Congress. That is a question which would have to be determined by another Government authority; but, in my judgment, when F. E. P. C. undertakes to review, change, or alter acts of Congress in the matter of letting contracts by superimposing upon the congressional act some requirements of its own, that amounts to a modification or repeal of an act of Congress. I do not believe that any creature of Congress—now that we have adopted the Committee on Fair Employment Practice—should have the authority or power to do anything in derogation of a solemn act of Congress. That is the purpose of the amendment.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Is it the Senator's contention that the section in the President's Executive order ordering procurement agencies to insert a clause in Government contracts requiring no discrimination because of race, color, or creed is a violation of any act of Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a matter of opinion. In my opinion, it is, in the case of contracts required by law to be let to the lowest bidder. Congress has enacted a law which very specifically and carefully deals with the question of awarding contracts to the lowest bidder. As I understand, there is nothing in that act which would require the contractor to submit himself to the orders of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice before being awarded a contract on a low bid. Some other authority may rule differently, but in my judgment that is an action of an agency which would have the effect of modifying or repealing an act of Congress.

Mr. BALL. Then, is it the purpose of the Senator's amendment to take away from the Committee any right to apply pressure through a procurement agency on any corporation having a Government contract, to correct what the Committee considers to be a bad practice?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; that is not a fair statement, because 85 or 90 percent of the contracts now being awarded are being let on some other basis than that of the lowest bidder. The amendment would not prevent the Committee from applying any other pressure that might be at its disposal to force a contracting party to submit himself to this agency. However, it would provide that the Committee may not establish a new requirement which goes beyond those prescribed by Congress in making a contract to be awarded to the lowest bidder. According to my interpretation, it is confined to that class of cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have one further amendment. I do not care to discuss it at length. I assume that this amendment will be controversial. However, I wish to offer it and have a vote on it.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any person who initiates, investigates, or prosecutes any proceeding against an employer and a labor union to amend or abrogate an existing contract between such employer and such labor union."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not care to belabor the subject. I discussed it at some length last Friday. A reading of the amendment will make its purpose perfectly clear. The purpose is to make sure that this agency has not the authority to disturb or abrogate an existing contract between two private contracting parties. That is the effect of it. If a contract expires, or if no contract is in being, the agency could proceed. I wish to be perfectly fair to all Members of the Senate. The purpose of the amendment is to deny to the Committee on Fair Employment Practice the right to repeal or modify an existing contract which is not otherwise illegal, entered into in good faith between a labor union and an employer.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I can go along with the Senator from Georgia on many things, but I will not go along with him in supporting an amendment which has for its purpose carrying out the caprice of any labor union when it is engaged in doing something which is un-American.

Mr. President, I have been carrying the torch for labor unions for years, but some of them are just as bad as any businessman or any corporation which dares to oppress the one who toils. I will not vote for any amendment to preserve the sanctity of a contract which to my mind represents an un-American effort by a labor union to use discrimination. I know something about labor unions. As I have said, in my State I have dared to speak in their favor when no one else would do so, when it was unpopular to speak in their favor. But I know of some labor unions which are just as un-American as some of the large corporations which are oppressing those who sweat and toil. I know of some labor unions which would not permit an Italian to belong to them. I know of some labor unions which would not permit persons of some other nationalities to belong to them. I know of some unions which would not let your son or my son be an apprentice to a carpenter or to a machinist. I will not vote for an amendment which would not limit such activities by labor unions which have been just as subversive of the rights of Americans as have the activities of anyone else who could oppress labor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I wish to make the brief observation that in my opinion the Senate very bravely marched up the hill by voting for the appropriation for the Committee, and in my opinion, the Senate, by means of what I think are these rather subtle amendments, is voting to march down the hill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that the amendment would not in anywise limit the power of the Committee to deal with a labor union as such or an employer as such. It would prevent the Committee from asserting the power to abrogate a contract already in existence.

I do not care to argue the question. As I have stated heretofore, that is the purpose of the amendment. I hope it will have that effect if it is adopted by the Senate.

I may say, in answer to the remarks of the Senator from Utah, that these amendments were frankly designed to provide some modest limitations on the power of the Committee.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has gone so far afield from the two small sections of the President's order that he simply does not recognize what we are legislating upon. At least, I cannot see any application or any relationship at all between the Senator's amendments and the order of the President.

If the Senator will indulge me a little further, I should like to read the two parts of the order which are at all important. The first is:

> All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter negotiated or renegotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The order also would require the contractor to include a similar provision in all subcontracts.

The other part is as follows:

All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for war production shall take all measures appropriate to insure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The amendments which the Senate has adopted, after voting the appropriation, have to do with the seizure of plants and the taking over of businesses which have nothing at all to do, in my opinion, with the Executive order promulgated by the President.

Why we should march up the hill and appropriate $500,000, and then turn around, by means of amendments, and march down again is hard for me to comprehend.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot assume responsibility for the inability of the Senator from Utah to see the purpose of the amendments. But if he has marched up the hill, and if the amendment does not mean anything, its adoption will not mean that the Senate is marching down the hill. If no one proposed to take over private plants under the powers this Committee is asserting, the amendment could not hurt a thing on earth. It could not injure the Committee in its work in any way at all.

But every amendment I have offered has been directed at some specific action the Committee has been taking, as disclosed by the hearings in the House and in the Senate. I have not offered the amendments merely for the pleasure of offering them. I am apprehensive lest this agency might undertake to have plants seized by Federal authority in this country, in cases in which employers refuse to submit themselves to the dictates of the Committee. If the Committee has no such intention, the amendment cannot hurt it in the slightest degree.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly do not wish to charge my distinguished friend, the Senator from Georgia, with ever offering an amendment which is not effective and which has no purpose. What I wish to charge him with is offering amendments which will destroy the effect of the action taken by the Senate earlier today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the compliment he pays me when he says the effect of the amendment will be to destroy the power of the F. E. P. C.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator's very purpose in offering the first amendment was to destroy the Committee. The Senator has not been successful in that respect.

In my opinion the Senator has been successful in greatly curtailing and, I think, destroying the activities of the Committee, by what has been adopted by way of amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the amendments will curtail the activities of the Committee so that it will not be able to seize private enterprise in this country. I hope it will have that effect.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My objections to the pending amendment are fundamental. There is no doubt whatever in my mind as to what the Senator from Georgia has in mind with reference to trying to prevent the committee from doing something which he thinks should not be done. I am positive of that. But the amendment will effect a situation which I shall now describe. In my State the Government has a contract for the building of an air base. The contractor who is building the air base has a contract with a union to furnish labor on the Government contract.

The viciousness of the pending amendment, as I see it, is that the unions have not and will not permit an American citizen go to work on the air base unless he first pays tribute to the union. That is the kind of contract the Senator's amendment would protect.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; the Senator misunderstands the effect of the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the way I understand the Senator's amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator misinterprets the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly I do. Everything which has been said against unions during the debate has been said about the C. I. O. But I know other unions which would not permit a person to do a little work in connection with the war effort unless he belonged to that particular union.

The Senator's amendment would protect a contract by which it would be necessary for a poor citizen of this country to pay tribute to a union. Unless he paid tribute to the laborer's union or the carpenter's union, he could not work. I think the F. E. P. C. should take care of a matter of that kind.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; the amendment has nothing to do with a matter of that kind. The F. E. P. C. has no right to declare an open shop anywhere, so far as I know. If it did have such a right, it would run head-on into the War Labor Board.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the amendment would protect the closed shop. I do not think the closed shop should be permitted in plants working in the war effort.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have any war industry in mind. I might say I had in mind a contract which has been entered into on a basis of years—I do not recall how many—between the southern railroads and the railroad brotherhoods. I have also some ideas that the question involved here is rather fundamental. I have always thought that a contract which was otherwise legal was something which should not be set aside for any light reasons, but that there should be sound and substantial reasons for the cancelation or setting aside of a contract.

All Senators know how they are going to vote on this question. I shall not discuss it further. The amendment would not have the effect stated by the Senator from New Mexico. It would only preserve the sanctity of existing contracts. That is its effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, again I invite the attention of my colleagues of the Senate to this rather extraordinary performance. More than ever I believe that these legislative amendments should be taken up in their regular order before a legislative committee, when an appropriate bill is under consideration. This is no time for the consideration of amendments which are as far-reaching as the amendments which we are considering.

I agree with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], who explained that we voted for the appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and gave it a substantial majority. We then turned around and voted against the same Committee.

Mr. President, I say this is an extraordinary performance on the part of the Senate. In my judgment, this Committee will be unable to take any action during the life of an existing contract. The proposal, I believe, would prevent consideration of all cases where contracts are in effect. Even if the employees should request the Committee the pending proposal would prevent any action of the Committee to correct what admittedly is an injustice should a party to the contract hold contrary views.

Mr. President, I believe we should be consistent with our original position, and if we are in favor of this Committee we should give it a chance to function.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to correct one statement of the Senator from New York. He said that the Committee would be prevented from operating even if it were invited to do so. The amendment provides that the Committee cannot initiate any proceeding.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I still believe that in a case where one party to the contract insisted on carrying out the provisions of the contract the Committee would be without jurisdiction.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). Announcing the transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and

the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]; and the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea", and that the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]; and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] has a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—22

Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Butler	Holman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Connally	McClellan	Wherry
Eastland	McKellar	White
Ellender	Maybank	
George	Overton	

NAYS—31

Aiken	Guffey	Thomas, Okla.
Ball	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Kilgore	Tunnell
Brewster	Lucas	Vandenberg
Burton	McFarland	Wagner
Capper	Maloney	Wallgren
Chavez	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	
Gillette	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—43

Andrews	Glass	Robertson
Austin	Green	Scrugham
Bailey	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Smith
Bridges	Jackson	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	La Follette	Tobey
Bushfield	Langer	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	Millikin	Weeks
Clark, Idaho	Moore	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Wiley
Cordon	O'Daniel	Wilson
Danaher	Radcliffe	
Downey	Reynolds	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now desire to call up an amendment which I had printed a few days ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 16, after the figures "$500,000'", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That not more than 25 percent of the part of this appropriation which is used for the payment of compensation for personal services shall be used for the payment of compensation of persons who are members of any race comprising less than 15 percent of the total population of the United States, according to the 1940 census."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the amendment. In my remarks on Friday last relating to the proposal before the Senate I pointed out that under the order of the President, the agency involved was to go into the Federal departments and see that there was no discrimination in employment on account of race, color, creed, or ancestry. In my opinion the Committee has been most successful in carrying out the provision of the President's order.

It developed, however, that more than two-thirds of the personnel of the agency were Negroes. Certainly an agency which was established to prevent discrimination should not discriminate in such a manner as that. The Negro population of the United States is slightly less than 10 percent of the total, and, as I stated, approximately 66 percent of the employees of this agency are Negroes. This amendment would allow 25 percent Negroes, which is two and a half times the percentage of the Negro population according to the last census.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I repeat the transfer of my pair as on the last vote, and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] would vote "yea."

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]; and the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr.

AUSTIN]; and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] has a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. These Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—15

Bankhead	Eastland	McKellar
Bilbo	Ellender	Maybank
Butler	George	Overton
Byrd	Hill	Russell
Connally	McClellan	Stewart

NAYS—37

Aiken	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Ball	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Brewster	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Burton	Lucas	Wagner
Capper	McFarland	Wallgren
Chavez	Maloney	Walsh, Mass.
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Murdock	Weeks
Ferguson	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Guffey	Pepper	
Gurney	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—44

Andrews	Glass	Reynolds
Austin	Green	Robertson
Bailey	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Jackson	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Langer	Tobey
Caraway	McCarran	Truman
Chandler	Millikin	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Moore	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Wiley
Danaher	O'Daniel	Willis
Downey	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Only 52 Senators voted on the last yea-and-nay vote. That is only two more than a quorum. I know how important it is that Senators be elsewhere now and then, but I urge Senators to remain on the floor in order that we may conclude action on the pending legislation before we recess today. Certainly final action on the measure ought not to go over until tomorrow, in view of the legislative situation, and I am sure it will not be a great hardship on Senators to remain so that we shall not find ourselves without a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 16, after "$500,000" it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the Committee on Fair Employment Practice shall make a study of wages payable in plants owned or operated by any department or agency of the Government, and in the event it finds there is any discrimination in wages paid in such plants as between different sections or areas of the country, the committee shall so advise the departments or agencies concerned and it shall thereupon be the duty of such departments or agencies to remove such discrimination against any section or area."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to say anything concerning the amendment. It speaks for itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Stewart
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Wagner
Cordon	McKellar	Wallgren
Davis	Maloney	Walsh, Mass.
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Ellender	Mead	Weeks
Ferguson	Murdock	Wherry
George	Murray	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). Repeating my announcement on the last vote, I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). Announcing my general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] has a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays, 34, as follows:

YEAS—17

Bilbo	Hill	Murdock
Chavez	Kilgore	Murray
Eastland	McClellan	Pepper
Ellender	McFarland	Russell
George	McKellar	Stewart
Hatch	Maybank	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Guffey	Tunnell
Ball	Gurney	Vandenberg
Bankhead	Holman	Wagner
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Wallgren
Brewster	Lucas	Walsh, Mass.
Burton	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Butler	Mead	Weeks
Capper	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Cordon	Reed	White
Davis	Revercomb	Willis
Ferguson	Thomas, Okla.	
Gerry	Thomas, Utah	

NOT VOTING—45

Andrews	Downey	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Glass	Reynolds
Bone	Green	Robertson
Bridges	Hawkes	Scrugham
Brooks	Hayden	Shipstead
Buck	Jackson	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Langer	Tobey
Chandler	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wheeler
Connally	Nye	Wiley
Danaher	O'Daniel	Wilson

So Mr. MAYBANK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

COMMITTEE FOR CONGESTED PRODUCTION AREAS

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Committee for Congested Production Areas to carry out the functions vested in it by Executive Order 9327, including travel expenses (not to exceed $48,000); printing and binding (not to exceed $2,550); purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $600); the employment of State, county, or municipal officials and employees, with or without compensation; and the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil service and classification laws (not to exceed $15,000); $669,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is not yet in order. We have not concluded action on the section which is now pending, as I understand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I made inquiry at the desk and was advised that my amendment is in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not make any point of order against it. I merely understood that consideration of the amendments in the section now before the Senate had not been concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that all the committee amendments have been disposed of, except for the one which was reconsidered. So the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. For what purpose?

Mr. MAYBANK. For the purpose of first suggesting that I am in thorough agreement with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and I am glad he offered it. But there are pending two amendments which I have had printed and which have been on the desks of Senators for 3 days. I am certain the Senator from Michigan would not object to having me call up one of those amendments. One of them is similar to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which was rejected by a vote of 22 to 31. And, of course, I shall not request that it be considered. But the other relates to volunteer workers. I shall ask that it be considered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will not object to having my amendment considered at this time, because it relates to the same matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If we now proceed to consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, which is not applicable to the section we have been considering, then that section of the bill is open to further amendment; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paragraph relating to F. E. P. C. will be open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The paragraph we have been considering will be open to further amendment, after the amendment of the Senator from Michigan has been disposed of; will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Committee for Congested Production Areas was organized in April 1943 to assist communities in which the influx of war workers had created innumerable problems. The Committee has finished its labors in several of the congested areas in which the problem has ceased to exist. But the problem still exists, emphatically exists, and exists to such a degree that the continued service of the Committee for Congested Production Areas is absolutely indispensable in 13 congested war production centers, namely, Seattle, Wash.; Portland, Oreg.; San Francisco, Calif., Los Angeles, Calif., San Diego, Calif.; Beaumont, Tex.; Mobile, Ala.; Key West, Fla.; Charleston, S. C.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Muskegon, Mich., Detroit, Mich., at Willow Run; and Hampton, near Norfolk, Va. I think the testimony as to each of those congested areas is universal that it is absolutely indispensable to war production that the work of the Committee for Congested Production Areas shall proceed at those points. I know nothing about the sufficiency of the funds which are suggested. I make no pretense of having any information that the amount which is sought to be appropriated is the correct amount, except that it is the amount of the Budget estimate.

I am simply urgently requesting that the matter go to conference. I shall be completely content with any decision the conference makes after it confronts the facts. The trouble is that the case has not had an adequate hearing either in the House or in the Senate. In the Senate, in particular, I think there is a total lack of information. I think the members of the Appropriations Committee would be the first ones to concede that there is a total lack of information regarding this utterly indispensable function.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered the amendment in the form which I understand is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and I am asking the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to take it to conference for conclusive consideration there, because I am totally confident he will find that the amendment is necessary to the war effort beyond any peradventure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that in the committee——

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from Tennessee commits himself, I desire to make a suggestion or two.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan has made a powerful appeal in the absence of all information. As a matter of fact, there was nothing before the Appropriations Committee which carried any conviction that this appropriation was necessary in any way. The requested appropriation is not unlike half a dozen other matters of the same kind. The Secretary of Labor appeared before the committee and requested an appropriation of $551,000 for a purpose not totally different from that contemplated by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. That occurred half a dozen times. The Appropriations Committee turned down all such requests.

There was no information before the committee which would justify this appropriation in any degree. If the Senator from Tennessee, who is indefatigable in the discharge of his duties as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee—and I agree with the Senator from Michigan in his statement to that effect the other day—wishes to take the matter to conference, I have no objection. But at the same time it should be pointed out that the conferees will give the matter very close examination, so as to determine whether there is any necessity for the requested appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will permit me to say so, I completely disagree with the statement he made in respect to the presentation of the evidence to the committee in the first place, because I think an adequate statement was made. But if it was not made, I am prepared to call to their feet, on the floor of the Senate, Senators from every one of the 13 communities, to have them assert that it is indispensable to the war effort that this activity should proceed. I do not retract that statement in any single phase.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. In substantiation of the statement of the Senator from Michigan, let me say that I have received from Portland, Oreg., a number of telegrams to the same effect as that indicated by the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have the impression, and I ask whether it is a fact, that a subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs gave very thoughtful consideration to this matter and to related

subjects. I recall that one of the Members of the House of Representatives talked to me at some length, and very earnestly, in behalf of such a proposal as the one the Senator from Michigan has advanced. However, I have no knowledge beyond that.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. REED. I do not wish to be understood as undertaking to assert that there is no congestion in any of those areas. As a matter of fact, there is congestion in a number of areas. If we are going to consider the influx of war workers as related to the size of the community, I should point out that my own home town in Kansas would furnish a shining illustration of that situation. At one time the war workers engaged in construction projects there were almost equal to the normal population of the town.

What I say is that there are a number of agencies which have been set up either by Executive order or by action of the departments to take care of these intangible, elusive, mysterious, and more or less nebulous coordinations of the various war efforts. So far as I know, all of them get at least formal support from the departments concerned with their production, and generally without very much knowledge on the part of the departmental officials as to the work they actually do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there is nothing intangible and nothing elusive about the work done by this Committee in the area with which I am familiar. The city of Muskegon, Mich., which is the source of my particular interest in the matter at the moment, has received $40,000,000 of new war contracts within the last 3 months. Of necessity the work is concentrated at that point, and it is a very serious question whether the work can continue successfully unless there be a substantial and effective coordination of uncoordinated municipal efforts at the moment at that particular point, and a coordination of many governmental agencies serving the situation. Representatives of the city of Muskegon testify to me that in respect to these contracts it is indispensable to the war effort that the work of the Committee for Congested Production Areas at that point, at least, shall continue. There is nothing elusive about it, and there is nothing which does not challenge the approval of constructive thought.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the only testimony which was brought before the committee about this matter was the testimony of Mr. Corrington Gill. The subcommittee, by a divided vote, rejected the proposal, and when it reached the full committee it was rejected by another divided vote. The President has written a letter calling attention to the same facts to which the Senator from Michigan has adverted. For that reason I see no objection to taking the amendment to conference, and we will give it the best consideration we can give it under the facts in our possesison.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is all I can ask of the Senator, and that is what I am asking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is an amendment on page 14, in line 24, which was heretofore reconsidered. At the time I got the Senate to reconsider the vote on the amendment on June 15 I placed in the RECORD a joint letter from the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War urging the restoration of the appropriation, not to the figures in the House provision, but to the Budget estimate, which amounted to $15,596,000. That amount represents a little more than a million dollars in excess of the amount carried by the amendment, but it does not represent any increase in employment.

The reason for needing more money for the coming fiscal year, without any increase in personnel, is that the work of the National War Labor Board entails more overtime, for which the Board is obligated to pay. When overtime is disregarded, the amount asked for is less than is available for the current year. The letter from the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War—and I also have a letter from Mr. Davis, Chairman of the National War Labor Board—asked for $15,596,000, which is only sufficient to enable the agency to preserve its present personnel and pay overtime, which it will be required to pay this year in an amount which is greater than that paid last year because of conditions which then existed.

I have conferred with the Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the committee, and I therefore move, on page 14, line 24, to strike out the figures "$14,437,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,250,000." That is a little more than $300,000 less than the Board, the War Department, and the Navy Department feel will be necessary for this year, but in view of the action of the House and the committee I hope the Senator from Tennessee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this matter was not considered in the committee on the basis referred to by the Senator from Kentucky, but it was considered on the basis of an increase to 2,543 in the number of employees this year over last year. As I read from the report of the Budget Bureau the number of employees last year was 2,240, and now the number is 2,543, or an increase of approximately 300 employees. The Senator will find that that is the reason why an increased appropriation is requested.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have a letter from Mr. Davis, the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, which I shall not take time to read, which breaks down the amount of the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Later I shall ask to have the letter printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, for the benefit of the conferees. The letter states that the requested increase in funds is not because of an increase in the number of persons employed, but because of an increase in the amount of overtime necessary to be paid due to the longer hours which the present personnel will work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the increase of approximately a million dollars will hardly pay for 300 extra employees. I wish the Senator would reduce the amount to $15,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will accept my amendment. The difference between $15,000,000 and $15,250,000 is rather inconsequential.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it is, but I would not want to give the Senator any encouragement as to what the conference will do, and therefore I think it would be better to compromise the whole thing here, without taking it to conference. If the Senator insists upon it, I shall take it to conference under those circumstances.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will take it to conference and do the best he can with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment on page 14, line 24.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, to which I previously made reference, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1944.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: This afternoon you were asked by Senator GEORGE on the floor of the Senate about the National War Labor Board's request for additional funds for the fiscal year 1945 appropriation, in view of the fact that the Board does not propose to increase its present level of personnel during the coming fiscal year. I would like to supply you with the pertinent information regarding this inquiry.

The National War Labor Board requested Congress to appropriate $15,596,000 for the fiscal year 1945. Of this amount, $1,904,883 was requested to cover overtime payments required by law. For the fiscal year 1944 Congress appropriated $14,437,300 for the Board's operations. Of this amount, only $346,000 was appropriated for overtime payments. Actually, the Board's overtime payments for the fiscal year 1944 exceeded $346,000, but the Board was able to absorb the difference in view of the fact that the Board was not able to recruit personnel, because of the tight labor market, up to the authorized number until several months after the beginning of the fiscal year. However, we are now fully recruited and could not, during the coming fiscal year, absorb overtime payments from lapsed funds on the same basis as last year.

This can be explained in the following figures:

Congress appropriated for 1944, $14,437,300.

This included the following amount for overtime payments, $346,000.

The rest of the overtime payments which the Board was obligated by law to pay was absorbed from lapsed funds for personnel we were not able to recruit at the beginning of the fiscal year.

This year we requested Congress to appropriate $15,596,000.

This is designed to include the following sum for overtime payments, $1,904,883.

Thus, the actual amount requested for 1945, less overtime, is $13,691,117.

This sum is to be compared with the following sum which was appropriated last year, not including overtime, $14,091,300.

In other words, our request for this year is less by the following amount than appropriated last, with overtime payments excluded, $400,183.

This fact was pointed out by me at the hearing before the House Appropriations Committee. The pertinent testimony, which appears on page 236 of the transcript of hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, was as follows:

"Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; I would be glad to do those things. I would like to say that approximately $2,000,000 of this $15,596,000 is for the purpose of overtime payments which we did not have to make last year, and which by act of Congress we have to make this year. One million nine hundred and four thousand eight hundred and eighty-three dollars is for the overtime payments.

"The CHAIRMAN. You were given $346,000. Now, you absorbed the difference, did you?

"Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; that is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. And you will make every effort to absorb as much of it as possible this year, I take it?

"Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir; that is right, but actually, taking into account that approximately $2,000,000 for overtime payments, our appropriation, the net appropriation of $13,700,000 is less than we had last year applicable to our actual running expenses, aside from overtime. Do you see what I mean? We are asking here for a total really of $13,700,000 in comparison with last year when we asked for $14,091,000. That is almost exactly $500,000 less."

In addition, you were asked on the floor of the Senate for the break-down for the $15,596,000 which the National War Labor Board requested in 1945. The transcript of hearings before the House subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, page 293, includes the enclosed table which contains the necessary information.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM H. DAVIS,
Chairman.

	Number of employees as of Mar. 15	Cumulative obligations as of Mar. 31	Estimated obligations, fiscal year 1944	Proposed number of employees, 1945	Estimated expenses, 1945
Personal services:					
Per annum	2,369	[1] $4,533,214	[1] $6,204,493	2,337	$6,135,680
Per diem		763,639	1,045,162		1,097,080
Travel		698,665	951,898		1,060,000
Transportation of things		3,698	4,367		4,800
Communication services		216,050	307,805		252,400
Rents and utility services		329,170	458,362		440,400
Printing and binding		27,769	36,970		31,300
Miscellaneous contractual services		162,618	259,659		224,200
Supplies and materials		133,318	158,023		93,500
Equipment		92,670	107,235		23,400
Special projects		4,226,773	4,903,326		5,041,000
Total		11,187,584	14,437,300		14,403,760
Overtime					1,190,540
Additional pay for foreign services					1,700
Total, departmental and field	2,369	11,187,584	14,437,300	2,337	15,596,000

[1] Includes overtime.

Excerpt from hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Tuesday, Mar. 28, 1944, p. 293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. President, I should like to say with reference to the amendment that I do not think the people should be working for the Government unless they are on the pay roll and unless they take an oath of office. It is not my purpose to ask for a year-and-nay vote, but I ask the Chair to put the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator's amendment mean that if there is someone, either now in this agency, or who might be willing to serve it without compensation, he would be denied the opportunity of doing so?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct, insofar as looking into and bringing cases against private business or Government agencies is concerned. Very frankly, I believe that the compensation could be small, it might be only a few dollars, so long as the oath of office is taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. One of the glories of the conduct of the American people in this war is that in all branches of the service so many persons have been willing to render service to the Government without pay.

Mr. MAYBANK. To that I thoroughly agree.

Mr. BARKLEY. That applies to the ration boards, to the O. P. A., to the Selective Service, to many departments of the Government which are engaged in war activities, and it is one of the things which I think is to the credit of the American people. When the war is over, and we ascertain the number of people who have been willing to do the best they could, and render service without compensation, it will be a very creditable and to some extent an amazing record.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the distinguished majority leader will yield to me on that point, I thoroughly agree with him, and I am happy the Senator brought out that point. My mind goes back to the great work the Senate of the United States did in preparing this country for war. The Senator mentioned the Selective Service. A law was passed suggesting that the governors of the States appoint, and submit in a constitutional manner to the President of the United States, the names of those to serve on the draft boards, the names of doctors, the names of all who would have to do with the proceedings and activities of the boards.

Likewise under the O. P. A. regulations, the governors of the States were asked to suggest defense counsel. They were constitutionally appointed. They were appointed by the governors of the States, or by the President of the United States, upon the recommendation of one or the other. I am happy that in my short span of life I have been associated with so many volunteers, not only those who volunteered on the ration boards, but others.

When the Congress of the United States by the law it passed asked the governors of the States to submit to the President not only the names of those to serve on the Selective Service boards, but the names of those who volunteered in war work, the governors did so. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I had no idea of suggesting an amendment which would in any way reflect on the service to this country in time of war of any individual, and I know that the majority leader did not mean to infer that my amendment would do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I did not mean that. The point is, why deny people, who are willing an opportunity to serve in connection with the committee now under discussion, any American who is willing to serve without compensation, when we are not taking such action as to any other activity?

Mr. MAYBANK. Very frankly, the general police powers of this country and of any State, as the Senator knows, are entirely different from those affecting volunteers on ration boards or in the selective service. While I am not asking for a yea and nay vote, I am conscientious in believing that the United States Government has sufficient money to pay those who are supposed to go around and look into complaints of some businessman, or someone else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. One moment, Mr. President. The majority leader brought up the subject of the volunteer work being done by the people of this country, and I am happy he did so. I want to have the record clear. My thought in connection with this is that where investigations under this Committee with police power are ordered, a committee for which $500,000 is appropriated, they should be undertaken by paid workers or those who have taken the oath of office. We need volunteers to assist in the war effort, but to turn the police powers of the Government of the United States over to individuals who have not taken the oath of office, and who are responsible to

no one except some member of the Fair Employment Practice Committee who may appoint them, is a mistake.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to delay a vote. I merely raised the question because it seems to me a little unusual that, inasmuch as in all the other agencies, the people are permitted to render service without charging for it, we should make it impossible for anyone to render service in connection with the agency under discussion without paying them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may move to reconsider the vote by which an item was agreed to, and I should like leave to make a brief explanation. It pertains to the appropriation for Federal and State cooperation through the Office of Civilian Defense.

The House of Representatives reduced the appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense from $4,700,000 for the year 1944 to $1,000,000 for the year 1945. However, the House committee stated in its report, on page 11, as follows:

> In making the decrease of $139,000 in the Budget estimates, the committee feels that it has provided the irreducible minimum for a Federal program of leadership in civilian defense considering the lessened danger of attack, but viewing the home-front activities which are carried on by State and local councils and their contribution to the war effort. All danger of coastal attack of some character is not definitely past, and those regions are entitled to and should continue to receive attention.

Mr. President, as I have said, in this item the House of Representatives provided $538,500 for the Federal-State cooperation program for civilian defense. That is a part of the civilian-defense activity in which the volunteer work of all citizens is coordinated through State and local councils by the Federal Government, through the Office of Civilian Defense.

As I have said, the House of Representatives cut $100,000 from a Budget estimate of $638,000, but the House committee said, in making the cut, that that was, in its opinion, the irreducible minimum, in fairness to the public interest being served by this agency.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations tock action, which has been ratified already by the Senate, cutting another 25 percent off the appropriation, bringing it down to $403,000. I know that the officials of the Civilian Defense Agency, and persons from several States, have contacted a number of Senators, and it is felt that a grave injustice will be done to this volunteer program, which embraces 11,000 local councils and 11,000,000 citizen volunteers working through the program.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the figure $403,875, which is the committee amendment, was agreed to, on page 9, line 18, of the pending bill, so that we may have a vote, not a record vote, but a vote, on whether the Senate would like to concur in the House item, which the House said provided the irreducible minimum.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not object to the Senator's request to reconsider the vote, but I appeal to the Senate in this matter not to vote these sums back into this appropriation bill.

The House allowed a million dollars, in all, for the Office of Civilian Defense. We all know what that is. There is not one one-thousandth of the danger there was when this organization was started. We have gradually reduced the appropriation from year to year, as the danger has passed. At present we are not doing much more than keeping the skeleton of the organization, and retaining some people in office. The committee thought a reduction from a million dollars to $750,000 was a very modest cut.

I do not think there was a member of the committee who did not agree respecting the several amendments aggregating $250,000. I am willing that the Senator from Florida shall have unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted, but when a vote is taken on the question I beseech the Senate not to provide for $250,000 additional to be spent absolutely uselessly. As a matter of fact, I think the amount of $750,000 provided for the Office of Civilian Defense is too much.

Mr. REED. It is too much; yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. But if there is any evidence that can be brought forth to justify that amount it can be brought to the attention of the conferees.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. I join with the Senator from Tennessee in the statement he has just made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. Of course, as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Florida, if he wants a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, it should be granted him. There is nothing left of the O. C. D. except a glorified boondoggling proposition. Instead of giving the O. C. D. $750,000 we ought to cut it down to $250,000 and tell them to wind up their work quickly. The country is no longer in danger of invasion. We no longer need black-outs. The O. C. D. was overexpanded to begin with, even at a time when there was an element of danger, which has now disappeared. It is now silly to continue these appropriations when there is no need for them. I believe a further cut should be made in the appropriation instead of stopping with the moderate cut which has been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Kansas thoroughly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 9, line 18, to strike out "$538,000" and to insert "$403,875" was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word now in opposition to the committee amendment. I wish to thank all Senators, and especially the able Senator from Tennessee, for his courtesy. The able Senator is in error, however, when he says that I am asking that the appropriation be increased by $250,000. I only wish to restore the House appropriation respecting the Federal-State cooperative program, and not to restore even to the House item that part of the appropriation dealing with the preservation of property. There was a cut of about $39,000 by the Senate committee respecting the preservation of the Federal property owned by the O. C. D., but we will let that pass. I address myself only to the substitution of the House figure of $538,500 on page 9, line 18, for the Senate figure of $403,875.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is that the only item respecting which the Senator asks for a reconsideration of the vote?

Mr. PEPPER. That is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly the same situation applies to this item that applied to other amendments. The House figure ought not to be allowed. The amount of $403,875 which the Senate committee allowed is more than sufficient to do the work, and I hope the Senate will vote down the proposed amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The vote by which the amendment was agreed to having been reconsidered, the matter is now before the Senate, as I understand, in the form in which it came from the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The committee amendment reduced the appropriation. Therefore the vote is on the committee amendment, and there is no amendment being offered to it, as I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, if that be the case, I move the adoption, if I may, of the amendment as reported by the Senate committee, of $403,875. Those who believe the Senate committee was correct in presenting that figure will vote "yea." I hope the majority of the Senate, if not all Members present, will vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 18, to strike out "$538,500" and insert "$403,875."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to make this statement. The hour is late. A good many Senators have already left the Chamber. I assume we will be unable to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I favor all the appropriations contained in the bill except the one for the continuation of the F. E. P. C. I cannot vote for the bill with that appropriation in it. I wish the RECORD to show that I still oppose the appropriation for the F. E. P. C., and shall vote accordingly.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I favor all the appropriations contained in the bill except the appropriation for F. E. P. C., and, therefore, because that appropriation is now in the bill, I shall vote against the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4879) was passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS—AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the conferees have agreed upon a report to be made as a result of the conference on the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes. The report probably will not be ready for another hour or two, and I ask unanimous consent that I may file the report during the recess between now and tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Mr. WAGNER subsequently submitted the conference report on the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes. For conference report see p. 6420 of the RECORD of the House proceedings.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma does not object I should like to dispose of the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. I do not think it will take more than 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4443) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 24, 33, 37, 50, 51, 54, 55, 57, 67, and 69.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47, 56, 58, 64, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,160,552"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,375,236"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building, except head houses connecting greenhouses, shall not exceed $2,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 per centum of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater, but in no event to exceed $2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$353,639"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$951,611"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$506,348"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$71,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a majority of the producers of such commodity within the area affected have requested the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "(or in the case of perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$25,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 27, 31, 40, 41, 43, 48, 52, 53, 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, and 71.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HARRY B. SHEPPARD,
ELMER H. WENE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4443, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 20, 1944.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 25, 31, 41, 43, 48, 52, 59, 66, and 71 to the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "*Provided*, That the cost of erecting any one building shall not exceed $7,500, and the cost of alterations to any one building shall not exceed $500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Secretary, whichever is greater."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment after "on" insert "extremely."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "That, excepting the foregoing item of $12,500,000, no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil-conservation and water-conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1944 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin, dated February 9, 1944: *Provided further*."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"Not exceeding $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to this section may also be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further*, That benefits under this section to schools or child-care centers shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school or child-care center as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further*, That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25-percent limitation contained in this section: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of the funds made available under this amendment shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds used in any State during any fiscal year under this paragraph shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the State and local school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers, or agencies having control thereof."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 65 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows: In the first paragraph of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$28,265,000" and insert "$26,000,000"; and in the third paragraph of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$96,710,000" and insert "$67,500,000."

That the House insist upon its amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 27, 40, 53, 63, and 65; and insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 60 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 27, 40, 53, 63, and 65.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Now I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4967, the Military Establishment appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4967) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement in connection with the pending bill. It is the bill which carries funds to support the Military Establishment for the next fiscal year. The bill contains appropriations of almost $50,000,000,000. It was passed by the House last Thursday. The Senate committee commenced hearings on Friday, held hearings on Friday and Saturday, reported the bill to the full committee on Monday, and the bill was reported to the Senate on the same day.

There are only about four slight amendments recommended by the Senate committee. One amendment reduces the appropriation in the sum of $1,217,000. That is caused by striking out of the bill funds for wildcatting for oil in Alaska. The Interior Department bill as passed by the House carried a sum to enable that Department to wildcat for oil in Alaska. The Senate subcommittee, the full committee, and the Senate struck out the item. That action has been approved by the conference committee, and the report has been approved by the House. We expect the conference report to come to the Senate this afternoon or tomorrow. The subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations having stricken the amount for the Interior Department to wildcat for oil in Alaska, the subcommittee on the War Department appropriations likewise refused to approve an appropriation for the War Department to wildcat for oil in Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very brief statement explaining somewhat in detail the amount of money carried by the bill.

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

The amount of money carried in the bill is $49,107,785,795, or a reduction of $1,217,000 below the amount approved by the House of Representatives.

The item is made up of two parts. One, an unexpended balance in the sum of $33,672,971,000 was reappropriated and the sum of $15,434,814,795 in new money is appropriated in the act and the sum of the carryover plus the sum of new money makes the total of $49,107,785,795.

For the fiscal year 1943 the Congress appropriated the sum of $74,903,515,893 to carry on the many activities of the War Department and the bill covering the fiscal year of 1944 carried the sum of $74,211,249,961; hence, the bill now pending before the Senate carries a sum of $25,103,464,166 less than the appropriations for the current fiscal year and the sum of $25,795,730,098 less than the sum appropriated for the 1943 fiscal year.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Army is now built up to approximately the maximum number, the cost of conducting the war during the 1945 fiscal year should be something like $25,000,000,000 less than the expenses incurred during either the present fiscal year or the previous fiscal year.

An estimate has been made showing that 97 cents out of every tax dollar goes for war. An examination into expenditures further

shows that we are getting more value for each dollar now than we received right after Pearl Harbor and this is because of the following facts:

First, early in the war the Congress enacted legislation providing for the renegotiation of all war contracts. Information has been made available that by the end of the present fiscal year the Government will have recovered, through renegotiation, a sum of approximately $3,500,000,000.

Another reason for the reduction in the amount of the pending appropriations is the fact that the economies in Army camps have been such as to reduce the cost of each soldier's upkeep approximately $36 per man. Most of the savings have resulted from the elimination of waste, from closer buying of equipment, and from redesigning and improving the wearing qualities of uniforms and clothing generally.

It is obvious that in order to train our vast Army that we had to purchase land, construct and equip camps of every kind, and now that the land has been paid for and the camps have been constructed and equipped, additional outlays for such purposes are not necessary.

The lands acquired have been paid for, the buildings erected have been paid for, the equipment in place has been paid for, and the efficiency of the workers in the factories permit of mass production on a more uniform basis so that the supplies needed by the Army are not costing as much as during the first and second years of the war.

At one time during the early planning for the war it was decided to raise and equip an Army of 8,200,000, but later these figures were revised, and the number of 7,700,000 were agreed upon. The reduction of the number in the armed forces amounted to approximately 6 percent, hence the appropriations reflect a reduction of much more than 6 percent.

The military strength of the Army is divided approximately as follows: Officers, 675,000; warrant officers, 30,000; nurses, 40,000; and enlisted men, 6,955,000.

At the present time there is an estimated number of 3,657,000 men outside the United States, and by December 31 of this year it is planned to have 5,000,000 men either on foreign battlefields or on foreign soil ready to take their places on the several fighting fronts.

The following facts are taken from the hearings. It requires some 5 pounds of food per day to serve each of our soldiers abroad; hence, the item of food costs, which includes transportation, is one of the major items of expense.

The bill carries the sum of $562,000,000 for the purpose of supporting the civilian population of the liberated countries. It is not planned that we shall feed all of the population in the coutries which are conquered and to be conquered. However, the plans are made to provide the liberated peoples who are in need of food the sum of 2,000 calories per day. The estimate for our own soldiers is 3,750 calories per day, so that the food to be made available to the needy in the conquered countries is scarcely more than one-half of the rations estimated necessary for the soldiers of our Army.

The bill carries the sum of $4,300,000,000 for lend-lease to be expended under the jurisdiction of the War Department. This sum of money is to be distributed roughly as follows: 64 percent to Great Britain, 26 percent to the U. S. S. R., 4 percent to China, and 6 percent to all other countries. The total sum reappropriated, together with the new funds, making the total of $49,107,785,795, is broken down substantially as follows:

Pay and travel	$12,685,000,000
Subsistence	2,899,251,000
Clothing and equipage	1,721,600,000
General supplies	681,000,000
Transportation Corps	1,850,000,000
Signal Corps	2,540,491,075
Air Forces	12,610,200,000
Medical Department	492,204,520
Engineer Service	2,662,212,500
Ordnance Department	8,599,067,600
Chemical Warfare Service	670,000,100
Expediting production	800,000,100
Special service schools, Department expenses, and miscellaneous	896,758,900

The amount recommended for the 1945 fiscal year is some $243,054,905 below the amount recommended by the Budget.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As I have stated, the bill carries appropriations of a little less than $50,000,000,000. Of that sum, $15,434,814,795 is new money and $33,672,971,000 is carry-over. It may be wondered why such a large sum was carried over. That is explained in the hearings and is also explained to some extent in the statement I have submitted. The War Department is now costing less than it formerly cost. When the war started we had to buy land on which to build camps. We had to construct buildings on the land and provide equipment for the buildings. We had to induct a large number of men into the Army. That expense has already been taken care of. The land is paid for, the buildings are constructed, the equipment is in place, and in the main the expenses are taken care of, so from now on the expenses of the War Department will probably grow smaller rather than larger because of the facts which I have just related.

As I have stated, the bill carries an appropriation of approximately $15,000,000,000 of new money and approximately $33,000,000,000 of carry-over money, making a total in excess of $49,000,000,000.

Only four amendments have been reported by the committee. At the present time, if the War Department desires to bring back from abroad some of our servicemen who have become worn out from fighting or flying planes, there is no provision of law which authorizes the Department to bear any of the expense of bringing them back; so the Senate committee recommends an amendment providing that the War Department may use these funds, within its discretion, to bring back from the fighting fronts such soldiers as the Department may think merit being brought back for rehabilitation and rest. That is the first amendment reported by the committee. We shall come to it in a few moments.

In connection with the second amendment reported by the committee, let me say that the House placed a prohibition in the bill denying the War Department the opportunity of continuing the education of medical and dental students. If that provision should remain in the bill, those two classes of students would be denied further assistance. It is the opinion of our committee that the War Department should maintain medical and dental students in the colleges so that when the war is over we shall have at least that additional supply of young doctors and dentists, to take the place of those who have been away, many of whom will be retired from service.

The third amendment reported by the committee has to do with the Alaska oil wildcatting, which I have briefly explained.

The fourth amendment reported by the committee deals with a provision inserted by the House preventing the War Department from leasing or selling any of the land which it now possesses. We think that provision goes entirely too far. We think that the antileasing provision should not be incorporated in the bill. Under the terms of the provision as it came from the House, the War Department could not transfer to the Navy any of the lands which it has. At the present time the War Department desires to transfer, and is actually transferring, land from its domain to the use of the Navy.

Those are the four amendments which the committee recommends. There is one further amendment which may be offered from the floor, which the War Department favors. Some time ago the Congress placed a prohibition in the War Department appropriation bill denying the right of the War Department to employ artists in making pictures of war scenes and things of that character in the war areas. The prohibition is carried in this bill.

The War Department is entirely agreeable to refraining from commissioning any more men and assigning them to the battle areas to paint pictures. The Senate committee is willing to have the restriction apply so far as further commissions are concerned, but the War Department very much desires to permit the personnel in the regular war establishment to continue to make paintings if they so desire. We have the promise of the Secretary of War, in a formal letter which I shall place in the RECORD, that if this prohibition is removed the Department will not commission any new members from civilian life to engage in this painting work; but the Department would like to have the present personnel of the Army, either enlisted men or officers, enjoy the privilege of painting. I understand that there are a great many very competent painters in the Army. That amendment will probably be offered from the floor. If so, I shall be glad to accept it. Later I shall place in the RECORD the authority for accepting the amendment, namely, a letter from the Secretary of War.

Those are the amendments which the committee has reported. If there are any questions, I shall be very glad to answer them if I can.

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

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Finance Department; Finance Service, Army" on page 10, line 4, after the word "personnel", to insert "all necessary expenses of travel to enable military personnel stationed abroad

to visit places in the United States, its Territories and possessions, for the purpose of recuperation, rehabilitation, and recovery."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army", on page 21, line 17, after the numerals, to strike out "*Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry if any expense on account of their education in such subjects was not being defrayed out of appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 prior to June 7, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army", on page 31, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "$1,800,217,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,799,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize that the hour is late, but I feel that it is necessary to make a statement in relation to this particular item.

There is included in this item an amount for the Canol project in Canada.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Are we about to consider that question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that this is the amendment in which that item is included.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The item to which the Senator refers is on page 31, line 3.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, that is the amendment now under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am informed by the Chair that that is the amendment which we are now considering. I wish to call attention to some figures included in that item. I think that before we vote on this question we should know at least what is included in the item so far as it relates to the Canol project.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am looking at the clock. It is now 10 minutes after 7. I do not know just what is included in this amendment. I do not know just what the Senator from Michigan has in mind, but surely at this late hour there is no opportunity to discuss or understand the amendment. Why is it necessary that we work on and on without knowing just what we are doing?

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, I suppose all of us are anxious to get away, because we have been in continuous session for more than 7 hours. But if this bill is to be passed tonight, it must be obvious that there will be no other opportunity for the Senator from Michigan to present his views with respect to the pending amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it is the last amendment, I think.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that if the Senator from Michigan can express his views, that will clear up the situation with regard to the item, so that we shall be in a position to vote on it.

Mr. WHITE. Yes. We may be able to dispose of the bill very speedily if the Senator from Michigan has an opportunity to conclude his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall do my very best to make my statement as brief as possible. Included in the bill is an item which I should like to discuss on the floor of the Senate. It is an item of $16,439,688 for maintenance and operation of the Canol project. The appropriation includes $8,066,158 for maintenance of that project, and $8,373,530 for operation.

Last year the Truman committee made an investigation of this particular project. They found it was costing approximately $134,000,000, not including many items of Army services in connection with the project, which would run into many additional million dollars. The committee made no particular objections to the part of the project which involved a service line from Skagway into Whitehorse, and then to operate along the air fields; but the committee did make serious objection to the building of the pipe line and to a road from Whitehorse to Norman Wells and to the refinery at Whitehorse. It is in relation to that item that I wish to speak at this time.

We find that in connection with the "refinery, access roads crude line oil field," there is an operation item of $6,326,540. For the maintenance in that connection the item is $5,705,920, making a total of $12,032,460.

The distribution lines and the flight strips are the ones to which the committee made no objection. There is an appropriation of $2,046,990 for their operation. For maintenance there is an appropriation of $2,360,238, or a total of $4,407,228.

We find that the item of $12,032,460 is made up as follows: For maintenance of production facilities at Norman Wells, $708,070; for operation, $2,843,720.

A pipe line was built and at the same time a road was constructed alongside the pipe line, to enable repairs to be made to the pipe line, and so forth. That road is 528 miles long. We find in this requested appropriation an item for repairs to a highway which is to be used only for the purpose of repairing the pipe line which is 597 miles long. The item is $2,694,010.

We find that for repairs during the coming year to a crude-oil pipe line 597 miles long, from Whitehorse to Norman Wells, there is an item of $1,334,740. We find that for the operation of that line alone there is an item of $1,167,540. We find that for repairs or maintenance of the refinery at Whitehorse there is an item of $969,100. We find that for operation of that refinery there is an item of $2,315,280. For maintenance, we find a total item of $5,705,920; and for operation, a total item of $6,326,540.

From the foregoing it would appear that $16,439,688 is requested for the Canol project, of which $12,032,460 is for operating and production facilities, and $4,407,228 for distribution facilities. We all wish to know approximately how much oil it is expected will be produced as a result of that expenditure. We learn from the War Department that the figures are merely for expected production. There is no guaranty that such a quantity of oil will ever be obtained.

By the way, up to the present time no 100-octane gasoline has been refined from the oil obtained from this project. Some may say that it is desired to obtain oil for our fleet in the Pacific, and that the fleet may be supplied with oil produced from these wells.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator will remember that from the analysis of the oil production in that region it appears that absolutely no oil for the fleet is produced. The oil produced is very volatile and is only suitable for gasoline of various qualities. The wells do not produce oil suitable for use by the fleet; is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I am glad the Senator from West Virginia has brought out that fact. Not one drop of this oil will be used for the fleet in the Pacific.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is a member of the committee, but he raised no objection to this item. No one before the committee raised any objection to the item, so far as I know.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I was on the subcommittee. The question whether any funds for the Canol project were included came up in the subcommittee. In the subcommittee it was my understanding that there were no funds for the Canol project.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana, in answer to his statement, that the facts which have just been stated by the Senator from Michigan were not divulged at that time. In the meeting they were withheld from the Senator from Missouri as being secret. As has been stated by the Senator from Minnesota, there was no statement that any money for the Canol project was included in the item. It was only in the last few days that we obtained the information that money for the Canol project was contained in the item. At the time of the committee hearing such information was highly secret.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a word, let me say that all the information is contained in the House hearings, and the

matter is explained in the House hearings.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the quantity of oil and gasoline which will be produced from these wells:

One hundred octane gasoline, 112,895 barrels.

Eighty octane motor gasoline, 351,080 barrels.

Diesel oil, 134,000 barrels.

Fuel oil, 93,800 barrels.

The foregoing is an estimate of the amount of oil which might be produced, and which it is expected will be produced. Request is made for an expenditure of more than $12,000,000 in order to produce it.

If the Government of the United States purchased a similar quantity of oil at Los Angeles, Calif., it would pay for it, at present rate, $2,568,997. Let us say that at the present time there is a shortage of oil on that west coast. The same amount of oil could be obtained from Aruba and all the freight and all other expenses paid for $3,267,893. We could purchase the oil in Aruba, and could send it to Alaska—and there is a pipe line from Skagway into these airfields—for approximately one-fifth of what it will cost the United States Government to produce the same amount of oil from the Canol project.

There are some who will say there is a shortage of oil; but when we compare the quantity of oil which will be produced from this field with the quantity of oil produced in the United States we find that it is so small that it cannot be figured. We produce 5,000,000 barrels of oil a day in the United States, and we are talking about the few thousand barrels involved in this project. It is this expenditure which was not explained to the committee that I wish to call to the attention of the Senate. It is the inclusion of this item under the Corps of Engineers that the people of this country ought to know about, and they should also know that we are asked to spend $12,000,000 in order to produce oil which we could buy and ship to that region at a cost of $3,000,000.

Mr. President, while realizing the lateness of the hour, I still thought it was my duty to call to the attention of the Senate the inclusion of this item in the lump sum appropriation.

We know what happened when the first appropriation came before us. Instead of calling for $134,000,000 the Army called for an expenditure of about $75,000,000. After a thorough investigation the Truman committee has found that there has been spent approximately $134,000,000 plus millions of dollars wasted in machinery and in equipment in connection with this project. Today we are unable to obtain lumber from our forests because the necessary machinery is not available; and yet along that highway in Canada there are thousands of trucks and machines which could be used in the forests here in the United States.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not a fact that the pipe line and refinery are our property? Does the Senator propose that we go away and leave them and not maintain them?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that at this time, in view of the figures involved, the property should not be used. It could be used in the case of any emergency.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator know that we have made an agreement with the Canadian authorities whereby we receive 60,000,000 barrels of oil as may be needed from time to time?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if there are 60,000,000 barrels of oil in that field, we have made a new arrangement. After the Truman committee investigated this matter the State Department and the Canadian authorities made a new agreement which is very good, but is not good enough to justify the expense to which we have been put, not only in manpower but in cash and bonds which have been sold here in the United States.

Mr. President, there has not been included in this item the actual cost of the oil.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that I voted against this item when it first came up. The Senate committee outvoted me, and the Senate outvoted me afterward. The project became the property of the United States and contracts were entered into. Under those circumstances I do not see how we could give it up without suffering a severe loss. I think we should go ahead with it to the extent provided in the pending bill. I do not see how we can abandon it at this late hour. I wish to say to the Senator that I had the same view which he has, and I voted against it in the first instance.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REED. No matter what view is taken, or how we may vote, this is a matter involving not only a great deal of money, but the question of whether we have followed sound business practices in the development of the project.

Suggestions have been made that information has been withheld. The chairman of the committee left town last night. I think the matter should be discussed more fully than is possible this evening, and therefore I call attention to the fact that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent that no quorum is present, and unless we can pass this bill tonight we shall have to allow it to go over until tomorrow. If Senators feel that it should not be passed tonight, I feel compelled to move a recess until tomorrow.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. May it be understood that if we adjourn or recess now the Senator from Michigan shall have the floor when the Senate reassembles tomorrow?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no question about that.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have listened with a great deal of attention to what the Senator from Michigan has said, and I am aware of the fact that during the past several months there have been many discussions in the Truman committee and elsewhere with respect to this appropriation. What I wish to say, Mr. President, is that I do not know how it is possible to fight a war economically.

I was present in the Appropriations Committee when this project was first undertaken. I know that there were prolonged discussions concerning it. There was a long off-the-record discussion, and in authorizing the expenditure of public funds for the purposes of this project we knew that we were authorizing the production of oil at an extraordinarily high price. The question was not one of whether we should make a good business arrangement for the production of the oil. The question which was presented to us was whether we should obtain a supply of oil at a point where it was needed very gravely. It was said that the whole west coast was in danger of attack from Japanese contingents. We did not know what the next month would bring forth. The Japs had moved into the outlying Aleutian Islands. There was no question that if we were to defend our western coast and carry on the war we must have this project. So the committee and the Congress authorized it.

With respect to the continuance of the project, I understand that the matter was fully discussed in the House committee. The Government of the United States, with the full knowledge of the Congress, and with the full approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, approved this project. We have invested in it approximately $129,000,000. The proposal here is to expend about fifteen and one-half million dollars in order to carry out our obligation to the Government of Canada.

I can see no reason why we should undertake to prevent that operation at this hour of the night.

My feeling is that there is plenty of opportunity for the Truman committee, or the Military Affairs Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, later on to point the finger at any of these operations if there is anything wrongful in them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. I make the point of order and call attention to the fact that a quorum is not present——

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. REED. I do not wish to press the point of order, but it is not debatable. What the Senator from Wyoming is saying will have its proper place tomorrow. It is really debate upon the merits of the

matter. All I am seeking is that we shall have an opportunity to hear a full and complete explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the Senator's point of order?

Mr. REED. I shall withhold it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is about to make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and if he does that, of course, it automatically will take the Senator from Michigan off the floor and force a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. REED. I am withholding the point, but I do not want to waste time in debate, not even on the part of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may conclude my remarks, they were all intended to develop the simple question whether or not we are going to act upon this bill this evening. I believe we should. I believe this question should not be raised here and now. I believe the appropriation bill should be passed.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Wyoming is going to insist on continuing, I insist upon my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. REED. I had the floor, was recognized——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, no Senator can intrude on another Senator's time and make a point unless the Senator having the floor yields for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That applies to all Senators in the Senate. The Senator from Michigan has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my only point is to determine whether or not the Senator from Michigan intends to proceed with this matter. I feel that the best interests of the Government will be served by the passage of the appropriation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. A point of order is always in order. I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there will be no difficulty about this situation. I should like to have a few postmasters confirmed.

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to ask what the parliamentary situation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the committee amendment on page 31.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes its session tomorrow the Senator from Michigan may be entitled to the floor.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Ivy W. Duggan, of Mississippi, to be Governor of the Farm Credit Administration for the unexpired term of 6 years from June 15, 1940, vice Albert G. Black.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Ralph A. Bard, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment and/or promotion in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

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

Several postmasters; and

Raymond E. McCanse to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo., in place of Robert Stemmons, resigned (reported adversely).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Franklin Brannan to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Charles Franklin Brannan to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Frank B. Leslie, New Canaan.

HAWAII

Charlotte M. Keala, Kamuela.
Jacinth T. Correa, Wailuku.

IOWA

Evelyn L. Earing, Lonerock.

MASSACHUSETTS

Irene S. Leary, East Pepperell.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Helen M. Lowell, East Rochester.

NEW YORK

Frederick A. Glynn, Craryville.
Clifford Veeder, Marilla.
Thomas F. Gray, Niagara Falls.
Richard S. Allen, Round Lake.
Helen J. Dygert, Russell.
Walter I. Nash, Sandlake.
Floyd D. Doolittle, Sidney.

RHODE ISLAND

Ralph Scotland, Jr., Oakland.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jane Dunn, Elkton.
Marie E. Hoven, Fort Pierre.

TENNESSEE

Edith Caldwell, Lupton City.
Amy E. Davis, Oakdale.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 1944

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

Thou ever-blessed Master, as we face the stern realities of these days, we pray that we may not be forced by the motive of duty alone, but by the urgency of love to God and man. Thou who art our sovereign friend, from whom earth's greatest souls have borrowed their finest gifts, bless us with the spirit of brotherhood without discord and with an understanding which brings wise decisions. O put purpose and resolution into all our lives that will help us to a well-ordered ministry of our responsibilities, despising injustice, smiting falsehood, and consumed with a passion to destroy prejudice and enhance personal worth.

Most gracious Lord, correct any false estimates of life and infuse Thy Biblical truth into all minds: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." Pity any whose hearts may have grown bitter and whose souls are closed to the great, wide needs of the world. Grant that our devotion to our

daily tasks may be so strong and our spirit so courageous, our fidelity and truth so impelling that criticism or derision cannot defeat. Thou who art at the hearthstone of every humble heart and whose hand is ever lifted to bless and not to smite, we pray that every surrender we make may be a revelation of our dear Redeemer. In His name. Amen.

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

WAKE UP, AMERICA

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

JAPANESE PROBLEM

Mr. PHILLIPS. 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. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand and am about to file with the House a petition from my district, which petition is signed by over 400 men and women; I figure it to be nearer 450 signatures. The petition asks for serious consideration of the Japanese problem and protests against the apparent beginning of a return of the Japanese to California. I call attention to it because this is a problem which should have the very serious consideration of the people in the East who do not understand the problem which California faces.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Not only are they going to return the Japanese to California, if they remain in this country, but the chances are the F. E. P. C. will try to make you accept them on terms of equality. That is what they are up to now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests; first, to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of veterans' legislation, and, second, to extend my remarks on the subject of railroad-retirement legislation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WELSH FAMILY

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was much impressed the other night while listening to the radio to hear tribute paid to an employee of the Standard Oil Co. who was honored by General Eisenhower for the services of this man's children in the armed forces. Then I wondered how many parents with large families have all their sons and daughters in the service of the country.

Then, over the week end it came to my attention that I had such a case right in my own congressional district in the town of Spring Grove.

I refer to Mr. and Mrs. George W. Welsh, who have five children in the service of our country. Mr. Welsh has had 44 years of continuous employment in the leading plant in Spring Grove, the P. H. Glatfelter Co., paper manufacturers. Mr. Welsh holds the honor among the mill employees of having the most children in the armed forces. They are Lt. Col. Spurgeon Welsh, Petty Officer (3d cl.) William Welsh, Pvt. Kenneth Welsh, Sgt. Ross Welsh, and Nurse Cadet Vera Welsh.

Of course, there may be many fathers just like George Welsh who have five or more children in the service, but I am proud, and the community of Spring Grove is proud, of a father like this.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a letter that I have addressed to our colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] relative to a report from Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. HARNESS of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests; in the first instance to extend my remarks and to include therein a newspaper editorial and in the second instance to extend my remarks and include a resolution of the Slovak Society.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of all legislative business on the Speaker's table and other special orders heretofore entered, I may have permission to address the House for 20 minutes today and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PREFERENCE EMPLOYMENT FOR VETERANS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4115) to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "honorably" and insert "on active duty."

Page 2, line 8, after "States", insert "and have been separated therefrom under honorable conditions and."

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "and the husbands of such service-connected disabled ex-servicewomen."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "honorably" and insert "on active duty."

Page 2, line 20, strike out all after "authorized)", down to and including "ex-servicewomen" in line 25 and insert "and who were separated therefrom under honorable conditions."

Page 2, line 25, and page 3, line 1, strike out "honorably discharged."

Page 3, line 1, after "served", insert "on active duty."

Page 3, line 4, after "authorized)", insert ", and have been separated therefrom under honorable conditions."

Page 4, lines 14 and 15, strike out "in the service of the United States."

Page 5, line 5, after "of", insert "a."

Page 8, line 15, strike out "rating" and insert "ratings."

Page 11, line 11, after "eligibles", insert ", except of 10-point preference eligibles."

Page 12, line 19, after "apply", insert "to any position in or under the legislative or judicial branch of the Government or."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include an article on the electoral college.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the business today and any other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOOL PRODUCTION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. When we were discussing the appropriation for U. N. R. R. A., I took the floor and did the best I knew how to explain what was happening to the wool producers of this country. Now I learn that the Commodity Credit Corporation is charging from one and one-eighth cents per pound up to two and four-fifths cents per pound for grading domestic wool. I enclose a table showing the total charges for grading this wool.

The following tabulation shows the total charge made with respect to all wool purchased by Commodity Credit Corporation through May 13, 1944:

Type of wool	Quantity purchased (pounds)	Rate per pound	Service and appraisal charge
		Cents	
Shorn wool (grease)	220,370,217	1⅛	$2,479,164.94
Pulled wool (grease)	26,160,128	1⅛	294,301.44
Shorn wool (scoured)	2,737,418	2⅘	76,647.04
Pulled wool (scoured)	25,696,452	1¾	449,687.91
Total	274,964,215	-------	3,299,801.33

When Alexander Johnston, Chief of the Wool Division of the War Food Administration, appeared before our committee he testified, and I quote—pages 71–72, hearing:

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have a particular test here which I will tell you about in a moment; I will give you the results of that. Two men in eastern Colorado, or western Kansas, I don't remember the exact spot, had a clip amounting to 50 bags and as it was being sheared one man took the even-numbered bags and the other took the odd-numbered bags, and they shipped it to the handler at two different spots under each man's name, you understand; and when the estimates of shrinkage came back on that wool one was 70 percent and other was 74 percent. The 74 percent wool was valued at $1.15 and the 70 percent wool was valued at approximately 5 cents more per pound that one fellow received above the other.

This [indicating on chart] is an average variation.

To give you the results in another way, on these 88 clips 54.5 percent of the core tests were within 1 percent of the actual shrinkage of the 10 bags, and of the appraisers only 25 percent, which is a little more than twice as great.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement, Senate amendment No. 41.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41, page 58, line 10, after the word "projects", strike out the words "including the cost of progressive and final liquidation of all of said project during the fiscal year 1945:"

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON of California moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the House will recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41, which makes it possible to continue the emergency guayule rubber project.

When the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill originally passed the House the House Appropriations Committee appropriated the sum of $3,952,585, but also provided for the complete and final liquidation of the project during the next fiscal year. At that time, however, the House committee had not had an opportunity to consult with Bradley Dewey, Rubber Director, nor did it have an opportunity to consider the report that has since been filed by the Poage committee, a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. The Poage committee has visited California and Texas, made a thorough inspection of the emergency guayule rubber project, and has unanimously recommended that it be continued. This view of the subcommittee has been concurred in by the full Committee on Agriculture.

It seems to me that there are a couple of fundamental policies involved that are going to be decided when we vote on this question. One is, Are we going to always continue to be dependent upon foreign sources for our entire supply of crude rubber? The other is, Do we believe in getting some return on our investment prior to liquidating a project of this kind?

Up to the present time some $45,000,000 has been appropriated, of which approximately $33,000,000 has been spent. We have now 32,000 acres of potential crude rubber in the field which, if harvested in an orderly fashion, following the 5 or 6 year liquidation program that has been advocated by the Forest Service, will yield us between 25,000 and 30,000 tons of crude rubber. It seems to me that we should get this return on our investment before we think of liquidating this project.

Up to the present time we have only produced some 440 long tons of crude rubber. It is good rubber. The Navy Department says so. The Rubber Director says so. The rubber factories, the rubber companies who use it, tell us it is good rubber. We do not need to worry about the fact that guayule does not produce rubber products which we need. We know it is excellent for mixing with synthetic rubbers in order to manufacture rubber products that are vital to the war effort.

The argument is advanced that we will not have enough rubber from guayule to be important to the war effort. That is neither here nor there. We need crude rubber. Our inventory is dropping rapidly. If the Members will refer to that letter which I mailed them last Saturday, together with a copy of a letter from the Rubber Director, you will find that our inventory of crude rubber will be down to the very low figure of about 50,000 tons by the end of this calendar year. The Rubber Director says that to him it is unthinkable that we would liquidate any potential source of crude rubber under those conditions. I heartily agree with him. I do hope the House will vote to sustain the motion I have offered to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield gladly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It would be well to say that in terms of money and in simple language the amount involved in this appropriation will bring back, by harvesting the present crop, about three times the appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes. I would like to point out that if the project is liquidated next year, the cost of the very small amount of rubber obtained will be in the neighborhood of $3 a pound. If we go through an orderly program of liquidating during the next 5 or 6 years we will reduce that cost to about 53 cents a pound, which is considerably less than we are now spending for the small amount of rubber that we get from South America.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment the Senate has taken the proper course and the House should concur. If we had followed the excellent advice of General Eisenhower in 1930 we would not have been caught with our rubber pants down on December 7, 1941.

We can and should take a farsighted view of the rubber situation and move now to protect our country from future shortages and from the domination of the powerful British-Dutch rubber monopoly. All of us hope that the war in the Pacific will be speedily and successfully terminated and that our former sources of crude rubber will again become available. However, I do not share the beautiful optimism of those who seem to think that the rubber plantations will be left intact and ready to produce by the Japanese.

The United States is spending millions of dollars annually on research and experimentation in various fields of endeavor. Why not spend some of this money in an attempt to develop a critical product that is so essential to our domestic economy?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter from the Rubber Director:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1944.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am informed that the conferees report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 1945, may be under consideration shortly. I feel that Members of the House of Representatives should be advised of my recent testimony before various committees of the Congress.

I do not take any position on guayule as a commercial post-war crop but, as Rubber Director, I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I were to allow to pass without protest a decision that at this time would liquidate any supplies of crude rubber, whether growing in American fields, or in warehouses, as a result of operations in the jungles of South and Central America.

* * * In the meantime, we will be draining down our stock pile which is also too low today. We are down today to less than 115,000 tons of crude. We will be down to 55,000 tons by the end of the year. So, there is no question about the fact the we need crude rubber.

In view of the facts expressed above I sincerely trust that the House of Representatives will vote to adopt the Senate version of the section pertaining to the emergency rubber project. I am told that this would necessitate the House taking action to agree with the Senate on amendment No. 41.

Sincerely yours,

BRADLEY DEWEY,
Rubber Director.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include therewith a letter which I received from Mr. Bradley Dewey, Rubber Director.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman not yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Several Members have indicated a desire to speak in behalf of this motion, and, so far as I know, I shall take the only time in opposition to it. It seems to me that if the gentleman would be satisfied with 2 minutes, that would be sufficient.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I will take whatever time the gentleman gives me, but the gentleman told me 10 days ago that I would be given 5 minutes. I did anticipate that is what I would have.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman is under the impression that I made such a statement to him I will yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Does not the chairman recall making that statement, because I asked him for 10 minutes and he said he would give me 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I do not remember that. If the gentleman says I promised him 5 minutes I will yield him 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to consume as little time as possible in calling the attention of the membership to the one question I think is involved in this guayule program. That is whether we are going to continue an important national insurance policy or whether we are going to let our insurance lapse for failure to pay the annual premium. I look upon our existing guayule acreage as the best and only insurance that we as a nation have against a complete lack of natural rubber. Possibly we will never need it. We hope we will not need it. We hope the war will be over; we hope our scientists will soon be able to produce synthetic rubber that will serve satisfactorily for all purposes without the admixture of any natural rubber. Unfortunately, we have no such synthetic rubber today. Just this morning I took a tire down to have it recapped. Much more important, you simply cannot build the tires needed for our B-29's and other heavy equipment with any synthetic rubber yet produced. It may be that next week someone will discover a new type of synthetic rubber, but I do not want to make our soldiers and sailors rely on such an uncertain event. We hope we never need to use an ounce of this guayule rubber; but, Mr. Speaker, I carry insurance, and so do most of the Members. At the same time, I never bought an insurance policy on which I wanted to collect. This Government may not have to use this guayule rubber, but just as surely as you need your life- and fire-insurance policies, just so surely does this Government need the insurance afforded by this 33,000 acres of guayule that the gentleman from Georgia would plow up. Unless the gentleman can give us some better guaranty as to the length of the war or the progress of future scientific development than he has been able to do, I think we would do well to pay the premiums on our rubber-insurance policy for another year.

The gentleman from Georgia would have us follow the bookkeeping of a man who would plant an apple orchard and at the end of 20 months go out and balance his books and determine he had spent a great deal more money planting his apple orchard than he had taken in in the production of apples from that orchard. That is exactly what we have in the case of guayule. We have a shrub that requires approximately 4 years for the minimum cycle of production. We knew it required that long when we planted it. We know that we cannot produce apples at the end of the first year. We knew we could not produce guayule at the end of 20 months in any appreciable quantities. I am not, therefore, very deeply impressed when the gentleman from Georgia tells us that the guayule project has not paid a profit. He will doubtless tell you that we have spent approximately $30,000,000. That is correct. We have spent that much on the natural-rubber projects of the United States. He will tell you that we have produced but a small quantity of guayule rubber. That is likewise correct. But nobody expected us to produce guayule rubber at the end of 20 months. We have actually done far better than we had a right to expect. We have our nurseries. We have our fields planted with 33,000 acres of guayule about 20 months old. If we leave it there approximately that much longer, we should be able to harvest from 25,000 to 30,000 tons of natural rubber just like this sample which I have here. I want the Members to notice that this is natural rubber. It is not synthetic rubber. We will be able to harvest natural rubber from that guayule which the conferees would have us plow up. We have produced substantial amounts of rubber already from the small acreage of old shrub which we bought from the Intercontinental Rubber Co., and we are today receiving very substantial shipments of guayule rubber from the wild shrub of old Mexico. Private companies own the Mexican guayule. They are not planning to plow any of it up. On the contrary, they are planting greatly increased acreages.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I wish the gentleman would bring out the fact that General Eisenhower, who is now leading the invasion, some years ago recommended guayule as a stand-by source of rubber for this country.

Mr. POAGE. I was just going to mention that very thing. I want to call attention to the fact that back in 1930, when General Eisenhower was a major in the United States Army, he was appointed to carry on a survey of the possibilities of the establishment of a reliable source of native rubber. After an exhaustive study of the subject he reported that guayule was the only practical source of native rubber in the United States, and recommended that we plant 400,000 acres of guayule. He pointed out that if we did that we would have insurance against exactly the situation that did develop.

The membership has seen the letter referred to by the gentleman from California written by the Rubber Director. As late as June 17, 1944, Hon. Bradley Dewey, the Rubber Director, said:

I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I were to allow to pass without protest a decision that at this time would liquidate any supplies of crude rubber * * *. We will be down to 55,000 tons (of crude rubber) by the end of the year. So, there is no question about the fact that we need crude rubber. In view of the facts above expressed, I sincerely trust that the House of Representatives will vote to adopt the Senate version of the section pertaining to the emergency rubber project.

In the face of such statements from those who know best about our needs and our supplies of rubber, I simply cannot vote to destroy this much-needed commodity even if I were to admit the authenticity of the gentleman from Georgia's system of bookkeeping whereby he charges all of the cost of planting an orchard to the second year's production to find whether or not the orchard was profitable.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a situation where we simply do not have enough natural rubber to guarantee us the successful termination of this war. Until we have the positive assurance—and I do not believe the chairman of the committee can give us that assurance, I do not believe the House itself can give us that assurance—but until we have the positive assurance that we are going to have all the natural rubber we need to make our synthetics useful, we cannot afford to let this guayule project lapse. Bear this in mind, that most of the synthetic rubber is not today useful unless it is mixed with some natural rubber. The Rubber Director tells us that our stock pile of natural rubber is getting very small and he is not able to assure us that next year and the following year there will be enough to mix even the minimum needed percentage of natural rubber with our synthetic rubber to make it useful. We have a great investment in synthetic plants. Unless we have a minimum quantity of natural rubber to mix with the synthetics we lose much of their usefulness. And remember that it is entirely possible that the 25,000 or 30,000 tons of natural rubber that those acres of guayule will produce may well make a quarter of a million pounds of synthetic rubber useful.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this House cares to take the tremendous responsibility of saying that we are going to stop this work, destroy it here today because perchance it is going to cost us two to five million dollars a year to keep it going. We have spent $30,000,000 on it. It seems to me that it would be very poor economy to scrap it just before it gets old enough to produce rubber in commercial quantities. I do not question the fact that the Appropriations Committee has gone into the matter of costs. I do not question that the cost per pound is high, but where can they get a reliable source of natural rubber at a lesser cost? All costs of war are high, but the highest war costs are those that result from an inadequate supply of needed equipment and supplies. No equipment is more vital than rubber. No supplies can flow by land, sea, or air without rubber. We simply cannot afford to be without it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is very nice to hear the gentleman from Texas talk about that insurance policy, but we do know and are being told that we are getting toward the end of the war. We voted something along that line yesterday. Churchill thinks the war in Europe will end this year. The best military authorities say so.

There is nothing substantial in this program that will make the rubber available to us before the end of this war. We are not going to get any substantial help from it in prosecuting the war, and when the war is over we are going to have plenty of rubber from the East Indies. So what is the use of spending money on a program that will be of no use to us in the war effort, that will not be available to us until the war is over, and when it is over we shall not need it? That is the whole thing.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. Perhaps the guayule program should be curtailed, but it should not be abandoned. We must have rubber, and since the Japs have seized most of the natural rubber in the world, we must provide synthetic rubber, and also encourage the growth and processing of the native guayule. I am one of those who believe that Congress should give encouragement and support to the development of all our own natural resources, so that we may not be dependent upon any foreign country for the necessities of life we must have.

I represent the extreme western district of Texas. Much of mine is a semi-arid country. In the so-called Big Bend of Texas and especially in and about Alpine, Marathon, Sanderson, and Fort Stockton, there is a considerable amount of guayule growing in its native state. There would be much more if the ranchers and landowners were given some encouragement to take care of and cultivate these plants to maturity. All experts now admit that the guayule plant has great value as a rubber producer. If the entire program is killed the incentive is gone.

After the last war a factory was built in my district, at the town of Marathon. It was a success until native rubber was imported at such a low price the company went broke. I think there are great possibilities in this field, and I beg you to vote for the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, just to get the situation clearly in mind, it is important to note that at the time we first authorized this guayule project it began with 60,000 acres. The War Food Administration claimed that too much lush acreage was being taken out of cultivation of food crops, and it was reduced to 31,000 acres.

When this bill was before the House we provided substantially $3,900,000 to put the guayule project on a liquidation basis and finally take it out of business. The Senate restored another million and a half to keep it going for another year on a maintenance basis and for the operation of an additional rubber mill.

I am going to support the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] to keep this project alive. I am doing so not because I have high hopes that guayule is going to give us the basis for a permanent rubber project—I do not believe that as a matter of fact, but with our crude-rubber stock pile, according to Col. Bradley Dewey, reduced to 55,000 tons by the end of the year, I do not believe we can take that chance. I am willing to abide by what Colonel Dewey says about it. He came before various committees of the House and Senate and made a real plea that this thing be kept going for a little while. That is one reason I am going along. The other reason is this: We are carrying on some rubber-development efforts in Brazil and in South America. We have now expended $81,000,000 in Latin America for rubber; $61,000,000 of that is in Brazil. The best calculations would indicate that this rubber will cost us $1 per pound. Rubber from guayule may cost us that much, maybe a little more, but we cannot take the chance not to have this guayule available to us. We should go along with the project on a maintenance basis for another year.

I may say in reply to the observation of my good friend and associate, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] that while there is every evidence that the victory will be won this year, yet it is a contingency. Our synthetic-rubber projects are getting on a good basis. This year we will be on a basis of about 864,000 tons annual production of synthetic rubber, but, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] pointed out, a certain amount of natural rubber has to be mixed with it, either from guayule or some other type of natural rubber in order to give it that resiliency and tensile strength in order to make it resist heat and friction. So my suggestion is that we should perhaps go along with this motion to recede and concur and give this project another chance, even though we may not believe it will prove the basis of a permanent rubber establishment in this country. It is in a sense an insurance project, and it is far better, in the light of our war needs of rubber, to be safe than sorry.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the past there were many who did not believe that wheat, corn, sweetpotatoes, or blackstrap molasses could be used as a basis for synthetic rubber; however, you have been convinced that it could be and has been used effectively.

I am sure both you and I would prefer that this war end soon. I have some very close relatives in New Guinea and many other places. Not long ago four servicemen wrote their wills in blood. Their plane went down and they were captured by our enemy. They were injured and later they died. If we fail to provide the natural rubber that is essential to the production of synthetic rubber tires and your son or brother or any of our other servicemen lose their lives, when a tire blows out because it cannot stand the terrific pressure and heat, then you and I will be to blame.

We hope the Japs will leave some of those rubber bearing trees; we also hope there will not be a Jap left in that area, but in getting rid of the Japs we know that many, if not all, of the trees will be completely destroyed, too.

In my opinion and according to the agricultural men who are carrying on this project, it will increase in value in the next 12 months at least as much as the appropriations we make this year. I have no interest in it other than an interest in our country and servicemen. I am one of the four Members of Congress who went to California to investigate the guayule rubber program. There were two Republicans and two Democrats. Every one of us is a pretty close penny pincher, but we came back with a unanimous report and recommendation that this guayule rubber project should be continued as previously planned by the House Agricultural Committee.

I urge you to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that even if the war should end in Europe this year, and we certainly hope and pray it will, this will not open the rubber plantations in the Pacific?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The distinguished gentleman from Florida is correct. There is not enough rubber, with all the rubber we are getting, to meet the essential needs much less all of the pressing demands. Furthermore, Bradley Dewey, the Rubber Director, has pointed out that the need for rubber immediately following the war will be greater than it is now. The president of the

Goodrich Rubber Co. has stated the same thing.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of those four Members of Congress who made a very searching and thorough investigation of the guayule project in California and the Southwest. Ordinarily we are quite interested in our own districts, in getting things for our own district, but guayule has no place in the Midwest, where I live. Therefore my interest is national in this problem.

We had some very interesting witnesses before us from the large rubber companies and every one insisted that this should be maintained for the present at least and for the next few years. We had men from the research departments, from the Navy Department, technicians, technical men, and rubber experts, all of whom said it is necessary that we maintain this guayule rubber project for the next couple of years anyway. They gave us some very pertinent reasons for continuing this project, which reasons I cannot reveal at this time on account of their military nature.

You talk about the cost of this. May I pay a little tribute here to the Forestry Service, under the very able direction of Mr. Paul Roberts, Rubber Director out there. They have done a very marvelous job. They have reduced the old process cost of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. many millions of dollars. They have just developed a continuous process in place of the old batch method, saving many, many thousands of dollars. In 1942 they employed 3,000 Mexicans out there to do hand weeding. In 1943 they only employed 300 to do the same job. They have also developed a process for destroying the weeds with an oil spray which does not hurt the guayule plant.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I hope the membership of this body will support the motion offered by the gentleman from California. Approximately 2 years ago it was my privilege to join with a subcommittee of a standing committee of this House which studied synthetic rubber. Testimony indicated the need for a synthetic rubber development in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, 1,800 pounds of rubber go into the construction of a 10-ton tank, more than 2,000 pounds go into the building of a Flying Fortress, and 150,000 pounds of rubber go into the fabricating of a warship. Rubber is a basic product in the material of fighting this mechanized conflict.

No one can say today during this debate, regardless of the utterances of Mr. Churchill, that this terrible struggle will end this year or next year. As Members of this legislative body we should do all that we can to see that there is a continuous flow of rubber products for the successful prosecution of the hard fighting yet to come.

I disagree vigorously with any man or any group in America who says now, as they have been saying, that after we have built our synthetic rubber industry in this country, when the war is over we should scrap it. I believe this Congress in its wise deliberations will deal with that problem sensibly at the proper time.

We must never again become dependent on foreign sources for rubber. No monopoly should exist, as it did prior to our entrance into the battle, when this country had no alternative but to buy from the British and Dutch. We paid the price, whatever it was at the time, for the rubber products or crude rubber shipped here from abroad. We can improve, and if necessary expand, our synthetic production to insure adequate supplies for the duration of the war, and for the increased peacetime consumption.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that due to the limitations imposed by the House in reference to the meeting of the House Military Affairs Committee today, at the request of the War Department I have called a meeting of that committee for 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. I hope that all members will be on hand at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning at that meeting.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

THE GUAYULE APPROPRIATION

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, when this House voted to strike from the agricultural appropriation bill the funds to carry the guayule project on to completion and orderly liquidation, several of us on this floor pointed out that such a step, in our judgment, was an error. Not only had the Office of the Rubber Director stated that we still faced an acute rubber shortage in this country but, at the time the appropriation was cut out, a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture had been authorized to investigate the whole guayule situation and was planning an inspection trip to the experimental station at Salinas, Calif.

What is the situation today? Let us review that situation briefly. The Senate committee, after checking the facts, decided that it was a wise course to reinsert the funds for continuation of the guayule work and for its orderly liquidation over a period of years, as provided in the original appropriation bill. The Office of the Rubber Director remains of the opinion that we continue to face a rubber shortage, and certainly the tons which will be made available from this experiment should be harvested. Finally, the special subcommittee of the House Agricultural Committee has visited the project, has made a thorough study into the whole situation, and has come to the unanimous conclusion that the appropriation for guayule should be retained. Certainly, on the basis of all the evidence we have, including the recommendation of our own subcommittee, we should reinsert this appropriation.

It is needless for me to recite the history of the guayule program again to the membership of this House. That has been done several times on this floor, by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], by myself, and by others. However, there are two or three points of special importance to which I should like once more to direct your attention.

The guayule project was an experiment. The need for knowledge about all aspects of it was tremendous. The scientific work which has taken place thus far has been in a sense preliminary to any later raising and processing of the shrub. Because of this fact, expenses have been higher than one would logically expect them to be from this point on. It is not fair, therefore, to judge the cost of producing guayule on the basis of the scientific groundwork which has thus far been laid. Experiments are continuing at the large station at Salinas; experiments in new strains and in new extraction processes which will provide the basis for lower and lower costs and for more profitable methods of production. Certainly it would be foolish suddenly to terminate this work, after we have already invested millions of dollars in it, just when the benefits of all the preliminary work are about to be realized.

We do not know how long this war is going to continue, especially the far eastern phase of it. It was from the Far East that the major portion of our natural rubber was obtained before Pearl Harbor. How long it will be before we can again get a normal supply from that source is problematical. Is it not common sense to hang on to what we have and to what will soon be available through guayule production? Is it not common sense also to carry through to completion the experimental work so that in case of future emergencies we shall have the knowledge necessary for providing a domestic rubber reserve?

This is a matter which is by no means limited to a single district or to a single State; it is Nation-wide in its importance and in its implications. I hope very sincerely that this House will follow the recommendations of our own subcommittee and the example of the Upper House and will restore the funds for guayule to the appropriation bill.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for granting me the time to make this brief statement.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 13, 1944.*

GEORGE E. OUTLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believing that if at all possible America should never again find itself facing a shortage of strategic raw materials such as natural rubber, may I urge you to vigorously oppose amendment 41, emergency rubber of agricultural appropriation bill which provides final liquidation of the guayule rubber project by June 30, 1945. This is in disagreement with Senate version which contemplates continuation of project. House

amendment 41 also in disagreement with House approved amendment 42 emergency rubber appropriating $5,420,000 for expenditure in fiscal 1945 including the erection of one additional mill in 1945 and contemplates continuing the project and extracting the rubber over the next several years from the shrubs now in the plantations.

Nation's best informed rubber experts agree that shortage of natural rubber becoming more acute daily and that varying percentages of natural rubber necessary as mixture with synthetic to produce numerous essential rubber items. Guayule only available source for natural rubber production in America and with continued research which has already produced surprising results it would seem probable that natural rubber from guayule can be produced in America during post-war period at costs no higher than average of importations. During post-war period American agriculture likely to face most serious overproduction problems yet experienced when will greatly need tremendous expansion of new industries like guayule rubber. Indeed, abandonment and liquidation of this project during next fiscal year as specified in House approved amendment 41 might well prove national disaster if Pacific war long continued or certainly during post-war slump.

I am wiring you as a substantial farmer having studied and been interested in this guayule project for years. I am also manager of California Walnut Growers Association, one of Nation's largest farm cooperatives.

CARLYLE THORPE.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when the war opened we were unexpectedly short of many critical materials, one of which was rubber, because we had expected to be able to hold the East Indies.

This proposition first came before a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having to do with deficiencies and that committee, although appreciating the importance of developing a local source of crude rubber, was dubious about the expenditure of the enormous sum of money which would be required, with the prospects of so small a return in actual crude rubber tonnage. The committee would have rejected it even in that distressed time had it not been that one member of the committee at that time called attention to the fact that no one knew how long this war would last. Many men were saying it would be a 10-year war. Some said it might last a generation and, as he said, we might be referring 5 or 6 years from now to the current year as one of the early years of the war.

Upon the prospect of a long war, something like the chilling possibility of even a 10-year war, and only on that prospect, this committee finally agreed to start this ill-advised project. It was a great mistake. Practically every dollar we have put into it has been lost or wasted. Every dollar beyond liquidation we put into it from now on will be utterly wasted.

We are nearing the closing days of the war. We are going to have all the crude rubber we will need by next year.

As a result of our experience with this project the next time this matter came before the subcommittee they voted unanimously against giving it another penny.

Of course, we expect wastage in war, but this huge wastage at this time is unwarranted and unjustified. Not only did the Subcommittee on Deficiencies vote unanimously after a long study of over 2 years of this matter against appropriating a dollar for the purpose, but it was then referred to another subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, under the jurisdiction of my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], one of the most level-headed men who ever sat in this Congress. It was again given an impartial study.

We did not take into consideration the interest of some one section of the country or some individual district or some particular industry. We took into consideration the interest of the United States and the United States Treasury, and that committee also voted unanimously against putting another dollar into this program.

My friends, you will shortly be on your way to the hustings to give an account of your stewardship. Many of you will decry what you will term extravagant expenditure, high taxes, unnecessary Government activities, and bureaus, and your undying opposition to all of them. No one can go out and criticize unnecessary Government expenditure when he has voted for this unnecessary expenditure. No one can denounce large Government pay rolls when this amendment means more employees on the Government pay rolls in a useless waste of money. No one can complain about high taxes when this amendment will unnecessarily increase taxes. No one can condemn a multiplicity of Government activities when this amendment means continuing an unnecessary Government activity. If you expect to do any preaching in your campaign this fall now is the time to practice what you preach. And if there is any disposition to dispute that, you have the unanimous report of two different committees, both Democrats and Republicans, all of them testifying to the fact.

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

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

Mr. MAY. How did the thing get up to the floor of the House then?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Another body put it in.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would just like to point out for the information of the gentleman who previously addressed the House that, as far as my congressional district is concerned, there is not 1 acre of guayule in it, so I hope my attitude is as national as that of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have no interest in this matter other than the interest of every American citizen in our trying to do whatever is necessary to win the war, and at the same time conserving the financial resources of the Nation and preventing wasteful expenditures wherever that is possible.

The emergency rubber project has so far expended about $45,000,000. So far there have been processed 440 short tons of rubber. We are assured that if this program is continued in accordance with the motion made by the gentleman from California they will be able to process 700 short tons of rubber in the fall and winter of this year. You will find that information set out on pages 570 and following of the House committee hearings.

If you will examine those hearings—and I trust you may have the opportunity to do so before you vote to continue this wasteful expenditure—you will find that very little hope is offered for the production of rubber from this project to aid in the war program or, indeed, for several years after the probable end of the war by the experts who have testified before our subcommittee in regard to this matter.

The most optimistic prediction, as I recall—and the predictions have not always been in accord, even those made by the experts—is that if we continue the program for 7 years, ending in 1951, we will be able to secure by this expenditure of something over $5,000,000 a year, if we have good luck, 10,000 tons of rubber during the whole 7-year period, at an expenditure, in addition to the $45,000,000 which has already been spent, of about $35,000,000, or $3,500 a ton, or $1.75 a pound, for the rubber which it is hoped by the most optimistic might be recovered in the further prosecution of the program.

The estimate of the cost of producing rubber per pound has varied from $3, according to testimony given by Mr. Caswell before the deficiency subcommittee a couple of years ago, to estimates as low as 27 cents per pound by the most optimistic; that is, 27 cents per pound plus whatever may be obtained from the sale price of the rubber, which, of course, would run the price, according to this optimistic prediction, up to 50 or more cents per pound.

In 1932 natural rubber was being imported into this country and sold at 3 cents per pound. Guayule rubber contains 77 percent of the efficiency and value of this imported rubber. Of course, the 1932 prices were very low and probably much lower than would obtain under ordinary conditions. However, it is apparent, I think, that this is not an industry that can be maintained after the war, because the cost of the production of the rubber from guayule is so much greater than the cost of the importation of the much superior natural rubber that it would be impossible for such an industry to carry on in this country, unless the plan which has been formulated by some of the interested people, of having the Government guarantee the price of American-produced rubber at a level which will enable that rubber to compete with imported rubber, even though the cost of the imported rubber be only a fraction of the American-produced rub-

ber, is consummated. That is what they have in mind, to have the Government subsidize an American guayule rubber-producing industry. Some of the farmers in California have indicated their willingness to participate in this guayule program if they are subsidized in that way.

One thing is clearly apparent. The farmers of California have not been interested in the program as at present carried on. They demanded last year that the program be abandoned and that all of this fertile land which has been diverted to the production of the guayule shrub be restored to agriculture.

Mr. Jeffers, who was then Director of the emergency rubber-project set-up, transmitted his recommendation to the Congress that the program should be abandoned for the time being and the land restored to the farmers from whom it had been taken by purchase or by lease, for the production of essential agricultural commodities, and agreed that there was no excuse for the labor that was being used in the guayule-production project and the machinery which was being used being diverted from other uses more essential to the war.

Remember that last year they had first sent over an estimate of $56,000,000 for this project, but when Mr. Jeffers changed his mind and decided to turn these lands back to agriculture, they voluntarily reduced that estimate to $13,000,000, estimating that much because they thought they might not be able to turn back all of the 60,000 acres of land involved. They did, however, turn back 28,000 acres, leaving 32,000 acres still under Government control and use. Sixteen thousand acres of that 32,000 acres is irrigated land. Some of it, according to the hearings, is worth $800 per acre. It is exceedingly valuable land for agricultural production.

As I have pointed out, there is no chance of this program being of any benefit as far as the war effort is concerned. I think the backers of this project realize that fact. They are hoping that some kind of an industry may be set up which will be of use to agriculture after the war.

It is significant that after this program had been virtually abandoned last year they decided to engage in a different sort of activity. They have bought about 200 experimental plots in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. Apparently they located each of those plots close to a live chamber of commerce. The result has been that a tremendous interest has grown up in these several States in the attempt to develop an industry which might be of service to agriculture after the war.

I believe those who are leading the farmers and business bodies of those States to believe that that is possible are doing them a disservice instead of a service. I think that anyone who reads the hearings in relation to this subject matter must come to the conclusion that it is an absolute impossibility that any such industry should flourish after the war, and, further, that if it is carried on now it will be of very limited if any benefit whatever to the war program and certainly not of sufficient benefit to justify the expenditures involved.

If you want to continue to spend these large sums of money without appreciable result so far as the war program is concerned, that of course is your affair. I am merely expressing the views of the majority of the conferees in the hope that further wastage of funds in this activity may be prevented.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman, as I understood him, made the statement to the House from the hearings before his committee that on the basis of $5,000,000 a year for the next 7 years the estimated return of rubber would be only 10,000 tons.

Mr. TARVER. I think that is probably a somewhat optimistic prediction.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I have the figures the gentleman had before his committee, and they can be found in the hearings. At a steadily decreasing expenditure which will be less than $5,000,000 next year, less than $3,000,000 2 years hence, and down to $2,000,000 6 years hence, the estimated return in crude rubber will be 29,000 tons. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair and does not desire to leave the wrong figures before the House.

Mr. TARVER. I want to be fair, but I was giving to the gentleman the consensus of the experts who testified before our committee. I do not recall that any of the several witnesses who appeared insisted that 29,000 tons of rubber could be recovered. My recollection is, as I stated, that 10,000 tons was the more optimistic prediction.

Let me point this out. In order to recover 350 tons of rubber you have to set up a $500,000 mill. The estimate which is sought to be approved here contemplates the purchase of another mill. They have one with which they can process 350 tons. If you provide this money, they propose to build another one at a cost of $500,000 with which they can process an additional 350 tons.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

For every annual capacity production of 350 tons of rubber you will have to provide an additional mill at a cost of $500,000.

It is all right to say we need rubber. Of course, we need rubber. General Eisenhower in 1930—he was then a major of Infantry—made some investigation of the guayule rubber industry. His report is of no advantage as far as the present situation is concerned. In his report he points out that:

> The officers detailed on this inspection are not technically trained in rubber production. The inspection was for the purpose of gaining first-hand information of conditions as they now exist and impressions as to personalities—

And so forth. In his further report you will find that the general, then major, said that we ought to provide for a source of raw rubber in the event of possible trouble with Japan. He quoted almost entirely from officials of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. as to the prospects of this guayule experimentation, but he did recommend that it be continued. It was continued for 12 years by the Intercontinental Rubber Co. after that. They made a failure of it, then they got out and sold it to the Government at a big price. Now we are advised that they would not consider buying it back on any terms at all. They have washed their hands of it; they have gotten through with it.

The experimentation has been done. Everything that can be learned about making rubber from guayule has been learned. If on account of the activities of these chambers of commerce in California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona you want to continue a program here which offers no hope to them and less hope to the Nation, at an expense of some $5,000,000 plus per year, that of course is your responsibility. I am simply giving you my views as gathered from the evidence to which I have listened in connection with this matter.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the evidence taken before the gentleman's committee indicate what the cost of production of synthetic rubber is at the present time?

Mr. TARVER. It does, but I am unable to quote exactly the cost. It is of course very much less than the cost of the production of guayule rubber.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the evidence indicate what the cost of production of natural rubber that is being imported now from South America is in comparison with the cost of production of guayule rubber?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. That cost is very high. I may say to the gentleman, but so far as the war is concerned and war usage, it would not be a question in my mind of the cost of rubber which may be utilized during the war, but the point is that you cannot get any rubber out of this project to amount to anything during the war; 700 tons for this year, none last year, 440 tons in the winter of 1942–1943. There is no prospect of satisfying the need for rubber at any price out of this program.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. According to the way the hearings look to me, there are about 440 tons of rubber that might be harvested in the coming fiscal year. Is that about right?

Mr. TARVER. No. Four hundred and forty tons were harvested the first year of the program, none last year, and 700 tons will be harvested this fall and winter if we provide $500,000 to provide another mill.

Mr. TABER. Seven hundred tons would be 1,400,000 pounds. If $3,000,000 were appropriated, that would be a little over $2 a pound.

Mr. TARVER. It is more than $3,000,000, I may say to the gentleman from New York, because they are planning on using the $2,000,000 unexpended balance in addition to that, making the amount that they propose to use something over $5,000,000.

Mr. TABER. The amount that is directly appropriated would be $3,000,000, would it not?

Mr. TARVER. That is right. There is an unobligated balance of $2,000,000 which is available for expenditure, making the total amount in order to get 700 tons of rubber something over $5,000,000. I may say that with the appropriation as we carried it in the House bill they contemplated using the mill they have now and processing 325 tons, so we would get only 375 tons additional by the adoption of the gentleman's motion as far as this coming year is concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 108, noes 20.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground no quorum is present, and make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is 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 300, nays 43, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—300

Abernethy	Burchill, N. Y.	Dilweg
Allen, La.	Busbey	Dingell
Andersen, H. Carl	Butler	Dirksen
Anderson, Calif.	Byrne	Drewry
Anderson, N. Mex.	Camp	Dworshak
Andresen, August H.	Canfield	Eaton
Andrews, Ala.	Carlson, Kans.	Eberharter
Andrews, N. Y.	Carrier	Elliott
Angell	Carson, Ohio	Ellis
Arends	Carter	Ellison, Md.
Auchincloss	Case	Ellsworth
Baldwin, N. Y.	Chapman	Elston, Ohio
Barrett	Chenoweth	Engle, Calif.
Barry	Church	Feighan
Bates, Ky.	Clark	Fenton
Beckworth	Clason	Fernandez
Bender	Clevenger	Fisher
Bennett, Mich.	Cochran	Fitzpatrick
Bennett, Mo.	Coffee	Flannagan
Bishop	Cole, Mo.	Fogarty
Blackney	Cole, N. Y.	Fulmer
Bland	Compton	Gale
Bloom	Costello	Gallagher
Bolton	Cox	Gamble
Bradley, Pa.	Cravens	Gathings
Brehm	Crosser	Gavin
Brooks	Cunningham	Gearhart
Brown, Ga.	Curley	Gerlach
Brown, Ohio	Curtis	Gilchrist
Bryson	D'Alesandro	Gillespie
Buck	Davis	Gillette
Bulwinkle	Dawson	Gillie
	Day	Goodwin
	Delaney	Gordon
	Dewey	Gore
Gorski	Lesinski	Rowan
Gossett	Luce	Rowe
Graham	Ludlow	Russell
Grant, Ala.	McConnell	Sabath
Grant, Ind.	McCowen	Sadowski
Gregory	McGehee	Sasscer
Griffiths	McGregor	Satterfield
Gross	McKenzie	Sauthoff
Gwynne	McMillan	Scanlon
Hall, Leonard W.	Maas	Schiffler
Hancock	Madden	Schwabe
Hare	Mahon	Scott
Harness, Ind.	Manasco	Scrivner
Harris, Ark.	Mansfield, Mont.	Shafer
Hart	Marcantonio	Short
Hartley	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Hays	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hébert	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Hendricks	Merritt	Smith, Maine
Hess	Michener	Smith, Wis.
Hill	Miller, Conn.	Somers, N. Y.
Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.	Sparkman
Hobbs	Miller, Pa.	Spence
Hoch	Morrison, La.	Springer
Hoeven	Mott	Stanley
Hoffman	Mruk	Starnes, Ala.
Holifield	Mundt	Stefan
Holmes, Mass.	Murphy	Stevenson
Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Tenn.	Stigler
Hope	Murray, Wis.	Stockman
Howell	Myers	Sullivan
Hull	Newsome	Sumner, Ill.
Izac	Norman	Sumners, Tex.
Jackson	Norton	Talle
Jarman	O'Brien, Mich.	Thomas, N. J.
Jeffrey	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thomas, Tex.
Jenkins	O'Hara	Thomason
Jennings	O'Konski	Tibbott
Jensen	O'Toole	Tolan
Johnson, Anton, J.	Outland	Troutman
Johnson, Ind.	Patton	Vincent, Ky.
Johnson, J. Leroy	Peterson, Fla.	Vinson, Ga.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Philbin	Voorhis, Calif.
Johnson, Ward	Phillips	Vorys, Ohio
Jones	Pittenger	Vursell
Jonkman	Poage	Wadsworth
Judd	Poulson	Walter
Kearney	Powers	Ward
Kee	Pracht, C. Frederick	Wasielewski
Keefe	Pratt, Joseph M.	Weaver
Kefauver	Priest	Weichel, Ohio
Kelley	Ramey	Weiss
Keogh	Ramspeck	Welch
Kilday	Randolph	Wene
King	Rankin	West
Kinzer	Reed, Ill.	Wickersham
Kirwan	Richards	Willey
Kleberg	Rivers	Wilson
Kunkel	Riley	Winstead
Lane	Robertson	Winter
Lanham	Robsion, Ky.	Wolcott
Larcade	Rockwell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Lea	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolverton, N. J.
LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.	Woodruff, Mich.
LeFevre	Rolph	Worley
	Rooney	Wright
		Zimmerman

NAYS—43

Bates, Mass.	Kerr	Rohrbough
Beall	Knutson	Sheppard
Buffett	Lambertson	Slaughter
Burgin	McCormack	Smith, Ohio
Cannon, Mo.	McWilliams	Smith, W. Va.
Celler	Maloney	Snyder
Cooper	May	Sundstrom
Courtney	Monkiewicz	Taber
Crawford	Monroney	Talbot
Doughton	Norrell	Tarver
Durham	O'Brien, Ill.	Whittington
Folger	O'Neal	Wigglesworth
Forand	Ploeser	Woodrum, Va.
Johnson, Okla.	Rees, Kans.	
Kean	Robinson, Utah	

NOT VOTING—87

Allen, Ill.	Chiperfield	Fuller
Arnold	Colmer	Furlong
Baldwin, Md.	Cooley	Gibson
Barden	Dickstein	Gifford
Bell	Dies	Granger
Bonner	Disney	Green
Boren	Dondero	Hagen
Boykin	Douglas	Hale
Bradley, Mich.	Elmer	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Brumbaugh	Engel, Mich.	Halleck
Buckley	Fay	Harless, Ariz.
Burch, Va.	Fellows	Harris, Va.
Burdick	Fish	Heffernan
Cannon, Fla.	Ford	Heidinger
Capozzoli	Fulbright	Herter
	McLean	Price
	McMurray	Rabaut
	Magnuson	Reece, Tenn.
	Mansfield, Tex.	Reed, N. Y.
	Merrow	Sheridan
	Miller, Mo.	Smith, Va.
	Mills	Stearns, N. H.
	Morrison, N. C.	Stewart
	Murdock	Taylor
	O'Connor	Torrens
	Pace	Towe
	Patman	Treadway
	Peterson, Ga.	Whelchel, Ga.
	Pfeifer	White
	Plumley	Whitten

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Miller of Missouri.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 60: Page 67, line 18, beginning with the words *"Provided further"*, strike out the balance of line 18 and lines 19 to 25, and page 68, strike out lines 1 to 17, inclusive.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 60.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 60.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 60.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may have that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is not an individual in my congressional district affected by this amendment. I am simply trying to help out in a very difficult situation.

When this matter came before the House I analyzed the amendment and came to the conclusion that it denied to the people of the Agricultural Department the right of free speech and the right of petition. I concluded that the amendment and the Harness amendment should not be in the bill. There is not another appropriation bill which carries an amendment of this character nor one that ever did.

I consulted the Comptroller General to find out if my analysis was correct. I took the position that they could not pay the Department of Agriculture employees unless there was a clearance every month in the form of a statement or affidavit that the employee had not violated the provisions of this amendment. It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the employees of the Department of Agriculture are subject to the Hatch Act and also subject to the Corrupt Practices Act. Mr. Warren, Comptroller General, wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee in the Senate, advising him that it was his opinion that if the amendment stayed in the bill the disbursing officer would be required to have a clearance from every official and employee of the Department monthly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman certainly does not condone the action of these Triple A people out in the field who are trying to force the farmers to join programs they do not want to join in order to be deferred from the draft or to get any kind of rationed articles. Does the gentleman condone that practice?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will answer the gentleman in this way: I will do everything in my power to assist the gentleman and other Members of this House to bring about the discharge of any employee who is guilty of any of the charges that were made on this floor.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How are you going to do it any other way than we have provided in this bill? This has acted as a deterrent. You have not heard these complaints since we inserted this amendment in the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. You can do it under the Hatch Act.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No. You cannot reach them under the Hatch Act.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then place them under the Hatch Act. I will repeat what I said. I will do anything that I can to prevent any employee of the Department of Agriculture guilty of the charges that were made on the floor engaging in that kind of conduct and I will insist that they be discharged if they do. That answers the gentleman's question. But the gentleman has tried to meet this situation in a way that he is punishing 99 percent of the employees of the Department of Agriculture for the act of 1 percent. I understand this amendment was not recommended by the subcommittee. It was put in by the full committee when it considered the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. COCHRAN. I accept the correction. The gentleman should know. I do know that some members of the subcommittee are not in favor of this amendment and never were in favor of the amendment.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The Harness amendment was put in on the floor, because the House knew that it had to be done.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman; it was put in on the floor, but the original amendment was not put in on the floor. It was put in by the full committee.

Mr. TABER. It was put in by the subcommittee.

Mr. COCHRAN. All right, by the subcommittee. In any event, you place an amendment in this bill that is found in no other appropriation bill, and never was contained in any other appropriation bill. If any Member has a solution, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the motion.

As I said before, there is not a single individual in my district who is affected by this amendment. I am just trying to help out. I know the Comptroller General is greatly disturbed by this amendment. He told me he was.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We have had the Hatch Act in effect for how many years now?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know, but several years.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It has been on the statute books for at least 2 or 3 years, and yet this practice has been indulged in. We have proved it on the floor of this House. You cannot depend on the Hatch Act to stop it. This is the only means of stopping it, and if we leave this amendment in the bill, it will be stopped.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is the gentleman going to require 99 percent of the employees of the Department of Agriculture to make an affidavit every month in order to get their pay?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would rather have every employee of the Department of Agriculture make an affidavit every month than to permit them to continue to impose upon the farmers of the country as they have in the past.

Mr. COCHRAN. I heard the speech of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who stated that two employees of the Department had visited his district. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that the Appropriations Committee, with the chairman at the head of it, could not go to the Department of Agriculture and get the Secretary to stop the practice?

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that in my judgment, if what he says is true and has happened, it is the fault of the management of the agency, and that this amendment should be directed to the head of the agency, and he ought to be fired if he does not stop it. Do not deprive the employees of their rights simply because the management of the agency has failed to curb one or two employees who may have done wrong.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is my purpose now to analyze this amendment.

First, it prohibits any employees of the Department of Agriculture from engaging in any political activity or lobbying activity—including but not limited to making or soliciting contributions to campaign funds of political parties or to any organization, association, corporation, or individual for the purpose of aiding or influencing the election or defeat of any candidate for political office.

This goes so far that if an individual had a brother or sister employed by the Department of Agriculture and he or she was a candidate for any political office from constable up, it does not have to be a Federal office, that individual is prohibited from lending the relative any financial support or asking any individual to vote for the candidate. The activity would be confined solely to the vote of the employees.

Second. Further analyzing the part of the amendment that I have quoted, no official or employee of the Department of Agriculture could attend a Jackson Day or a Lincoln Day dinner, or any kind of a meeting where any part of the cost would divert to a political party, or to any organization or association that would be actively engaged in politics.

No official or employee of the Department would be permitted, under other provisions of this amendment, to contribute an article or write a letter to any newspaper or other publication expressing his or her views in reference to any candidate for any political office.

Further, there is a provision that prevents any employee of the Department taking any action whatsoever in reference to any legislation pending in Congress, be it an appropriation or any other kind of legislation.

There is another provision that prevents any employee from visiting a Member of Congress or talking to a Member of Congress over the telephone in reference to any matter in which he or she might be interested.

If this is not denying the right of petition to the officials and the employees of the Department, I do not know what the language means. The amendment is

so worded that unless a Member of Congress or a committee of Congress requested information from an individual in the Department, or the Department itself, the information could not be furnished.

The Harness amendment relates solely to per diem employees and provides that no part of the money can be used to pay them if personally, or by letter, he or she demands that a farmer join the A. A. A. program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity.

In view of what has been said by various Members of Congress relative to the activity of those in control of the A. A. A. program, I would not offer any objections to that proviso, but I do object to the general language that was placed in the bill by the committee, which covers every official and employee of the Department.

I cannot see how the House of Representatives can place such restrictions upon 99 percent of the employees of the Department of Agriculture simply to reach 1 percent whom they accuse of activities which the Harness amendment proposes to prohibit.

Freedom of expression and the right of petition are guaranteed by the Constitution and the House of Representatives should not attempt by legislation to set aside these guaranties.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this amendment when it was offered to the bill, and I see no reason for changing my views. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that the Hatch Act has not done the business. It was necessary to write this provision into the act in order to correct an evil that has been growing by leaps and bounds. Within the month I have had letters from farm constituents complaining that they could not get an allocation of sufficient gasoline, nor could they get tires, unless they agreed to join the Triple A and the program for crop control.

There is no question but what this provision should stay in the bill. If we vote to take it out, then we lay ourselves open to censure by those who believe that this Government should not be run by petty bureaucrats and crackpots.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the proviso for placing a restriction on political activities and lobbying activities on those who are on the Federal pay roll, particularly in the Department of Agriculture, was inserted in this bill by the subcommittee. It was approved by the full committee. It was approved by the action of the House.

The bill went to the Senate. This item was stricken from the bill by the Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations. It was reoffered on the Senate floor by Senator DANAHER in slightly revised form. It was voted down on the floor of the Senate—if I may trespass on the rules long enough to get this story before the House—on the 17th day of May, by probably a strict party vote, at least so the RECORD indicates. That is the whole story about this amendment.

Should it remain in the bill or should it be deleted? The chairman of our subcommittee offers a motion that the House further insist on its disagreement. That is the thing we should do. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] proposes that we recede and concur. In my judgment that is the thing we should not do.

If we are going to preserve clean politics and develop an atmosphere where we get away from pernicious political activities on the part of any person who has a vested interest in the Federal pay roll because he has a job, then there must be a restriction, similar to that proposed by the subcommittee.

The gentleman says that the Hatch Act applies. That statement was also made in another body. But let me point out to you that on the 6th day of January 1941, Mr. Mastin White, then Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, said:

> It is the opinion of this office, therefore, that the officers, committee members, and employees of the county agricultural conservation associations are not officers or employees of the United States within the meaning of section 9 of the Hatch Act.
>
> From this it would appear that the Hatch Act does not apply to all persons who serve in agricultural functions.

That is the Solicitor's opinion; not mine.

It occurs to me that there ought to be an interdiction on those political activities. We have restrictions, of course, on lobbying the Congress on appropriations, and that sort of thing. That act was put on the books long ago and it is known as the Antilobby Act. It was enacted after the First World War, when a rather surcharged pay-roll lobby attempted to persuade the Congress on every piece of legislation that came along. Too often it is freely violated. There have been some violations.

Here is a photostatic copy of a letter which our investigators obtained from the files of the Department of Agriculture pertaining to the dismissal of Mr. Schooler, regional director of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the west central region. He was fired by Chester Davis for those activities. In my office, too, is a file of photostats that we obtained from the Department of Agriculture which indicates many abuses, many meetings, many telegrams sent at Government expense, that seek either to persuade Congress to a course of action, or go into some kind of political activity against Members of this body.

If we are going to preserve clean politics, then obviously those who have that vested interest in the pay roll should, to some degree, at least, be restricted from operating as sort of a great governmental political machine. I know of no other way to do it effectively in the light of this opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture in 1941 than to retain this interdiction in the present bill.

That is the whole story in a nutshell. I hope that the proposal offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] will not prevail. I trust that the motion made by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, chairman of the subcommittee, will prevail, and that the House will insist, and that we get some kind of action on this problem.

An examination of the legislation which has been enacted over the years with respect to elections and the exercise of the voting right indicates the same common pattern, namely, the preservation of the voting right free from influence, domination, interference, or coercion. In fact, the language of the Hatch Act speaks of the right to choose officials without interference. The original Corrupt Practices Act under which candidates for Federal office must file statements of receipts and expenses and the inhibitions against contributions by corporations chartered under Federal law are all designed to keep our elections free and representative and uninfluenced by some dominating influence. In the light of that pattern, why should those who have an interest in the Federal pay roll and in the perpetuation of the administration which provided them with a job not come under some reasonable restriction so that pressure in the form of political activity cannot be exercised to influence the course of an election? This is the very theory of the Hatch Act and since it is impossible for this House to legislate in an appropriation bill, no other course is available than to provide a restriction on the appropriations whereby those engaged in such political activities are prevented from drawing pay out of the Federal Treasury.

When all is said and done, they are the recipients of public funds and, therefore, have no fair right to engage in that type of political activity which, by the letter and spirit of the Hatch Act, has been outlawed. They have their choice. They can leave the Federal pay roll if they like and become politically active. It does not restrict their right to vote; it does not restrict their right to talk politics privately and freely; but political activities in the accepted sense as interpreted by the Civil Service Commission are restricted. That is what this, in fact, does.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think this amendment is for the protection of a large group of people who do not care to be forced into political activity, which they have been, and I do not think that is an idle statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is exactly right. It is oftentimes so easy for one in a position of authority to impress his will on his subordinates. We can protect those people on the pay roll by preserving this interdiction. When the first vote comes on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, I hope that it will

be voted down and that we will maintain the committee's position.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the conferees on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that when the Hatch Act was before this House I voted against it and spoke against it. I thought at that time that it was one of the most peculiar pieces of demagoguery and hypocrisy that had ever been brought into this body. There is not a man in this body that some time or another in addressing the Kiwanis Clubs or high school graduation exercises has not said it is the duty of every citizen to participate in the politics of this country. Yet you would cut off a large segment of our population from taking part in the body politic. Why not cut out the farmers, who receive subsidies and other moneys from the Government? Why not cut out those people who work on the roads, who also receive their checks from the United States Treasury? Let us not adopt a holier-than-thou attitude. Let us be practical and give to every American citizen the right to have an active say in his own Government.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a single man or woman in this House who will condone the practice of some of the Triple-A agents in the field of saying to the farmers of this country, "If you want draft deferments or if you want a rationed article or commodity, you must join the Triple-A program whether you believe in it or not." That is reprehensible, and you agree with me when I say that. This amendment will stop that practice. If you want to protect this Triple-A program and the honest men and women who are participating in it, you had better go along with this amendment.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say for clarification that when the Senate struck out the so-called antilobby provision it also struck out the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana on the floor, which he refers to at the present time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this confined to the Triple A program?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then why does not the gentleman offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment and apply it to the Triple A alone?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This applies to the Triple A program in the Agricultural appropriation bill. It is the only way that I know you can reach it.

Mr. COCHRAN. On the other hand, you are penalizing every other employee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. You are not penalizing anyone unless they violate the law. My good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], awhile ago said, "Why do you want to penalize all of the employees of the Agricultural Department?" This does not do that at all. It is not going to penalize a single individual unless he indulges in the practice that we are denouncing here today.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman will make his amendment apply the Hatch Act to the people whom the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says are not covered, I will vote with him, but he is applying this penalty, which goes far beyond the Hatch Act as I understand it, to a group of people who the gentleman does not even claim have attempted to violate any regulation at all.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman is such an astute lawyer that he knows that statement is incorrect. He knows that this does not apply to anyone except that small group throughout the country who have been violating the law. The Triple A program has agents in every county in the United States. In the 10 counties that I represent, every county has an organization of the Triple A. Most of these men are good, honest, conscientious people who would not indulge in this practice. We have a few, however, in my district and in other districts, who have been forcing the Triple A program on unwilling farmers who apply for draft deferment and rationed farm machinery or gasoline. These are the men we want to reach by this amendment. We have taken it up with the heads of the agencies, as the gentleman from Missouri suggested awhile ago. They appear to be helpless in the matter. They say, "We did not know this was going on, but how are we going to stop it?" This amendment will stop it, and I hope you will vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the average man working for increased food production, and I do not care whether he is an A. A. A. man or any other man with an Agricultural Extension position, does not care to be mixed up in partisan politics. He may have his opinions and he is entitled to them just as much as anyone here has to his political opinions. The great majority of these men do not want to be involved in partisan politics. The reason I supported this measure when it was here on the floor before is that from my observation I am convinced that the little fellow does not care to be in politics. He has been following bad advice from a superior or from superiors.

Mr. Dodd has made every effort to prevent politics in his department. Mr. Evans, the A. A. A. Administrator before Mr. Dodd, was also opposed to political activities. A few men have no doubt become involved in political activities and have not cooperated with other Federal agencies working for increased food production.

What do you suppose is the reason given for noncooperation?

The answer every time—and I believe them, for they are men I have known—was that they got the order from on high, so they should not be criticized for doing something they had orders to do.

If you pass this amendment, these little fellows that are out in the byways and the byroads on the farms will not be forced by anyone in a higher office to do things and carry on political activities they do not want to carry on and in which they know they should not be engaged. For that reason, I hope we maintain the position the House took when this agricultural appropriation bill was up for consideration before.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say just a word for those Members of the House who are unfortunate enough to serve on the Committee on Appropriations? And may I say they have been particularly unfortunate in the last 2 years? Their task—always a difficult one—has been especially difficult during the War Congress when all nonwar expenditures were necessarily being reduced or discontinued. It is much easier to give everybody the appropriations they want. It is much more pleasant to be a good fellow and say, "Why, certainly, we will report out your appropriation. How much do you want?" than it is to be a grouch and be always saying, "No, we have to save some of the taxpayers' money. We cannot appropriate everything there is in the Treasury. We must somewhere at some time in some way exercise just a little economy."

That is the primary issue in this amendment. It was the elementary and unavoidable necessity of retrenching nonwar expenditures and reducing nonmilitary appropriations that brought about the situation giving rise to this provision in the bill.

The war has entirely changed our national fiscal system. Before the war when the United States was the richest nation on earth, with enormous resources and vast revenues and the American people entertained a great and growing interest in the social phases of government, we appropriated for all departments an ever-increasing flood of funds and contractual authority. Each year appropriations were higher and expenditures more lavish for innumerable new activities until the totals reached stupendous sums of money.

And every new agency and each additional activity created and financed grew like proverbial trees from little acorns. Each agency and every employee reached out constantly for more money, more authority, wider jurisdiction, more employees, and additional prerogatives. Government budgets mushroomed and pyramided and skyrocketed.

Even before the war we had begun to realize that this could not go on forever; that there must be a limit somewhere; but no stopping place could be found and taxes and expenditures raced each other until we were brought suddenly up against the necessity of diverting all energies and resources to arming the Nation for war. The first war need was money. And the first casualties of the war were the nonwar expenditures. Every expenditure not directly contributory to the war program was cut to the bone.

Of all the departments which had enjoyed rapid growth and expansion the Department of Agriculture was probably the most favored. And naturally when it became necessary to retrench civil expenditures the budget of the Department of Agriculture was decreased in proportion to its previous expansion. The total appropriation for the Department of Agriculture at its highest was in excess of $1,000,000,000 per annum. In cash appropriation it is now about half that amount. We made the cut regretfully, but it was inevitable. In the greatest war in history, with the survival of our form of government at stake, guns and planes and tanks and ships came first.

But the employees in the Department did not take kindly to the reduction in their appropriations and the curtailment of their activities. They not only protested but they organized and they organized for political activity.

They sent three men over my district, Victor M. Robb, Paul Dubboert, and one other whose name I have forgotten. These three men traveled over my district on Government pay and at Government travel expense and contacted the agricultural committeemen of the district. They told them I was working against the farmers' interest; that I was trying to destroy the A. A. A. and the F. S. A.; that I was the greatest enemy of the farmer had in Congress.

Such efforts at political activity originating here in Washington—these three men said they were acting under orders from their superiors—strike at the foundation of representative government. They threaten the most jealously guarded prerogative of the Congress, the control of the national purse strings. Whenever a Government department or bureau or other agency can threaten or coerce or intimidate Members of Congress to the extent of dictating their own appropriations, our form of government is in danger. And that is exactly what they were trying to do. These men did not know me personally. I never saw them to my knowledge. I had had no correspondence with them. They were civil-service employees of the Department of Agriculture. Their only information was secured from an order issued by someone here in the Department of Agriculture in Washington to proceed, at Government expense, to bring political influence to bear on me at home to force me to increase departmental appropriations.

The power of such a political organization can be understood when it is remembered that these men have represented the Government in making loans and grants of Federal money to a large part of the people of the average congressional district. They appeal to the beneficiaries of their largess and to their hope of future loans and grants. No more potent political machine can be devised.

As explained when this provision in the bill was last before the House, I did not draw it. I did not suggest it. But as it is now under consideration I give you my own experience for what it is worth. It is of no personal consequence to me. The people at home know, and the Members of this House know, my attitude toward agriculture. And the efforts of these three industrious gentlemen fell on barren soil. But that was not their fault. It was not the fault of the organization here in the Department which directed their efforts. This paragraph in the bill will discourage such activities, will protect Congressmen when they consider it necessary to reduce expenditures or deny new appropriations.

This provision has the unanimous approval of the subcommittee and the whole Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, told me just now that he put the question but did not vote for it. He did not vote against it. An attempt was made to take this clause from the bill when it was last before the House. Another attempt is now being made to take it from the bill. To take it from the bill would be to encourage Government employees to organize and intimidate Members of Congress and dictate the amount of the funds which will be turned over to them for their expenditure. And no department of the Government has ever yet been given as much money as it wanted.

I ask the Members to support the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations; to support the action of the House when it passed this bill and to support the managers on the part of the House on the conference committee. This proposition has received an overwhelming majority every time it has been voted on at every stage of its consideration. I trust the House will vote down the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and support the committee.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY].

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, the practices which this amendment is designed to curb are current today. Last Friday I placed in the RECORD a written statement signed by 63 Montgomery County, Ohio, farmers, which states affirmatively over their signatures that representatives of the A. A. A. had suggested to them openly that it would be easier to obtain deferments for their sons, and that they would get greater allowances of gasoline with which to operate their farms and farm equipment, if they joined this organization. With that statement I placed in the RECORD 3 affidavits, signed by some of these farmers who used the names of the A. A. A. representatives who were guilty of these practices. They appear on page A3073 of the Appendix of the RECORD. It is high time that this House affirmatively and definitely stopped these practices.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make my position on this matter perfectly plain. I voted for the Hatch Act and I still believe that any employee of this Government who expects to make a career of the Government service must give up some political rights. I would be perfectly willing to have the Hatch Act extended, or an amendment added to this bill which provided that any employees who are not covered by the Hatch Act, as alleged by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be covered by it. But the objection which I have to the provision under discussion is that it is undertaking to legislate on an appropriation bill about a matter, the jurisdiction of which belongs to the legislative committees; that it is penalizing employees of the Department of Agriculture who are not involved in the matter. The Committee on Appropriations has a staff and has the funds with which to hire investigators. If any such things have happened as have been alleged here, why do they not investigate it and why do they not present the names of the guilty parties to the Secretary of Agriculture for dismissal from the service? That is the procedure which ought to be followed by the Committee on Appropriations instead of bringing in a blanket indictment against some thirty-odd thousand employees and presenting an administrative problem which the Comptroller says cannot be worked out. That is the orderly procedure and that is what this House ought to do.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this problem came up before one of the committees of which I am a member, in

connection with O. P. A. regulations. We discussed the matter with the top officials of the Office of Price Administration, who, in turn, made their own investigation and found that these very things of which we are complaining had been happening, following which they issued definite orders against the continuation of such practices, but they have been continued, notwithstanding, in many instances.

So there is sufficient evidence these practices have been followed and are still occurring regularly in the United States.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to say to the gentleman and to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that I turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture at least 50 complaints with the names of the individuals, and as far as I know, nothing has ever been done about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have yielded myself this time in order that I may endeavor to make clear for the RECORD my individual position. Members of the House will understand that in offering the motion to insist upon disagreement to the Senate amendment I was acting by direction of the House conferees, as is my duty. However, there is nothing contained in legislative ethics which will prevent me expressing my individual opinion. My fellow conferees have not hesitated to do that in the consideration of several matters in connection with this conference report, and strange as it may seem, in connection with one of the votes on an amendment in disagreement, I was the only member of the House conferees who voted to sustain the position of the House conferees. So at this time I desire to explain my position personally, and not as chairman of the conferees, with regard to the pending motion.

I fear this disagreement between the House and Senate over this political amendment may delay the enactment of the Agricultural Department appropriation bill. I do not believe the Senate will recede from the attitude which it has assumed, and has assumed by a very considerable majority. The question, therefore, presents itself——

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield at this time. I will yield later. The question presents itself as to whether or not we should persist in the difference of opinion between the two bodies over this amendment which, in my judgment, is of minor importance, and thereby delay and perhaps make impossible the enactment before the proposed recess of the Congress of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

In my judgment it would be better for each of the bodies to yield something on this question rather than to bring about that result.

As far as I am individually concerned I voted against the Hatch Act. I did not approve of the Hatch Act at the time of its passage and I do not approve of it now. I do not believe that Government employees should use the time for which they are paid by the Government in any sort of political activity or in endeavoring to solicit the making of appropriations by the Congress. That latter type of activity has been for years expressly prohibited by law, and is a criminal offense. That law is applicable to all Government employees. But, when a Government employee has finished the discharge of his duties his time is his own, and I do not feel that he should be prohibited from the expression of his opinion on any political question which might exist or be under discussion in his locality.

I seem to remember a few years ago when the Republicans were in power that the outstanding exponents of Republican doctrines in my district were the Republican postmasters, both when on duty and when off duty. They were agitating on behalf of Republican principles and Republican candidates. It has only been since the Democrats have assumed charge of the Government that it has been made a crime or an offense justifying removal from office for an employee of the Government to take any interest in political matters.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

As far as the Harness amendment is concerned, if the facts upon which that amendment is based can be shown, those facts should be dealt with in some way, because that amendment was based on the idea that while men were engaged in the performance of their duties they were making representations which were unauthorized in order to force the farmers of the country to go into the farm program. I do not agree with the statement that those charges have been proven. Except for the submission of a few postal cards and letters to the House of Representatives, they have not been proven. I feel there ought to be some way to deal with offenders of that type, if they do exist. And perhaps there may be a few in the country somewhere. There should be some way of dealing with them otherwise than by putting a restriction on this bill that would require the submission of a certificate every month by every employee of the Department of Agriculture as to his not having been guilty of this practice, before he can be paid his monthly salary.

I have submitted this motion to insist on disagreement with the Senate amendment. I do not intend to vote for my own motion, because I have a right to disagree with the attitude taken by the House conferees. I believe the House should recede from its position in this matter and let this bill go to the White House, as it will in a day or so if the motion of the gentleman from Missouri shall be agreed to. But, if you prefer to stay here and fight all summer over what is purely a political question, of course, that is a matter of your own judgment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman feel that if we have a roll call and go on record very definitely against proceeding under this amendment, the Senate will realize the importance of it and will yield?

Mr. TARVER. On the contrary I do not believe the Senate will yield on this amendment as at present written, in any event. I hope the Senate will not. I opposed the Harness amendment as strongly as I could when it was adopted in the House. I believe its adoption in its present form is exceedingly unwise, but if the House should further insist, if it should adopt my motion to insist on disagreement with the Senate amendment, it is my hope that we may be able to work out some modified form of this language which might meet the approval of both bodies. I think the simplest and fairest way to deal with the matter would be to agree to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. I do not believe there is any reason for applying a different rule to the employees of the Department of Agriculture from that applied to employees in all the other different branches of the Government.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. It is significant to note that the Department of Justice reports with reference to the Hatch Act that grand juries refused to bring true bills and petit juries refused to convict. There have only been five convictions, three resulting in suspended sentence, one resulting in 1-cent fine and 1 hour in custody of the marshal, and only one case ended with the imposition of a fairly significant sentence. Those are the only five convictions which were had during the whole period of the life of the Hatch Act.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, we cannot repeal the Hatch Act here, but it does seem to me, since you have the Hatch Act on the books, and since you have on the books a statute making it illegal for the time of a Government employee on duty to be used in soliciting appropriations from the Congress or in political activity whether on duty or not, that that should be sufficient, unless you want to apply a different rule to all other employees of the Government than to the employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. How would the gentleman be able to take this back to conference to work out a modification, which he suggests, unless we vote down the preferential motion?

Mr. TARVER. I say in my judgment the House ought to adopt the motion, but if it does not adopt that motion, then I hope we may be able to work out in conference, some modified form of the language of the two provisions which are here in dispute, which will meet with the approval of both bodies. I think the best way to end the matter would be to adopt the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TARVER] has expired.

Does the gentleman from Kansas insist on his request that the question be divided?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Shall the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 60?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 50; noes 137.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 219, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—123

Allen, La.	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gore	O'Brien, Mich.
Barden	Gorski	O'Neal
Barry	Gossett	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Outland
Beckworth	Green	Patton
Bland	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
Bloom	Hare	Price
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Priest
Bradley, Pa.	Hays	Ramspeck
Brooks	Hendricks	Randolph
Brown, Ga.	Hoch	Rankin
Bryson	Holifield	Richards
Bulwinkle	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Burchill, N. Y.	Jackson	Rooney
Burgin	Jarman	Rowan
Camp	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sadowski
Capozzoli	Kee	Sasscer
Celler	Kefauver	Scanlon
Chapman	Kelley	Sikes
Clark	Kerr	Smith, W. Va.
Cochran	King	Snyder
Coffee	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Colmer	Lane	Sparkman
Cooley	Lesinski	Spence
Cooper	Lynch	Sullivan
Courtney	McCormack	Tarver
Crosser	McGehee	Thomas, Tex.
D'Alesandro	McKenzie	Vincent, Ky.
Davis	McMillan	Voorhis, Calif.
Dawson	Madden	Walter
Dingell	Mahon	Ward
Doughton	Maloney	Wasielewski
Durham	Manasco	Weaver
Eberharter	Marcantonio	Weiss
Fernandez	Merritt	Wene
Fitzpatrick	Murphy	Whittington
Flannagan	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Fogarty	Myers	Winstead
Folger	Norrell	Worley
Forand	Norton	Zimmerman

NAYS—219

Abernethy	Carlson, Kans.	Feighan
Andersen, H. Carl	Carrier	Fellows
Anderson, Calif.	Carson, Ohio	Fenton
Andresen August H.	Carter	Fisher
Andrews, Ala.	Case	Fulmer
Andrews, N. Y.	Chenoweth	Gale
Angell	Church	Gallagher
Arends	Clason	Gamble
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Gathings
Baldwin, Md.	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Barrett	Compton	Gerlach
Bates, Mass.	Costello	Gilchrist
Beall	Cox	Gillespie
Bender	Cravens	Gillette
Bennett, Mich.	Crawford	Gillie
Bennett, Mo.	Cunningham	Goodwin
Bishop	Curtis	Graham
Blackney	Day	Grant, Ind.
Bolton	Dewey	Griffiths
Brehm	Dilweg	Gross
Brown, Ohio	Dirksen	Gwynne
Buck	Drewry	Hall, Leonard W.
Buffett	Dworshak	Hancock
Burch, Va.	Eaton	Harness, Ind.
Busbey	Elliott	Hartley
Butler	Ellis	Hess
Canfield	Ellison, Md.	Hill
Cannon, Mo.	Ellsworth	Hinshaw
	Elston, Ohio	Hobbs
	Engle, Calif.	Hoeven
	Fay	Hoffman
	Fish	Holmes, Mass.
	Ford	Holmes, Wash.
	Fulbright	Hope
	Fuller	Howell
	Furlong	Hull
	Gibson	Jeffrey
	Gifford	Jenkins
	Granger	Jennings
	Hagen	Jensen
	Hale	Johnson, Anton, J.
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Johnson, Ind.
	Halleck	Johnson, J. Leroy
	Harless, Ariz.	Johnson, Okla.
	Harris, Va.	Johnson, Ward
	Hart	Jones
	Hébert	Jonkman
	Heffernan	Judd
	Heidinger	Kean
	Herter	Kearney
	Horan	Keefe
	Johnson, Calvin D.	Kilday
	Johnson, Luther A.	Kinzer
	Kennedy	Kleberg
	Keogh	Knutson
	Kilburn	Kunkel
	Kirwan	Lambertson
	LaFollette	Lanham
	Landis	Larcade
	Lemke	Lea
	Lewis	LeCompte
	Luce	LeFevre
	McCord	Ludlow
	McLean	McConnell
	McMurray	McCowen
	Magnuson	McGregor
	Mansfield, Tex.	McWilliams
	Merrow	Maas
	Mason	Mansfield, Mont.
	May	Martin, Iowa
	Michener	Martin, Mass.
	Miller, Conn.	Mason
	Miller, Nebr.	May
	Miller, Pa.	Michener
	Monkiewicz	Miller, Conn.
	Monroney	Miller, Nebr.
	Morrison La.	Miller, Pa.
	Mott	Monkiewicz
	Mruk	Monroney
	Mundt	Morrison La.
	Murray, Wis.	Mott
	Newsome	Mruk
	Norman	Mundt
	O'Brien, N. Y.	Murray, Wis.
	O'Hara	Newsome
	O'Konski	Norman
	Philbin	O'Brien, N. Y.
	Phillips	O'Hara
	Pittenger	O'Konski
	Ploeser	Philbin
	Poage	Phillips
	Poulson	Pittenger
	Powers	Ploeser
	Pracht, C. Frederick	Poage
	Pratt, Joseph M.	Poulson
	Ramey	Powers
	Reed, Ill.	Pracht, C. Frederick
	Rees, Kans.	Pratt, Joseph M.
	Rizley	Ramey
	Robertson	Reed, Ill.
	Robsion, Ky.	Rees, Kans.
	Rockwell	Rizley
	Rodgers, Pa.	Robertson
	Rogers, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.
	Rohrbough	Rockwell
	Rolph	Rodgers, Pa.
	Rowe	Rogers, Mass.
	Russell	Rohrbough
	Satterfield	Rolph
	Sauthoff	Rowe
	Schiffler	Russell
	Schwabe	Satterfield
	Scott	Sauthoff
	Scrivner	Schiffler
	Shafer	Schwabe
	Sheppard	Scott
	Short	Scrivner
	Simpson, Ill.	Shafer
	Simpson, Pa.	Sheppard
	Slaughter	Short
	Smith, Maine	Simpson, Ill.
	Smith, Ohio	Simpson, Pa.
	Smith, Wis.	Slaughter
	Springer	Smith, Maine
	Stanley	Smith, Ohio
	Stefan	Smith, Wis.
	Stevenson	Springer
	Stigler	Stanley
	Stockman	Stefan
	Sumner Ill.	Stevenson
	Sundstrom	Stigler
	Taber	Stockman
	Talbot	Sumner Ill.
	Talle	Sundstrom
	Thomas, N. J.	Taber
	Thomason	Talbot
	Tibbott	Talle
	Troutman	Thomas, N. J.
	Vinson, Ga.	Thomason
	Vorys, Ohio	Tibbott
	Vursell	Troutman
	Weichel, Ohio	Vinson, Ga.
	Welch	Vorys, Ohio
	West	Vursell
	White	Weichel, Ohio
	Wigglesworth	Welch
	Willey	West
	Wilson	White
	Winter	Wigglesworth
	Wolcott	Willey
	Wolfenden, Pa.	Wilson
	Wolverton, N. J.	Winter
	Woodruff, Mich.	Wolcott
	Woodrum, Va.	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Wright	Wolverton, N. J.

NOT VOTING—88

Allen, Ill.	Hale	Miller, Mo.
Arnold	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mills
Bell	Halleck	Morrison, N. C.
Boren	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Boykin	Harris, Va.	O'Connor
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Pace
Brumbaugh	Hébert	Patman
Buckley	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Burdick	Heidinger	Pfeifer
Byrne	Herter	Plumley
Cannon, Fla.	Horan	Rabaut
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calvin D.	Reece, Tenn.
Curley	Johnson, Luther A.	Reed, N. Y.
Delaney	Kennedy	Rivers
Dickstein	Keogh	Sabath
Dies	Kilburn	Sheridan
Disney	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Dondero	LaFollette	Starnes, Ala.
Douglas	Landis	Stearns, N. H.
Elmer	Lemke	Stewart
Engel, Mich.	Lewis	Sumners, Tex.
Fay	Luce	Taylor
Fish	McCord	Tolan
Ford	McLean	Torrens
Fulbright	McMurray	Towe
Fuller	Magnuson	Treadway
Furlong	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Gibson	Merrow	Wheichel, Ga.
Gifford	Mason	Whitten
Granger	May	Scott
Hagen	Michener	Scrivner
	Miller, Conn.	Shafer
	Miller, Nebr.	Sheppard
	Miller, Pa.	Short
	Monkiewicz	Simpson, Ill.
	Monroney	Simpson, Pa.
	Morrison La.	Slaughter
	Mott	Smith, Maine
	Mruk	Smith, Ohio
	Mundt	Smith, Wis.
	Murray, Wis.	Springer
	Newsome	Stanley
	Norman	Stefan
	O'Brien, N. Y.	Stevenson
	O'Hara	Stigler
	O'Konski	Stockman
	Philbin	Sumner Ill.
	Phillips	Sundstrom
	Pittenger	Taber
	Ploeser	Talbot
	Poage	Talle
	Poulson	Thomas, N. J.
	Powers	Thomason
	Pracht, C. Frederick	Tibbott
	Pratt, Joseph M.	Troutman
	Ramey	Vinson, Ga.
	Reed, Ill.	Vorys, Ohio
	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
	Rizley	Weichel, Ohio
	Robertson	Welch
	Robsion, Ky.	West
	Rockwell	White
	Rodgers, Pa.	Wigglesworth
	Rogers, Mass.	Willey
	Rohrbough	Wilson
	Rolph	Winter
	Rowe	Wolcott
	Russell	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Satterfield	Wolverton, N. J.
	Sauthoff	Woodruff, Mich.
	Schiffler	Woodrum, Va.
	Schwabe	Wright
	Scott	
	Scrivner	
	Shafer	
	Sheppard	
	Short	
	Simpson, Ill.	
	Simpson, Pa.	
	Slaughter	
	Smith, Maine	
	Smith, Ohio	
	Smith, Wis.	
	Springer	
	Stanley	
	Stefan	
	Stevenson	
	Stigler	
	Stockman	
	Sumner Ill.	
	Sundstrom	
	Taber	
	Talbot	
	Talle	
	Thomas, N. J.	
	Thomason	
	Tibbott	
	Troutman	
	Vinson, Ga.	
	Vorys, Ohio	
	Vursell	
	Weichel, Ohio	
	Welch	
	West	
	White	
	Wigglesworth	
	Willey	
	Wilson	
	Winter	
	Wolcott	
	Wolfenden, Pa.	
	Wolverton, N. J.	
	Woodruff, Mich.	
	Woodrum, Va.	
	Wright	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McMurray for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Brumbaugh against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Miller of Missouri against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. Hale against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Elmer against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Fuller against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Engel of Michigan against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Arnold against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Landis against.

Mr. Torrens for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Halleck against.

General pairs:

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Lemke.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Chiperfield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 79, line 22, insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws, (2) loans to needy individual farmers, (3) grants, and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, $28,265,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $57,000 for compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects, under his supervision, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

"In making any grant payments under this act the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability

or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $96,710,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at not to exceed the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion, or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agricultural commodities.

"The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation, shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1945 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In the first paragraph of said amendment, strike out the sign and figure "$28,265,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,000,000."

In the third paragraph of the amendment, strike out the sign and figure "$96,710,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. This is a very important matter and a quorum should be present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. TARVER. 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. 101]

Andrews, N. Y.	Hale	Merrow
Arnold	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Mo.
Auchincloss	Halleck	Mills
Bell	Hare	Morrison, N. C.
Boren	Harless, Ariz.	Mundt
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Murdock
Bradley, Mich.	Harris, Va.	Murray, Tenn.
Bradley, Pa.	Hart	O'Connor
Brumbaugh	Hartley	O'Konski
Buckley	Hébert	Patman
Burdick	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Byrne	Heidinger	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Herter	Phillips
Chiperfield	Holifield	Plumley
Cooley	Jennings	Rabaut
Crosser	Johnson, Calvin D.	Reece, Tenn.
Dawson	Johnson, J. Leroy	Reed, N. Y.
Delaney	Johnson, Luther A.	Rizley
Dies	Kennedy	Robinson, Utah
Dirksen	Keogh	Sheridan
Disney	Kilburn	Smith, Ohio
Dondero	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Douglas	LaFollette	Snyder
Elmer	Landis	Stearns, N. H.
Engel, Mich.	Lemke	Stewart
Fay	Lewis	Taylor
Fish	Luce	Tolan
Ford	McCord	Torrens
Fulbright	McLean	Towe
Fuller	McMurray	Treadway
Furlong	Magnuson	Wadsworth
Gale	Mansfield, Tex.	Whelchel, Ga.
Gibson		White
Gifford		Whitten
Granger		
Hagen		

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Three hundred and twenty-one Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time we have talked about Farm Security this year. A year ago you remember the trouble we had when we asked for a rule. The Committee on Agriculture went to the Rules Committee and asked that we not have a rule waiving points of order.

We have been legislating for a great many things for years that we had no authority for. Let me say incidentally right here, we have not yet had authorization for 40 different things that we passed in March. The Pace bill is not a law yet. Now, when this year came around we went into hearings on agriculture, and just before we brought our bill to the House we had the Pace bill which did authorize many of these projects—all but Farm Security.

That was left out because there was going to be a special bill dealing with that from the Cooley subcommittee. About 15 months ago they started their investigation and I understand that only last Saturday did the committee report a bill. That is the first Cooley bill that has been reported out of the whole Committee on Agriculture authorizing Farm Security. There is nothing in the law yet that has authorized it. The Pace bill went to the Senate. We did not put anything in the House appropriation bill for Farm Security; the Senate did; they put in $97,000,000 for new loans with $28,000,000 for administration the day the Pace bill conference was agreed to. The Pace bill came back here and once or twice the Pace bill conference committee report was withdrawn from the House and taken back in to conference. I was trying to follow it as well as I could, keeping in touch with the chairman. I happened to be off the floor one afternoon, June 1, and it was brought in here 2 days before both whip notices said it was going to be called up and after a point of order was sustained against the conference report. The Clerk read the Farm Security amendment which did not mention Farm Security by name. Nobody said it was Farm Security, nobody asked what it was. At the time the Clerk read it nobody said anything and the Speaker put the motion and it was carried. More was said for congressional pensions than F. S. A. That was the first authorization Farm Security ever had in its whole existence and that was secured without one Member's saying one word for it or anybody's asking a question as to what it contained.

The school lunch was the next amendment read and it was discussed an hour and passed. It concealed Farm Security.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was on the floor at the time that provision was up for consideration. I did not say anything about it. There was probably a good reason why many other Members did not say anything about it, particularly members of the Committee on Agriculture. As the gentleman knows, the Committee on Agriculture through a subcommittee, called the Cooley committee, conducted an investigation of the Farm Security Administration having in mind to ascertain some of the facts regarding Farm Security, particularly with reference to communistic activities and projects. The Cooley committee reported a bill to the full committee. This bill created a new organization called the Home Farmers' Loan Corporation, setting up a tremendous corporation with

nearly a billion dollars' worth of assets. A good many of us on the committee felt we were not in favor of creating such a corporation at this time and would not support it until there was a complete revamping of the whole farm credit structure, which the committee is going to undertake. So we thought it best to permit the continuance of Farm Security for another year with appropriations so there would not be any lapsing of time in the operation of this type of direct lending.

I want to point out to the gentleman that I believe the appropriation for land purchases and administrative expense is far in excess of what it should be; the amounts are excessive. For instance, last year Farm Security spent around $28,000,000 to administer about $100,000,000, going to pay salaries and traveling expenses, automobile upkeep, and so forth. The people who are to be benefited are not getting anything out of this appropriation. So there was a curtailment of the administrative activities.

But, getting back to the point to which the gentleman has referred, let me say that if the Farm Security could be continued for another year with adequate appropriations to take care of maximum needs I believe it would be satisfactory, because we believe that inside of another year we shall be able to establish a division in the Farm Security Administration to take care of this credit for rural farmers who are not able to get credit elsewhere.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I thank the gentleman. Last spring we were promised this Cooley bill and we thought we should have our day in court here where the whole matter of authorization could be thrashed out without there being involved any question of funds, but we were denied everything that had been promised us. It was left out of the first Pace committee bill because it was feared it would make a controversial matter. We were expecting it in a separate bill and I looked forward to it with a lot of interest because we were going to have a real show-down on it. The fact is we have not had it at all. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], called up a conference report the other day and the House concurred in an amendment. Nobody asked what the amendment was, either. It seems the House just dropped into a lethargy. On the other hand, that last amendment was a very vital socialized medicine amendment and nobody asked a word about it: under that set-up the people cannot even choose their own doctor. That amendment they offered and it was agreed to by the House without anybody's seeking to modify it.

I just want to show you what has happened to Farm Security, how it was eased along. The Senate put it in. The House conferees without any authority from the House yielded. The House itself had left it entirely out, expecting an authorization bill. But it was brought back in this way and was authorized. The Pace committee yielded to the Senate, when they were helpless before their own larger committee.

I am opposed to the whole proposition of Farm Security. It should be liquidated. It was born of Tugwell; it has been communistic all through. The last Administrator, Mr. Baldwin, before the present one, now is the assistant director of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee with Sidney Hillman. A man who used to be the head of N. Y. A. went into the Farmers' Union as an organizer, an organization I used to be proud of and was an active member of and held offices in, but which is dominated nationally today by the same influence, the C. I. O. You got this letter the other day telling you what you ought to do about this Farm Security. They want to put back the Senate figures. The C. I. O. did not do so well in Maine yesterday. I understand our good colleague was renominated 10 to 1 against the C. I. O. candidate who opposed him in the Republican primary; so we should not be worried about that.

In this letter they are concerned about the returning soldier to the farms—they are interested only in driving the farm wedge.

Another thing: We provided for the liquidation of 150 communistic projects in Farm Security. They said our mandate would be carried out. My chairman will probably say something about that, because he knows it is true that they have not been liquidated. Our orders have not been carried out. They do not intend to liquidate any communistic project, although they got extra money to do it. There is a new man connected with this outfit, a former colleague of ours, an outstanding fellow, but I cannot understand why we have not had some liquidation in the last year or more under the authorization of the Congress. It just shows their determination to do this thing. We know how they handled the labor proposition for the farmers a couple of years ago, how the C. I. O. got their fangs into that thing and mussed it up with Farm Security hanging onto it. This thing was put through as a twin of W. P. A. when the farmers needed help and everybody else needed jobs. I think it is perfectly ridiculous now.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The next amendment provides $20,000,000 to buy farms for tenant farmers in a period of war and inflation—$20,000,000 to buy land. Not a dollar should be spent to encourage anybody to buy land at this time at inflated values. They talk about rehabilitation. Nobody needs rehabilitation today out here on these farms. They are doing pretty well as they are. The only argument they have left under the present war situation is to produce more food. I deny that it has this result. I have not time to go into that. I do not think it provides a bit more food to make these rehabilitation loans to farmers.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. We are likely to get confused on this. Rehabilitation was part of our basic law under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act. That and rehabilitation loans are a part of our basic law. It comes under the Bankhead-Jones Purchase Act.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. It is part of our basic law.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. There never was a law for the other part of it.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I will say, however, that much of it has been maladministered. To that extent I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The Bankhead-Jones matter is a land-purchase proposition. There was no legal authority and there never was any law passed that created these other things that have been set up by Executive order and carried on for years. The only authorization has been this left-handed authorization which we gave it on June 1.

Mr. Speaker, I am in the position of opposing the gentleman's motion to recede with an amendment, which provides for a lesser sum. I am opposed to extending the whole proposition now, including the pernicious activities of the C. I. O. associated with Farm Security, which runs through the whole proposition.

Let us have a show-down on this proposition today. Let us vote against the thing that will even reduce, then try to sustain the position of the House that we have not authorized anything for this purpose and maintain our position.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the House Committee on Agriculture has recently reported a bill which we hope to bring before the House at some time in the early future. In that bill we have provided for an expeditious and orderly liquidation of all of the objectionable projects which have been administered by the Farm Security Administration and we have likewise provided for abolishment of all of the Federal lending agencies which are engaged in making direct loans to low-income farmers.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. But you have been 15 months getting it done and selling it to the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I grant that we have been several months in preparing the bill but I think that the gentleman should be willing to go along in a reasonable way with these low-income farmers until Congress has an opportunity to consider and adopt basic legislation. That is all the gentleman from Georgia has in mind doing, that is, holding the agency together and protecting the interests of the Government as well as these low-income families pending final determination by the Congress.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I understand the committee the gentleman speaks of had hearings all last summer, and traveled all over the country at considerable ex-

pense. Here it is the following June and only last Saturday they brought a bill in.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It was not the fault of the Cooley committee that it was so long in bringing out a bill.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It was the fault of the Committee on Agriculture which made the complaint about lack of authorization before the Rules Committee. The Cooley committee was denied support from the Agricultural Committee up until last Saturday when they reported this bill. There is no more excuse for rehabilitating people today in wartime, when jobs are plentiful and wages good. Prices are good. A chairman of our Appropriation Committee used to say if the House of Representatives is not going to hold things down, if it is not going to watch the Federal Treasury, who is going to do it? If you Members who are going into the campaign shortly, Republicans and Democrats alike, maintaining that you are for abolishing bureaus, pray tell me when you are going to begin if you do not begin on Farm Security? That is one that is due to go.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I can agree with so much that has been said by my genial associate from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. There is, however, a different situation with which we must contend at the moment. Farm security has outstanding hundreds of millions of dollars in loans. That is money which belongs to the taxpayers of the United States of America that has been loaned to Farm Security clients. Those funds must be administered. We can throw Farm Security out of the window today, but if we do, this function of administering those loans, collecting the principal and interest installments thereof, must be handled by some agency of the Government. You might transfer it to the Farm Credit Administration, but that would require legislation, and that is not before us today. We can either maintain F. S. A. for another year or create a new agency to perform this function.

What is before us is simply this: It is a proposal to carry this operation on for one more year, and in carrying it on for another year, we have undertaken to cut down the administrative funds and to reduce the loan fund as well.

Let me give you a picture of what has been done, in economizing on this operation in recent years.

I believe I can address myself to this with some modesty because the House knows quite well that I have been a very consistent critic of Farm Security Administration. I have opposed many of its activities from the very outset as one of the tragic creatures of an Executive order. It has floundered around the wilderness of Washington without legislative authority and here in all its nakedness today we see what happens when with such facility a huge organization is created by a stroke of the pen in the form of a Presidential order. So we have to wrestle with the problem.

I have undertaken to get these funds reduced over the years. In 1942 their administrative funds were in round figures $71,000,000. In 1943 it had dropped from $71,000,000 to $42,000,000. In 1944 it dropped from $42,000,000 to $30,000,000. In 1945 we finally agreed on $28,500,000, but in conference we cut that down another $2,500,000. So we are going to report by action of the conference committee $26,000,000 for grants, rehabilitation funds and so forth. That is a reduction from $71,000,000 in 1942 to $26,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945. Frankly, therefore, we have made some progress in that field. I can agree that even more progress can be made in the interest of efficiency and economy.

Let us consider for a moment this question of loans. In 1942 we authorized F. S. A. to make $120,000,000 in loans. Then the battle began. I tried to get that reduced on occasions by $30,000,000 but did not succeed. In 1943, however, it dropped to $97,500,000. In 1944 the committee reduced the loan authorization by $30,000,000 to $67,500,000. When the Department of Agriculture went before the Bureau of the Budget this year for its fiscal 1945 estimates it asked for $125,000,000 for loan funds. The Budget Bureau sliced that to $97,500,000, which is a reduction of approximately $27,500,000. When it came to our subcommittee in the House we reduced it another $30,000,000 to $67,500,000. Another very great deliberative body, which is a part of the coordinate legislative structure, in its composite wisdom decided that should be increased by $30,000,000.

When we went to conference, the F. S. A. item caused considerable discussion between House and Senate and for a time it appeared that agreement or compromise was impossible. At long last, an agreement was reached. I think we came out with some glory to ourselves, because we reduced the administrative funds another $2,500,000 and we reduced the loan fund by $30,000,000. The motion that will be made by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, in pursuance of our agreement will be to concur with an amendment reducing the administrative fund to $26,000,000 and the loan fund to $67,500,000.

Now, a word or two about the Farm Security operation generally. I hope before you go home for recess that you will secure a very interesting document. It is House Report No. 1430, Union Calendar No. 492. It is a report submitted by the committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and is dated May 9, 1944. The reason this is so interesting to me is because through the years my genial friend from North Carolina and I have been respectively protagonist and antagonist on this whole Farm Security matter, and for that matter in the field of farm tenancy. He was a very worthy foe on this floor.

My friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and I used to debate on this floor as to how much or how little Farm Security should have. He used to chide me in reference to statements I would make about this agency. So it is interesting to read the Cooley report. It carries assertions that I never would have dared to have made on this floor about the Farm Security Administration. As an example, for instance, I read to you from this report:

> The Farm Security Administration was financing communistic resettlement projects, where the families could never own homes or be paid for all that they made or for all the time they worked, and was supervising its borrowers to the extent of telling the borrower how to raise his children, how to plan his home life and, it is strongly suspected in some cases, how to vote. Some families were "kept on the Government" indefinitely, while other families that were willing to work just as hard and do their best to pay their debt, would not get any help from the Government at all.

Further in this report it says:

> It is dangerous to the continuation of the essential features of the Farm Security Administration program to let the entire operation continue as heretofore.

The report continues:

> By legal interpretations placed upon certain language contained in the several appropriation acts providing funds for the agency, the officials of the Farm Security Administration continued to operate an ever-expanding land-acquisition program under which it illegally acquired title to and possession of hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land, a very large part of which is not now occupied or in cultivation.

In this report it says:

> Families have been colonized, regimented, and supervised to an extent which cannot possibly be justified.

In this report it says:

> They (Farm Security Administration) established, maintained, and operated communities and villages in rural and suburban areas; built and maintained streets, roads, and highways; shops, stores, and warehouses; hotels and inns; recreational halls and community houses and playgrounds and other places of amusement. They built power plants and water systems. They built hospitals and rest homes, sewage-disposal plants and irrigation systems.

And so forth. I did not say that. The committee that was authorized by this House to make a thorough investigation has finally probed the situation and given the intolerable facts not only to the Congress but to the country as well. I am glad that job is done, and I take off my hat to the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD COOLEY, for coming up with such a great, courageous report.

There is one other matter I want to allude to. It was brought by my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. He spoke of the provision in the Pace bill relating to medical care. I quite agree with the gentleman from Kansas about it. Here is the language. It astounded me, I am frank to say, and I am very much disturbed about this language in the present bill. It talks about medical care, and then it says:

That no part of such sums—

Meaning the sums that are appropriated for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation—

be available for the promotion or aid of any program of medical care which prevents the patient from having the services of any practitioner of his own choice so long as State laws are complied with, except that this provision shall not be applicable to the promotion or aid of a program of medical care where a majority of the participants within the program group elect to confine their choice of practitioners to a list of available licensed practitioners selected by them.

When they make an agreement with a group of medical practitioners, everybody in the group who would get the advantage of this low-cost care must have one of the doctors on whom the group has agreed. What has become of the "four freedoms"? It is, of course, easy to say he can go outside and find a doctor of his choice and pay him. True; but this program is being set up for low-income families so that they might have the benefit of low-cost medical care. You put a collective tag on it and say it is all right if you take the doctor that the group selects for you. When this right of the choice of a practitioner is limited, and when an individual can obtain low-cost medical care only if he abides by the selection of practitioners, have we not ventured well into the field of social medicine? That is what the gentleman was referring to.

That item, however, is not in issue in the pending bill, and I allude to it only because it will become of increasing interest in the days ahead.

I hope the Members will support the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, because it is the best we can do under the circumstances. It will then become the responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture to report a legislative bill dealing with the Farm Security Administration. I hope that it will occur in the near future and that the rather loose farm-credit structure which has developed in recent years can be coordinated and made more effective from the administrative standpoint.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind and gracious words concerning the work of the select committee investigating the Farm Security Administration. That committee is composed of Mr. FLANNAGAN, of Virginia; Mr. ZIMMERMAN, of Missouri; Mr. PACE, of Georgia; Mr. HOPE, of Kansas; Mr. ANTON JOHNSON, of Illinois, and Mr. ROSS RIZLEY, of Oklahoma.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. With such an indictment coming from the gentleman's committee representing the membership of the House, why should we not immediately start to liquidate such a program?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. The reason I am taking the floor at this time is to say that this committee has worked diligently in connection with its authority under House Resolution 119. We visited typical projects in all sections of the country, and we conferred with officials in county, State, and regional offices.

In the bill which we reported last Saturday we have provided for the immediate liquidation of every objectionable project which has been administered by Farm Security.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When will that bill be reported?

Mr. COOLEY. The bill is now before the Committee on Rules, and I assume that the Chairman of the Committee on Rules will accord us an opportunity to appear for the purpose of requesting a rule at some date in the near future. I had hoped that we might get the bill out before the recess, but I doubt it very much. Every member of the committee is anxious for an early consideration of the measure so that we may correct all of the evil practices which have been carried on by Farm Security in the past.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman if the committee found any traces of political activity on the part of the administrators in the various regions, in connection with the Farm Security program.

Mr. COOLEY. It was difficult for us to single out anything that could be called political activity, but such accusations have been made against the agency in the past, as the gentleman knows, and for us to find that any of the personnel of F. S. A. had engaged in political activities was a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman should be complimented for his efforts to bring out the facts, but I do think it should appear in the RECORD that though some of this money has not been too well spent, which nearly everyone will agree with me on, yet the rural people did receive, in many cases, much benefit from the money that was spent in a correct manner, and at the same time that these few dollars were being spent for these rural people, our city cousins were building homes costing on the average from $4,900 to $6,900.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. Although much money has been wasted by the agency, I think that the farm people have received some benefit from it.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHORT. Can the gentleman inform the House what percentage of these loans have been repaid? Has the gentleman any figures on that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have figures on that.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] says that he has the figures. Of course, they differ in different sections of the country. Collections in some parts of the country have been better than in other sections.

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

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The over-all payments for the United States as a whole on the production loans or the rehabilitation loans are 86.7 percent. The Bankhead-Jones loans are over 99 percent.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What is talked about concerning Farm Security most of the time are certain things about which many Members have objected, which the gentleman's bill, as he has pointed out, would end. But I would like to hear some debate on the main work of making loans to enable poor farm families to continue.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to have an opportunity to debate that proposition, but my time is limited. I would like to say this on behalf of the committee, that we have conscientiously tried to stop the land-acquisition program.

I know that every member of the committee has opposed the Federal Government's going into the land business. This agency, in many instances, without any authority of law has acquired and has control of approximately 2,000,000 acres of farm land in America. All the members of the select committee are opposed to further acquisitions of farm land by the F. S. A., and we are sure that no other lands will be acquired. I hope that the bill we have recommended will be considered at an early date.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the good thing about the Tarver amendment that has been offered is that it is not so bad as the Senate amendment. On the other hand, I do not believe we ought to go on with the Farm Security Administration at all. I believe it ought to be immediately liquidated.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia presents this picture: $67,500,000 for new loans, so-called rehabilitation loans, and $26,000,000 for expenses. This means administrative expenses totaling 39 percent. The setup this year is $67,500,000, with $30,786,000, or 45 percent, for expenses. That is the kind of picture it presents, to loan $67,500,000 with $26,000,000 of expense.

Someone asked about the amount of loans that had been repaid. The total loans as of December 31 last were $809,000,000. The repayments were $443,000,000. The 86 percent comes in this way, that 86 percent of the amount of the matured principal has been repaid, but the way that has been brought about, as appears from all sorts of investiga-

tions, is that they have made new loans to the borrowers to cover these maturities. That is the way they keep the percentages of collections up. It is one of the most ridiculous things. You cannot tell very much about the way these things go, but on page 972 of the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill there appear the operations of this set-up on the farm tenancy business, and I am going to read you the figures as to two States:

New Jersey: Maturities, $19,000. Payments on principal, $8,800. Amount of principal and interest in default, $989. Anybody subtracting $8,800 from $19,000 gets a little over $10,000.

New York: $114,000 maturities. Payments on principal, $69,000. Then over in the column of delinquencies is $4,600. So that you cannot tell a thing from the reports of this agency. That is the kind of an agency I do not like to see continued.

In my district they have people running around soliciting farmers to take loans of that kind, which the farmers do not want. They are a menace. They went to one fellow last year and asked him to take a loan to put in fresh vegetables. They told him he would not have to pay it if he did not get a good crop. He did not get any crop, due to weather conditions, and they came around and annoyed him to death for 3 or 4 months trying to collect it, when they had represented to him that they would not ask for it. That is the way they have done business. That is the reason I do not like to have that kind of an organization running around loose. It is a menace to the American Government to have that kind of an approach.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think that particular practice has traveled all over the country, but we cannot hold the Farm Security Administration accountable for that particular practice because they were handling it for the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation in connection with those nonrecourse loans.

Mr. TABER. Nobody has to conduct that kind of an operation unless he wants to. I do not condone it and I do not approve of it, and I do not intend to vote for it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In connection with the observation made by the gentleman from New York regarding the administration cost, may I call the attention of the House to the fact that this agency is administering assets of the value of approximately $1,000,000,000?

Mr. TARVER. I had intended to do that. If the gentleman will wait until I can conclude my remarks, if he then feels there is anything I have omitted to mention, I shall be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I think I have been as critical of the conduct of the affairs of the Farm Security Administration as any Member of this House. An examination of the hearings of the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations for the last several years will disclose that fact. I have participated with my fellow members of that subcommittee in the attempted correction of some of these practices which we regard as bad practices. You will find some of the limitations, which have brought about some corrections, included in the amendment which we are asking the House to approve at this time.

We have attempted to bring about the liquidation of all these so-called cooperative projects, which now number 151. Some progress, but not enough progress, has been made along that line.

There are many particulars in which the administrative activities of those who have been in charge of the Farm Security Administration work could be legitimately and properly criticized. However, after all is said, it seems to me that the person who approaches the consideration of this subject in an impartial way must recognize the fact that this organization has accomplished a great deal of good for the low-income farmers of the United States. It is the one organization of the Department of Agriculture which is devoted to the interests of the poor man. In my judgment, it ought to be shorn of those things which have brought about justified criticism by the enactment of appropriate legislation by Congress when the legislative bill from the Committee on Agriculture comes before us for attention. But in the meantime we are faced with a practical situation, requiring dealing in an intelligent way with a very great problem of the Government.

The Government has outstanding loans made under the Farm Security Administration at this time of approximately $385,000,000, if my recollection of the evidence is correct, and of the administrative expense which was provided by Congress for the present fiscal year, something over $23,000,000, was provided for the administration and the collection of loans which had already been made, and only slightly in excess of $4,000,000 was provided for administrative expenses for the purpose of making new loans. We have by this proposed amendment which I have offered by the direction of my conferees proposed to reduce the administrative expenses still further, to $26,000,000 from a total of $28,000,000-plus which has been estimated by the Budget, and only a minor portion of that $26,000,000 will be available for the purpose of making new loans. Most of it will be for the purpose of administering loans already made and for locking after the interests of the Government and insuring their collection.

The gentlemen of the House will probably remember some time ago we announced in the House that we had postponed the conference with the Senate on the Agricultural Department appropriation bill until the House took action on the Pace bill to determine what disposition it desired to make of the school-lunch question and of the Farm Security Administration question and that we would feel bound by the action of the House, whatever it might be, and that if the House declined to approve either of those programs, we should, of course, decline to bring in a recommendation that an appropriation be made for them; yet, on the other hand, if the House approved these programs, we would consider that as an instruction to us to take action on the conference committee in accordance with the action which had been taken by the House. So on June 1 the House considered the Pace bill and considered the amendments to the Pace bill and adopted amendments authorizing for 1 year the school-lunch program and the Farm Security Administration program. So we brought in the exact language which the House had approved on June 1 for this school-lunch program with the exact authorization which the House had approved. On yesterday, without objection, this House approved our amendment proposing to authorize that program exactly as the House had approved it on the 1st day of June. We have done the same thing with regard to the Farm Security Administration program. You authorized without any dissenting voice on the 1st day of June in connection with the Pace bill the continuance of this program as it has been carried on for the present fiscal year for another year.

Now the Senate had provided funds largely in excess of those which had been made available for the present fiscal year, but in accordance with what we conceived to be the instruction of the House, we insisted that those funds be reduced to amounts available for the present fiscal year and in the case of administrative expenses we insisted on a further cut below the amount of funds made available for the present fiscal year. We have brought this matter before you in substantially the way in which you approved it on the 1st day of June, and we think without regard to how you feel about the Farm Security Administration or what should be done with it, you should approve the action of your subcommittee in doing exactly what you in effect instructed us to do. All of the members of our subcommittee, both Republicans and Democrats, have approved this action, with the exception of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The difference between the approval of the Farm Security Administration on June 1 and the lunch program was that the lunch program was talked about for an hour and the Farm Security item was put over and nobody asked questions on it in particular.

Mr. TARVER. No; the Farm Security Administration provision was not slipped over. I was present in the House. Was the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] present?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; I was not.

Mr. TARVER. Then the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is not in a position to say it was slipped over. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture, was present and was sitting at the table where the gentleman is standing now. The matter was called up and no Member of the House who was present saw fit to object to the adoption of the amendment adopted in the Pace bill and which we have proposed here in accordance with what we construe to be the will of the House. Of course, if the gentleman had objections to that amendment he had the right to be present and raise those objections.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As the gentleman knows, I favor the continuation of the Farm Security for a year, pending complete investigation of the Farm Credit structure, with the hope that we can consolidate all these agencies under one head. But in looking over the figures that the committee has submitted here for land-purchase the thought occurs to me that really, this is no time to put these farm tenants on high-priced land.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, but we do not carry a thing in this bill for the purchase of land, that is, for the Farm Security Administration, except in the farm tenant land-purchase program, which is a different item. There is not a dollar of this money that can be used for the purchase of land.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, the Farm Security Administration is administering the farm tenant land purchases.

Mr. TARVER. That is true, but that is another item. That is not this item of the bill. That item has already been agreed to. In fact, the House had in the bill when it passed the House, the $15,000,000 for the farm tenant land-purchase program and this item does not provide anything for the purchase of land, but on the contrary it has an express inhibition against the use of this money for the purchase of land. I call the gentleman's attention to this language:

"None of the moneys provided or authorized under this caption, 'loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program."

Not a dollar of this money, if it is approved by the House, can be used for the purchase of land.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the attitude of the committee, and I want to compliment the committee for taking that position.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another minute in order to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how many farmers is it estimated that the Farm Security Administration aids or has aided, say in the past fiscal year, approximately?

Mr. TARVER. I do not know the current figures, but it is something in the neighborhood of a million farmers since the beginning of the program. I think there are about 376,000 at the present time. And they are the poorest farmers in the United States. Unfortunately the poorer farmers are in the majority, at least in my part of the country, and I think perhaps that is true of the gentleman's district also.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The administrative expenses have been cut over $2,500,000?

Mr. TARVER. That is, below the Senate bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; and you have cut the Senate's proposal of loans from $97,000,000 down to $67,000,000?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct, to $67,500,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Are any members of the gentleman's committee, on the conference committee of the House, opposed to the gentleman's motion as he has submitted it?

Mr. TARVER. None, except the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], as I understand it. So far as the amount involved is concerned, may I say to the gentleman, while the Pace amendment authorized the appropriation in such amounts as might be thought necessary by Congress, at the same time the language of the amendment seemed to indicate that Congress desired the program carried on for the next fiscal year substantially as it had been carried on for this fiscal year. It is largely for that reason that we did not consent to recommend additional money.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAMBERTSON) there were—ayes 133, noes 22.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 68: On page 84, line 11, strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 68.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 71: On page 86, line 22, after the figures, insert: "which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 71.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the various votes by which action has been taken in connection with the conference report, and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 and upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 40, 53, 63, and 65, that a further conference with the Senate be requested, and that the Speaker appoint the conferees on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a luncheon address at the Inter-American Bar Association by Col. William C. Rigby. I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office that this article will cost $182.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

marks in the RECORD on the shortage of oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech delivered by Mr. Shaughnessey, of the Department of Immigration and Naturalization, on I Am an American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. LUCE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and to include in each certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, General Saunders, who led the B-29 raid on Japan recently, is a citizen of South Dakota, of whom we are all very proud. I ask unanimous consent to insert a newspaper article telling of his activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with regard to House Joint Resolution 93, which was passed yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by the Governor of Pennsylvania, Hon. Edward Martin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered at Atlantic City on Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1634. An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1432) entitled "An act to extend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939"; agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. BREWSTER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of War.
3. Selective Service System.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1718) entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes"; agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. Administration Office of United States Courts (U. S. District Court, District of Maryland).
8. Civil Service Commission.
9. Federal Works Agency.
10. Selective Service System.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4679) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 43, 45, 46, 47, 62, 63, 64, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 85, 86, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 106, 107, 110, 111, 114, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 131, 132, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 180, 181, 182, 185, 188, 194, 195, 197, and 206.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 21, 34, 37, 49, 67, 68, 81, 83, 87, 90, 91, 102, 103, 105, 108, 121, 137, 177, 179, 187, 199, 200, 201, and 208, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,813,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$302,130"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$79,930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$132,953"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$212,827"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$132,953"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$212,827"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$345,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$89,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "not exceeding $21,650 for construction and equipment of a dormitory building at the Denehotso Day School on the Navajo Indian Reservation;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and on the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona, $5,066,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,444,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,321,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$170,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$797,595"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$90,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,024,480"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$657,640"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 176: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,106,278"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$317,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$865,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "334,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", $610,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,185,548"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,085,548"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$825,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 205: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Not to exceed a total of $40,000 of the appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for expenditure for long distance telephone tolls, and not to exceed a total of $40,000 shall be available for expenditure for telegrams and cablegrams, and the savings effected thereby in the items "communication services", as set forth in the Budget estimates submitted for such appropriations shall not be diverted to other use and shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "9", and insert in lieu thereof "9a"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 39, 40, 41, 42, 82, 84, 88, 89, 93, 94, 115, 116, 127 128, 133, 138, 155, 156, 166, 169, 191, 196, 202, and 203.

JED JOHNSON,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES, (except as to amendments 106, 108, 109, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 130, 134, 135, 136, and 138),
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4679) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Appropriates $1,222,420, for salaries, Office of the Secretary, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,306,480, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 2: Appropriates $224,843 for personal services, Office of the Solicitor, instead of $243,900, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 3: Appropriates $115,580 for personal services, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, as proposed by the House, instead of $155,580, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, relating to the Grazing Service: Provides $25,000 for purchase of automobiles, as proposed by the House, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the Senate, appropriates $977,740 for salaries and expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,041,000, as proposed by the Senate, corrects the total for the "Salary and expense" item, as proposed by the House; appropriates $115,000 for range improvements, instead of $105,000, as proposed by the House, and $125,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $8,500 for leasing grazing lands, instead of $8,000, as proposed by the House, and $9,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 9: Appropriates $200,000 for the Petroleum Conservation Division, as proposed by the House, instead of $214,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 10, 11, and 12, relating to soil and moisture conservation operations: Provides $100,000 for departmental personal services, as proposed by the House, instead of $105,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $4,000 for purchase of motor vehicles, as proposed by the House, instead of $5,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $1,200,000 for such purpose, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,300,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 13 and 14, relating to fire protection of forests: Authorizes the use of $8,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $525,000 for such purpose, as proposed by the House, instead of $530,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 15: Appropriates $54,775.82 for payment of awards, war minerals claims, under the act of May 18, 1936, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 16: Appropriates $164,000 for contingent expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $168,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 17 and 18: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate authorizing membership payments to certain societies or associations which issue publications to members, and appropriates $500 for purchase of books, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,500, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 19: Appropriates $200,000 for printing and binding, as proposed by the House, instead of $205,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 20 and 21, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration: Authorizes the use of $3,813,540 of the unobligated balance of construction funds for operation, maintenance, and so forth, of the project, instead of $3,686,540, as proposed by the House, and $3,940,540, as proposed by he Senate; and authorizes the use of $485,000 of construction funds for the construction of a transmission line from the Grand Coulee Dam to Brewster, Washington, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 22 and 23, relating to the High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands: Appropriates $98,160 as proposed by the House, instead of $115,675, as proposed by the Senate, of which $5,200 shall be available for expenditure in the discretion of the High Commissioner, as proposed by the House, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 24: Appropriates $290,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination, as proposed by the House, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 25 and 26, relating to the Solid Fuels Administration for War: Appropriates $4,669,200 for this Administration, as proposed by the House, instead of $5,025,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $700,000 for fuels conservation.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

No. 27: Appropriates $850,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of $871,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 28: Appropriates $20,000 for traveling expenses of employees, as proposed by the House, instead of $24,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 29: Appropriates $500,000 for surveying public lands, as proposed by the House, instead of $530,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 30: Appropriates $370,000 for salaries and expenses, Branch of Field Examination, as proposed by the House, instead of $376,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 31: Appropriates $174,000 for salaries and expenses of land offices, as proposed by the House, instead of $175,200, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 32: Appropriates $300,000 for timber operations on the Oregon & California grant lands, as proposed by the House, instead of $303,500, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 33: Appropriates $45,000 for range improvements on public lands, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the House, and $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 34: Appropriates $4,852.54 for payment to the department of forestry, Oregon, for fire-protection work, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 35: Appropriates $798,175 for departmental salaries, as proposed by the House, instead of $828,175, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 36. Appropriates $41,800 for travel expenses of departmental employees, as proposed by the House, instead of $47,500, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 37. Appropriates $321,000 for maintaining law and order on Indian reservations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $315,040 as proposed by the House.

No. 38. Appropriates $182,000 for repair and improvement of agency buildings, as proposed by the House, instead of $187,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 43. Appropriates $504,000 for preservation of timber on Indian lands, as proposed by the House, instead of $524,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 44. Appropriates $175,000 for timber-sale expenses, instead of $170,000, as proposed by the House, and $180,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 45. Appropriates $681,000 for agriculture and stockraising, as proposed by the House, instead of $706,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 46. Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $22,500 for expenses of the National Indian Institute of the United States.

No. 47: Appropriates $100,000 for development of water supply, as proposed by the House, instead of $108,800, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 48, 49, and 50, relating to miscellaneous irrigation projects: Appropriates $302,130 for such projects, instead of $274,630, as proposed by the House, and $309,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $25,000 for the White

Narrows project, as proposed by the Senate, and makes $79,960 available for administrative expenses, instead of $77,460, as proposed by the House, and $86,830, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55, relating to the San Carlos project, Arizona: Appropriates $345,780, for operation and maintenance, instead of $307,360, as proposed by the House, and $384,200, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61, relating to the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz.: Appropriates $89,600 for operation and maintenance, instead of $84,600, as proposed by the House, and $94,600, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 62: Appropriates $35,000 for protection of project works, as proposed by the House, instead of $36,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 63 and 64, relating to construction and repair, Indian irrigation projects: Appropriates $100,000 for surveys, investigations, and expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $103,750, as proposed by the Senate, and corrects the total of appropriations for such projects, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 74, relating to Indian education: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to make appropriations for the support of Indian schools available for construction and inserts a specific provision providing for a dormitory building at the Denehotso Day School on the Navajo Reservation; appropriates $6,066,940 for the support of such schools, instead of $6,000,000, as proposed by the House and $6,230,040, as proposed by the Senate, of which $41,750 is provided for school facilities, including construction, for the Navajo Indian Reservation, $3,000 is for operation of Kinishba ruins on the Fort Apache Reservation, Ariz., as a museum, and $22,190 is for the transfer to gratuity appropriations of the same amount provided in the House bill as a tribal-fund appropriation; appropriates $320,000 for lease, repair, and improvement of school buildings, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House, and $340,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $193,405 for operation of the Sherman Institute, Riverside, Calif., as proposed by the House, instead of $211,155, as proposed by the Senate; corrects the total of nonreservation boarding-school items, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $1,444,250 for education and relief purposes for natives in Alaska, instead of $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,488,500, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 75: Appropriates $3,202,700 for general support and administration of Indian property, as proposed by the House, instead of $3,283,625, as proposed by the Senate, the amount appropriated including $5,225 for a special attorney for the Osage Indians, as provided in the bill as passed by the House.

Nos. 76, 77, 78 and 79, relating to general support and rehabilitation: Appropriates $500,000, as proposed by the House instead of $700,000, as proposed by the Senate, $35,000 for administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $46,000, as proposed by the Senate, $24,000 for departmental personal services, as proposed by the House, instead of $32,000, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision of the House that not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for rehabilitation purposes.

No. 80, relating to reindeer in Alaska: Appropriates $85,650, instead of $75,000, as proposed by the House, and $96,300, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91 and 92, relating to the support and administration of Indian property from tribal funds: Appropriates $8,500, including not to exceed a $500 gift to the American Red Cross, from funds of the Cherokee Indians, North Carolina, as proposed by the Senate; removes the limitation of $72,380 on the purchase of cattle by the Klamath Indians, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to make $2,500 available for an attorney for the Colville Indians, Washington; appropriates $118,400 for Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $114,400, as proposed by the House; provides $10,000 for repairs to the Choctaw Chapter House, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $200,000 for support of the Osage Agency, Okla., instead of $213,700, as proposed by the House, and $173,960, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 95, relating to construction and repair of roads and bridges: Appropriates $950,000, of which $50,000 is recommended for further work on the Maverick Springs Road, Wyoming, instead of $900,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, and 113, relating to appropriations from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $95,000 for salaries and expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,761,000, with authority granted the Secretary to determine what part thereof should be nonreimbursable, as proposed by the Senate; restores the amounts recommended by the House under the heading "Administrative provisions and limitations"; authorizes the use of $350,000 of power revenues for operation of Parker Dam, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $340,000, as proposed by the House; authorizes the use of $400,000 for operation of the Shasta Dam, Central Valley project, from power revenues, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $385,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $99,000 for the Boise project, Idaho, as proposed by the House, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of $135,000 from power revenues for operation of the power system on the Kendrick project, Wyoming, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $200,000 for the operation and maintenance administration, as proposed by the House, instead of $220,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $250,000 for the Palisades project, Idaho, as proposed by the House, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,250,000 for continuation of construction on the Deschutes project, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,250,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $450,000 for general investigations, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $125,000 for administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the totals appropriated from the reclamation fund.

No. 114: Appropriates $950,000 from power revenues for operation of the Boulder Canyon project, as proposed by the House, instead of $968,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 117, 118, 119, and 120, relating to the Colorado River development fund: Appropriates $1,250,000 for such purpose, of which $500,000 is made available for investigations of projects in the four States of the upper division, and $750,000 is available for the comprehensive plan for utilization of waters of the Colorado River, in lieu of the respective amounts recommended by the House and the Senate; and authorizes the use of not to exceed $15,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia in connection therewith.

No. 121: Authorizes the use of an unexpended balance for construction of that part of the Davis-Phoenix transmission line, Arizona, from Parker Dam to Phoenix, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, and 132, relating to construction from general fund appropriations: Restores the provision of the House relating to the Central Valley project, California, appropriating $960,200, together with the unexpended balance heretofore available for transmission-line construction which is allocated to other construction features of the project, instead of an appropriation of $3,495,200, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $750,000 for the Kings River project, California, appropriates $1,437,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, instead of $1,237,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $4,300,000 for the Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,040,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $700,000 for the Yakima project, Washington, as proposed by the House, instead of $600,000, as proposed by the Senate, appropriates $375,000 for general investigations, including investigations in connection with Missouri Basin projects, instead of $375,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,950,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $325,000 for administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $375,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 134, 135, 136, and 137, relating to water conservation and utilization projects: Appropriates $1,700,000 for such purpose, instead of $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides $170,000 for surveys, investigations, and administrative expenses, and $23,750 for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of the amounts recommended, respectively, by the two Houses; and strikes out the proposal of the House relating to the transfer of functions heretofore performed by the Department of Agriculture to the Interior Department.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Nos. 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, and 146, relating to the Geological Survey: Appropriates $1,180,360 for topographic surveys, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $177,000 for investigation of mineral resources of Alaska, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,252,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $350,340 for printing and binding, as proposed by the House, instead of $368,000, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of such items, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF MINES

Nos. 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, and 168, relating to various items under the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates $797,595 for operating mine rescue cars and investigations, instead of $772,595, as proposed by the House, and $822,595, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,024,480 for the coal mine inspection service, instead of $936,270, as proposed by the House, and $1,527,880, as proposed by the Senate; and provides $90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia and $7,000 for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles, instead of the respective amounts recommended by the House and Senate; appropriates $575,000 for enforcement of Federal Explosives Act, as proposed by the House, instead of $600,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $250,000 for protection of mineral resources, as proposed by the House, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $435,000 for mineral mining investigations, as proposed by the House, instead of $440,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $657,640, for oil and gas investigations, of which $7,640 is to restore a reduction in that amount by the House, and $50,000 is provided to determine how the quality of base stocks for aviation gasoline can be improved, instead of $600,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,187,640, as proposed by the Senate; ap-

propriates $762,000 for mining experiment stations, as proposed by the House, instead of $772,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $160,000 for maintenance of buildings and grounds at Pittsburgh, Pa., as proposed by the House, instead of $168,100, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $575,000 for economics of mineral industries, as proposed by the House, instead of $590,750, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $2,900,000 for investigation of deposits of critical minerals, as proposed by the House, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Nos. 170, 171, 172, 173, and 174, relating to the National Park Service: Appropriates $407,165 for salaries, as proposed by the House, instead of $413,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $24,000 for general expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $25,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $171,820 for national monuments, as proposed by the House, instead of $199,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $441,000 for national military parks, battlefields, and monuments, as proposed by the House, instead of $460,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $133,000 for administration of recreational demonstration areas, as proposed by the House, instead of $158,000, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Nos. 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, and 195: Appropriates $200,000 for general administrative expenses, instead of $196,100, as proposed by the House and $206,700, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,106,278 for propagation of food fishes, instead of $1,097,555, as proposed by the House, and $1,115,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $562,500 for investigations respecting food fishes, instead of $547,265, as proposed by the House; appropriates $317,540, for fishery industries, instead of $277,540, as proposed by the House, and $342,540, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $99,260, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $92,420, as proposed by the House, for fishery market news service; appropriates $126,150 for fur-resources investigations, as proposed by the House, instead of $133,450, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $193,715 for biological investigations, as proposed by the House, instead of $243,715, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $865,000 for control of predatory animals, instead of $815,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $334,900 for protection of migratory birds, instead of $322,400, as proposed by the House, and $347,400, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $150,000 for enforcement of Alaska game law, as proposed by the House, instead of $156,530, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $610,675 for maintenance of mammal and bird reservations, instead of $590,675, as proposed by the House and $666,675, of which $36,000 was for the purchase of land in Humboldt County, Nev., as proposed by the Senate; provides that $40,000 of the 1944 unexpended balance shall continue available in 1945 for work in the Wichita Mountains Refuge, as proposed by the Senate, appropriates $58,330, for migratory bird conservation refuges, as proposed by the House, instead of $63,330, as proposed by the Senate; corrects the totals for salaries and expenses and for the Fish and Wildlife Service; appropriates $900,000 for Federal aid in wildlife restoration, instead of $800,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,300,000, as proposed by the Senate; makes $825,000 available for departmental personal services; and restores the language of the House, providing for "purchase" of motor vehicles, instead of the "exchange", as proposed by the Senate.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Nos. 197, and 198: Appropriates $1,000,000 for construction and repair of roads, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,180,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $1,250,000 for continuation of construction of the Richardson Highway, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Nos. 199, 200, and 201: Appropriates $22,560, for expenses of the office of the Governor and the Secretary, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $21,600, as proposed by the House.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

No. 204: Appropriates $100,000 for defraying the deficit of the municipal government of St. Croix, instead of $70,000, as proposed by the House, and $140,000, as proposed by the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS

No. 205: Limits the use of funds for telephone tolls to $40,000, and telegrams and cablegrams to $40,000, instead of a limitation of $25,000 in each instance, as proposed by the House, and elimination of the section, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 206: Corrects a section number.

No. 207: Prohibits the use of funds appropriated in the act for any purposes in connection with the Jackson Hole National Monument.

No. 208: Strikes out the proposal of the House prohibiting the use of funds to pay the salary of any male person between the ages of 18 and 30 physically qualified for military duty, with certain exceptions.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 39: Purchase of improvements on lands, Havasupai Indian Reservation, Ariz. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 40, relating to purchase of land, Fort Peck Reservation, Mont.: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 41, relating to purchase of land, Flathead Indians, Mont.: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 42, relating to the purchase of land, Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 82, relating to payment of rewards for theft of Indian cattle, Klamath Reservation, Oreg.: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 84, correcting a total.

No. 88, relating to funds for an audit of the books of the Menominee Indian Mills: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 89, correcting a total.

No. 93, relating to expenses of tribal officers, Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes, Wyoming: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 94, relating to fulfillment of the Atoka agreement with Choctaw-Chickasaw Nations of Indians. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 115, relating to report on expenditures incurred in operating Boulder Dam: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 116, relating to work on the Colorado River front including the vicinity of Needles, Calif. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 127, relating to the Tucumcari project, New Mexico. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 128, relating to the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 133, correcting a total.

No. 138, relating to the Fort Peck project, Montana: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 155, relating to anthracite investigations: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 156, relating to synthetic liquid fuels: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 166, relating to raw material resources for steel production: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 169, relating to processes for recovery of waste metals: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 191, relating to the payment of overtime in connection with Federal aid in wildlife restoration funds: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 196, relating to reimbursement for the cost of supplies, Fish and Wildlife Service: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 202, relating to salaries and expenses of the Governor, Virgin Islands: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 203, relating to the agricultural experiment station, Virgin Islands: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

JED JOHNSON,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES (except as to amendments 106, 108, 109, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 130, 134, 135, 136, and 138),
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is unnecessary for me to make an extended statement at this time with reference to the action of the conferees, but I do think the Members of the House would like to know about what action was taken concerning the 208 amendments in dispute between the two Houses. I believe the House would also like to know whether or not we are under Budget estimates or over the Budget estimates, so I will give just a few figures and then yield briefly to the ranking minority member and other members of the committee who wish to make brief statements.

Mr. Speaker, as recommended by the House conferees the bill totals $103,293,796.36. This is a reduction in the Budget estimate of $12,080,599. This the conferees feel is a very satisfactory showing.

The net reduction in the bill as it was passed by the Senate is more than $20,000,000, to be exact, $20,389,549.

The net increase in the bill over the amount it carried as passed by the House is $15,000,000, but in that connection it should be remembered that after the bill

left the House more than $18,000,000 of Budget estimates went to the Senate.

The Senate has receded on 103 out of a total of 208 amendments. That is something very unusual, it is unusual for them to recede on half as many amendments, and we feel we have made an excellent showing in persuading them to yield completely on 103 amendments. The House receded on only 25 amendments. We have agreed to 56 Senate amendments with amendments. Twenty-four amendments remain in disagreement.

I believe this is all I have to say at this time except to state again that members of the committee on this side of the aisle are deeply grateful to the minority members for the fine patriotic service they are rendering in connection with this bill. There was no partisan politics of any kind in connection with this bill. We worked in harmony and the result shows what can be done by way of economy when a committee really works together.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be pleased to yield to my distinguished friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman. Is it appropriate for the gentleman to discuss at this point the attitude of the conference committee on the item I shall direct attention to briefly?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I prefer that we discuss the various amendments as we reach them. I believe I know some of the things the gentleman refers to for there are one or two things in which he is tremendously interested. I might say that I believe that members of the committee are sympathetic with what the gentleman from West Virginia is doing and trying to do for the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, has made a very fair statement in regard to this bill. As he told you, the Senate receded on 103 of the amendments they offered to this bill. This is a record, so far as I know. On a number of other amendments they receded with amendments.

I have helped write a number of Interior Department appropriation bills during the time I have served on the Appropriations Committee but it seems to me the bill we are now considering comes nearer meeting what I believe the Interior Department appropriation bill should be than any with which I have ever had anything to do. Had I had my way entirely certain items in the bill would have been cut further, but you who serve on conference committees know that no one individual can have his own way about these things; that it is often a matter of compromise; but on the whole I believe this is a very good bill.

There are some 24 items that are still in disagreement. They will be taken up individually later. So far as the conference report itself is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for its adoption and then express myself on the separate items as we take them up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an inquiry about Senate amendments Nos. 141 and 142, under which it was proposed to appropriate $1,075,000 for exploration of the oil resources of Alaska. The item was inserted in the bill in the Senate, but in the conference the Senate receded and upon adoption of the conference report in its present form it will not be in the bill. If the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee or anyone else cares to comment upon it I shall be pleased to have information. I suggest that inasmuch as Alaska lies on the direct line, you might say, upon the advanced line, or the fighting line between the United States and Japan, it may be of the highest national importance to find out whether there is any oil in Alaska and how much oil is there so we may make use of it in the current war emergency, because we all know that if oil is found in quantity it takes comparatively little time to develop it. At the present time all the oil used in Alaska and the Aleutians must be hauled from the States to and through Alaska and out into the Aleutians and so on toward Japan as we proceed in that direction. It would be helpful to the war effort if we could develop some oil in Alaska; and that is the proposition, to at least explore and find out what oil there is and how much there is, if any. In the hearings in connection with another bill which was recently passed it was indicated—and this is said without criticism—that the United States Government had spent up to date $129,000,000 in attempting to make use of some oil in the Mackenzie River valley in Canada at a place called Norman Wells. That oil must be hauled about 600 miles to Whitehorse, where it is refined, then hauled or piped another 111 miles to the seaport of Skagway for use along the coast of Alaska or further west.

The proposal in this Senate amendment is to make explorations for oil, where oil is indicated by the engineers at several places along the coast of Alaska, and it would supplement the effort now being made or about to be made by the Navy in the Arctic region in Alaska.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman would like to know why the committee having to do with the Interior Department appropriation bill did not permit this appropriation for the investigation of oil in Alaska. It is a rather long story, but I will make it as short as I possibly can.

In this House we recently turned down an amendment to one of our bills to raise the price of crude oil about 35 cents a barrel. Just as long as the Congress insists on not giving the oil producers in this Nation, the small oil producers in this Nation, where we know the oil is and where it is already flowing in the lower producing fields, I for one, as a member of the Interior Appropriation Committee, will insist that we do not go outside of the confines of the United States and spend a lot of money to get oil and to make investigations, because we can get all the oil we want right now in this war period, and we would be getting it if we will pay a fair market price instead of doing what the administration wants to do—pay subsidies for the production of every conceivable thing. The committee is certainly in favor of spending some money in due time for drilling and in investigating for oil and minerals in Alaska, which the gentleman represents so efficiently; but we do insist that we first get the oil that is already available here. We know where it is. It would not cost a dime to investigate. Certainly the membership of this committee would not be justified in spending millions and millions of dollars to look up new oil wells when we know we have them right here and they are ready to go.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from Iowa does not take the position that he is opposed to the development of Alaska and our insular possessions, does he?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. WHITE. How are you going to find out where the oil is if you do not look for it?

Mr. JENSEN. We have the oil right here.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is contending we should not look any further.

Mr. JENSEN. After the war is over, or if the war lasts longer than we anticipate it will, why, of course, then possibly we will have to look for it, but I do not think so. We have all the oil we need right here today on the mainland, but they will not let it be produced; they will not let the wildcat wells or the low-producing wells produce because they cannot produce at the price they are allowing.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman's opposition is to going to foreign countries, but he is not opposed to developing our own insular possessions?

Mr. JENSEN. Of course I am not, and if the gentleman had been listening to me he would have heard me say that.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to congratulate the Delegate from Alaska for standing up so ably for the Territory he represents. While I have a good deal of sympathy for what the gentleman from Iowa has said, I feel that Alaska is a part of the United States and that it is up to the Congress to do what it can to bring about the exploration and development of the natural resources which it has. Alaska does have oil resources which we will very likely need in our war with Japan. We can spend a hundred million dollars to develop Canadian properties, but when it comes to spend-

ing a million dollars for the development of our own properties we are up against something that cannot seem to be overcome. I would suggest to the House that it give serious consideration to bringing Alaska into the family of States, and at the earliest opportunity pass the bill granting her statehood.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the gentleman about this proposal, because it is related to an item of something over a million dollars in the appropriation bill for the War Department which passed this House a few days ago and is now pending in the Senate. Do I understand that the money that was provided in this bill was for geological work in connection with that project?

Mr. DIMOND. It was to be given to the Geological Survey under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior to explore and develop oil in other parts of Alaska, not, as I understand, the particular area to which the War Department is giving attention.

Mr. CASE. It is not related to the Wide Bay project?

Mr. DIMOND. No. I understand it does not cover the Wide Bay project. Some part of this money may have been intended for use at Wide Bay, because the Department of the Interior still has title to all of the lands in the Wide Bay area. Only the surface has been placed in a military reservation. This is an integral part of the plan to explore for oil in that part of the world, which is important to us now.

Mr. CASE. If there is any particular need for doing anything in connection with oil in Alaska at this time, it would seem to me it should be related to the war effort. If oil can be produced near a logical center, that is one thing. The general exploratory purpose is something quite different. May I ask the gentleman, from his own knowledge in Alaska, what is the most likely spot for producing oil?

Mr. DIMOND. I am not an engineer, Mr. Speaker, and I can only guess. I would say the most likely part is the Arctic, and the Navy Department is attempting explorations there, but that is something like 800 miles from the southern coast, and I think it is invaluable to find out how much oil is there because there is no great difficulty in getting it to the coast provided we want to spend the time and money to do it. The areas that are sought to be explored by the Geological Survey under the amendment put in the bill by the Senate are right on the seacoast, where any oil produced is immediately available. They are on a direct line between the United States and Japan. In view of the shortage of shipping, and I can say to the gentleman that the shortage is still acute, I think it would promote the war effort if this exploration could be made. Oil on the coast of Alaska would be of high value for present military purposes—perhaps invaluable.

Mr. CASE. Let us settle one thing. This particular project is not necessarily related to or dependent upon the project that was provided in the War Department appropriation bill?

Mr. DIMOND. I understand that to be the case, although I am not able to give a categorical answer to the question.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that this committee would be just as willing to recommend an appropriation of money for geological surveys and the discovery of oil in Alaska as it would in the continental United States. It is the position of the committee that public funds should not be expended for these purposes anywhere, either in continental United States or in our insular possessions until the small oil companies have an opportunity to spend their own private funds for geological surveys and for the exploration of oil. The committee does not mean to draw a line of demarcation between Alaska and continental United States.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's position, but all of this land in Alaska is reserved by the Government and no private individual can explore it.

If the land were available for private exploration and development under the Oil Leasing Act, or under any other law, the case would be different. But for the protection of the public interest, and to insure, if possible, a supply of oil for the Army and Navy, all of the potential oil land of Alaska has been placed in reserve except for a few acres privately owned, from which no production is now being had. Virtually all of Alaska which gives promise of oil is in reserve. Hence, if any exploration is undertaken, the work must be done by some arm of the Government. Wisely, I think, the Navy is proceeding with some oil exploratory work in the immense oil reserve on the Arctic coast. The Army is proposing to do some work at Wide Bay and funds for that purpose were carried in the War Department appropriation bill which recently was passed by the House. The sum, $1,075,000, carried in the amendment under discussion is largely intended for explorations at Yakataga and at Katalla and at Iniskin, although it may be that some part of it is intended for use at Wide Bay, and a part of it was earmarked for northern Alaska, as indicated in the justification of request for appropriation made to the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations.

For national defense purposes this work should have been done years ago. In support of the successful prosecution of the war it ought to be done now. Nor should there be delay because all of the oil in the States has not been exhausted. Surely, if we go to Norman Wells, and are even planning to go to Arabia to get oil, it is the part of common sense and wisdom to at least see if we have any oil in an area which is just as much a part of the United States as any of the States and which is closer to Japan than any other oil-producing area under our control in all the world. No one knows how long the war with Japan will last nor what its demands will be. Considering the strategic position of Alaska it may well be that the discovery and development of oil in the Territory will be not only true economy but a substantial contribution to victory. I offer, Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the printed record of the hearing on this subject before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations held on May 12, last.

HEARING BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

(Statements of William E. Wrather, Director; Philip S. Smith, Chief Alaskan Geologist; William B. Heroy, Foreign Production Division, Petroleum Administration for War; Michael Straus, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior)

Mineral resources of Alaska

Amount of Supplemental Estimate

Senator HAYDEN. We have a supplemental estimate in the amount of $1,075,000 under the item "Mineral resources of Alaska."

Mr. STRAUS. Mr. Wrather, Director; Dr. Smith, of the Alaskan Branch; and Mr. Heroy, of the Foreign Production Division of the Petroleum Administration for War, are here in connection with this item.

Senator HAYDEN. I believe I will include at this point the justification prepared by the Department in connection with this item.

(The justification referred to follows:)

"MINERAL RESOURCES OF ALASKA

"(Estimate, $177,000+$1,075,000 in Senate Document No. 196; act, $150,000+$20,000 overtime)

"(P. 67, lines 9 and 10)

"(1) Page 67, line 9, strike out '$177,000' and insert '$1,252,000', to allow supplemental estimate of $1,075,000 in Senate Document No. 196.

"(2) Page 67, line 10, strike out '$60,000' and insert '$150,000', to allow an increase of $90,000 in the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia, as recommended in Senate Document No. 196.

"(1) The purpose of the first amendment is to include $1,075,000 for an oil-exploration program in Alaska as a part of the budget for 1945.

"War demands have resulted in a very heavy drain on petroleum supplies in the Pacific area. In fact, California production even now is unable to meet immediate demands adequately. It is anticipated that requirements in the Pacific will increase rather than decrease.

"In the circumstances it would be of great help if Alaska were self-sustaining in regard to petroleum products, and would be even better if the Territory were able to contribute to requirements outside of Alaska. At present, all petroleum products used in Alaska must be shipped there.

"This situation has long been predicted by the Department of the Interior and on November 16, 1942, Mr. Ickes, as Petroleum Coordinator for War, presented to the President a proposal that the Government undertake to develop oil production in the Alaskan area. This proposal contained the following paragraphs:

"'The strategic importance of Alaska becomes more and more evident as the war goes forward. The relative proximity of the Territory, and especially of the Aleutian Peninsula, to Japan and Asia, and its location in relation to the circumpolar and transpolar air routes that undoubtedly will be utilized to an increasing degree, emphasize the importance of developing indigenous sources of petroleum and petroleum products in that area. Liquid fuels and other petroleum products must now be brought from California by tank ship, and this at a time when

the many other essential demands on such shipping can be met only with the greatest difficulty. Obviously, if Alaska could be made anywhere nearly self-sufficient so far as oil is concerned, it would be a highly advantageous development.

"'The reasons for the failure of private enterprise adequately to explore the oil potentialities in Alaska are basically economic, and are not due to inferior geological prospects. The promising areas are remote from the large consuming centers, supplies and equipment must be transported over considerable distances, and, due to the rigors of the climate, exploratory operations can be conducted during only a limited portion of the time and then only at a relatively high cost. Undoubtedly the oil possibilities of the Territory would long since have received more active attention by oil companies had not the physical and financial deterrents been so great. Any serious exploration for oil by private interests is in any case impractical under presently existing conditions.

"'Fully realizing the importance of the discovery of petroleum in Alaska to the conduct of the war, this office has made an exhaustive review of the available data bearing on the subject. The Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior and the private-oil companies which have carried on exploration and development activities in the area have furnished us the material resulting from their experience. It is our belief that the exigencies of the situation and the prospects for successful exploration are sufficiently great to justify a program of substantial character.'

"The strategic importance of lands in Alaska that may contain significant petroleum resources is further illustrated by Public Land Order 82, issued January 22, 1943, which withdraws certain tracts in Alaska from sale, location, selection, and entry under the public-land laws, including the mining laws, and from leasing under the mineral-leasing laws, and reserves the minerals in such tracts under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, for use in connection with the prosecution of the war. The lands withdrawn include all of the areas that are regarded as being most likely to contain petroleum deposits of value, and obviously the lands were withdrawn with petroleum in mind.

"Since the letter from the Petroleum Coordinator for War to the President in November 1942, and since the issue of Public Land Order 82 in January 1943, the Pacific petroleum situation has become more acute and the need for geological investigations on which any intelligent drilling for oil must be based, is more pressing now than before.

"In spite of the President's approval of the proposal of the Petroleum Coordinator for War, repeated attempts to get this urgent program under way have so far been unsuccessful. Another Alaskan field season is at hand and the small start that the Geological Survey has been able to make on oil investigations within its present budget will have to be almost completely abandoned unless funds are made available to carry the petroleum-exploration program through the fiscal year 1945.

"The program in the fiscal year 1945 is for investigations in the five areas that seem, on the basis of earlier Geological Survey work, to hold the best possibilities of containing significant petroleum reserves. These areas include:

Yakataga	$367,900
Katalla	359,000
Iniskin	47,950
Alaska Peninsula	184,070
Northern Alaska	79,800
Administration	36,280
Total	1,075,000

"The principal objectives of the program are: (1) to determine as rapidly as possible justified locations for test wells and to drill such information wells; (2) to study and map the geologic features of as much as possible of the five areas in sufficient detail to constitute an adequate basis for the location of subsequent test wells; (3) to appraise the possibilities of the five areas as sources of petroleum; (4) to plan future investigations that may be needed in areas contiguous to those studied in detail; and (5) to correlate and integrate the information obtained in order to be in a position to guide the development of any oil pools that may be discovered.

"The scope and objectives of the program have been carefully worked out in the Geological Survey and the work in each area has been planned in considerable detail. However, because of the conditions under which the work will be performed, it is impossible to forecast specific estimate details. For instance, as planned, a large amount of the actual labor in the field will be done by contract but, if suitable contracts cannot be entered into, because of military exigencies, priorities, etc., it may become necessary for the Geological Survey to supply additional personnel, equipment, and materials, and contract for its use. In this event many of the items in the estimate will have to be adjusted.

"The personnel provided in the estimate will be used mainly in the diverse professional and technical phases of the work, which is contemplated in about a dozen field projects. The travel item is relatively large because of the high cost in Alaska of special boat and plane travel. 'Transportation of things' includes the movement into remote areas by plane and boat of a large amount of such equipment items as tractors, drills, casing, etc.

"The ratio between other contractual services and equipment and some other items cannot be estimated accurately because all the various situations which will arise cannot be predicted. Other contractual services include such items as the drilling of 38,000 feet of holes and a considerable amount of geophysical work for geologic information. The drilling will include perhaps as many as 50 holes which will be distributed in several of the areas to be investigated. In general, a large amount of the physical work of geologic drilling and similar work has been estimated as contractual. Some of the large items of equipment for the work such as some of the drills, prime movers, etc., have been estimated in the equipment item. Consequently, the actual carrying out of the job may involve either larger equipment and pay-roll costs and lower contractual costs or vice versa.

"Budget details of the proposed expenditures under this item are as follows:

Personal services, departmental:	
Man-years:	
1 principal scientist, P-6	$5,600
2 senior scientists, P-5	9,200
2 assistant scientists, P-2	5,200
1 junior scientist, P-1	2,000
2 assistant clerk-stenographers, CAF-3	3,240
Overtime pay	4,146
Total	29,386
Personal services, field:	
2 senior scientists, P-5	9,200
18 associate scientists, P-3	57,600
8 assistant scientists, P-2	20,800
11 junior scientists, P-1	22,000
24 temporary employees	60,000
Overtime pay	35,519
Additional pay for foreign service	15,000
Total	220,119
Total personal services	$249,505
Travel	70,000
Transportation of things	40,000
Communication services	2,000
Rents and utility services	5,000
Other contractual services	508,495
Supplies and materials	50,000
Equipment	150,000
Total	1,075,000

"The purpose of the second amendment is to increase the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the increased estimate."

Senator HAYDEN. We will be pleased to have further verbal justification in addition to what has been placed in the record in writing.

Exploration for oil

Mr. STRAUS. I will offer just a brief justification. This is for the exploration of Alaska for oil. In this connection the Navy and the Army have an agreement with the Interior, each undertaking a share of it. The Navy is going to operate on the petroleum reserve in Alaska, the Army is going to operate in the Wide Bay area, and the Geological Survey, at the request of the services, is going to operate in other areas in Alaska, all of which is Government land.

Need for oil

The need for oil is the driving motive at the present time, and the necessity of the Government doing this is because private enterprise cannot and does not and will not do it at this time.

I will ask Dr. Wrather and Mr. Heroy to supplement that statement as they see fit.

Mr. WRATHER. This item covers the geological exploration for oil in Alaska which is clearly a function of the Geological Survey. While we are desperately struggling to find oil to service the war in the Pacific, it has been increasingly apparent in recent months that additional sources of supply are badly needed in that general area, and we anticipate that the demand for oil in the Pacific will be greater as time proceeds.

While we are tapping every known source of oil to meet the demands of the Navy and the Army, Alaska remains practically untested, and yet it is recognized to have possibilities for oil production. Surface indications of oil are numerous, and throughout the years the Geological Survey has made certain progress on this investigation, but the limited appropriations available have been scarcely sufficient to more than scratch the surface in such a large and undeveloped territory.

It becomes increasingly urgent that the Geological Survey should perform its obvious function and proceed with the geological exploration which must precede any actual drilling for oil. We are anxious to get at the job and are submitting this request so we can undertake exploration during the coming season on a more comprehensive scale than has been possible in the past.

When work could be started

Senator HAYDEN. If this money were made immediately available, how soon could you go to work?

Mr. SMITH. We are starting with the regular funds, the balance from the 1944 appropriation to send certain parties in the field so that we will have a small nucleus.

You might say we will be immediately available to go ahead on the larger program should the funds be granted.

Indications that oil will be found

Senator HAYDEN. You state that there are surface indications that oil will be found. Those are encouraging, are they?

Mr. WRATHER. There are encouraging indications. In an area along the south coast of Alaska and in another considerable area on the north coast, surface indications exist which indicate that oil may be present. The

final story will never be told until drilling is done and we must make a thoroughgoing geological study in order to indicate the best prospective areas.

Senator HAYDEN. The Geological Survey has in other parts of the country been successful in indicating to drillers a good place to put a hole in the ground and find out whether there is oil?

Mr. WRATHER. Yes, sir; that is the function of the Survey.

Senator HAYDEN. You believe that you can repeat the performance in Alaska to a satisfactory end?

Mr. WRATHER. I wouldn't guarantee the discovery of oil, but I will say we will make the best possible geological investigation.

Senator HAYDEN. What further statement do you wish to make?

Supplying of oil to Northwest area

Mr. STRAUS. I think Mr. Heroy would very briefly state the position in supplying oil to the Northwest section of the country at the present time and the difficulties that the Petroleum Administration for War, which he represents, has in that task.

Mr. HEROY. Senator, as you know, during the early stages of the war, the military situation in Alaska was such that it was impracticable to do anything there in the way of oil development. The situation, of course, has improved now where it does seem feasible to go in there and do certain things that couldn't be done earlier. As regards the supply on the Pacific coast, California is producing at the present time about 825,000 barrels a day of oil which is just about the very maximum which can possibly be done in that area. Everything is being strained to the utmost to get that amount of oil out. In spite of that fact, we are drawing on storage in California to meet the military situation about 80,000 barrels a day of crude oil, so that if the total production in California were 900,000 barrels a day, we wouldn't be any more than breaking even and we are greatly concerned about the shortage of oil on the Pacific coast at the present time, and everything is being done to increase the production in California itself.

Demands for oil in North Pacific

There are going to be large demands for oil in the North Pacific as we look ahead, we feel quite sure, and anything that can be done over a period of a year's time to bring in additional oil up there will be most helpful.

At the present time, for instance, in British Columbia there is a shortage of oil, and we are now planning to bring oil from western South America up to British Columbia in tankers to take care of that situation. So that we have in the North Pacific a very acute situation and we, therefore, feel that anything that can be done to add to the supply there and to cut off this deficiency will be very helpful.

How oil would be gotten out of Alaska

Senator HAYDEN. Now, the particular area that you believe it is desirable to explore is so situated that, if oil were found, it would not be difficult to get it to the seaboard?

Mr. HEROY. That is right. These areas in which Dr. Smith proposes to do most of his work are located very close to the coast on the south coast of Alaska, and if promising prospects were developed there, as we feel quite sure they will be, in several of these areas it will be a relatively simple matter.

Senator HAYDEN. It wouldn't be similar to the experience in northwestern Canada?

Mr. HEROY. In northern Alaska it would take a pipe line 800 miles long to bring it to the coast, but in no instance here would it take a pipe line more than 20 or 25 miles long to put the oil right on the coast, a thing that could be done within a few weeks, so that the oil would be immediately accessible for the war program if any were developed as a result of this work. Yes; I would like to make that very clear: That this is stuff that is right close to transportation.

Senator HAYDEN. Are there any further statements with regard to the matter?

Mr. WRATHER. Dr. Smith, do you have anything further to say?

Dr. SMITH. No, sir.

Preparatory study of project

Dr. WRATHER. We have worked over this budget very carefully, Senator. It has been in progress since last fall. First, we undertook to review all the accumulated information in the files of the Geological Survey bearing on the subject and in the light of this information appraise the gaps where additional work was needed. We have gone into this in considerable detail even to the point of the location of the areas in which field parties are to be placed. Some of the geologists are now proceeding to the field as the weather permits, and others will follow along as fast as possible. Of course, we will not be able to get the full force into the field until we are assured of how much money we will have available for the enterprise. There are limitations in manpower which, of course, are present in everything one tries to do these days, but we think we can carry the program forward as outlined.

Mr. STRAUS. One other statement, Senator. This is part of the three-way attack on the problem. The Congress has recently provided the Navy with a larger amount, I think, a million and a half dollars, to engage in an operation on the naval petroleum reserve on which no petroleum has been produced to date.

Development near coast line

Senator HAYDEN. That is located where?

Mr. STRAUS. On the north coast.

Senator HAYDEN. That is way up by Point Barrow?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Senator HAYDEN. In that instance, if oil were discovered, it would not be far from ocean transportation?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir. It is a difficult season up there, but it is close to the ocean.

Senator HAYDEN. If the oil were taken out of the well during the wintertime, it could be taken out when navigation opened and made available?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes; the reserve is very large geographically, but small in comparison with the other parts of Alaska which will be explored by the Survey.

The Army's participation—and this is by agreement and encouragement of the Army—is a drilling program at Wide Bay, the Wide Bay area in Alaska. That is what the Army is going to seek to do in the exploration of Alaska, and the Geological Survey is undertaking the part that has just been described.

Senator HAYDEN. Speaking of Wide Bay would indicate again that it was a development comparatively near the coast, and we would not be embarrassed by long transmission lines.

Mr. WRATHER. Directly on the coast, Senator.

Senator HAYDEN. I think that makes a satisfactory report.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein the brief hearings had before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 22, line 9, insert the following:

"Purchase of improvements on lands, Havasupai Indian Reservation, Ariz.: For the purchase of improvements on exchanged lands as authorized by and in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 4, 1944 (Public Law 246), $11,100: *Provided*, That title to any improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Indians of the Havasupai Reservation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 23, line 7, insert the following:

"Purchase of land, Fort Peck Reservation, Montana (tribal funds): For the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Indians of the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont., $25,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians: *Provided*, That title to any land and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Fort Peck Indians."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 23, line 14, insert the following:

"Purchase of land, Flathead Indians, Montana (tribal funds): For the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Indians of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., $38,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians: *Provided*, That title to any land and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Indians of the Flathead Reservation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 23, line 21, and insert the following:

"Purchase of land, Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina (tribal funds): For the purchase of land and improvements thereon for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina, $2,500, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians: *Provided*, That title to any lands and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 49, line 18, strike out "$216,045" and insert the following: "$223,670, of which not to exceed $1,200 shall be available until expended in units of $300 for standing rewards for information leading to the apprehension and conviction for the theft or killing of any Indian cattle (tribal and individual) on the Klamath Reservation, of any person or persons under rules and regulations adopted by the Klamath Cattle Committee and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 50, line 6, strike out "$217,045" and insert "$224,670."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 51, line 14, after the words "Indian Affairs", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $10,000 shall be immediately available for an audit of the books, accounts, and operations of the Menominee Indian Mills by a certified public accountant or firm of accountants under a contract to be entered by said accountant or firm of accountants with the Menominee Tribe acting by its advisory council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 89: Page 51, line 22, strike out "$544,325" and insert "$558,950."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$556,450."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 54, line 17, insert the following:

"Expenses of tribal officers and other purposes, Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes, Wyoming (tribal funds): For the current fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior, or such official as may be designated by him, is hereby authorized to pay out of any joint tribal funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indians of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., in the Treasury of the United States the following salaries and expenses:

"To the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Shoshone and Arapaho Joint General Council and members of the Shoshone and Arapaho Joint Business Committee, or other committees appointed by the Joint General Council, when engaged on joint business of the tribes, a sum of not to exceed $8 per diem for attendance to cover salary and all expenses; to such official delegates of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes who may carry on the joint business of the tribes in Washington or Chicago a per diem of not to exceed $10 in lieu of salary and expenses: *Provided*, That the rate of per diem shall be fixed in advance by the Joint General Council or by the Joint Business Committee if authorized by said Joint General Council: *Provided further*, That the official delegates of said tribes, carrying on business in Washington or Chicago shall also receive the usual railroad and sleeping-car transportation to and from Washington or Chicago: *And provided further*, That the length of stay of the official delegates in Washington or Chicago shall be determined by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Secretary or his designate is also authorized and directed to expend from said joint tribal funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indians with the consent of the Joint Business Committee, not exceeding $1,500 per annum for pay of game and fish wardens to be appointed by the Joint Business Committee, for patrolling the lakes, streams, and hunting areas of the Wind River Reservation: *Provided*, That receipts derived from fishing and hunting licenses and permits and from fines shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribes pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560): *Provided further*, That all the aforesaid pay and expenses for all purposes shall not exceed in the aggregate $7,500 per annum."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as folows:

Senate amendment No. 94: Page 56, line 24, insert the following:

"Fulfillment of Atoka agreement with Choctow-Chickasaw Nations of Indians: That pursuant to the provisions of the treaty between the United States and the Choctaw-Chickasaw Nations of Indians, known as the Atoka agreement, and the supplemental agreements thereafter made and the laws enacted by the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States for the purchase from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians in Oklahoma for all the present right, title, and interest of said Indians in the land and mineral deposits reserved from allotment in accordance with the provisions of section 58 of the act entitled 'An act to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1902. The Secretary shall cause such contract to be executed on behalf of said Indians by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation, and shall then submit such contract to said Indians for their approval. If and when such contract has been approved by said Indians, the Secretary shall submit the contract to the Congress for its ratification: *Provided*, That the approval of such contract by the said Indians shall be through a special election called and held pursuant to rules and regulations to be promulgated by the said Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That before the said rules and regulations are promulgated they must be submitted to and approved by both the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation. Such contract shall not be binding upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the Congress.

"Upon the approval of such contract by the Congress—

"(a) The amount of the purchase price fixed in such contract when appropriated shall be placed to the credit of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians on the books of the Treasury of the United States, and thereafter such proceeds shall be distributed to such Indians in pursuance with the terms and provisions of such contract and shall be exempted from attorney fees and other debt contracted prior to the passage and approval of this act; and

"(b) The Secretary shall cause a proper conveyance to be executed by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation conveying all right, title, and interest of said Indians in such lands and mineral deposits to the United States, and thereupon, all such right, title, and interest shall vest in the United States.

"The appropriation of such sum as may be necessary for making the payments to such Indians pursuant to section 2 (a) of this act is hereby authorized. There is also authorized to be appropriated the sum of $20,000 to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to defray the expenses of negotiating the contract and holding of the election authorized by section 1 hereof, including the making of such appraisal or appraisals as may be deemed necessary.

"The land and mineral deposits when acquired hereunder shall become part of the public domain subject to the applicable public land mining and mineral leasing laws. The coal deposits acquired hereunder may be leased in accordance with the provisions relating to coal of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended. The asphalt deposits acquired hereunder may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as he may by general regulations prescribe, and in areas not exceeding 640 acres each. Leases for such asphalt deposits shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, not less than 25 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds of marketable production, and upon payment in advance of a rental of 25 cents per acre for the first calendar year or fraction thereof; 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, respectively; and $1 per acre per annum thereafter during the continuance of the lease, such rental for any lease year to be credited against royalties accruing for that year. Leases for such asphalt deposits shall be for a period of 20 years, with preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the expiration of such periods. All asphalt leases issued hereunder shall be subject to such further terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as may be incorporated in each lease or prescribed by general regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior prior to the issuance of the lease, including convenants relative to mining methods, waste, period of preliminary development, initial investment, and minimum production. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to

modify or amend as to area any asphalt lease issued hereunder upon application of the lessee if he finds such modification or amendment to be to the best interests of the United States and of the lessee. The general provisions of sections 1, 27, 29 to 34, inclusive, 37, and 38 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, shall apply to asphalt leases issued under the provisions of this act, sections 1, 34, and 37 thereof being amended to include deposits of asphalt acquired hereunder, and section 27 thereof being amended to provide that no person, association, or corporation shall take or hold more than 2,560 acres under asphalt lease at any one time. The entire net income from coal and asphalt leases issued under this act shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This amendment authorizes the acquisition from a group of Indians of a lot of coal and so-called asphalt lands. It seems to me that we ought to have some information as to what it would cost and if there is any reason why we should do it. We are rather embarking upon a considerable undertaking, it seems to me. I would like to have the gentleman explain the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's request is reasonable, and I will be glad to give him the information. I will say that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] is quite familiar with the Atoka agreement on which this amendment is based, and a little later I shall ask him to give the House more detailed information.

I do not intend to go into the merits of this item at length. As I indicated a moment ago, I do want to point out that Senate amendment No. 94 relates to the Atoka agreement entered into by the Government of the United States and the Indians involved in 1898. May I say that this amendment, if adopted, will not at this time commit the Federal Government to any expenditure of funds other than the cost of submitting the agreement to the Indians through a special election. I want to make that clear. It will give the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians and the Government of the United States an opportunity to get together, negotiate, and if possible settle, this perplexing problem which has been pending in one form or another since 1898.

Briefly, the amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into negotiations with authority to make a contract for the purchase of 379,000 acres of coal and asphalt lands from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians of Oklahoma. The contract must be submitted to the Indians for their approval at a special election, and upon its approval by the Indians it must be submitted to the Congress for ratification. It does not commit this Congress to pay any specific sum for these valuable coal lands. But by the passage of this pending amendment the Congress will demonstrate that it is willing to keep faith with these two great tribes of Indians. It will then be up to the Department of the Interior and the Indians to see whether or not they can get together on a price that is fair and reasonable.

Since all the opposition apparently comes from the Republican side of this Chamber let me call attention to the fact that you gentlemen are going to meet in Chicago in a few days to write another platform in which you will "view with alarm" as you did in 1940, in 1936, and to some extent in 1932. Without any desire to be presumptuous, let me suggest that before you write another platform that you read the one you wrote 4 years ago in which you solemnly promised the Indians to assist in every way to wind up their affairs. In fact, both Democratic and Republican platforms made similar promises in this respect.

Some Indians in Oklahoma, judging from the vote, assumed your party really meant what you said then. By your stubborn opposition here today some Indians might get the idea that you are generous with campaign promises at election time but weak on performance when the occasion arises to put those promises into action. This is an opportunity to assist those two Indian tribes in winding up their affairs and at the same time keep faith with them. The amendment specifically provides that the contract shall not be binding upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the Congress.

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

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

Mr. JENKINS. I am not opposed to this because I am not as well posted on this as I might be, but I am wondering why the Committee on Appropriations is called upon to submit agreements between the Indians and the United States. Is not that outside the purview of the activities of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman that theoretically it may be outside the purview of the activities of the Committee on Appropriations, but the gentleman has been here a long time, he is a very able and distinguished member not only of his party but of the Congress, and a member of a great committee, and I think if he has observed as closely as I believe he has, he knows that there are very few annual appropriation bills that come in here that are not literally loaded down with legislation. This is not an exception to the rule. Theoretically it might be argued that the Committee on Appropriations should not be called upon to enact legislation, but actually that committee does. Especially is this true since Pearl Harbor. The gentleman must admit that is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. I have heard of that before.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And he will hear it many times in the future before this war is over. If the gentleman insists we should hew to the line at all times and under all circumstances and not permit legislation on appropriation bills, I might go along with him, but no one knows better than he that this Congress is not adhering to that rule. He knows, too, that we will not do it in the future. The gentleman knows that very well. Let us not confuse the real issue here by a mere subterfuge. Let us be perfectly frank, realistic, and practical.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not propose to raise a point of order about it, but this is what I had in mind. If it is of such importance that the Committee on Appropriations feels constrained to submit this thing to the Indians to be passed upon by them, then what is the next step? What in the natural sequence will be the next thing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, the gentleman knows a point of order would not now be in order. Answering the gentleman I will say the next step would be for the Interior Department and the Indians to attempt to get together and submit the matter to tribes in question to see if an agreement can be reached. Before you vote on this I want Members to know that these lands are very valuable involving several millions of dollars. We are told that there is not only a potential shortage of coal but that in the next few months there is going to be an actual shortage of coal.

I weigh my words when I say there is sufficient coal in this area in Oklahoma to fire every ship that floats the sea. I feel sure I am not exaggerating the facts when I say that. There is a tremendous amount of coal in that area. It is almost unlimited, and most of it is of high grade. It is reasonable to assume, considering the coal shortage, that the Government of the United States would want some or all of that coal and might need it badly before this time next year. If the Indians get together with the Department of the Interior on a reasonable price, and that is submitted back to the Congress of the United States, then there will be sufficient time to say, "This is too much" or "This is not enough." Why haggle over that now?

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand, the Committee on Appropriations has not committed itself or the Congress of the United States to pay any special price for this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. It has not committed itself in any contract with these Indians or anyone else that the Government should operate these mines and mine this coal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; but may I add that the Atoka agreement speaks for itself.

Mr. JENKINS. Then anyone who is in the coal business can look at what we do today and say, "The Government and the Congress are not bound in the least by implication, or otherwise, to mine or produce any coal."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think, too, that is a fair assumption. The gentleman will be perfectly consistent to vote for this amendment today and a year from now or later use his own judgment as to whether a contract that may be entered into is fair and reasonable either to the United States or to the two tribes of Indians concerned.

Mr. JENKINS. I should not be opposed to the Government's buying coal land if it wants to, but I should be opposed to the Government's going into the coal business, mining and producing coal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has made his position perfectly clear.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it a fact that this same proposition was once previously before the Congress, and was not an authorization passed similar to this and then repealed after they found they had gotten into a mess over it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad the gentleman has mentioned that. There have been a number of acts passed with reference to this subject during the past 46 years.

I may say to the gentleman that another legislative body at the other end of this Capitol has passed almost unanimously a bill proposing to do this very thing.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the Atoka agreement was made under that old bill, and that after the agreement was entered into Congress repealed the authority?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Atoka agreement was made back in 1898. It is true, I believe, that Congress went back on that agreement. But when Congress practically repudiated a solemn agreement entered into by the Government of the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes, such action was not to the credit of the Congress of the United States. It will be recalled that this Government also told the Indians in another treaty that they should never be moved as long as grass grew and as long as water ran, but we did not keep that agreement with the Indians. The way some of the Indians have been treated is a shame and a disgrace to the Nation. But the fact that Congress has not kept its agreements with all other Indian tribes is no reason why Congress should repudiate and refuse time after time to keep its promises and obligations with reference to the Atoka agreement.

Mr. TABER. Someone would say that we were not keeping our agreement, probably, if the Congress refused to ratify the agreement the Secretary of the Interior might make. That is what I am disturbed about in connection with this. It seems to be something where someone heretofore has thought that when we got into it were getting the Government in wrong. Now if we go ahead and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a contract with these Indians, we are going to get the Indians all stirred up with the idea that they are going to get something. Then if the Congress does not agree to it afterward we will be in trouble. That is the way it looks to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. The gentleman knows that I do not always agree with the Secretary of the Interior by any manner of means, but in many ways he has proved himself to be an able and fearless administrator. Whether we like him or not I think it is fair to say that he can be depended on in a matter of this kind to protect the rights of the Indians as well as the Federal Government. I repeat, this is simply giving an opportunity to work out the sale of these valuable coal lands to the satisfaction of the Indians and to the Government that may be needed very badly during the next year or two if this war continues that long.

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

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

Mr. CASE. I note on page 58 that the proposed language includes these words:

> Such contract shall not be binding upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I have pointed that out.

Mr. CASE. I recognize that. At the same time, on page 57 there appears this language:

> The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States for the purchase from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indiana in Oklahoma—

And so forth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is also correct. I have called it a tentative contract because that is all it could be when we tied this string to it that it must be ratified by both the Congress of the United States and also by the Indians. Keep in mind that these Indians are not going to give away one of the finest coal fields in all the world.

Mr. CASE. I notice that it also states that:

> If and when such contract has been approved by said Indians, the Secretary shall submit the contract to the Congress for its ratification.

It seems to me perfectly clear that under the language here proposed the contract will not be binding until it has been ratified by both parties. With the gentleman's long experience in dealing with the Indians, I am sure he will agree that it will be important in the explanation of this to the tribe that attention be called to that, otherwise some of the Indians will read the portion that speaks of authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract and take the meaning which was suggested by the gentleman from New York and understand that the Secretary has been authorized to act on behalf of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I now am going to ask my good friend, the distinguished and able Member from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], who has been a very active and able Member for several weeks, and yet who is so modest and retiring that he has not yet uttered a word, so far as I know, on the floor of this House, to make a statement about this matter and to answer any questions that any member of the House may want to ask.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield first?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. When was this treaty made?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In 1898.

Mr. BENDER. Did not the Congress reverse itself later?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I understand it did. Congress has reversed itself many times on many occasions. It may not be a credit to the Congress of the United States that it has reversed itself, but it has done so, and it may reverse itself in the future. We do not know about that. We do know we made a solemn agreement with these Indians, and the least we can do today is to give them an opportunity to attempt to sell this land at a fair and reasonable cash price.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER].

SALE OF COAL AND ASPHALT DEPOSITS OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, being a freshman in this great body, I rise on this occasion with a great deal of apprehension and reluctance. But the importance of it to my people and to my State demands that I break the ancient custom and tradition of the House that a freshman should be seen and not heard. Therefore I ask your sympathetic indulgence while I present my views on this amendment.

First, may I give you a little of the history with reference to this legislation? Before doing so, however, I desire to thank and congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] for the valuable assistance he has rendered in connection with the amendment. He deserves the thanks of every Choctaw and Chickasaw. May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that he has proven to be a true friend everywhere of all Indians. I also wish to thank his committee for permitting me to appear before them.

The Choctaw-Chickasaw Tribes of Indians are located principally in the southeastern and southern part of Oklahoma. They occupy an area of approximately 21 or 22 counties in our State. I happen to be a duly enrolled member of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians, and am part Chickasaw. My tribe came from the State of Mississippi. They gave up their land in Mississippi at the insistence of the Unted States Government for lands in the then Indian Territory, now Oklahoma. We received a patent in fee to them from our Government, probably two of the few tribes in the United States which have so received title to their lands. My people came to Indian Territory around 1830. As time went on white people migrated to the Indian Territory and within a very short while insistent requests and demands were made by them upon the Federal authorities to cause this Indian Territory to become a State of the Union.

Due to that pressure Congress passed an act in 1893 creating a Commission, which became known later as the Dawes Commission, and Senator Dawes, who had been a Member of the United States Senate, became Chairman of that Commission. The purpose of that Commission was to cause the land, which was owned at that time in common by the two tribes, to be allotted to them individually and the balance of the surplus land sold to white settlers. Reluctantly but due to much high pressure, the Choctaws and Chickasaws finally acceded to the request of the Government and proceeded to permit the machinery to be set up to make these allotments in severalty. That caused the act of June 1898, commonly known as the Atoka agreement, to be enacted by the Congress of the United States. The act was voted upon at a special election by the two tribes and ratified. It contained plans for the allotment of lands and final settlement of affairs. It further provided that the coal and asphalt land and deposits should remain and be the common property of the two tribes, of which at that time there were approximately 445,000 acres. That was reserved and set aside from allotments. No individual member of the Choctaw-Chickasaw Nation could allot any portion of this land. In the same section of that act authority was given to the Secretary of the Interior to lease these mineral lands for 30 years to anyone who desired a lease thereon. Many leases were given. Fifteen cents a ton was paid as royalty for all coal mined and 60 cents a ton for the asphalt mined. We had something like 3,000 acres of asphalt land. We still own that number of acres of asphalt land. Today there are approximately 370,000 acres of coal land which we own in common, and it is practically the only land that the two tribes own in common. The Indians became very dissatisfied with the leasing provisions of this law. They sent their representatives to Congress to petition the proper authorities for relief.

As a consequence of their efforts the supplemental agreement of July 1, 1902, was enacted into law by Congress. This supplemental agreement was ratified by my people on September 25, 1902. Section 59 of that agreement contained a positive provision that the Secretary of the Interior would sell the coal lands within 3 years from September 25, 1902. But what happened? Long before that time passed, by a provision attached to an appropriation bill approved on April 21, 1904, Congress took these coal lands off the market until their further direction, contrary to the provisions of this supplemental treaty. That, however, was not the first evidence of Congress breaking faith with its Indian wards. There was nothing done with reference to the sale of these lands, in keeping with the treaty of July 1, 1902, until February 19, 1912, when Congress passed an act authorizing the sale at public auction of the surface lands overlying the coal and asphalt deposits leased and unleased, the sale to be by tracts.

Then in 1918, on February 4, Congress passed an act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell at public auction the tribal coal and asphalt deposits, under rules and regulations prescribed by him. Many tracts were sold and today we have authority to sell these coal lands if we could find a buyer. But they have such a great value that there is no private individual who wants to invest that much money. The taxes would be too enormous. As a consequence the Choctaws and Chickasaws are here again today asking Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the tribal officials for the sale of these deposits to our Government. Our people have been coming here for more than 40 years asking Congress to keep its word—a solemn pledge it made in 1902.

I want to go back just a moment, if I may, to the period from 1904 to 1912, and call your attention to an act of Congress which was enacted on April 26, 1906. The title of that act is "An act providing for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory", which tribes are the Creeks, Cherokees, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws of Oklahoma. Section 13 thereof again postponed the sale of both the leased and unleased coal and asphalt lands and deposits until the then existing leases should expire, or until such time as might be otherwise provided by law.

As embodied in the title, the purpose of that act was to wind up the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes. Accordingly the tribes, believing in our Government, kept faith by dissolving their tribal governments and turning their affairs over to the Secretary of the Interior for final disposition. And since April 26, 1906, the Choctaws and Chickasaws have been coming to Washington every year, parking at the doors of various committees, asking Congress to pass appropriate legislation to help the two tribes wind up their affairs so they could stop the tribal expense to which they have been and are subjected today.

All this amendment does is to permit negotiations to be carried on between the Secretary of the Interior and the two tribal officials, the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for the sale of our coal and asphalt lands. It only authorizes them, if you please, to negotiate for the sale of the mineral rights in these 370,000 acres. There is no appropriation; there is no commitment made by Congress, but it simply authorizes those three people to get together and see if they can agree upon a price to carry out the solemn agreement that was made in June 1898 and July 1, 1902. After the negotiations have been concluded, the contract is then submitted to the members of the two tribes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STIGLER. That contract will be submitted to the members of the two tribes for their approval through a special election. They either approve or reject the price agreed upon by their representatives. After they have had an opportunity to vote and the contract is approved, it is then submitted to Congress for its approval. If the Congress approves the agreement, then and then only is an appropriation made. We are here today asking Congress to keep faith with our people to whom a solemn promise was made some 40 years ago, that they would sell these coal lands. What could be more fair? Surely that is not asking too much, if one believes in keeping a solemn obligation.

I want to emphasize what the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the subcommittee who handled this bill, said, when he made the observation that both political parties are committed to help wind up the affairs of the Indians in Oklahoma and provide for a final settlement. I have before me the platform of the two parties. They are very definite and certain about it. Since 3 years have passed, we are asking again that both parties help carry out that pledge. Surely by your action this afternoon you are not going to send word back to the Indians of Oklahoma that the language contained in your party platforms of 1940 is nothing but an empty gesture. For you the test is here. You have an opportunity to prove where your party stands and I refuse to believe you will be found wanting.

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

Mr. STIGLER. I gladly yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman about the nature of this coal. You say there are about 360,000 acres. How far below the surface is it, and what is the grade and quality of the coal?

Mr. STIGLER. The coal is bituminous and semibituminous and of various grades and quality, consisting mainly of low-volatile bunker coal for steamship use, high-grade domestic coal, railroad steam coal, high-grade blacksmith and coking coal. It is in seams, averaging 4 feet thick, with an average dip of from 10° to 15°. There are several beds of this coal. It ranges in depth all the way from 4 feet down to where it is necessary to sink shafts to extract the coal.

Mr. JENKINS. Has there been any coal taken out of that vicinity?

Mr. STIGLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. JENKINS. How is it done? By steam shovel?

Mr. STIGLER. By stripping, steam shovels, and by shafts.

Mr. JENKINS. What proportion of this is asphalt territory? You say a certain percentage of it is asphalt?

Mr. STIGLER. The coal deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes are within the Choctaw Nation and on June 30, 1942, amounted to a total of approximately 378,117.08 acres. These deposits extend from the northeast corner to the southwest corner of the old Choctaw Nation. In area they are about 125 miles in length and vary in width from 5 to 15 miles. They lie in six counties of the

State, namely, Atoka, Coal, Pittsburg, Latimer, Le Flore, and Haskell. The tribal asphalt deposits consist of five tracts, aggregating 3,040 acres.

Mr. JENKINS. Where is the coal shipped that is mined there?

Mr. STIGLER. To St. Louis and other places.

Mr. JENKINS. Most of it is strip mining?

Mr. STIGLER. Oh, no. A lot of it is strip mining, but some of it is by shafts and slopes. Today we are shipping coal all over the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. But your State is a big State. Is it the same grade and quality of coal that you referred to? When you say you are shipping coal, that is over about Muskogee. That would be in mountainous country, where they would have a different grade and different quality of coal, naturally. Is your coal in this vicinity you are talking about the same kind of coal, or do you have two or three different veins of coal?

Mr. STIGLER. Most of it is smithing coal. It is not anthracite coal.

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

Mr. STIGLER. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. If I understand my colleague from Oklahoma correctly, the amendment proposed by the other body, which we are now attempting to incorporate in the bill, does not carry any appropriation.

Mr. STIGLER. None whatsoever.

Mr. RIZLEY. It is simply an amendment which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to carry on negotiations with those two tribes, and then the tribes must submit this to a vote amongst themselves. Then whatever arrangement may be reached, provided your people agree to the matter, must all be submitted back to the Congress for further consideration?

Mr. STIGLER. The distinguished gentleman is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. And that is all the amendment provides?

Mr. STIGLER. It is simply an enabling act. We are not committing or binding the Congress in any way whatsoever, as far as money is concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it was due to the persistent effort of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that this matter is before the House this afternoon. The gentleman from Oklahoma has certainly worked hard to bring this matter before the House.

One of the things wrong with this matter today is that the proposal we are considering is a matter of legislation and not an appropriation matter. This bill should be before the Committee on Indian Affairs rather than before the Committee on Appropriations. It was not submitted to the House subcommittee, but was put on in the Senate, where they often put on legislative matters.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. CARTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman says, that this legislation should originate before a legislative committee.

Mr. CARTER. Well, let us put that principle into practice right now.

Mr. RIZLEY. I found out not long ago, when we had this fair-employment practice question up here, as well as some other things, that we are rather inconsistent about these things. Here are these two Indian tribes who apparently have a treaty or some agreement with the Government, and they simply want to carry on further negotiations. It does not cost one dime of money. This thing we took on the other day costs a half million dollars. This matter does not cost a dime. I think we should be consistent about these things. If we are going to make that iron-clad rule, I will go along with the gentleman, but since we have not, let us deal fairly with these Indians.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The Indian Affairs Committee considered this very bill, I believe. At least the provisions were quite similar if not the same, and the bill was reported out favorably, as I remember it. I was wondering what became of it. It was considered in our committee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further at this time. I am not a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs and regret I cannot inform the gentleman. But I want to say that legislative matters are thrust into these bills occasionally. There is no doubt but what the gentleman from Oklahoma is correct, they should not be there. The House subcommittee has not had a hearing on this matter. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] did appear and made a very clear statement in regard to this matter to the House committee, but we told him very frankly that this was a matter of legislation and that it should come into the House through the proper legislative committee; and that is what I am recommending at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has answered the speech of the gentleman from California. I cannot answer it further.

I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARTER) there were—ayes 38, noes 23.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 115: Page 73, line 2, after the word "Secretary," insert ": *Provided*, That on or before June 1, 1946, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on expenditures incurred and revenues received in the construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, together with his recommendations for allocation and adjustment of such expenditures and revenues between the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities; and that such expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund prior to such allocation and adjustment, under this or other appropriation acts heretofore or hereafter enacted, shall be without prejudice to the rights, if any, of power contractors to have adjustments, with respect to such expenditures, made to accord with the substantive provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 115 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 116: Page 73, line 23, strike out "$50,000" and insert "to be immediately available, $350,000, of which not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for the purchase of lands subject to seepage or overflow and improvements thereon: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any moneys for the purchase of said lands and improvements or for remedial or other necessary works for the protection of public or private property in or near the city of Needles, Calif., shall not be deemed a recognition of any obligation or liability whatsoever on the part of the United States: *Provided further*, That any moneys received by the United States as reimbursement in accordance with contracts heretofore entered into under the authority of the act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), as amended, and ratified by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), for work in or near said city of Needles, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 116 and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

"In line 2 of said amendment, strike out '$350,000' and insert '$340,000.'"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 127: Page 77, line 5, insert "Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $2,250,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 127 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert '$2,500,000.'"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 128: Page 77, line 6, strike out "$545,000" and insert "$945,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate No. 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In lieu of the sum proposed insert '$1,045,000.' "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 133: Page 78, line 4, strike out "$8,642,200" and insert "$17,642,200."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 133 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In lieu of the sum proposed insert '$12,142,200.' "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 138: Page 78, line 11, insert:

"Fort Peck project, Montana: For construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1938 (16 U. S. C. 833), $800,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which amount shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed $12,000) and for all other objects of expenditure as specified in this act under the head 'Administrative provisions and limitations' appearing under the caption 'Bureau of Reclamation,' but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

"In line 4 of said amendment, strike out '$800,000' and insert '$400,000.' "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 155: Page 88, line 7, insert:

"Anthracite investigations: For all expenses necessary to conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and use of anthracite coals; including temporary employment by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of engineers, scientists, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and plants; purchase of special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; and other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior,' purchase not to exceed $4,500, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; and not to exceed $6,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $131,000: *Provided*, That of this amount $50,000 shall be available for the purchase of land and the construction and equipment of a laboratory building as authorized in the act approved December 18, 1942 (Public Law 812, 56 Stat. 1056), only upon the fulfillment of the condition that an equal amount shall be contributed for the same purpose by State or local organizations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur in same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 155, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

" 'Anthracite investigations: For all expenses necessary to conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and use of anthracite coals; including purchase of special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; and other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior"; purchase, not to exceed $3,000, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; and not to exceed $6,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $81,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources.' "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 156: Page 89, after line 5, insert the following:

"Synthetic liquid fuels: For all expenses without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, necessary to carry into effect the act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, etc., approved April 5, 1944 (Public, No. 290), including construction and acquirement of camp and laboratory buildings and equipment, personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work, purchase, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles, printing and binding, and purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior,' $8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds may be utilized to provide transportation between the proposed plants and related facilities and communities that provide adequate living accommodations, of persons engaged in the operation and maintenance of these plants; and for transportation to and from schools of pupils who are dependents of such persons, which transportation shall be by methods which the Office of Defense Transportation shall find to be most advantageous and efficient: *Provided further*, That pursuant to agreements approved by the Secretary and the Office of Defense Transportation, the transportation equipment available to the Bureau of Mines may be pooled with that of school districts and other local or Federal agencies for use in transporting persons engaged in operation and maintenance of these plants, pupils who are dependents of such persons, and other pupils, and in the interest of economy the expenses of operating such equipment may be shared: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of $22,000,000 during the period covered by the aforesaid act, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

"In line 9 of said amendment, after the word 'Columbia', insert '(not exceeding $90,000).'

"In line 12 of said amendment, after the word 'purchase', insert '(not exceeding $15,000).'

"In line 16 of said amendment, strike out the sum '$8,000,000', and insert '$5,000,000.'

"And in line 34 of said amendment, after the word 'shared', insert a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the conference committee, which has gone into this matter carefully and has conferred with the Senate conference committee, believes that the amount of $5,000,000 is sufficient at this time to begin the program of the development of the synthetic liquid fuels industry of this country. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct. It is enough to make the plans and get started on the program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman tell the membership of the House what the position of the Bureau of Mines, speaking through its Director, R. R. Sayers, is as to the amount which you have agreed is sufficient?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee talked to Dr. Sayers before we reached a final agreement. He is very enthusiastic about the proposed program, he is very sympathetic with it, he feels it is essential, but I think I am violating no secret when I say that while he never asked us to cut the appropriation he believes this is sufficient to make a good start.

Mr. RANDOLPH. One further observation. I believe that the House by almost unanimous vote and the Senate likewise passed this measure believing that we needed in this country to supplement our natural petroleum resources by the development of a liquid fuels industry. The House expected its Appropriations Committee at the proper time or times to provide the necessary funds to in an orderly fashion carry forward

this program. I am sure that the committee will want at future times to take care of any necessary funds whi h must be provided if this program is to be successful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that the membership of the committee is sympathetic with the program. It is hoped that this war might be over within a few months, although we do not know. It may be several months or years. The committee feels that it would be better for the Bureau of Mines to start with this particular amount, and come back next year, make a showing as to what it has done and what it proposes to do, and then either this Congress or the succeeding Congress will be in a better position to decide how much is needed to continue the program. I assure the gentleman there is no disposition on the part of any member of the committee to try to curtail this program.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the entire amount provided in this item be used for the production of liquid fuels from coal and oil shale?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] as author of this legislation is more familiar with what is proposed than I am. He can probably answer the question.

Mr. COOLEY. I understood that the basic legislation authorized an appropriation for two purposes; one for the purpose of conducting experiments with regard to coal and oil shale and the other with agricultural and forestry products.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand it, the Interior Department will use this entire amount in connection with the experiments on coal and oil shale and nothing is provided for the agricultural and forestry products. Can the gentleman give me any information on that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This committee, of course, is not in any position to make an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. I am sympathetic with the suggestion made by the gentleman that the Department of Agriculture might be interested in promulgating the program, but we are not in position to make an appropriation to that Department.

Mr. COOLEY. The basic legislation would clearly indicate that it was to be a joint program between Agriculture and Interior. Apparently nothing is being done for Agriculture in this item.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say that the language of this appropriation bill is as follows: It is synthetic liquid fuel from coal or oil shale, agricultural and forestry products. So it is my position that the Bureau of Mines ought to carry out the basic law of the land.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman they ought to do it, but I am wondering if Agriculture has been given any part of this fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe I have the answer to the gentleman's question. On page 638 of the Interior Department appropriation hearings over in the Senate, at the bottom of that page, Senator O'MAHONEY asked First Assistant Secretary Straus this question:

> Let me first ask if you have had conferences with the Department of Agriculture respecting the provision of the bill referring to the Agricultural Department?
>
> Mr. STRAUS. We had several conferences with the Department of Agriculture respecting the part of the bill with reference to agricultural sources of liquid fuel, and we hope to work those out satisfactory to both Departments.

Further on he says, "But those are the principal ones that we plan in the initial part of the program."

I believe that answers the question.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is in contemplation in the initial part of the program, but I just wonder if Interior would not take all this money and leave Agriculture out entirely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. During the debate in the House it was clearly indicated that there was no disposition on the part of the Members who might especially be interested in coal or in oil shale or in agriculture or forestry products to set them apart as the most important subjects to be experimented with in the carrying forward of demonstration plants. There was unanimity of opinion here that all of these substances would be investigated and that the demonstration plants would operate on a broad scale.

The Department of Agriculture has indicated its desire to cooperate with the Department of the Interior in laying out this broad basis by which the Congress can accomplish the purpose expressed in the legislation. You will recall that coal and oil shale, forestry and agricultural products were specifically mentioned and also the use of the language "and other substances." There was no disposition either, when the House passed the act or now, when the Committee on Appropriations brings in this initial sum of money, to set one substance as against the other in importance. We must leave it to some determining body to develop this program.

Mr. COOLEY. Who will develop it?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The United States Bureau of Mines. That is our basic legislation.

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

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

Mr. NORRELL. I think it is the disposition of this committee in recommending the expenditure of this money that agricultural and forestry products be considered along with coal and oil shale. Certainly it is within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior to make a proper test not only of coal, but of timber, for example.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to interrupt, the basic legislation contemplates that the Secretary of Agriculture will have control of the program dealing with agricultural and forestry products.

Mr. NORRELL. I think the gentleman is in error about that.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the act says, "under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. NORRELL. The basic act says:

> Any activities under this act relating to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products shall be carried out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and subject to the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. But the Department of the Interior has to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture. The point is that the Secretary of the Interior will have to initiate the program, and if he fails to initiate a program for agricultural and forestry products then we will not have one.

Mr. NORRELL. The evidence before the committee is that the Bureau of Mines is cooperating perfectly with the Department of Agriculture. May I say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I, for one, on this committee, am anxious that coal and agricultural and forestry products all be included in this test. We have all three in my State and I am anxious that they all be treated alike.

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

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

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to take a little time, if I may, to try and bring out a little further the point raised by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] who inquired with reference to the position of agriculture in this scheme.

When the House passed this original bill, of which the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] was the author, we passed a bill to do one thing, and that was to make liquid fuel. Under that bill the power and authority to carry on this work was given to the Department of the Interior. In order to make liquid fuel, it was understood, impliedly at least, that the liquid fuel would be made out of coal, primarily. Later it developed that it would be well to include oil shale, and later agricultural and forestry products such as sawdust were discussed. In the discussion we got to the place where we decided that we would give a fair test to oil shales, and then we decided to give a test to the agricultural products, such as corn, and also the products of lumber, such as sawdust and things of that sort. But regardless of how many groups were included that would make no difference when it comes to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. When Congress passed the law providing for the construction of these plants and authorized the appropriation of $30,000,000 for that purpose and put the construction of the plants under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior then the Appropriations Committee was authorized to appropriate that amount if it wished to do so. That is why some of us rather disagreed with the action of the Committee on Appro-

priations. That committee in this bill appropriates $5,000,000 toward the fulfilment of this program. It does not earmark this money in any way. The agricultural interests of the country might say, "Why not spend that money on our activities." The coal-mining industry might say, "Why not spend that money on our activities," and the same will be true as to the oil-shale interest. For that reason I think it would have been better and wiser for the Appropriations Committee to have retained the Senate's language and appropriated $8,000,000 and stipulated that the remainder of the $30,000,000 should be held under contract obligation and paid as ordered by the Secretary of the Interior as needed.

The Senate amended the House bill as I have just stated but the conferees have modified the Senate's plan and it might be difficult for the Bureau of Mines of the Interior Department to spend this $5,000,000 agreed upon by the conferees in a manner to give coal, oil-shale, and agricultural products exactly the same consideration. If the $30,000,000 had been appropriated and $25,000,000 held back until the work was far enough along to justify its expenditure that would have enabled the Bureau of Mines to spend the money more economically than if the money was paid out in uncertain installments.

While I think the Senate plan would have been preferable to the plan now before us I am glad to say that I have consulted with the Bureau of Mines and they tell me that they think they can adjust this matter and work it out. They can use the $5,000,000 and use it wisely and in the furtherance of the provisions of the law providing for the construction of these plants. The Bureau of Mines will give proper consideration to coal, agriculture, and oil shale, because it cannot in fairness discriminate between them. This is a three-way proposition. Congress voted on a three-way program and not on a one-way program. Coal, oil-shale, and agricultural products shall each be considered.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If such a provision were put into law, does not the gentleman believe that we should earmark it and provide that not more than one-half or two-thirds of the money should be spent on any one experiment?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not think it should, for several reasons. These men who are to construct and operate these plants are scientific men, and it might develop that they would need but $2,000,000 to develop coal, whereas they might need a great deal more to develop agriculture. The officials of the Bureau of Mines should be given discretion to act. We showed that we had confidence in them when we gave the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines the power to locate and construct and operate these plants. They were supposed to consult with the agricultural authorities. But the law does not stipulate that this $30,000,000 must be divided equally among coal, oil shale, and agricultural products. But if we are going to scatter this money out among too many bureaus and subheads we are going to lose the very purpose of the legislation. Although I have not consulted with the coal industry or the oil-shale industry or the agricultural interests, I feel sure that all these interests are willing to forego any advantage that might accrue to them respectively and abide by the decision of the Bureau of Mines as to whether they are to have 33⅓ percent of the amount appropriated or some other amount that might be fair under all the circumstances. We are now approaching the day when Congress is planning to take a recess, and I think it would be wise for us to accept the amendment recommended by the conferees. We can do this and serve notice on the Appropriations Committee that we will be back within a short time, showing that we have made a good start and asking for more money to carry out the program that Congress has approved.

Mr. COOLEY. In the Senate amendment they did not restrict the Secretary of Agriculture in obligating the $22,000,000. He could have obligated it all to coal and oil shales and left agriculture out entirely.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman means, did not restrict the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what I meant to say.

Mr. JENKINS. We did not. When Congress passed the legislation we did not restrict him. I suggested, in dealing with the agricultural feature which was put in after the original bill was drawn, that those in authority who carry out the purposes of the law should consult with the agricultural authorities so that we could get the very best results. As I have already stated, I feel that under the law passed by this House a few months ago we are bound to consider coal, oil shale, and agricultural products.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does agree that agriculture should have its fair share of this money.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; but if the gentleman suggests that we divide it or earmark it in three equal shares I do not agree to that. It may be that agriculture should have more than its one-third share. And on the other hand, it might be that agriculture should have a smaller proportion. The law provides that the Bureau of Mines should proceed to experiment in the making of liquid fuel out of these three sources, but it does not provide that equal amounts should be spent on each group.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman may be correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Personally I think that experimentations on coal have been pretty well made. The most uncertainties with this program will come from oil shale and agricultural products, and not from coal. My judgment is that it might be that the agricultural interests will get more money than the coal interests, although coal was the principal basis for the whole program.

Mr. COOLEY. Just so agriculture gets its fair share; I think we will be satisfied then.

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

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that our committee, the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, cannot appropriate for the Department of Agriculture. We can appropriate only for the Department of the Interior. Naturally, we still expect that the Committee on Agriculture will make certain recommendations to the Congress. We left $25,000,000 in this authorization. Certainly the Committee on Agriculture, working in conjunction with the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, will work out some kind of a plan to give an appropriate sum of money for experimentation on agricultural products. I for years have recommended that we have such experimentation and that we make many things out of agricultural products. I want the Congress and the people to know that our subcommittee did not think we were foreclosing on agricultural products, because we cannot appropriate for the Department of Agriculture, we can appropriate only for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JENKINS. I think we are getting a little misunderstanding here. When the gentleman from Iowa says they cannot appropriate for the Department of Agriculture, he does not quite mean that. He means that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the Department of the Interior would not invade the prerogatives of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, but at the same time this bill we hold in our hands is not a bill from one branch of the Committee on Appropriations, it is a bill from the whole committee. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations is just a subcommittee of the whole Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. I want the gentleman to understand that our subcommittee cannot appropriate for the whole committee. We can appropriate only for such things as deal with the Interior Department.

Mr. JENKINS. When the gentleman referred to the fact that his subcommittee cannot appropriate for the Department of Agriculture he did not mean that we would have to wait for action by the House Committee on Agriculture, he was referring to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JENSEN. Working in conjunction with the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. JENKINS. We all agree. I well understand the gentleman. What he means is that the Appropriations Committee is divided into several subcommittees, each of which deals with appropriations to some special departments of the Government. For instance, the subcommittee of which the gentleman is a member deals with appropriations for the Department of the Interior, and

since the law providing for the construction of these three plants provides that the plants must be constructed by the Department of the Interior, it is only natural that the gentleman's subcommittee is the proper subcommittee to consider the appropriations for these plants. But the gentleman must agree that even if the Bureau of Mines should decide that one of these three plants should be constructed to manufacture liquid fuels from agricultural products, still it would be up to his subcommittee on Interior appropriations to make appropriations for that plant just the same as if it were a plant to make liquid fuel from coal, and, besides, the gentleman will agree that the actions of any subcommittee of the Appropriations is the action of the full Committee on Appropriations when it finds expression in the form of a bill being considered on the floor of this House.

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

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Are there not already in existence four experimental laboratories in the Department of Agriculture for finding new uses for excess agricultural crops?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. That is my understanding of it, but I do not know the full extent of that activity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if we are clear that agriculture can expect to participate in the fund that is provided in this bill? The chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill says that in this bill we cannot appropriate any funds for agriculture, and then we are told that agriculture will participate. Let us get it clear. Will agriculture participate in the money provided here, or will it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think I can answer the question.

Mr. JENSEN. Let us get this clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I repeat that this committee, of course, has no authority whatever to appropriate a dollar directly to the Department of Agriculture. The gentleman knows that. But in a joint matter of this kind, wherein agricultural officials will be called in and wherein officials say that they are conferring directly with agricultural officials, indirectly it might be said that we are appropriating to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me ask the gentleman the direct question: Is it the gentleman's intention that agriculture participate in this money?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Absolutely.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very glad to have that in the RECORD, and hope that agriculture will get at least part of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I should like to see agriculture participate in this program.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the investigations will be carried on under the supervision of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, but I do not want the Department of the Interior to claim the entire fund.

Mr. JENSEN. I am perfectly in agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope we can bring in an appropriation bill here soon, even before we adjourn, or if not, shortly after we reconvene, that will make some money available out of this authorization to carry on more experiments on farm products.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman can be assured that legally agriculture can be taken into consideration under this appropriation.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very glad to have that assurance.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will refer to page 89 of this bill he will find that this synthetic-liquid-fuel experimentation is being carried on under Public, 290, which I believe was a bill introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia. This appropriation is made—

For all expenses without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, necessary to carry into effect the act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, etc., approved April 5, 1944 (Public, No. 290).

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad that all the members of the committee seem to be in accord with reference to the use of this fund.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman's position with reference to agricultural products. It was my idea in advocating the elimination of the $22,000,000 committal provision of this bill and the elimination of the $3,000,000 of current funds that we would give the departments an opportunity to start the program and make them report to us at the end of this fiscal year. Then next year, when we go to pass on the appropriation requests, we can see if we are satisfied with it. If agriculture has not been properly treated, I for one will be against the program as it stands today. I want agricultural products considered along with coal, and all of them treated fairly and alike.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, what I previously stated this afternoon. I am sure it was the consensus of opinion of the Members of the House that when we passed the liquid fuels legislation we made no differentiation between the substances to be used. We believed in a broad base for a synthetic liquid fuel program in this country. Today or tomorrow will be no time for any of us, regardless of our particular sections or interests, to attempt to break down or to retard the orderly and effective development of the synthetic fuel industry in the United States. Our country's resources, whatever they may be, must be an insurance against the draining of our petroleum pools. Let us use them wisely for the future. Certainly we, as Members, whether from agricultural or mining sections, can join in the confidence previously expressed in the ability and judgment of the personnel of the United States Bureau of Mines. They will, I am sure, do a constructive and beneficial task for America's future.

Mr. COOLEY. It is the gentleman's understanding, then, that this fund will be used for the general purposes provided in the law?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I so stated. There need be no conflict in the accomplishment of this worth-while work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

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

Mr. ROCKWELL. Do I correctly understand that Senator O'MAHONEY and the others in the Senate have agreed that they will accept this amendment if it is passed by the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that the conferees of the Senate have indicated very clearly that they will agree to this amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. In fact, they did agree to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. They did agree to it, and they will agree to it officially perhaps today or tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 166: Page 93, line 9, insert the following:

"Investigation of raw material resources for steel production (national defense): For all expenses, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines to develop individual deposits of minerals useful in the steel industry the existence of which is known, and concerning which preliminary geological or other reports are available from State mineral agencies, previous investigations of the Bureau of Mines, or other sources; to conduct geophysical surveys, surface and subsurface exploration on such deposits; to conduct laboratory, pilot plant, and demonstration-plant tests to establish methods for utilizing more fully the products of such deposits; including the purchase or lease of land or buildings; mineralogical explorations for and development of sources of ferrous, nonferrous, or nonmetallic minerals useful in alloying or coating by plating or otherwise of iron and steel to reduce or eliminate corrosion, and the research and development of commercial processes therefor; construction of buildings to house laboratories, pilot plants, or demonstration plants; procurement of necessary materials,

ores, and equipment; travel expenses; purchase, not to exceed $75,000, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; not to exceed $150,000 for temporary employment of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, by contract or otherwise, without regard to civil-service and classification laws, necessary to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; printing and binding; purchase in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere of furniture and equipment, books of reference and periodicals, and purchase of special wearing apparel of equipment for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior'; and not to exceed $120,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $6,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources and to carry out the projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In line 20 of said amendment, strike out '$75,000' and insert '$35,000.'

"In line 22 of said amendment, strike out '$150,000' and insert '$75,000.'

"In line 34 of said amendment, strike out '$120,000' and insert '$50,000.'

"In line 35 of said amendment, strike out '$6,000,000' and insert '$3,000,000.'"

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it the purpose of the committee to continue the investigations which are authorized by this item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the Senate authorized $6,000,000 and the House is insisting on cutting it down to $3,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman feel that $3,000,000 is all that can well be spent at this time on this particular work?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman, more than that might efficiently be spent. On the other hand, the committee is recommending the full amount of the Budget estimate, which is 50 percent more than was used for this purpose last year. Again I might say to the gentleman that before the committee acted we called into consultation Dr. Sayers, who was very complimentary as to what the committee had done last year. There is no disposition on the part of this committee to unduly curtail the splendid activities of the Bureau of Mines in this connection. It is a great work. It has done a good job.

Mr. COOLEY. And if further funds are needed in the future, I understand the gentleman is in sympathy with the idea of providing those funds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Absolutely, if the need is demonstrated.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Steel Shortage, of which I am a member, is appreciative of the splendid cooperation on the part of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that the members of my committee feel very kindly and very appreciative for what the distinguished gentleman has done in this connection. He has made a valuable contribution to the war effort. It has been more than many of us realize.

Mr. WELCH. It will be recalled a deposit of tungsten was discovered in North Carolina as a result of the $2,000,000 made available last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. The estimated value of this deposit is over $15,000,000. Mr. Speaker, can we anticipate the committee will make further appropriations for pilot borings and explorations until the quantity and quality of iron ore and other critical mineral deposits in this country have been fully determined?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think I can say to the gentleman without committing other members of the committee, that as long as the Bureau of Mines continues to use funds for this purpose to such good advantage, as it has in the past, there is no question but what the attitude of this committee will be extremely sympathetic and that funds will be available, just so long as the present splendid showing is continued.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 169: On page 101, at line 5, insert:

"Development of processes for recovery of waste metals (national defense): The appropriation under this head in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby made available for the same purposes and under the same conditions until June 30, 1945."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 191: On page 116, line 10, after the word "Act", insert ": *Provided further*, That the limitation in said Act upon the amount available for administrative expenses is hereby waived to the extent necessary to provide for overtime or additional compensation pursuant to the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment No. 196: On page 117, line 13, after the word "land", insert "Reimbursements for the cost of supplies and materials and the transportation and handling thereof issued from central warehouses authorized to be established by the act of June 24, 1936 (16 U. S. C. 667), may be credited to the appropriation current at the time supplies and materials are allotted, assigned, or issued, or at the time such reimbursements are received."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment No. 202: On page 122, line 15, strike out "$208,375" and insert "$216,000, to be expended under the direction of the Governor."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 202, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$208,375, to be expended by and under the supervision and direction of the Governor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment No. 203: On page 22, line 17, insert:

"For salaries and expenses of the agricultural experiment station and the vocational school in the Virgin Islands, including technical personnel, clerks, and other persons; scientific investigations of plants and plant industries, and diseases of animals; demonstrations in practical farming; offical traveling expenses; fixtures, apparatus, and supplies; clearing and fencing of land; and other necessary expenses, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $47,260."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

"At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, and before the period, insert a comma, and the following: 'to be expended by and under the supervision and direction of the Governor.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the various motions on the conference report was laid on the table.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4183), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 5, and 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$51,344,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 7.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
FRANCIS CASE (except as to No. 7),
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9, to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1, relating to cemeterial expenses: Appropriates $1,224,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,859,240, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3, relating to rivers and harbors: Appropriates $51,344,000, instead of $46,800,000, as proposed by the House, and $53,044,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase being intended for employment as follows:

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway	$1,620,000
Missouri River, mouth to Sioux City	2,924,000

Amendments Nos. 5 and 8, relating to flood control (general): Appropriates $100, as proposed by the House, instead of $400,100, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the matter inserted by the Senate with regard to the promotion of the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war which would be facilitated by the prosecution of irrigation projects or flood control or joint irrigation and flood control projects.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $26,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000,000, as proposed by the House, for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 2, RULE XX

The managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses concurrence in the amendment of the Senate as follows:

Amendment No. 7, authorizing the acquisition of mineral rights in a land area in Oklahoma in order to permit work to go forward on the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
FRANCIS CASE (except as to No. 7),
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am definitely opposed to this conference report. My colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is likewise definitely opposed to the conference report. He is not present to speak against it today due to the fact that he is out of Washington on official business for the War Department of a nature which I cannot mention.

If the membership would refer to the RECORD of February 16, 1944, page 1777, when the civil functions, War Department, bill passed the House, they will find that after we reached the river and harbor items I made a short statement. I want to read that statement now for the benefit of the House.

This is from the RECORD of February 16, 1944:

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

Mr. Chairman, now that the Clerk has read up to the item "United States Soldiers' Home" the entire portion of the bill dealing with rivers and harbors and flood-control items has been read. I want to say to the Members that this is the first time within my memory of 12 years' service in Congress that a civil functions War Department bill has been read under the 5-minute rule without some Member trying to amend the bill and place therein either a river-and-harbor or a flood-control project within his district or State. Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism of that practice. Many of these projects approved by the War Department engineers are worthy and in time all of them, of course, will be included in our bill, but it has been the policy of the committee and the policy of the engineers to include no projects during this time of emergency which do not definitely relate to the war effort and which are not definitely helpful to the war effort.

I rise at this time to thank the membership for the attitude they have taken and to guarantee as far as I personally am concerned that when we go to conference with another body, if any river-and-harbor or flood-control projects are added to this bill in that body which have not been sent down by the Bureau of the Budget, I for one will definitely oppose them and will not come back with my signature on the conference report if any of those projects are agreed to. I say this, I hope, in all kindness, but certainly in all fairness, because if the Members of this House who have worthy projects refrain from trying to put them in this bill at this time I see no reason why another body should be allowed to load up the bill with projects of a similar type. I do not know whether I am speaking for the chairman or other members of the committee, but I do know I am speaking for myself. If the chairman or any other member of the committee cares to make a statement either for or against what I have said, I think the additional assurance might give the House a little more hope than we have on the usual appropriation bill that goes to another body which is so economy-minded in the public and in the press but which, in the vernacular, puts on an appropriation bill "everything but the kitchen sink."

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what has happened in another body. The other body has added to this bill in actual cash $5,544,000 covering three individual projects. I am not going to argue the merits of the projects. They are all meritorious. By the same token, a number of other projects, hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of them, which are in the various districts and States of the membership of both Houses, are also meritorious. But I see no reason in the world why certain Members of another body should just reach out and take a project in which they are interested and put it into one of these bills, and the rest of the membership suffer because they cannot get their projects. It has been done for a great number of years. I hope that by voting down this conference report we can stop that practice and stop it forever.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conferenec report.

The question was taken; and (on a division demanded by Mr. POWERS), there were—ayes 37, noes 42.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum 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 208, nays 134, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—208

Abernethy
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, N. Mex.
Andrews, Ala.
Baldwin, Md.
Barden
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Bland
Bloom
Bonner
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Burch, Va.
Burchill, N. Y.
Burgin
Byrne
Camp
Cannon, Mo.
Capozzoli
Carlson, Kans.
Carrier
Case
Celler
Chapman
Clason
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Cooley
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravens
Crosser
Cunningham
Curley
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Davis
Dawson
Delaney
Dickstein
Dingell
Doughton
Drewry
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Furlong
Gale
Gathings
Gearhart
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Grant, Ala.
Green
Gregory
Hare
Harris, Ark.
Hart
Hays
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hess
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoeven
Holifield
Izac
Jackson
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
Jonkman
Judd
Kearney
Kee
Kefauver
Kelley
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
Lesinski
Lynch
McCormack
McGehee
McKenzie
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
May
Merritt
Miller, Nebr.
Monroney
Morrison, La.
Mott
Mundt
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Myers
Newsome
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
O'Neal
O Toole
Outland
Pace
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Philbin
Pittenger
Ploeser
Poage
Price
Priest
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin
Richards
Rivers
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Rolph
Rooney
Rowan
Russell
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Satterfield
Scanlon
Schwabe
Scrivner
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Slaughter
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Starnes, Ala.
Stefan
Stigler
Stockman
Sullivan
Sumners, Tex.
Talle
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tolan
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vursell
Walter
Ward
Weaver
Weiss
Wene
West
White
Whittington
Wickersham
Winstead
Woodrum, Va.
Worley
Wright

NAYS—134

Allen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Blackney
Bolton
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Busbey
Butler
Canfield
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Chenoweth
Church
Clevenger
Compton
Crawford
Day
Dewey
Dworshak
Eaton
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Elston, Ohio
Fellows
Fenton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillespie
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Hall, Leonard W.
Hancock
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jeffrey
Johnson, Anton J.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Kean
Keefe
Kinzer
Kunkel
Lambertson
LeCompte
LeFevre
Luce
McConnell
McCowen
McGregor
McWilliams
Maas
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Pa.
Monkiewicz
Mruk
Murray, Wis.
Norman
O'Konski
Poulson
Powers
Pracht, C. Frederick
Pratt, Joseph M.
Ramey
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Rizley
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rowe
Sauthoff
Schiffler
Scott
Shafer
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stevenson
Sumner, Ill.
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott
Troutman
Vorys, Ohio
Wadsworth
Weichel, Ohio
Welch
Wigglesworth
Willey
Wilson
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.

NOT VOTING—88

Arnold
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Brumbaugh
Buckley
Burdick
Cannon, Fla.
Chiperfield
Clark
Colmer
Cox
Dies
Dilweg
Dirksen
Disney
Dondero
Douglas
Durham
Ellsworth
Elmer
Engel, Mich.
Fay
Fish
Fitzpatrick
Ford
Fulbright
Fuller
Fulmer
Gavin
Gibson
Gifford
Granger
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Halleck
Harless, Ariz.
Harris, Va.
Hébert
Heidinger
Herter
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Luther A.
Kennedy
Kilburn
Kleberg
Klein
Knutson
LaFollette
Landis
Lemke
Lewis
Ludlow
McCord
McLean
McMurray
Magnuson
Maloney
Mansfield, Tex.
Merrow
Miller, Mo.
Mills
Morrison, N. C.
Murdock
O'Connor
Patman
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Phillips
Plumley
Rabaut
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Sheridan
Smith, Va.
Stearns, N. H.
Stewart
Tarver
Taylor
Torrens
Towe
Treadway
Wasielewski
Whelchel, Ga.
Whitten
Woodruff, Mich.
Zimmerman

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Engel of Michigan against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Fuller against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Knutson against.

Mr. Heidinger for, with Mr. Landis against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Hale against.

Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Calvin D. Johnson for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. McMurray for, with Mr. Douglas against.

Mr. Torrens for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia for, with Mr. Brumbaugh against.

General pairs:

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Lemke.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. McCord with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. ROLPH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 8, line 4, after the word "repealed", insert the following: "*Provided*, That the provision contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942 (55 Stat. 320), concerning the acquisition of mineral rights owned by the Osage Tribe in lands to be acquired for the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project is hereby amended by adding the following: '*Provided*, That if just compensation cannot be agreed upon the Secretary of War may institute proceedings to condemn said mineral rights pursuant to existing laws: *Provided further*, That the construction of the dam may be commenced at any time after the institution of such proceedings.'"

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, this is the single amendment of the civil functions bill remaining in disagreement. It is amendment No. 7 as added by the Senate.

It proposes to permit condemnation proceedings in connection with some mineral rights on Indian lands in Oklahoma. The appropriation for the so-called Hulah Dam and reservoir has been previously approved by the Congress. Some difference of opinion has arisen between the War Department and the Indian tribe as to the value of the land that would be flooded. The engineers of the War Department have estimated that the land and the mineral rights might be worth at some point between $35,000 and $100,000. The Indians contend that the rights are worth at least $1,000,000.

The language proposed by the Senate amendment would permit the matter to go into the courts for condemnation. Nothing was brought before the conference that in my opinion justifies sending this to condemnation at the present time. While it is true that the courts would presumably protect the rights of the Indians, yet there was no evidence that there had been any great effort made to achieve reconciliation between the parties to see what could be done by negotiation. Consequently, in signing the conference report I noted my exception to this amendment. I feel that if condemnation is to be authorized, it should be done only after due consideration in a legislative bill, rather than by appearing here in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in answer to what my distinguished and able friend has said, may I give you a brief history of this amendment.

The Hulah Reservoir was authorized along with the Fort Supply, Optima, and Great Salt Plains project. These were all a part of the comprehensive plan for control of floods on the Arkansas and Mississippi Rivers. The project was not constructed because of difficulty in acquisition of Indian-owned lands and mineral rights.

Congress authorized the Department of the Interior and Department of War to agree upon a fair value of the mineral rights. This cannot be accomplished in that the Interior Department appraisers have set a fictitious value of approximately one million dollars on these properties, while the War Department have found the values to be approximately fifty thousand dollars.

Amendment No. 7 of the civil functions appropriations bill for the War Department will give the Army engineers the right to condemn these mineral rights in the same manner as they acquire like property from private ownership.

We do not expect immediate action on this project, but this question of acquisition of mineral rights must be settled before the project can ever be constructed, and we feel that this should be among the first of the flood-control projects to be constructed in Oklahoma.

As I have indicated, the differences between the War Department and the Department of the Interior are so wide that the procedure of condemnation is the only realistic way out of the situation. It is fair and it is reasonable. Nobody can object to condemnation proceedings on the part of the War Department. That Department is not going to pay a dollar more for this land than is necessary. We all know this is the American way of doing things.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

AID TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, (2) to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped, (3) employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The said committee or any subcommittee is authorized to obtain and use for statistical purposes only, confidential information (1) from the record of the Selective Service System, (2) records from the War Manpower Commission, and (3) from the records of the Bureau of the Census subject to the restrictions of 46 Statutes at Large 25, section 11 (U. S. C. 13: 211).

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed or has adjourned, to hold hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the commitee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, upon the urgent request of many Members, especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Committee on Rules has reported favorably the resolution which has just been read. I believe that it is necessary that this resolution be adopted so that the Committee on Labor may be given the power to make a thorough investigation with regard to matters that should be of interest to every man who is interested in those who have been disabled.

The resolution provides that the Committee on Labor is authorized and directed, first, to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped; second, to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped; third, employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I wish to say that I have received a very large number of communications, telegrams, and resolutions from nearly every section of the United States favoring the passage of this worthy resolution.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] who sponsors this resolution is known to the membership as a sincere, able, and fair-minded gentleman. As an employer of those engaged in the most hazardous industry, he is familiar with the condition of those who have become physically handicapped and as he stated to me just this morning, it is his aim in life to be of service to them. I know that he, as chairman of the investigating subcommittee, having been informed he will be so named, will obtain information from all sources, which will materially aid the Congress and serve as a guide in passing on future legislation in behalf of the physically handicapped. As it is now, our Government is spending millions, and the States, cities, counties, and private institutions are also spending large sums, and I therefore feel that there should be coordination to effectively render assistance to the physically handicapped. To attain that end, I have the utmost confidence that under the gentleman's leadership the needed and required information will be obtained that will assist in unifying and coordinating all these worthy activities, which will serve as a tremendous help to the hundreds of thousands of our physically handicapped citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, the object of the proposed investigation is of deepest interest to me. Over 37 years ago I introduced a bill in this House providing for workingmen's compensation, realizing then that industry would rehabilitate machinery and facilities and the railroads their locomotives, cars, and the upkeep of their roadbeds, but the thousands of men who made possible the operation of our industries and the running of our railroads were ignored and neglected. True, they had the right at that time to sue, but invariably it was years before they could obtain compensation or before anything was done for them. At the time I introduced my bill the principle of workingmen's compensation was not known in the United States and it required several years' effort on my part to show the necessity of such legislation and the benefits that would inure not only to the maimed and crippled but to the industries and railroads as well. Today I am happy that the workingmen's compensation laws have been enacted not only by our Federal Government but by nearly every State in the Union. Therefore it is with the greatest feeling and pleasure that I have offered this resolution which is broad in scope and the results which will be obtained through investigation and study are bound to be of tremendous aid to the physically handicapped and will serve, I hope, to bring about greater expansion in our vocational education and in general will be a step in the right direction to safeguard the greatest asset we possess, namely, human lives and labor. Consequently I hope the House will give this worthy resolution its unanimous approval.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe anyone on this side has any objection to this resolution. It merely permits the Committee on Labor to investigate the extent and character of aid that is now being given throughout the United States to the physically handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, we are properly giving a great deal of attention to the problems involved in the rehabilitation and reconversion of industry to peacetime production. This is taking the form of legislation already passed and under consideration by various congressional committees. House Resolu-

tion 230 now under consideration provides in some degree for similar problems as they relate to human interest. Specifically it deals with the human rights of physically handicapped individuals. Human rights are above property rights and we should give them fair consideration, as we are giving to property rights. This resolution carries that purpose into effect and should be passed today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to authorize a study by the Committee on Labor designed to explore the problem of unemployment of physically handicapped, of whom it is said there are 25,000,000 in the United States, and to provide a means whereby Congress itself may be possessed of the requisite knowledge to deal with that problem. One fact is very clear, in making the investigations, as far as I have gone, and that fact is this, that there is an astonishing lack of knowledge on this subject. There are something like 18 different governmental agencies that have something to do with the physically handicapped. Two-thirds of the information relating to the physically handicapped, and the various agencies that are active in this country, is now in the States or in the municipalities and it would be necessary to go outside the realm of the Federal Government to obtain this information. There is not, in the files of any Federal agency, the necessary information to enable Congress to deal with the problem, nor is there to be found a complete digest of all laws or regulations, Federal, State, or local, affecting the problem of the physically handicapped. Before Pearl Harbor it was estimated that 800,000 people became physically handicapped each year. The rehabilitation agencies could take care of 30,000 of them a year. That is, they were rebuilding and rehabilitating 30,000 a year, approximately. That is the best information we can get. So you see there were 770,000 individuals who were left to shift for themselves.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did I understand the gentleman to say there were 25,000,000 physically handicapped people in the United States?

Mr. KELLEY. That is the nearest estimate we have; yes. That includes amputees, cardiacs, victims of infantile paralysis, the deaf and the hard of hearing, the blind and all the categories of the physically handicapped.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wonder if the gentleman could give us an estimate as to how many of that 25,000,000 are unable to work and support themselves.

Mr. KELLEY. It is only an estimate of what are termed "shut-ins" or those who are helpless, and the estimate is 3,000,000 people.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania be kind enough to yield?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe also that there are approximately 16,000,000 physically handicapped individuals who fall between the ages of 15 and 64. I believe also that we must, in the future, provide for the conservation of our manpower in the industrial establishments of the United States. Many of these men who will come back as deserving veterans after the conflict is over, can with proper training and with proper supervision be used in the labor market. If we allow them to shift for themselves they will be unable to fit themselves into our peacetime day-by-day economy. I think the gentleman's resolution will be helpful and productive of a better understanding of this group of persons who can be useful workers if they are assisted toward that end. For many years I have been especially interested in full opportunity for the blind. It is encouraging to know of the contribution of these people to our war effort.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman is correct and I thank him.

Now since Pearl Harbor the number of people who become physically handicapped each year has been tremendously increased over the 800,000 figure. It has been increased by casualties due to the war on the active battle fronts, and it has also been increased by the increased tempo of industries as a result of the war. There is no estimated figure now as to how many people are going to become physically handicapped annually. There are two aspects of the problem. One is that of humanitarianism, and I do not think there is any dispute about that. The other is the aspect of utility. Here is a vast reservoir, as the gentleman from West Virginia so well stated, and today with the great manpower shortage, this enormous reservoir can be drawn upon by the Nation. I believe this resolution and the results of this investigation will be of great benefit to the physically handicapped and to the Nation.

The distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is much interested in the welfare of the physically handicapped. It is a subject which is close to his heart. He has devoted his time and effort to the success of this resolution. I, as well as are the physically handicapped people, am grateful to him.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] joined with the majority leader in promoting the success of this resolution.

I am also informed that the resolution has the approval of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WEISS. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that Mrs. Clements, representing 13,000 physically handicapped people in my district, heartily supports this resolution.

Mr. KELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The investigation, of course, will bring out a great deal of information. The letter I put into the RECORD recently from Mr. McNutt, went into details with reference to what the States were doing concerning those who are disabled and physically handicapped. I followed that up recently by placing in the RECORD a statement written by the president of the Mines Equipment Co., of St. Louis, which showed they had at least 6 blind persons working in their factory manufacturing articles for the Navy and the Army, and some of them were inspectors. I also placed in the RECORD another statement by a St. Louis corporation that had been employing the physically handicapped for 20 years.

If this committee could work out a way to induce industry throughout the country to do what those firms are already doing, it would be really beneficial. As I understand it, is this for the purpose of bringing in legislation extending Federal aid to the States or trying to work out a program of legislation for the benefit of industry in the United States to assist the physically handicapped?

Mr. KELLEY. The purpose will be to formulate a program to assist the physically handicapped to the end that they may be profitably employed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS—1945

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

AID TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is all right. I think there are a great many Federal agencies and State agencies investigating the physically handicapped. I think there is one difficulty, though, in defining what a physically handicapped individual might be, and what we should do for him. The author of the resolution speaks about 25,000,000 people in the United States being physically handicapped. I dare say that if the 435 Members of the House of Representatives were carefully screened you would find a great number of heart, kidney, liver, and glandular difficulties, and so forth, and even some amputations, as we have in the House. We might be physically handicapped but we do not want any sympathy or any particular attention from the Federal Government nosing into our business.

On the other hand, we have in the United States quite a number of babies born every year that are physically handicapped. The Children's Bureau has a very careful record of those individuals who have physical handicaps, up to 21 years of age. The purpose of the resolution is good and the only difficulty I see is that there ought to be some definition, some circumscribing and outlining of just what a physically handicapped person might be, whether you are going to take in the cardiacs, kidneys, livers, and so forth. If you do, you have an immense amount of work on your hands that you will never finish. I think it would be better for the committee that goes to work on this if they would keep their investigations limited to the visible physical handicaps, the hard of hearing, loss of eyes, loss of an arm, loss of a leg, or some deformity of a physical nature, and not go into the more intricate details of your heart, your kidney, your liver, or your glands.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman has raised a very important point in connection with the resolution, which is commendable and with which I am in sympathy. But I can see the possibility of enlarging the activities we have already provided. For instance, under the Social Security Act, we have provided grants to the States in aid of crippled children. That does not apply to those who might have some physical handicap, but to those who are crippled and unable to perform any kind of work. The same is true of the vocational rehabilitation provision under the Social Security Act. I think it is quite important, if we are going to make an investigation, to make a survey and determine the physically handicapped throughout this country. It is an enormous problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON].

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. When I first came to Congress a year ago last January, I was very much surprised to find that nothing had been done regarding legislation for the physically handicapped in this country. We have heard this afternoon that there are over 25,000,000 of those people in this country. We hear every day of the manpower shortages. On March 22, 1943, I introduced in this House a joint resolution which only stipulated one particular thing. That was that in order to effectively prosecute the war by utilizing to the fullest practical extent the services of persons who are physically handicapped, and in order to formulate a comprehensive and effective program for recruiting, registering, and employing such persons, there would be established in the United States Employment Service a division to be known as the Division for the Physically Handicapped. That is all my resolution provided. I only asked that there be provided in the United States Employment Service a department or division known as the Division for the Physically Handicapped.

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

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman said at the outset of his remarks that he was surprised to find that nothing had been done for the physically handicapped.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. I was.

Mr. COCHRAN. Did not the gentleman know that the Social-Security law made such a provision, and that we make an annual appropriation to the States?

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman answer a question for me? This has been before the House in many, many different bills. I found hearings before the Committee on Education, hearings before the Committee on Labor for the last 5 or 6 years.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; but we have got laws.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. You have laws, but you have a conflict of laws. That is the trouble. You have a manpower shortage on one side and you have 25,000,000 physically handicapped on the other side. Why do you not utilize them in the way they can be utilized? I am in favor of this resolution, because it does get a start at doing something.

Let me bring to the attention of the House a letter which I think may clear up the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. I have a letter addressed to me on April 15, 1943, from the honorable chairman of the Committee on Labor, Mrs. NORTON, which encloses a letter from War Manpower Commissioner McNutt. In that letter Mr. McNutt says:

> We are in agreement with the general objective of House Joint Resolution 103, which proposes to set up within the United States Employment Service a division for the physically handicapped.
>
> The Commission recognizes that qualified physically handicapped persons should have a part in the administration of any program that concerns them.

That is from the War Manpower Commissioner. The Civil Service Commission have gotten mixed up between rehabilitation and placement of labor. That is where the difficulty is now. Many of these people do not need rehabilitation at all. Many of them are not only qualified but extremely anxious to do their part on the home front. As a practical proposition it seems to me imperative that the services of the physically handicapped be utilized immediately, especially in this period of national emergency. Many of these people could be given additional training while working at some essential occupation. There is a vital need for planning and executing a truly national program on behalf of the physically handicapped. We save scrap but continue to scrap men.

Further answering the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] I find that there is now pending in the House of Representatives H. R. 2536 which is the fourth of a series of vocational rehabilitation bills which have received the careful consideration and study of the Committee on Education. H. R. 5906 was introduced on October 23, 1941. On August 13, 1942, H. R. 7484 was introduced and extensive hearings were held toward the close of the Seventy-seventh Congress. In January 1943, H. R. 699 was introduced and again many hearings were held with specialists from all groups of the handicapped, State administrators of rehabilitation, State educational officers, representatives of private agencies, and the disabled themselves testifying. In addition to these hearings, executive sessions of the committee were held over a period of nearly 3 months; and as a result of the careful deliberations of the Committee on Education, headed by the most capable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] H. R. 2536 was introduced and printed, and the entire committee approved both the bill and the report.

Under the above circumstances it seems to me that it was unnecessary to appoint a committee solely for the purpose of investigation of the program for the physically handicapped, as contained in House Resolution 230. However, since these worthy people have experienced so much difficulty in securing a definite program, I am in favor of this resolution as it will be a step in the right direction.

All that is asked by the physically handicapped is that unfair discrimination be removed and that they be given the right of equal employment with the nonhandicapped, provided, of course, that the handicapped otherwise possesses the qualifications for the position. It is imperative that we immediately plan a national program to provide a cushion against the unhappy days of post-war chaos and possible unemployment and want which a large number of these people have experienced in the past. They are patriotic in the extreme, many having sons, brothers, or even fathers in the armed forces, and they liberally subscribe to all war activities.

I am proud of being an honorary member of Lodge No. 1 of the American Federation of Physically Handicapped, of Washington, D. C.

The American Federation of the Physically Handicapped has as its head Paul A. Strachan, who is an excellent gentleman and a great leader. The vice president of this organization is Jesse E. Gross, of Canton, Ohio—my home town—whom I have known for many years and who is one of our leading citizens. I have personally for over 20 years been interested in the welfare of the physically handicapped. Through my efforts there has been set up in my congressional district an employment agency for the physically handicapped, which, among other things, has been instrumental in placing nearly 40 blind people in the Timken Roller Bearing plant and in the Hoover Suction Sweeper plant. It has also inaugurated a training program with capable men in charge to aid and train those who are disabled.

In speaking of the 25,000,000 physically handicapped in the United States, it was not my intention to convey to you the impression that all of these are handicapped by the loss of limbs, as this figure includes all physical handicaps, such as the loss of sight of an eye or partial loss

of hearing. In a survey made by Columbia University it was disclosed that industrial injuries affecting the eye occur at the rate of 1,000 per day, and that 20 percent of the total injuries occurring in industry result in permanent or partial deafness. Many additional statistics could be quoted showing development of incipient pulmonary diseases, including tuberculosis, silicosis, and various bronchial affections, as well as cardiac ailments and other diseases, as a result of accident or injury or improper working environment in industry.

I sincerely hope the resolution will be adopted and that said committee will, as soon as practicable, complete its investigation and report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their study, inquiry, and investigation, which will result in proper legislation being enacted to establish a truly national program for the physically handicapped.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had always supposed there were Government agencies that were looking after this kind of work. Perhaps they are not. I do know that the Ford Motor Co. is carrying on this kind of a study and also taking care of many who are physically handicapped by providing work. Do I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has no objection to the appointment of another investigating committee? Apparently not.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman I am not controlling the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. Usually the gentleman opposes the creation of new committees. There are two good things about this resolution. One is the purpose, and the other is that it is introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] who will probably head it.

Now, let us take a look at it. I would like to offer an amendment later on if that was possible. Let me read: "The Committee on Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees." Note the words "or subcommittees." The Labor Committee and one subcommittee ought to be enough. We do not want several committees traveling all over the country on this.

Then down in lines 14 and 15 you will notice that the committee is given the power; and these subcommittees are given the power—there may be a half dozen of them under the resolution—they are given the power to subpena witnesses, hold hearings anywhere in the United States, call in the companies and business houses and have them produce their books. I assume the chairman of the committee will appoint one committee and not have a half dozen, but we ought to be sure about it.

I notice the chairman is nodding her head. I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] does not want a half-dozen committees running all over and calling in factory heads and asking them to produce their books while they are in war production.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is a resolution. The gentleman will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment unless the Committee on Rules will yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SABATH] yield for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know yet. I will have to think it over.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is going to be passed in a few minutes. All right; if you want to appoint a half-dozen committees, let the Labor Committee do it. I cannot prevent it, but one committee should be enough.

Mr. COCHRAN. You have appointed a whole lot of committees that are going around here, but this one might result in doing some good for some disabled people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It might.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from any comment on the colloquy that just ensued.

I think this resolution is a very important resolution. We read in the newspapers recently that in the invasion of France, around 3,200 were killed. Over 15,000 were wounded. There is no doubt in my mind that a great many of those 15,000 will come back physically handicapped. Many more have already come back, and the ensuing days will bring thousands of those people back who will be physically handicapped, with legs and arms shot off, blind, hard of hearing, and all different things.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The bill we just passed takes care of all that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is more to taking care of this situation than just appropriating money. There is a comparatively new science known as occupational therapy which has been developed in recent years. It started sometime after the last war. This science is developing very rapidly. These registered occupational therapists are coming out of these schools, and they are in great demand. Quite a few of them are working at Walter Reed. Quite a few of them are in St. Elizabeths Hospital. I have visited those different sections. There is no doubt in my mind that this resolution will bring to one central point a great deal of information on this subject, not only to those who are in civilian life who are handicapped but also information which can be applied to taking care of the wounded who come back from this war.

I am, therefore, supporting this resolution. I do not think we could make a mistake in bringing this type of information to a focal point and restoring the usefulness toward society of all this great mass of people both in the civil and military ranks.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say this resolution is offered by a Member of this House who has five sons in the fighting services of this country. I want to take my hat off to him. In the second place, I am very much in favor of this resolution for this one reason: The handicapped people of this Nation do not want a pension or a stipend, what they want most of all is rehabilitation to the point where they can take a normal place in the productive life of this country. They want an opportunity to get back on their feet in order that they may go to work like other people. A lot of work has been done by various groups throughout this country to aid the handicapped. We all know of the excellent work that has been done with the blind in certain small communities. What this study ought to do is to bring into focus the work that has been done to put handicapped people in a position to take their place normally in society and show us how to continue that effort in order that we may apply that work on as large a scale as possible to accomplish this great result.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting this resolution. The question was first called to my attention some months ago by Mr. Paul Strachan, who has interested himself in it and is working with physically handicapped groups.

I think there is no finer person in this House to head this inquiry than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], He has been both an employee and an employer in an industry which is very hazardous, the mining of coal.

It is my hope that out of this inquiry will be developed means by which the physically handicapped will need less aid from the Federal Government and will be better enabled to maintain themselves because they will find occupations in the business interests of this country, will be brought to the stage where they can be used, as many of them have been during this war emergency. I am glad to see this resolution brought up and I am quite sure that under the direction of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] it will be a job well done and one that will be of great value to the people of this country.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining if he desires to use it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think 3 minutes is necessary to get a vote on this very worthy resolution. I am very happy that it has finally reached the House after having been introduced more than a year ago. It is a very worthy resolution and one I am sure you will all join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] in endorsing.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I am very much interested in this resolution and very much in favor of it, but I am wondering if the gentlewoman will explain to the House just how the local agencies will be brought into this legislation.

Mrs. NORTON. That, of course, would have to be done by legislation after the investigation has been completed.

Mr. ROLPH. This committee will cooperate with local agencies?

Mrs. NORTON. It will cooperate fully. We are hoping that out of this investigation, which I am sure will be conducted on a very high plane, we shall enact legislation that will be of great assistance to the physically handicapped persons.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wish to endorse everything the gentlewoman from New Jersey has said, and all the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has said with respect to this resolution. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is to be congratulated on introducing the resolution. I hope it will have the support of every Member of the House and I believe we shall find from the work of this committee that good legislation will be presented to us so as to carry out its recommendations.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to call the gentlewoman's attention to the fact that farming is one of the most hazardous occupations in this country according to insurance reports. I should like to ask if my good friend and colleague from New Jersey would take it upon herself to pay particular attention to the accidents that have happened in the past in the rural areas particularly because I assure her that many serious accidents have happened there but many a farmer continues his work despite the loss of an arm or a hand. Thousands are doing it all over the country today.

Mrs. NORTON. I am sure that when we reach the stage of considering legislation the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] will give the Committee on Labor the benefit of his very good advice.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. While we are considering this very worthy resolution of investigation will the gentlewoman tell us what it will cost?

Mrs. NORTON. I could not say, but I am sure it will be as modest a sum as possible commensurate with the amount of work involved.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope this resolution will be adopted unanimously. I believe every Member is just as much interested in helping the physically handicapped as is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], and the chairman of the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON] for the purpose of extending his remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF FEMALE PILOTS AND AVIATION CADETS IN ARMY AIR FORCES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 563 providing for the consideration of H. R. 4219, a bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots and aviation cadets in the Air Forces of the Army.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4219) to provide for the appointment of female pilots and aviation cadets in the Air Forces of the Army. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs relating to the appointment or commissioning of officers in the Army of the United States. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4219, the so-called WASP bill, concerning which there has been considerable discussion. The WASP bill provides in substance that female pilots who are now in the Army and who have a civil-service status shall be taken into the Army proper, not in the WAC's but in the Army Air Corps, just as nurses and doctors are taken in.

There is no question but what there is a shortage of pilots, although there may be some difference of opinion as to the proper method in which this shortage should be met; nevertheless, the Army, and when I say the Army, I mean General Arnold, General Giles, and the Secretary, Mr. Stimson, are strongly in favor of this bill and have recommended and asked for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 500 women have been trained for this service and perhaps as many more are in the course of training at the present time. While they enjoy merely a civil-service status, they are flying all the ships that the Army has at the present time within the continental limits of the United States, with the exception of the very largest ships. While they have done a splendid work, according to the Army and according to those persons who are informed, there are very definite drawbacks to the present arrangement, not only from the standpoint of the Army, but of the women themselves. For instance, these female pilots come into various Army posts and after they ground their ships there are no facilities for taking care of them. They are not permitted to go into the officers' clubs; they are not permitted to buy from the post exchange; they are not permitted to go into certain portions of the Army reservation; and, although they are doing work identical with that of the Army flyers, they are not eligible for certain benefits, including insurance. The Army, on the other hand, complains that while these women who enjoy a civil-service status are doing this highly important work, the Army does not have the necessary and essential control over them which it should. In other words, while they are closely connected with the Army, in truth and in fact they are completely outside so far as authority is concerned, and for that reason the Army through General Arnold is urging the passage of this bill.

There has been one objection raised, which is totally erroneous, and that is that this bill would create another Women's Army Corps.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If I understand it correctly, this rule makes in order the Brooks bill?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I am coming to that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. H. R. 4269 or any other amendment relating to the same subject matter as the Brooks bill.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That is, if it is offered by the Committee on Military Affairs, according to the rule.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the rule limit the offering of amendments to the committee bill?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. It is my recollection that it does. I do not have a copy of the rule in front of me.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Then am I to undertsand that no Member of the House, even a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, could offer an amendment to the so-called Brooks bill?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to explain that my understanding of the rule is that it makes in order any amendment authorized by the House Military Affairs Committee and not subject to a point of order. Any other amendment, as I understand it, can be offered by any Member who wishes to do so, but it is subject to any point of order that might lie against it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I want a member of the Rules Committee to interpret this rule for me. As I understand it, the Brooks bill, H. R. 4269, is made in order because the Military Affairs Committee has authorized and directed the chairman to offer it as an amendment. Is any other Member of the House or the committee permitted to offer an amendment pertaining to the same subject matter to the so-called Brooks amendment?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I may say to the gentleman that the wording of the rule is unambiguous on that point. It states:

> It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs relating to the appointment or commissioning of officers in the Army of the United States.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But suppose the Military Affairs Committee has not directed any other amendment to be offered, then is it in order?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to have that question answered.

Mr. BROOKS. It is my understanding that an amendment to H. R. 4269—that is, a committee amendment—might be offered; is that correct?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That would be my understanding.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have an amendment I want to offer to the Brooks bill. That amendment will not be offered by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. I want to know whether this rule will shut me out of offering that amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The bill states further:

> At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments—

And so forth.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This rule says: "any amendment by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs." Now, will that shut out any other amendment?

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MICHENER. What part of the rule is it the gentleman questions?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am not questioning any part of it. I merely want to clarify the situation so there will be no doubt as to the possibility of offering an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I understand the gentleman's question correctly, the gentleman would like to know, assuming the committee offers an amendment and it is offered by direction of the committee, which amendment if offered by a Member would not be germane to the pending bill, could the gentleman offer an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No, that is not my question at all. I will direct the gentleman's attention to the rule, page 1, line 11, where it is stated:

> It shall be in order to consider without intervention of any point of order any amendment offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs relating to the appointment or commissioning of officers of the Army of the United States.

Now, I have an amendment to the committee amendment. Is that in order if it is not authorized by the committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I would not undertake to state what the ruling of the Chair might be on a given amendment but, in my opinion, an amendment which would be germane to the committee amendment would be in order. It would be in the second degree. If it is germane, my own personal opinion is, if it is germane to the amendment offered by the committee, then I think any Member could offer an amendment to it.

Mr. MICHENER. There is no question in the world about that. This rule makes in order an amendment to the bill. That amendment would be subject to amendment or perfecting amendment before it is offered, under the general rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. To an amendment in the second degree, and germane.

Mr. MICHENER. Under the general rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the general rules of the House, yes, that would be my personal opinion.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman will permit another observation. The thing that disturbs me about the wording of this rule is the waiving of points of order only to an amendment offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs. The amendment that I propose to offer is germane to the committee amendment but it may not be germane to the WASP bill. My amendment has not been authorized by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, his amendment will go to the amendment to be offered known as the Brooks amendment, is that right?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Of course, I can only speak as an individual, but my interpretation would be the same as that of the majority leader who just spoke. It is a matter that will have to be passed upon by the chairman when the time comes, but it would be my personal feeling that the Brooks amendment, being in order, the gentleman's amendment would be in order. The gentleman appreciates the fact that this is purely a personal opinion.

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

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Any amendment that might be offered by any Member of the House to this amendment offered by the committee, and which would be germane to this amendment, unquestionably would be in order. In other words, if the gentleman from Indiana desires to offer an amendment to an amendment offered by the chairman of the committee, or at the direction of the committee, and his amendment is germane to that amendment, unquestionably the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole will hold it in order.

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

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I would like to have this point definitely understood by the Members of the House. The gentleman gives as his reason for offering the resolution that it will make in order the consideration of H. R. 4219 which, in substance, the gentleman says, will permit taking these female pilots into the armed services, for the reason that there is a shortage of pilots. Is that right?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In what branch of the service is there a shortage of pilots?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. May I say to the gentleman that I can only base my opinion and statement on the statement of General Arnold, the head of that branch of the armed forces, together with the Secretary of War. I think we must assume—at least I assume, so far as I am concerned—that they know what they are talking about. I anticipate the argument that the gentleman is about to make, and I wish the gentleman would withhold it, because I am going to take up the question of the Brooks bill in just a moment, which I assume the gentleman is going to mention as an argument against the WASP bill; is that correct?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I was just wondering whether or not the gentleman is of the opinion that there is a shortage of pilots not only in the Army but also in the Navy. What information does the gentleman have about that?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I am frank to say to the gentleman I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I will answer that a little later.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I was about to say a few moments ago that one argument which has been raised against this bill is totally erroneous, and that is, if this bill is passed, it would create what would be in effect another branch of the Women's Army Corps. The very contrary is the case, because as matters now stand these women of civil-service status are set off in sort of a group by themselves. This bill, if it passes, will absorb this group and amalgamate them and bring them into the Regular Army Air Corps.

Furthermore, before they are taken into the Army each and every one of these civil employees will have a chance to enlist; in other words, they will not be taken in automatically. If they do not want to go in, they will not be coerced. It is purely a voluntary matter with them.

We come now to the amendment which I anticipate will be offered, which is the Brooks bill.

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

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I believe the gentleman stated that these trainees would be given an opportunity to go into the military organization or not to go in, as they saw fit. I believe that was the gentleman's statement, was it not?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. As a matter of fact, they will have an opportunity to go in or to get out of the service; one or the other. Either they will give up their present work or they will take a military status. That is the condition, is it not?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. May I say to the gentleman that I do not think it would be particularly practical to pass this bill to bring them into the Army and still leave this group of civil-service employees, or at least a portion of them, which is one of the things this bill seeks to eliminate. I may say to the gentleman that he is perfectly correct in his statement.

Mr. SIKES. They do not have much choice in it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnseota.

Mr. O'HARA. How many thousands of young men taking the Air Corps flight training have been washed out by the Army Air Corps?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I was just going to come to that, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed.

The Brooks bill seeks to do justice to the young men who have taken part in the war-training-service program which was conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Authority. I am not going into the details of it, because there are gentlemen here who can explain it far better than I.

At the time this program was started under the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, young men flocked into this training program. They paid all of their own expenses, except board and lodging which the Government furnished. Finally Congress provided that they would be paid $50 a month for 8 months. Before that relief was given, many of them had dipped into their own resources in order to take this training which was so essential to provide pilots for our armed forces and for the services connected with it. On January 15 of this year that training program was suspended, with the result that thousands of these men, some of them having as many as two, three, and even four thousand hours of flying experience, were left stranded, so to speak. In other words, the program was cut off.

They have no chance of getting a commission. The Brooks bill, as I understand it, provides in substance, that those members of this service who have had this training under the Civil Aeronautics Authority will be commissioned as second lieutenants in the Army, provided they are accepted on the basis of a physical examination, or on the basis of such other tests and qualifications as the Army may require.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in his usual excellent manner the gentleman from Missouri has thoroughly explained this bill. There is no objection on this side to the adoption of the rule, and I have had no requests for time.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this evening, in spite of the lateness of the hour, to explain the situation which has arisen. It is one in which I think everybody is interested. I doubt that during the last few months any particular bill affecting individuals has brought as many inquiries to the Congress as has the bill regarding the disposition of the pilots trained under the Civil Aeronautics-W. T. S. program.

May I briefly, in the time allotted me, give you just a little bit of the history behind this program and especially the object of the proposed amendment? The amendment, Mr. Speaker, is designed to take care of the trainees who have entered the Civil Aeronautics-War Training Service program and who are still in service and have not been commissioned in the Army. Those men are now on the ground, so to speak. They are serving in the ranks, mostly as privates on the ground. It is the object of this amendment to make sure that those men who have been trained by the Civil Aeronautics-W. T. S. program are given an opportunity to use in the armed services the flight training that they have previously received. The amendment which will be offered will, in effect, give these men who have finished the first four courses in the C. A. A.-W. T. S. program commissions as second lieutenants or as flight officers in the air forces.

Mr. Speaker, when this program was instituted the Government was called upon to assemble some 25,000 men to take the Civil Aeronautics-W. T. S. program. Radio announcements were put out on all the radio stations in the country, urging men interested in flying to enter the Civil Aeronautics-W. T. S. program and do their part for the Nation toward winning the war. The Army cooperated with the Civil Aeronautics Authority in this program. They called on patriotic organizations like the American Legion to join and help recruit these men.

These men were recruited for the purpose of supplementing the Regular Army flying instructional program, which at that time was being run to its very capacity. Every Air Forces training school at that time was filled to capacity. These flyers were recruited and trained by the Civil Aeronautics Authority as a force additional to the Army Air Forces training program.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that in the ads for these flyers it was pointed out and stated specifically that they were not required to be of as good physique as the combat flyers, and that they could enter the service even though they had some minor handicap?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. They were also promised when they entered that if they qualified at the end of their training they would be commissioned as second lieutenants.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Does the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, assure that these men, when they apply for their commissions, will be taken in on exactly the same physical standards as those on which they entered the service?

Mr. BROOKS. My bill does not seek to set their physical standards. The idea of the committee amendment is to tell the Army Air Forces that we think those men who have trained over a period of 18 months and who were certainly impliedly promised commissions should receive the commissions they were promised when they complete the course.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The same thing applied to the boys in the A. S. T. P. program. Over 112,000 of them were taken out of the program entirely and put into the ground forces. Many of the boys who were in the Civilian Pilot Training program were also taken out and put in the ground forces. Does the gentleman subscribe to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri that there is a shortage of pilots in this country, and, if so, where?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not recall exactly what the gentleman from Missouri had to say, but if the gentleman will allow me to proceed I will be very happy to answer his question in the course of my explanation.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is there a shortage of pilots, and why is it necessary to go into a female pilot training program at a cost of $100,000,000 or more?

Mr. BROOKS. There is a shortage of certain types of pilots, especially combat pilots.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe the gentleman was in error in saying that there was an enrollment of 26,000 in the W. T. S. program. The enrollment was 27,804.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman.

The men that were originally enrolled were sent to training camps throughout the Nation. Most of them were housed in Army housing and were fed by the Army and given uniforms. That is about the extent of the obligation of the Army. Individually, these men had to take care of their own expenses, and it cost them personally a great deal of money. After some 8 or 10 months of training the situation appeared so unfair to the Congress that we passed a bill authorizing the payment of $50 a month for those trainees for a period of 8 or 10 months, but those who trained the 18 months have never been paid for the full extent of their training.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman discuss the actual situation with respect to what the Army has undertaken to do in order to make these Civil Aeronautics trainees available to the Military Establishment in the way of screening them and rescreening and screening again?

Mr. BROOKS. I shall be very happy to do this.

Beginning with a number that ranged above 25,000, the Army has screened and trained and rescreened and retrained these men. They screened and trained them until on May 1, 1943, there were 12,335 trainees remaining in the program. They went through additional courses and came out, with a rescreening which left 7,374 trainees. Out of the group that were trained the Army released from service a large number and commissioned practically 1,000 at that time. Following that, some 4,684 were actually inducted into active service in the Army and sent to basic training schools. Those men were kept in the training schools from the middle of the summer of 1943 until February 15, 1944, when all of those schools were closed, leaving almost 5,000 trainees in the camps with incompleted courses and without commissions in the Army, which they had certainly impliedly been promised.

As to this group of 5,000, we have taken that matter up with the War Department, and the War Department has agreed to accept for cadet training 1,049 of this group. It has said it would take 968 for technical training, discharge 70 for physical disability, and dispose of 36 more for physical reasons. This leaves a balance of some 3,000 trainees who are actually in the ranks, and many of those men have hundreds and thousands of flying hours to their credit.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I talked to a young man from the District of Columbia who had 1,100 flying hours. He was a trainee in that program, yet he was serving as a member of the ground forces, as a soldier in the ranks. I talked to another man who had over 2,000 flying hours. It seemed to me when I talked to that young man, who had a college education, that he was well able to do a much finer service for the Army than to remain in the ground forces as a foot soldier in the ranks.

I understand that some of these men have up to 3,000 hours of flying time, yet they are not being used as fliers at the present time. The object of this amendment is to make sure that they are used as fliers and commissioned officers in the war program of the Army Air Forces.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when the application for the rule was made there was division and some opposition to the bill as it was drafted. An agreement was finally made and a pledge has been given that the Committee on Military Affairs will agree to offer the Brooks amendment, which was satisfactory. I hope the committee will do so, because that was the understanding before the rule was granted on this bill. With that amendment, I believe all the interests will be taken care of.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman understand that the Brooks bill or the so-called committee amendment is merely a gesture toward these men, that unless you go further and require the military forces to maintain the same physical standards they had when these men enlisted, they are out?

Mr. SABATH. We understood that with the Brooks amendment all opposition has been satisfied. I can state to the House that it has been agreed that that amendment will be offered and supported by the committee. That is what I want to bring home.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Let me say to the chairman of the Committee on Rules that I never make an agreement with my committee or anybody else that I do not keep. It was understood that this Brooks bill, or the provisions of it as offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], in the House Committee on Military Affairs, would be offered, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for the purpose of offering it.

Mr. SABATH. I am satisfied the gentleman always keeps his word. That is the reason we reported the rule.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL) there were—ayes 58, noes 46.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the Kelley resolution may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DELORES LEWIS

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Delores Lewis, for printing in the RECORD.

EDDIE T. STEWART

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart, for printing in the RECORD.

EDWARD E. HELD AND MARY JANE HELD

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held for printing in the RECORD.

MAVIS NORRINE COTHRON ET AL.

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, for printing in the RECORD.

MILDRED B. HAMPTON

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton, for printing in the RECORD.

LOUIS COURCIL

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Louis Courcil, for printing in the RECORD.

REV. C. M. McKAY

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay for printing in the RECORD.

REV. JAMES T. DENIGAN

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of Rev. James T. Denigan, for printing in the RECORD.

MRS. JULIA BUBY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2855) for the relief of Mrs. Julia Buby, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,475.86" and insert "$7,975.86."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EVA M. DELISLE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3102) for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,335.75" and insert "$3,335.75."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. F. ALLEN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3661) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 24, strike out "account" and insert "accounts."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VOLA STROUD POKLUDA

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 272) for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL J. CAMPBELL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1220) for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "Paul J. Campbell, of East St. Louis, Ill., the sum of $2,000; to pay."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$3,500."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE HOLCOMB

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1588) for the relief of the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, a minor, with a House amendment thereto, and that the House recede from its amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

O. W. JAMES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of O. W. James, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert "$660."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. SABATH, by direction of the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 605) on the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act (Rept. No. 1689), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act. That after debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 592) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education is authorized and directed—

(a) To make a study of the effect upon colleges and universities throughout the United States of (1) reduction in enrollment and in faculties as a result of service by students and faculty members in the armed forces of the United States or in other war activities, and (2) recent curtailment and prospective further curtailment of Army and Navy training programs in such colleges and universities, with a view to determining means by which such effects may be alleviated.

(b) To formulate, as soon as practicable, for consideration by the House, such legislation as the committee deems appropriate for the purpose of alleviating such effects.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee (a) may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it finds necessary; (b) may, with the consent of the head of any department or agency of the United States, utilize the services, facilities, and personnel of such department or agency; and (c) may request such information and assistance as it deems desirable from individuals, organizations, and agencies, both within and outside of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the Evening Star on free ports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I have been advised by the Public Printer that the extension exceeds the limit and that it will cost $130. Notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me today under a special order may be assigned to me for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, what will be the order of business tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. The first order of business will be the conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill. I may say that from day to day conference reports will take precedence, so that any announcements will have to be considered in connection with that.

The conferees on the O. P. A. have agreed, I understand, but the Senate must act first. If the Senate acts on

the conference report, of course then we will take it up.

It is the intention now that following the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments bill the resolution in relation to campaign activities will be taken up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will probably be later tomorrow? It would not be during the early hours?

Mr. McCORMACK. The State, Commerce, and Justice Departments bill will be taken up first. Then, of course, the WASP bill will be taken up under general debate. Then we have the insurance bill which we want to act upon before this week is finished.

Then the program will be followed as has been heretofore announced.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

WARS ARE WON WITH GOLD

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the International Monetary Conference is scheduled to meet in Bretton Woods, N. H., July 1, 1944. The opening date is less than 2 weeks ahead. Two Members of the House, Representatives BRENT SPENCE and JESSE P. WOLCOTT, have been appointed by the President as members of the American delegation. Gold will figure largely in the discussions, and it is about gold that I desire to speak this afternoon.

In October 1942, the War Production Board declared gold mining as nonessential. Limitation Order L 208 was issued, and as a result of this order, serious conditions have developed in every mining section of California. So as to be accurately informed as to the effect of the order in every area, I wrote to the California Division of Mines, and as part of my remarks I will attach a letter from State Mineralogist Walter Bradley dated San Francisco, May 21, 1943, together with reports from district engineers located at Redding, Sacramento, and Los Angeles. All these letters tell the same story. Far-reaching, severe hardship in each community.

Back of the order was an idea that men would move from gold mines to copper mines. While it is strange how widely the estimates vary as to those employed in gold mines, some authorities setting the figure at 3,500 while others claim 12,000, all agree the number that eventually sought employment in the copper mines was disappointing. Less than 500 actually applied.

Mr. Speaker, the mines should be allowed to reopen, not only for the gold itself, but also to preserve the mining properties. These properties are national assets. Unless one has had the privilege of going down a mine shaft it is difficult to understand how rapidly mining properties deteriorate unless the mines are constantly worked. The drifts fill with water and the timbers are crushed beyond repair. If allowed to go on for any length of time the whole mining property may be permanently in peril.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation may very well, sooner or later, be glad for all the gold it can get. In the War between the States the credit of the Federal Government was protected by the gold and silver received from the mines of California and Nevada.

In the deliberations next month at Bretton Woods, gold reserves will be one of the major topics. One authority writes "Wars are fought with metals but wars are won with gold." The California Senate a few days ago unanimously adopted Senate Resolution 28, which reads as follows:

Whereas it has become reasonably apparent to the Senate of the State of California that even if current legal restrictions governing the gold mines of California were removed by the President of the United States through Executive order, it would be impracticable for most if not all of these gold mines to resume operations because, on the one hand, they are compelled by existing laws and regulations to sell their gold bullion product to the United States Mint at a fixed price of $35 per ounce, and on the other hand, would be required to pay costs for labor and materials required in operation which in the aggregate would exceed the return for their bullion; and

Whereas the current price of gold bullion was fixed by Executive order of the President dated January 31, 1934, under the provisions of an act of Congress empowering the President to reduce the standard weight and fineness of the gold dollar by not to exceed 50 percent, and under the terms of said act of Congress, as subsequently extended in time limitation, the President has to date exercised said authority only to the extent of fixing said gold dollar weight at 15 5/21 grains, whereas 50 percent of its former weight would be 12.9 grains, equal to a maximum value of $41.34 per ounce for gold of nine-tenths fineness; and

Whereas it is currently reported that the free market price for gold in India, North Africa, and Asia Minor has fluctuated between $40 and $70 per ounce, and that mines in British Dominions are enjoying that price for their product; and

Whereas a majority of the Members of the Senate of the State of California believes that restoration of the ability of American gold mines to produce gold at the earliest moment consistent with war manpower demands, is essential to the preservation of the local economies of the districts in which they are located (including 19 counties of California), to post-war employment opportunities for miners and prospectors, to the maintenance of an adequate national currency backing of gold, and to the stabilization of international money exchanges on a basis that will permit of the free resumption of international trade after the war; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the President be memorialized to exercise his authority to reduce the gold content of the United States gold dollar to 12.9 grains of the nine-tenths fineness, and thereby to increase the mint price for newly mined gold bullion to $41.34 per ounce; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and through him, the Secretary of State of the United States be memorialized to take such steps and enter into such negotiations as will make free markets for gold in foreign countries available to American gold producers, and will remove current legal restrictions on the export of newly mined gold to such markets by American producers; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and Congress be memorialized to lift the current legal restrictions on the production of gold in this country at the earliest moment consistent with the national safety and war manpower requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and Congress be memorialized to provide in post-war international exchange stabilization agreements, for a gold medium for settlement of balances and such currency ratios as at the same time will stabilize the American dollar in terms of foreign currencies and will make possible an early resumption of trade between the United States and foreign countries; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and to each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

Delegates from abroad will be thinking of gold as is evidenced by an article from the pen of John S. Piper, financial editor of the San Francisco News. The subject concerns Britain's agreeing to a raise in the price of gold as disclosed by Prime Minister Smuts of South Africa. The article is particularly timely. Quoting it in full:

In a speech to the South African parliament at Capetown, Prime Minister Jan Smuts disclosed that the British Government has agreed to raise the price of gold. A Reuter's dispatch said the General Smuts explained that the step would be taken to counteract the black markets in Egypt and in India.

In his speech, the premier said that in those countries black market gold is selling for £14 to £15 ($60.30) an ounce. The fixed Government price is £8 8s. This is equivalent to the Bank of England rate of $33.81.

SOUTH AFRICAN UNION WANTS BENEFIT OF PRICE

Mr. Smuts continued:

"The South African Union Government is alive to the situation. It has suggested to the British Government that South Africa get some benefit from the rise in price. The British Government has no objection to this. It is prepared to meet the Union Government regarding its wishes for an increase in the price of the metal."

The prime minister added that negotiations are in progress as to the best methods of arriving at a suitable arrangement.

WILL DEMAND FREE GOLD MARKET

A Dow-Jones dispatch from London reveals that Col. Charles Frampton Stallard, South African minister of mines, told the Capetown Parliament earlier this week that after the war the country will refuse to take payment for its gold in any artificially fixed quantity of international currency. Instead, he said, the Government will demand a free gold market.

Jan Frederick Hofmeyr, minister of finance and education, supported Mr. Stallard's arguments.

The two leaders made these points:

1. As to the Keynes and White international currency plan, the union is noncommittal.

2. If either the unitas (the currency under the White plan) or the bancor (the Keynes plan unit) is established, South Africa will refuse to sell gold for any fixed quantity thereof, and will demand the highest price it can get in a free market.

WANT HARD MONEY

Colonel Stallard said that the free market price of gold is 340 shillings ($68.42) (the

British Treasury's fixed price is 168 shillings).

"If an arbitrary paper money is established," he continued, "we won't sell our gold for any fixed quantity of this paper money. We will want the highest price we can get. A free market for gold is a requirement for South Africa.

"The people of the world would sooner have hard sovereigns than paper money. The increased sales of diamonds and of land prove they want something more solid than bank balances."

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has been much concerned about the gold situation.

Under date of October 1, 1943, the chamber wrote in part:

Cognizant of the part which gold has played in the history of San Francisco and California and in the making of the West, but mindful of the international situation and the post-war era, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce advocates the use of gold and its free exchange as a monetary standard in any international currency stabilization plan to be supported by the United States.

While the chamber of commerce is primarily concerned at this time with the foundation which will be afforded for the world's post-war economy, it is of interest to note that whereas approximately $51,000,000 in gold was produced in California in 1940, the State's production this year probably will not reach 10 percent of this amount. No other industry, as such, has been so adversely affected in cooperating in the war effort and we are hopeful that gold mining may make a strong comeback in the peaceful future.

Any steps which it may be possible for you to take to defend and support gold as an international monetary standard and its free exchange will be deeply appreciated.

I also quote a resolution adopted by the San Francisco Chamber on September 23, 1943:

Whereas—

(a) The gold mining industry in the Western States of the United States and throughout the world has been directly reflected in the growth and development of San Francisco;

(b) Some agencies, national and otherwise, are seeking to minimize the importance of gold in the world economy;

(c) The efforts of the victors in World War No. 2 will have been futile unless they result in a healthy world economy and means to facilitate world trade;

(d) The stabilization of the currencies of the world will be essential to a wholesome world economy and international trade; and

(e) The soundness of a world monetary standard will measure the success or failure of any stabilization plan: Now, therefore,

Be it, and it hereby is, resolved, That—

1. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce shall advocate the use of gold and its free exchange as a monetary standard in any international currency stabilization plan supported by the United States Government;

2. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce shall endeavor to secure the support of all other interested agencies for gold as an international monetary standard;

3. Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the United States Treasury Department and California's Representatives in Congress with the request that they endorse gold as a final measure of value for world currencies and its free exchange;

4. The importance of the gold-mining industry to the economy of California, the Western States, the Nation, and the world at large shall be widely publicized.

Mr. Speaker, I now submit detailed correspondence regarding gold mining in California:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DIVISION OF MINES,
San Francisco, May 21, 1943.

Congressman THOS. ROLPH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROLPH: Answering your letter of the 10th instant, relative to the effect of the War Production Board order closing the gold mines in California; I am enclosing statements from our District Mining Engineers at Redding, Sacramento, and Los Angeles. These will give you a close-to-the-scene picture of the effects better than any summary which I might write from here. They are in the field and in direct touch with those mining communities.

Trusting that this will assist you, I am,

Very truly yours,
WALTER W. BRADLEY,
State Mineralogist.

STATE DIVISION OF MINES,
Redding, Calif., May 15, 1943.

Mr. WALTER W. BRADLEY,
State Mineralogist,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: In reply to your inquiry concerning the effect the War Production Board order closing gold mines had in this district: Gold mining was the sole support of many small communities in this district and the closing order has just about made "ghost towns" of them.

French Gulch has no pay roll since the Washington and St. Jude quartz mines and the French Gulch dredge were shut down.

Many families have moved away from Weaverville, and some small businesses have closed since the Junction City dredge had to suspend operations. It carried the largest pay roll in the community.

There were five gold dredges operating on the Klamath River between Yreka and Happy Camp that were able to keep operating in spite of the draft and the migration of most of the younger men to the war industries. They were employing older men with families who had their homes in the communities and recruited from dredges closed for inability to get needed repair parts. The loss of employment will work a severe hardship on these men and their families and the loss of their wages will be felt by many of the merchants.

The Thurman gold dredge which operated on Clear Creek south of Redding employed about 20 men and the loss of that pay roll can be felt even in a city as large as Redding.

I have mentioned only the pay roll loss and direct loss of employment, but there are many other losses to the communities when their main industry is shut down. It means less money for the merchants and less employment in their stores, the loss of income through royalties to landowners, loss through depreciation of machinery and equipment, etc.

I am often asked for my opinion as to when the gold mines can start again. I wish I had some encouragement to offer them.

Very truly yours,
J. C. O'BRIEN,
District Mining Engineer.

STATE DIVISION OF MINES,
Sacramento, Calif., May 14, 1943.

Mr. WALTER W. BRADLEY,
State Mineralogist,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 13 asking for a brief statement of the effect of the War Production Board order closing the gold mines in California.

The effect of the order has not been the same in all communities. Some of them that were dependent on gold mining alone are rapidly approaching the condition of "ghost towns"; for instance, Amador City. A place like Jackson has other industries like lumbering in the vicinity and, hence, is not hit so hard. Grass Valley is near Camp Beale, a military camp, and many persons connected with Camp Beale live there. Then again the mines at Grass Valley are being maintained and kept pumped out, and this gives work to quite a few mining people.

The real hardship, as I see it, falls on the persons who own deep gold mines. They are faced with the decision of whether to allow the mines to fill with water, which means that some of the workings may cave and that the expense of reopening them may be prohibitive, or whether to keep them pumped out and properly timbered so that the workings will not cave. This maintenance is extremely expensive, and no arrangement has been made by the War Production Board to give any relief on the matter. As the order of the War Production Board has changed many of these properties from ones that were producing good income to ones that are running up large bills of expense, the order amounts to a confiscation of property without compensation. I believe that something should be done about this matter of maintenance; otherwise many of the gold mines are likely to fill with water and cave to the extent that it will not be possible to reopen them. Of course, towns that were dependent entirely on gold mining have suffered a tremendous depreciation in property value.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES V. AVERILL,
District Mining Engineer.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DIVISION OF MINES,
Los Angeles, May 15, 1943.

Mr. WALTER W. BRADLEY,
State Mineralogist,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: The effect of the War Production Board closing gold mines in California resulted in closing all gold-silver mines, large and small, in southern California and the employees leaving the gold mining districts for employment in defense plants in Los Angeles, plants at Las Vegas, Nev., or on construction work on Army camps in various areas in southern California. Very few of the miners sought employment in the copper districts, a limited number going to mines in tungsten-producing districts, such as Bishop, Darwin, and Atolia.

The following is a brief outline of the mines producing gold and silver that suspended operations due to the closing order of the War Production Board:

IMPERIAL COUNTY

Madre-Padre Mines situated in the Cargo Muchacho Mining District, Ogilby, Calif.; operated by the Holmes & Nicholson Mining & Milling Co.; 50-ton cyanide plant. Fifty men were employed.

Tumco Mines Co. (Sovereign) operated Sovereign, Golden Queen and Gold Crown Mines in Cargo Muchacho District, Ogilby, Calif.; 35-ton cyanide plant. Twenty men were employed.

Mary Lode Mine, Glamis District, Glamis, Calif. Shipped high grade ore. Six men were employed.

Desert Gold & Aluminum Corporation (gold placer); 150-yard concentration plant. Twenty men were employed.

INYO COUNTY

Ballarat district, Panamint Mountains:

Cecil R. Mine and 5 small gold mines shipping ore to Burton Bros., Inc., Rosamond, Kern County, and to Kelly Gold-Silver Mines, Red Mountain, San Bernardino County.

Ruth Mine, Argus mining district; Burton Bros., Inc.; 150-ton cyanide plant. Forty men were employed.

Orondo Mine. Orondo Mining Co., Los Angeles, Calif. In Argus mining district; 100-ton cyanide plant. Twenty men were employed.

Keane Wonder Mine. In Chloride Cliff mining district; 100-ton cyanide plant completed when closing order forced suspension of operation. Thirty men were employed.

Delnorte-Skidoo Mines. Skidoo mining district in Panamint Mountains, Skidoo, Calif.; 30-ton amalgamation and cyanide plant. Thirty men were employed.

KERN COUNTY

Big Blue Mine, Cove mining district, Kernville; Kern Mines, Inc.; 150-ton flotation plant; 100 men were employed.

Mojave mining district, Mojave, Calif. The largest producer of gold and silver was especially hard hit by the closing order. The following mines suspended operations:

Cactus Queen Mine, Cactus Mines Co., Mojave, Calif.; 150-ton flotation and cyanide plant; 150 men employed.

Golden Queen Mine, Mojave, Calif.; Golden Queen Mining Co.; 500-ton cyanide plant; 400 men were employed.

Tropico Mine, Rosamond, Calif., Burton Bros., Inc.; 100-ton cyanide plant operated also as a custom mill, the largest in southern California; 50 men were employed.

Standard Mine, Mojave, Calif.; Standard Mining Co.; 50-ton mill; 20 men were employed.

Yellow Rover Mine, Mojave, Calif., A. J. Bruce; 10 men were employed; 20-ton mill.

Lodestar Mine, Mojave, Calif.; Lodestar Mining Co.; shipping ore to Golden Queen Mill; 150 men were employed.

Randsburg-Atolia mining districts:

Black Hawk Mine, Ernest Stevens, lessee, Randsburg, Calif.; 25-ton amalgamation and cyanide plant; 10 men were employed.

Butte Lode, Rand mining district, Randsburg, Butte Lode Mining Co.; 10-stamp mill; 10 men were employed.

G. B. Mine, Rand mining district, Randsburg, Bert Wegman, operator; 10 men were employed

King Solomon Mine, Rand mining district, Johannesburg, King Solomon Mines Co.; 100-ton amalgamation and flotation plant; 30 men were employed.

Yellow Aster Mine, Rand mining district, Randsburg, Calif., Anglo American Mining Corporation, Ltd.; 1,100-ton cyanide plant operating Yellow Aster Mine tailings; 50 men were employed.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Governor Mine, Acton, Calif., Governor Mining Co.; 125-ton amalgamation and flotation plant; 50 men were employed.

MONO COUNTY

Gold Crown Mine, Benton district, Robert G. Jones, Benton, Calif.; 150-ton cyanide and flotation plant operated as custom mill; 50 men were employed.

Log Cabin Mine, Mono Lake district, Leevining, Calif., Log Cabin Mines Co.; 100-ton cyanide plant; 40 men were employed.

Monte Christo Mine, Mammoth Lakes district, Mammoth post office, Monte Christo Mining Co.; 25 men were employed. Ore shipped to Jones mill at Benton, Calif.

Standard Mine, Bodie mining district, Bodie, Calif. Roseklip Mines Co., Bodie; 250-ton cyanide plant; 50 men employed.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

Mission Mine, Misson Mining Co., Pinto Basin district; 25-ton cyanide plant; 10 men were employed.

Golden Bee Mine, Pinto Basin district; post office, Twenty-nine Palms. Shipped ore to Gold Crown mill, Dale district; also to Burton Bros., Inc., custom mill, Rosamond, Kern Co.; six men were employed.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Burcham Mine, Burcham Mines, Inc., Calico mining district. Large tonnage of gold, silver-lead ore developed. Planned to install 200-ton mill; 25 men were employed.

Gold Crown Mine (supply), in Dale mining district; Gold Crown Mining Co.; 50-ton cyanide plant, which also operated as a custom plant for small mines in Dale mining district; 30 men were employed.

Gold Mountain Mine, Big Bear district; Gold Mountain Mining Co.; 50-ton flotation plant; 15 men were employed.

Goldstone Mining & Milling Co., Barstow district; 100-ton cyanide plant. Were milling ore from Goldstone district; 20 men were employed.

Goldstone Mine, Dale district, shipped ore to Gold Crown Mining Co.; 10 men were employed.

Holcomb Valley Placer, Holcomb mining district, Big Bear Lake; Holcomb Valley Placer Co. Ten men were employed.

Kelly Mine, Rand mining district, Red Mountain; Kelly Gold & Silmer Mines. Shipped high-grade ore to American Smelting & Refining Co.'s smelter, Selby, Calif.; also operated a custom mill, flotation, and cyanide plant, capacity 100 tons. Forty men were employed.

Morning Star Mine, Mescal mining district, Cima, Calif.; E. P. Halliburton, Inc. Fifteen men were employed on development work. Planned to install 500-ton cyanide plant. Developed 500,000 tons of ore, with average value of $7 per ton.

Sulphide Queen Mine, Mountain Springs, Sulphide Queen Mining Co.; 100-ton cyanide plant. Thirty men were employed.

Telegraph Mine, Solo mining district, Baker, Calif.; Telegraph Mines, Inc.; 30-ton cyanide plant. Fifteen men were employed.

Valley View Mine, Ivanpah mining district, Ivanpah, Calif.; Valley View Mining Co.; 75-ton flotation plant. Thirty men were employed.

Vulcan Mine, Ship Mountain mining district, Cima, Calif.; Vulcan Mining Co. Fifteen men were employed.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Eagle Nest Mine, Long Valley, Pine Valley, Calif.; Long Valley Mining & Milling Co.; 25-ton flotation plant. Fifteen men were employed.

Ranchito Mine, Julian mining district, Julian, Calif.; Ranchito Mining Co.; 5-stamp mill. Six men were employed.

In addition to above-mentioned mines that were producers, there were a large number of smaller mining properties that were under development which were forced to suspend operations.

Yours very truly,

W. B. TUCKER,
District Mining Engineer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein three newspaper articles with regard to Washington, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short statement and also an additional statement by Drew Pearson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House is convening at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization had scheduled a hearing on the free port, besides a number of bills introduced by Members of Congress. I desire to state that the meeting will be called off and will be set down when the Congress convenes again, at which time we will be glad to hear any Member who wishes to be heard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SCOTT, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. PHILLIPS, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. LAFOLLETTE (at the request of Mr. HORAN), for Tuesday and Wednesday, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a splendid article written by Mr. William T. McCarthy, assistant United States attorney in Boston, entitled "A Prosecutor's Viewpoint on Narcotic Addiction." This article is estimated to cover two pages at a cost of $104. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding, it may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months I have had occasion to speak to boys from back home who have returned from the battlefields in Africa and Italy. They informed me that Goebbels would nightly broadcast by way of the German radio in an attempt to discredit the morale of the American soldiers in an assertion to the effect that a promise had been made that they would not be sent into foreign wars. At the time, I was so much interested that I decided to investigate the entire problem. Recently I have traveled through parts of New England and I

learned that there was an attempt on the part of some to use that line of propaganda among some of the people in that region in the hope that they would create a lack of confidence in the war effort.

More recently, I have heard in the city of Washington references made to these words in various forms to the effect that a promise was made that our boys would not be sent into foreign wars; others that a promise was made to our boys that they would not be sent overseas.

The other day on the floor of this House in this distinguished body, I heard the alarming statement made by a distinguished Member of the House, said statement to the mothers and fathers of America, "They are weeping over their let-down and I trust the gentleman will quote the President properly at that time."

We are all familiar with recent history. The American people know that one of the reasons why France collapsed was that when the safety of the state was imperiled politics were not adjourned.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced personally that propaganda is being used in America by those interested in other than politics in an attempt to break the hearts of the American mothers and fathers and to imperil the proper conduct of the war. I pray God, Mr. Speaker, that no one interested in politics would ever place political advantage above the desire to win the war and to win a just peace at the earliest possible date, and I make no accusations of anyone in politics striving for that particular end.

The fact is, however, that appeals to the emotions, the use of catch words, slogans, and phrases sometimes tend to create confusion of counsel, public indecision, political paralysis, the possibility of a state of panic, and through all of this the danger that sound national policies might come to be viewed with skepticism.

In his very excellent book on Frontiers of American Culture, James Truslow Adams, commences his book with the following:

> I once knew a fine old Scot who loved to argue and who had all the mental tenacity and clarity of his race. When settling down for an evening's delight in logic the discussion never got beyond a few sentences before he would exclaim, "Define your terms, mon! Define your terms!"

I propose to define my terms and I propose to discuss the exact language as it appears in the RECORD.

But first may I review for the RECORD some of the history of the war from 1931 up to 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief résumé of the incidents from the invasion of Manchuria by Japan down to and including the attack on Britain in 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

1931, Japan invaded Manchuria. League of Nations protested, but nothing more.

1935, Italy invaded Ethiopia. The powers protested. League of Nations voted sanctions against Italy but penalties were not enforced. The King of Italy was proclaimed Emperor of Ethiopia.

In the midst of the Ethiopian crisis, Hitler tore up one of the clauses of the Versailles Treaty by sending German troops on March 7, 1936, into the Rhineland, which the treaty had demilitarized. The League condemned the action, but nothing else.

In July 1936 civil war broke out in Spain. The Fascists were supported by Germany and Italy, the Loyalists by Russia.

Meanwhile, Germany was rearming. Hitler was stating his next demand would be the last one.

In March 1938, Austria was seized.

In the summer of 1938, Hitler threatened Czechoslovakia, demanding the Sudetenland. Russia was ready to go to war to save the Czechs.

At Munich on October 1, 1938, the Sudetenland was ceded to Germany. On March 14, 1939, the Nazis occupied Czechoslovakia.

March 22, 1939, Memel land was annexed.

Next Germany struck at Versailles again, seeking the Free City of Danzig and the Polish Corridor.

Poland was invaded on September 1, 1939, putting into action the modern theory of blitzkreig. By September 17, 1939, only Warsaw still held out, soon to fall.

April 9, 1940, Denmark and Norway were invaded. The former was quickly overrun in a few hours. Norway held out for 2 months. A nation of 3,000,000 previously at peace for 126 years.

At dawn on May 10, blitzkreig came to the West, with an attack on the Low Countries, in a campaign of less than 6 weeks' duration.

As 1939 gave way to 1940, people talked of the war of nerves, the phony war, while the Germans prepared in the West wall and the French dallied behind the Maginot line.

The campaign in France was highlighted first with the Battle of the Meuse, which was crossed in four days. Later came the battle of the channel ports. On May 21, 1940, the Nazis reached the sea.

The last phase of the battle of France began on June 5 along the Somme.

June 10, 1940, Italy entered the war, attacking hard-pressed France from the south. June 14 the Germans entered Paris.

By June 24 the fighting was at an end.

Remember the railway car on the siding in the forest of Compiegne, where the Germans signed the armistice on November 11, 1918. The same railway car, a museum piece since that time, saw the French on June 22, 1940, sign an armistice with the Germans.

The fall of Norway put Nazi planes at Stavanger, 390 miles from Edinburgh, 330 miles from Scapa Flow.

The fall of The Netherlands gave the Germans air bases 135 miles from Norwich, 155 miles from London.

The fall of France brought the Germans within 26 miles of Dover.

Then followed the Battle of Britain. On August 8, 1940, the aerial blitzkrieg, due to continue for 2 months, got fully under way. First a large-scale daylight raid, which appeared as a prelude to invasion. Ports and industrial cities were pounded for 10 days.

Next came the second phase of another fortnight's duration. This time ports suffered less than airfields and inland industrial cities.

In September the aerial attacks reached a vast climax. In one day alone the Germans lost 185 planes, pounding London by day and by night.

The assault fell off until by the end of October it had lost its blitz qualities.

More than 14,000 civilians in London were killed. The British claimed to have destroyed 2,375 of the invader's planes. The bombing continued for months, but the threat of immediate invasion had been lifted.

Let me put it another way. From the War in Maps;

Since Hitler came to power, January 1933, he has dominated or invaded 15 countries:

1. Austria, March 1938.
2. Czechoslovakia, October 1938–March 1939.
3. Poland, September 1, 1939.

(Britain and France declared War September 3.)

4. Denmark, April 1940.
5. Norway, April 1940.
6. Luxembourg, May 1940.
7. Netherlands, May 1940.
8. Belgium, May 1940.
9. France, June 1940.
10. Hungary, November 1940.
11. Rumania, November 1940.
12. Bulgaria, March 1941.
13. Yugoslavia, April 1941.
14. Greece and Crete, April–June 1941.
15. Soviet Russia, June 1941.

Stettinius, in his excellent book on lend-lease, reviews recent years as follows:

"September 1939 Germany invades Poland. Britain and France declare war on Germany.

"November 1939 arms embargo lifted to permit purchase of weapons in United States by Britain and France.

"June 1940 Dunkerque. France falls. United States sends guns to defend Britain against invasion.

"September 1940 destroyers for bases deal with Britain—the forerunner of lend-lease.

"March 1941 Lend-lease enacted. $7,000,000,000 appropriated for aid to countries resisting aggression.

"June 1941 Germany attacks the Soviet Union. United States and Britain pledge material aid.

"October 1941 Nazis open drive on Moscow. Billion dollar Soviet aid program approved by President.

"December 1941 Japs attack Pearl Harbor. United States declares war on Japan, Germany, and Italy.

"February 1942 first of 12 mutual-aid agreements signed, providing for reserve lend-lease aid to United States.

"April 1942 Burma Road cut by Japanese. Air route from India replaces last land route into China.

"March 1943 Lend-Lease Act extended by votes of 407–6 in the House and 82–0 in the Senate.

"May–July 1943 Allies pool men and equipment. Axis driven from Africa. Invasion of Europe begins."

Mr. MURPHY. I also ask unanimous consent that I may place in the RECORD at this point by way of review of the years from 1933 up to the present time, a review set forth in an excellent book called Rendezvous With Destiny, by J. B. S. Hardman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

March 4, 1933: Franklin D. Roosevelt is inaugurated as President of the United States. "In the field of world policy," he says on this occasion, "I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

December 28, 1933: Stating that probably 90 percent of the people in the world are content to settle their problems peaceably, the President warns that unless the other 10 percent can be persuaded "to do their own thinking and not be led," peace is insecure.

January 16, 1935: The President asks that the Senate consent to membership of the United States in the World Court, which

action would enable this country "to throw its weight into the scale in favor of peace." The Senate rejects the proposal.

August 18, 1935: In a personal message to Mussolini, President Roosevelt urges negotiation and peaceful settlement with Ethiopia, warning that hostilities would touch off serious conflicts.

August 31, 1935: The President approves neutrality legislation passed by the Congress and providing for an arms embargo against any nation, aggressor or victim, engaged in conflict. In signing it, the President observes that the "inflexible arms-embargo provisions might drag us into war instead of keeping us out."

November 11, 1935: President Roosevelt emphasizes that our primary purpose is to keep out of war, but warns that we cannot "build walls around ourselves and hide our heads in the sand."

January 3, 1936: The President warns the Congress that the "tragedy of general war" is a possibility and that the United States must engage in adequate defense if it is to avoid attack and embroilment.

January 8, 1937: The President directs the Navy Department to proceed with the construction of two replacement battleships.

October 5, 1937: Mr. Roosevelt, in his "Quarantine" address at Chicago, calls attention to the world situation as one to cause grave concern; "the epidemic of lawlessness" is spreading.

January 28, 1938: The President recommends to the Congress the strengthening of our national defense. Recommendation adopted.

September 26, 1938: In a personal message to Adolf Hitler, the President urges peaceful negotiation of Hitler's claim to the Sudetenland, Czechoslovak territory. Hitler replies that if the Sudetenland is not handed over to Germany, he will take it by force.

January 4, 1939: The President asks Congress to appropriate half a billion dollars for Army and Navy equipment.

April 14, 1939: In messages to Hitler and Mussolini, the President requests assurances that their armed forces will not attack any of the independent nations of Europe and the Near East. No reply.

May 27, 1939: Secretary Hull, with the approval of the President, urges the Congress to remove the arms embargo "which gives aid to the aggressor and denies it to the victim." No action taken.

June 7, 1939: The President approves a $100,000,000 appropriation for the acquisition of strategic materials to supply the defense needs.

August 25, 1939: The President sends a second message to Hitler, again urging peaceful settlement of German-Polish dispute.

November 4, 1939: The arms embargo is repealed, carrying out, in substance, the program urged by the President on May 27.

April 29, 1940: The President sends a message to Mussolina in the hope of keeping Italy out of the war.

May 16, 1940: President Roosevelt calls for a program providing 50,000 military and naval planes, and requests appropriation of $1,000,000,000 to improve and expand Army and Navy equipment and increase production facilities to supply Army and Navy needs. He subsequently announces that we will extend all possible aid to the opponents of the Rome-Berlin Axis.

September 3, 1940: The United States transfers 50 overage destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for 99-year leases to naval and aircraft bases in the Atlantic.

December 19, 1940: The President states that it is clear the Nazis intend to enslave the whole of Europe and then to use the resources of Europe to enslave the rest of the world. We must, he says, be the great "arsenal of democracy."

May 27, 1941: President Roosevelt proclaims the existence of an "unlimited national emergency."

July 7, 1941: The President announces that by agreement with Iceland, American forces have been established on the island.

August 14, 1941: President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill meet at sea, they draw up certain common principles on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world. These become known as the Atlantic Charter.

October 9, 1941: The President asks the Congress to modify the Neutrality Act to enable us to arm our flag ships and to deliver lend-lease materials in our own vessels. Favorable action is taken.

October 27, 1941: Referring to the sinking of United States ships by Nazi submarines, the President declares that we wished to avoid shooting but the shooting has begun and "history has recorded who fired the first shot * * *."

December 8, 1941: Following the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt appears before a joint session of the Congress, calling for a declaration that a state of war exists between the United States and Japan. Both Houses act immediately with only one dissenting vote.

December 11, 1941: A joint session of the Congress, in response to a message from President Roosevelt, passes a resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the United States and Germany and the United States and Italy. This action followed the declaration of war against the United States by Germany and Italy, made earlier the same day.

January 6, 1942: The President, in his message to the Congress, states that for the year 1942 "we must raise our sights all along the production line": 60,000 planes; 45,000 tanks; 20,000 antiaircraft guns; 8,000,000 tons of merchant shipping.

April 27, 1942: Mr. Roosevelt, stressing that the cost of living is rising and that "the time definitely has come to stop the spiral," presents a 7-point stabilization program: Reduction of personal and corporate profits; ceilings on prices and rents; stabilization of wages and farm prices; War-bond purchases; rationing; reducing credit buying; paying off of debts.

Mr. MURPHY. Again may I quote for the RECORD some of the declarations of our esteemed and beloved President down through the years from 1932 up to and preceding the election campaign of 1940.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent, because of the lateness of the hour, that I may extend in the RECORD at this point a summary prepared by me of the declarations of President Roosevelt on the question of war and peace, commencing with 1932 down to the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Annual message to Congress January 3, 1936: "Since the summer of that same year of 1933 the tempers and the purposes of the rulers of many of the great populations in Europe and Asia have not pointed the way either to peace or to good will among men. Not only have peace and good will among men grown more remote in those areas of the earth during this period but a point has been reached where the people of the Americas must take cognizance of growing ill will, of marked trends toward aggression, of increasing armaments, of shortening tempers—a situation which has in it many of the elements which lead to the tragedy of general war.

"The evidence before us clearly proves that autocracy in world affairs endangers peace and that such threats do not spring from those nations devoted to the democratic ideal."

Address at Chautauqua, N. Y., August 14, 1936: "I am more concerned and less cheerful about international world conditions than about our immediate domestic prospects. * * *

"We must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend upon their day-to-day decisions."

Letter to Representative DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, January 21, 1937 (source, Financial Chronicle, vol. 144, p. 544, January 23, 1937): "In the present unfortunate state of world affairs we dare not in justice to ourselves relax our effort or abate the vigor of our leadership in a world-wide movement for durable peace through economic prosperity."

Address at dedication of Outerlink Bridge, Chicago, Ill., October 5, 1937 (source, Washington Star, October 5, 1937, p. A-8): "The political situation in the world, which of late has been growing progressively worse, is such as to cause grave concern and anxiety to all the peoples and nations who wish to live in peace and amity with their neighbors. * * *

"The situation is definitely of universal concern. The questions involved relate not merely to violations of specific provisions of particular treaties; they are questions of war and peace, of international law and especially of the principles of humanity."

Navy Day letter to Secretary Swanson, October 27, 1937 (source, Washington Post October 27, 1937, p. 6): "We are at peace with all the world and for that we are thankful. We as a Nation have no plans of conquest; we harbor no imperial designs. War will be avoided by all honorable means."

Radio address from the White House June 24, 1938: "Copperhead" speech, discussing those who wish peace at any price.

Annual message to Congress January 3, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 458, 75th Cong. 3d sess., p. 1): "In spite of the determination of this Nation for peace it has become clear that acts and policies of nations in other parts of the world have far-reaching effects, not only upon their immediate neighbors but also on us.

"I am thankful that I can tell you that our Nation is at peace. It has been kept at peace despite provocations which in other days, because of their seriousness, could well have engendered war. The people of the United States and the Government of the United States have shown capacity for restraint and a civilized approach to the purposes of peace."

Defense message to Congress January 28, 1938: "It is our clear duty to further every effort toward peace but at the same time to protect our Nation."

Message of Chancelor Hitler and President Eduardo Benes September 26, 1938: "The fabric of peace in the Continent of Europe if not throughout the rest of the world is in immediate danger.

"* * * The supreme desire of the American people is to live in peace."

Address at Gettysburg Battlefield, Pa., July 3, 1938: "Lincoln was Commander in Chief in this old battle; he wanted above all things

to be Commander in Chief of the new peace. He understood that battle there must be; that when a challenge to constituted government is thrown down, the people must in self defense take it up; that the fight must be fought through to a decision so clear that it will be accepted as being beyond recall."

Thanksgiving Day proclamation, November 19, 1938: "We have lived in peace and understanding with our neighbors and have seen the world escape the impending disaster of a general war."

Annual message to Congress, January 4, 1939: "A war which threatened to envelop the world in flames has been averted; but it has become increasingly clear that world peace is not assured."

Message to Hitler and Mussolini, April 4, 1939, advocating settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

Graduation address at United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., June 12, 1939: "We seek peace by honorable and pacific conduct of our international relations; but that desire for peace must never be mistaken for weakness on the part of the United States."

Address on the one hundredth anniversary of the Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., November 11, 1939: "We have never had the illusion that peace and freedom could be based on weakness. * * * The only object of arms is to bring about a condition in which quiet peace under liberty can endure."

Radio address before Pan American Governing Board, April 15, 1940: "This cooperative peace in the Western Hemisphere was not created by mere wishing and it will require more than mere words to maintain. In this association of nations whatever touches any one of us touches us all. We have only asked that the world go with us in the path of peace. But we shall be able to keep that way open only if we are prepared to meet force with force if challenge is made against us. * * * All this is not of mere academic interest. We know that what happens in the Old World directly and powerfully affects the peace and well-being of the New. It was for this very reason that we have adopted procedures that enable us to meet any eventuality.

"At Buenos Aires we agreed that we would consult should our peace be threatened. At Lima we agreed to stand together to defend and maintain the absolute integrity of every American nation from any attack, direct or indirect, from beyond the seas. At Panama we worked out means for keeping war away from our hemisphere. I pray God that we shall have to do no more than that; but should it be necessary I am convinced that we should be wholly successful."

Six hundred and fifty-eighth press conference, Hyde Park, N. Y., July 5, 1940. "Four freedoms" discussed: "There are certain freedoms. The first I would call 'freedom of information' * * * you will never have a completely stable world without freedom of knowledge, freedom of information."

Statement on the adoption of peacetime universal selective service, September 16, 1940: "Universal service will bring not only greater preparedness to meet the threat of war, but a wider distribution of tolerance and understanding to enjoy the blessings of peace."

New York Times, May 27, 1940, reported the talk of Franklin D. Roosevelt on radio on May 26, 1940, on State of Our Defense: "There are some among us who were persuaded by minority groups that we could maintain our physical safety by retiring within our continental boundaries—the Atlantic on the east, the Pacific on the west, Canada on the north, and Mexico on the south. I illustrated the futility, the impossibility, of that idea in my message to the Congress last week. Obviously a defense policy based on that is merely to invite future attack.

"* * * There is an added technique for weakening a nation at its very roots, for disrupting the entire pattern of life of a people. It is important that we understand it.

"The method is simple. First, discord. A group—not too large—a group that may be political is encouraged to exploit their prejudices through false slogans and emotional appeals."

Address at drawing of numbers for conscription, November 1940—quotation of then Bishop, now Most Rev. Archbishop Francis J. Spellman: "But we really can no longer afford to be moles who cannot see, or ostriches who will not see, but some solemn agreements are no longer sacred and vices have become virtues and truth synonymous of falsehood. We Americans want peace, and we shall prepare for a peace but not for a peace which definition is slavery or death."

December 30, 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York Times, speech of December 29, 1940: "Never before since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock has our American civilization been in such danger as now."

May 16, 1940, address of Franklin D. Roosevelt to Congress: "The element of surprise which has ever been an important tactic in warfare has become the more dangerous because of the amazing speed with which modern equipment can reach and attack the enemy countries."

Fireside chat on national security, White House, December 29, 1940: "The Nazi masters have made it clear that they intend not only to dominate all life and thought in their own country, but also to enslave the whole of Europe, and then to use the resources of Europe to dominate the rest of the world.

"* * * In other words, the Axis not merely admits but proclaims that there can be no ultimate peace between this philosophy of government and our philosophy of government. * * *

"Every realist knows that the democratic way of life is at this moment being directly assailed in every part of the world. * * *

"We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

Radio address proclaiming unlimited national emergency, Washington, May 27, 1941: "We must not be defeated by the fear of the very danger which we are preparing to resist. Our freedom has shown its ability to survive war, but it would never survive surrender."

Introduction to the Public Papers and Addresses, 1939 volume, July 10, 1941: "I think that historians will record the fact that ever since 1933 the United States and its Government has persistently and actively sought to prevent this conflict and to preserve peace in the world. This search for peace was the very keystone of our entire foreign policy. It was dictated not only by a natural humanitrian desire to prevent bloodshed and horrors of war, but also by a realistic appreciation that any European war would be a definite danger to our own peace and security and to the welfare of the entire Western Hemisphere and the rest of the world. * * *

* * * * *

"In my annual message to Congress on January 4, 1939, I pointed out that all about us undeclared wars were raging, deadly armaments were growing, and new aggression was being threatened. Although we in the United States wanted peace it was obvious that no nation can be safe in its will to peace so long as any other powerful nation refuses to settle its grievances at the council table. I therefore urge upon Congress the necessity of increased national defense to protect ourselves against attack.

"During 1939 and on April 14 on behalf of the American people I again sent a message to Hitler and Mussolini suggesting another approach to the solution of the problem of avoiding war and preserving the peace of the world.

* * * * *

"As our information indicated that the prospects of war were becoming imminent, on August 24, 1939, I sent another message to the European powers in the interest of peace—this time to Hitler, King Victor Emmanuel, and President Moszicki of Poland. On the following day I sent a second letter to Hitler. These were, of course, all unavailing, and war was begun on September 1."

Introduction to the Public Papers and Addresses, 1940 volume, July 17, 1941: "By the beginning of 1938 this had become so clear to us that the matter of national defense became one of predominant concern. Thereafter, although not relenting in the efforts to promote world peace the United States began to pay prime consideration to build up its national defense.

"* * * By the fall of 1940 the twofold purpose of arming ourselves to the teeth and at the same time helping Great Britain and the other democracies had become the aim of the vast majority of American people."

Radio address on freedom of the seas, September 11, 1941. "We have sought no war with Hitler. We do not seek it now but neither do we want peace so much that we are willing to pay for it by permitting him to attack our naval and merchant ships while they are on legitimate business."

Mr. MURPHY. Now the statement has been made that the President made a promise during the 1940 campaign that our boys would not be sent to "foreign wars." What is a "foreign war"? Certainly it is not an "American war."

Is there any red-blooded American who would do anything but want to help in every possible way to bring about the successful outcome of this war? Mr. Speaker, this is our war, this is your war, it is America's war from the President on down to the most humble citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I assert and I will prove that there was no promise made in the 1940 campaign relative to America's war which has not been kept to the letter. I make this statement of my efforts to prepare myself to make this address; I have gone to the following sources: First, I read all the campaign speeches of President Roosevelt in the last campaign; next, I read all of the campaign speeches of Mr. Willkie in the last campaign. Secondly, I made an examination, study, and reading of the newspapers covering that period, particularly the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Washington Star, the Christian Science Monitor, magazines, the commercial and financial chronicles, and particularly the magazine Newsweek and United States News. I read the Rendezvous With Destiny, by Mr. J. B. S. Hardman, and, incidentally, I have a fondness for that book because it was printed in my home town, Scranton, Pa. Third, the public papers and addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, five volumes published by Random House; four volumes published by Macmillan; the White House releases, and the files in the Library of Congress.

What were the statements during the campaign referring to war? First, I read from the Republican platform on national defense in 1940:

We declare for the prompt, orderly, and realistic building of our national defense to the point at which we shall be able not only to defend the United States, its possessions, and essential outposts from foreign attack, but also efficiently to uphold in war the Monroe Doctrine. To this task the Republican

Party pledges itself when entrusted with national authority.

What did the Democratic platform say on the subject? It said this:

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

On July 26, 1940, the President was reported in the United States News as having made his speech of acceptance on July 19, from the White House and from that I quote the following:

United States News, July 26, 1940, speech of acceptance of Franklin D. Roosevelt on July 19 from the White House: "Because there are self-appointed commentators and interpreters who will seek to misinterpret or question motives, I speak in somewhat personal vein; and I must trust to the good faith and common sense of the American people who accept my own good faith and do their own interpreting.

"* * * The task of safeguarding our institutions is two-fold. One must be accomplished if it becomes necessary by the armed defense forces of the Nation.

"* * * I do not regret my consistent endeavor to awaken this country to the menace for us and for all we hold dear.

"I have pursued these efforts in the face of appeaser fifth columnists who charge me with hysteria and warmongering. But I felt it my duty to arouse my countrymen to the danger of the new forces loose in the world.

And again:

"All that I have done to maintain the peace of this country and to prepare it morally, as wel as physically, for whatever contingencies may be in store, I submit to the judgment of my countrymen.

"The American people must decide whether these things are worth making sacrifices of money, of energy, of self."

On September 11, 1940, the President made an address at Constitution Hall at Washington, D. C., before the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers. In that address he said among other things the following:

In all of these plans for national defense, only those who seek to play upon the fears of the American people, discover an attempt to lead us into war. The American people will reject that kind of propaganda of fear, as they have rejected similar types which are "occasionally" spread forth near election time. They know that against the raging forces loose in the world today the best defense is the strongest preparedness, fighting men and equipment in front, and fighting industry and agriculture behind the lines.

Weakness in these days is a cordial invitation to attack. That's no longer a theory; it's a proven fact, proved within the past year.

I hate war, now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away for these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, and outside of my party as President of all the people, on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than 2 months ago. It said:

"We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

On October 7, 1940, Newsweek reports that Franklin D. Roosevelt during the week previous had made two speeches, one at the dedication of the Recorder of Deeds Building and the other at the opening of the Washington Airport.

On October 12, 1940, the President made an address on hemisphere defense, at Dayton, Ohio, which he spoke inter alia, as follows:

We are building a total defense on land and sea and in the air, sufficient to repel total attacks from any part of the world. Forewarned by deliberate attacks of the dictators upon free peoples, the United States for the first time in its history has undertaken the mustering of its men in peacetime. Unprecedented dangers have caused the United States to undertake the building of naval and air forces sufficient to defend all the coasts of the Americas from any combination of hostile powers.

The clear facts have been stated over and over again. The country wants no war with any nation. The American republics are determined to work in unity for peace, just as we work in unity to defend ourselves from attack.

* * * We aim to defend ourselves. The strongest reason for that is that it is the strongest guaranty for peace.

On October 19, 1940, the President declined an invitation to speak three times in the Middle West, stating that he was unable to get away because things had happened with such rapidity in the international field:

Events which had been a constant threat to the security of the country.

On the 23d of October President Roosevelt spoke in Wilmington, Del. On that occasion he spoke of Abraham Lincoln and the Liberty League.

That night in Philadelphia the President talked in Convention Hall, and I should like to quote parts of his talk on that occasion:

Since July hardly a day or a night has passed when some crisis, or some possibility of crisis, in world affairs has not called for my personal conference with the Secretary of State or other officials of the Government.

With every passing day has come some urgent problem in connection with our swift production for defense and our mustering of the resources of the Nation.

Truthful campaign discussion of public issues is essential to the American form of government, but willful misrepresentation of fact has no place during election time or at any other time.

I make the charge now that these falsifications are being spread for the purpose of filling the minds and hearts of the American people with fear. They are used to create fear by instilling in the minds of the people doubt of each other, doubt of their Government, and doubt of the purposes of their democracy.

Mr. Speaker, along that same line the other day the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] brought on the floor of this House a question in regard to the Kent charges and the Ramsay charges in the Parliament of England. The headline in the Washington Times-Herald reads, "Full F. D. reply to Kent charges asked in the House."

Mr. Speaker, the incident referred to at that time had reference to the time when the honorable and distinguished Winston Churchill was connected with the Admiralty in England.

I would like to give the answer now to that charge in the words of our beloved President Roosevelt uttered on October 23, 1940, in Convention Hall, Philadelphia:

The worst bombshell of fear which Republican leaders have let loose on this people is the accusation that this Government, without the knowledge of the Congress or of the people, has secretly entered into agreements with foreign nations. They even intimate that such commitments have endangered the security of the United States, or have pledged the participation of the United States in some foreign war. It seems almost unnecessary to deny such a charge. But so long as the fantastic misstatement has been made, I must brand it for what it is.

I give you this most solemn assurance: There is no secret treaty, no secret obligation, no secret commitment, no secret understanding in any shape or form, direct or indirect, with any other government, or any other nation in any part of the world, to involve this Nation in any war or for any other purpose.

The desperation of partisans who can invent secret treaties drives them to try to deceive our people in other ways.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the revered majority leader from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that a very distinguished Governor of this country, a Republican who is being seriously considered for the nomination of President, at one time openly advocated an alliance with England, which, of course, no Democrat had ever thought of advocating.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The President at Philadelphia said further:

Tonight there is one more false charge—one outrageously false charge—made to strike terror into the hearts of our citizens. It is a charge that offends every political and religious conviction that I hold dear. It is the charge that this administration wishes to lead this country into war.

This charge is contrary to every fact, every purpose of the past 8 years. Throughout these years my every act and every thought has been directed to the end of preserving the peace of the world, and more particularly, the peace of the United States—the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

As I saw the war coming, I used every ounce of the prestige of the office of President of the United States to prevent its onset.

When war came, I used every ounce of the prestige of the office to prevent its spread to other nations. When that effort failed, I called upon the Congress, and I called upon the Nation, to build the strong defenses that would be our best guaranty of peace and security in this hemisphere.

To Republicans and Democrats, to every man, woman, and child in the Nation I say—your President and your great Secretary of State are following the road to peace.

We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war.

We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on

the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

After the Philadelphia talk on October 25, 1940, to the New York Herald Tribune Forum, the President wrote:

We are preparing for the defense of the two American continents, and of the oceans that are the highways of those continents, and we are doing so in a mode of determination but unafraid and resolute in our will to peace.

Mr. Speaker, the next speech by President Roosevelt was made on October 28, 1940, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, and I would like to quote from that speech as follows:

I am asking the American people to support a continuance of the type of affirmative realistic fight for peace. The alternative is to risk the future of the country in the hands of those with this record of timidity, weakness, and short-sightedness, or to risk it in the inexperienced hands of those who in these perilous days are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports.

And, again, the President answered charges that our defense was so slow that we would not be able to meet threats from abroad, and stated further as follows:

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands, but I was only called an alarmist by Republican leaders and by a great part of the Republican papers.

Thereafter our President outlined our preparations for defense.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the President's remarks made at Hartford, Conn., on the afternoon of his Boston speech. The Christian Science Monitor, a great American newspaper, of October 30, 1940, stated that the President spoke about the insurance-fear program and said:

The result of that effort (defense) is to make the United States strong enough in order to defend itself from attack from the outside, and you should know, too, that we aim to defend only against attack from the outside.

The same evening the President made his Boston speech, and I would like to quote from that address, as follows:

I repeat: Our objective is to keep any potential attacker as far from our continental shores as we can.

* * * unprecedented dangers require unprecedented action to guard the peace of America against unprecedented threats.

And again:

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.

I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again.

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

The purpose of our defense is defense.

And again:

We are telling the world that we are free—and we intend to remain free and at peace.

Mr. Speaker, the President had quoted the Democratic platform in Washington, he had quoted the Democratic platform in Philadelphia, he said at Hartford that we were aiming to defend only against attack from the outside, yet the statement is made on the floor of this House that the mothers and fathers of America are weeping because, in effect, they have been "sold out" by the President of the United States. I say those remarks should be apologized for in this RECORD and before the House.

Mr. Speaker, the President made a speech at Buffalo, N. Y., on November 2, 1940, in which he said:

We believe too equally that in arming against any possible attack we are going to preserve our democracy from being endangered by any other form of government. * * * I hope and I believe that this administration will be able to keep this country at peace during the next 4 years.

At Erie, Pa., after leaving Buffalo, the President stated:

We believe that in turning out airplanes we are helping in the defense of America against any possible aggression from overseas. More than that, in creating that safety for us, we are preventing any other form of foreign government from coming to these shores.

The President spoke at Pittsburgh and at Akron, Ohio. At Akron, Ohio, the President said:

I am confident that in the future we shall be able to avoid being brought into war by attack by someone else on the Americas. The best way to avoid an attack is to be ready to meet one.

The President also spoke in Brooklyn, N. Y., at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, on November 1, 1940, and stated:

I am fighting to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of the United States.

The President spoke at Cleveland, Ohio, on November 2, 1940, his fifth and last campaign speech.

What did he say there?

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war. At the same time we seek to keep foreign conceptions of government out of the United States.

* * * The second purpose of this policy is to keep war as far away as possible from the shores of the entire Western Hemisphere. Also our policy is to give all possible mutual aid to the nations that still resist aggression across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

We make it clear that we intend to commit none of the fatal error of appeasement.

Finally on the eve of election day, Franklin D. Roosevelt talked to the Nation and ended his talk with a prayer.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, I have prepared an outline of the speeches made by Mr. Willkie in that campaign, commencing with the nomination speech by Representative HALLECK, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana and a gentleman for whom I have the greatest of love and respect; later referring to the speech at Coffeyville, Kans., later referring to the remarks of Mr. Willkie at Chicago when he said, "I will never send an American boy to fight in any European war." I refer to his speech in Illinois where he spoke about the "Sold down the river" incident, relating to Czechoslovakia. I refer to the time that Mr. Dewey introduced Mr. Willkie on October 7, 1940, when he, Mr. Willkie, said, "I want to say to you that if we do not prevail this fall this way of life will perish." I also refer to the remarks of Mr. Willkie in Chicago on November 7, 1940, when he said:

If his—the President's—promise to keep our boys out of foreign wars is no better than his promise to balance the Budget they're already almost on the transports.

I refer also, Mr. Speaker, to the speech of Mr. Willkie at Elwood, Ind. I refer to the speech of Mr. Willkie at St. Louis in which he said:

We may perhaps take comfort in the fact that Japan is very far away. And likewise we may perhaps also take comfort in the recent intimation by the Japanese Foreign Office that the New Alliance is not really aimed at the United States. We deeply hope that that is right.

I refer to Newsweek of October 21, 1940, relating to the remarks made Mr. Willkie in Boston:

To begin with we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's war. Our boys shall stay out of European wars.

Again I refer to the remarks of Mr. Willkie quoted in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, November 9, 1940, in which they speak of him making a Nation-wide address on the eve of election, quoting in part as follows:

I promise, as I have promised many times before, not to send your husbands and sons and brothers to death on a European or Asiatic battlefield.

I will avoid bringing about a condition of affairs that will make war necessary. And I will never take this country into war until your representatives in Congress declare it.

At this point I insert in detail those remarks.

Nominating speech by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK. Spoke of Willkie personally and of freedom of life and freedom of enterprise.

Willkie opened campaign at the baseball park in Coffeyville, Kans., September 26, 1940.

Newsweek, September 23, 1940, page 16, reported that Willkie, at Chicago, after Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech to the Teamsters' Union in Washington, said:

I will never send an American boy to fight in any European war.

On Saturday in down-State Illinois, Willkie misspoke on the "sold down the river" Czechoslovakian incident.

Newsweek, October 7, 1940, page 18, tells of Mr. Dewey introducing Willkie, when the latter said:

I want to say to you that if we do not prevail this fall, this way of life will perish.

Newsweek, November 7, 1940, reported that in Chicago after hearing the statement of Franklin D. Roosevelt on September 11 that he was doing all he could to keep war away from these shores for all time, said:

If his promise to keep our boys out of foreign wars is no better than his promise to balance the Budget, they're already almost on the transports.

Speech accepting the nomination at Ellwood, Ind., August 17, 1940—Vital Speeches of the Day:

No man is so wise as to foresee what the future holds as to lay out a plan for it. No man can guarantee or maintain peace. Peace is not something that a nation can achieve by itself. It also depends on what some other country does. It is neither practical nor desirable to adopt a foreign program committing the United States to future action under unknown circumstances.

FOREIGN POLICY GUIDE

For instance, we must not shirk the necessity of preparing our sons to take care of themselves in case the defense of America leads to war.

Speaking of aiding opponents of force and in preparing ourselves:

I am in agreement with these two principles. I do not understand them as implying military involvement in the present hostilities.

Gentlemen, one of the outstanding statements made in America by a great statesman was the speech of Wendell Willkie, from which I now quote—Willkie's loyal opposition speech, Armistice Day, November 11, 1940:

In the campaign preceding the election serious issues were at stake. People became bitter. Many things were said which in calmer moments might have been left unsaid or might have been worded more thoughtfully.

But we Americans know that the bitterness is a distortion, not a true reflection of what is in our hearts. I can truthfully say that there is no bitterness in mine. I hope there is none in yours.

We have elected Franklin D. Roosevelt President. He is your President. He is my President. We, all of us, owe him the respect due to his high office. We give him that respect. We will support him with our best efforts for our country. And we pray that God may guide his hand during the next 4 years in the supreme task of administering the affairs of the people.

Mr. Willkie to the Women's National Republican Club, Hotel Astor, New York, January 8, 1941:

We will, however, stay out of the war, in my judgment, if the men of Britain are supported to the utmost and immediately.

Everyone in America knows that on the eve of Pearl Harbor a message was sent by the President of the United States to Emperor Hirohito, urging the Emperor to listen to reason, and I quote—message to Emperor Hirohito of Japan December 7, 1941:

Almost a century ago the President of the United States addressed to the Emperor of Japan a message extending an offer of friendship of the people of the United States to the people of Japan. That offer was accepted, and in the long period of unbroken peace and friendship which had followed, our respective nations, through the virtues of their peoples and the wisdom of their rulers have prospered and have substantially helped humanity.

* * * * *

Developments are occurring in the Pacific area which threaten to deprive each of our Nations and all humanity of the beneficial influence of the long peace between our two countries. These developments contain tragic possibilities.

The people of the United States believing in peace and in the right of nations to live and let live have eagerly watched the conversations between our two governments during the past months. We have hoped for a termination of the present conflict between Japan and China. We have hoped that a peace of the Pacific could be consummated in such a way that the nationalities of many diverse people could exist side by side without fear of invasion, that unbearable burdens of armaments could be lifted for them all, and that all peoples would resume commerce without discrimination against or in favor of any nation.

* * * * *

I am certain that it will be clear to your Majesty, as it is to me, that in seeking these great objectives, both Japan and the United States should agree to eliminate any form of military threat. This seemed essential to the attainment of the high objectives. (From the New York Times, December 8, 1941.)

May I say by way of interpolation that it was this Congress that declared war against Germany and Italy, and it was Japan who declared war against this Nation. All this Congress was asked to do was to recognize that situation, that a state of war existed, and anyone who says that we should not have gone to war on that occasion, I say that he better look at himself before the American flag and look at himself in the mirror.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address this distinguished body. I hope that the facts I have inserted in the RECORD, which I claim are clear, unequivocal, and uncontradictable, may be sufficient to prevent in the future any misstatement as to any alleged false promise by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief. Gentlemen, let America get on with the war. There is work to be done; a war to be won, and a peace to be won, and a great future to be built.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it has just been announced that the Senate has today concurred in the action of the House wherein this body recently, by a vote of 123 to 119, appropriated the sum of $500,000 to pay the salaries and expenses of the Fair Employment Practice Committee during the next fiscal year.

In view of this action, this would seem to be an appropriate time to call the attention of the House to the pending Scanlon-Dawson-LaFollette bills, which would make the Fair Employment Practice Committee, known as the F. E. P. C., a permanent agency of our Government. Hearings on these proposals are now being conducted by the House Committee on Labor, of which I am a member. These bills, if enacted, would, in my judgment, constitute a revolutionary departure from the traditional American system of free enterprise and are so far-reaching that they would indeed be a severe blow at our democratic system of Government. I shall with fairness and candor point to some of the vices which the passage of such a measure would involve.

Since the pending bills provide for a continuation of practically the entire F. E. P. C. set-up as it now is, it is necessary to make some brief references to the existing agency, its personnel, and some of its activities. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] have both recently done a real service to the country by exposing certain facts dealing with the personnel of the F. E. P. C. and the past subversive records of many members of its staff. I shall, by way of summary, repeat and supplement some of those disclosures and then proceed to discuss the pending bills.

EXISTING F. E. P. C. HAS RETARDED WAR EFFORT

The existing F. E. P. C. was created by Executive order a year ago as a temporary wartime agency, presumably intended to aid in solving certain problems pertaining to the distribution and use of manpower in industries engaged in war production. However, this agency in the manner of its operation has in fact actually retarded the war effort. Instead of confining itself to the task of aiding in the solution of certain manpower difficulties, it has busied itself in attempts to break down traditional and time-tested segregation practices between Negroes and whites.

One of the very first things this bureau did after its creation was to attack 22 railroad companies and the 4 brotherhood unions that operate them, for alleged discrimination against Negroes. The F. E. P. C. contended that conductors, engineers, and all other such specialized classes of employees should include Negroes, whether the railroad companies and the unions wanted them and found them to be adaptable in such specific positions or not. This was done even though the railroads and the unions had valid contracts inconsistent with the demands of the F. E. P. C. Finally, 12 of those railroads—the 12 that happened to be in the South—were cited to the President of the United States for discrimination in the respects referred to. It is significant that even though the other railroads have not to this day employed Negro conductors or engineers, they were not cited to the President.

Was that a service calculated to solve for the railroad companies in wartime a manpower problem? It was not. There you have an example of a bureau in Washington, without having on its staff a single executive who had ever operated a railroad or worked on one undertaking to dictate methods of employment and practices contrary to the good business judgment and experience of the companies and the unions. To force such changes in wartime could but cause discontent, irritation and slow-downs and thereby retard the war effort.

NONSEGREGATION PRACTICES CAUSED STRIKES

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many people realize the amount of industrial unrest that has been caused by racial troubles resulting in many instances in lack of regard for proper segregation safeguards. I do not have the figures up to the present time, but I am informed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that

during the year 1943 there were 50 strikes in which racial issues were of major importance. The number of workers involved in these strikes was 65,232 and idleness during the stoppages amounted to 221,114 man-days.

ATTEMPTS TO FORCE SOCIAL EQUALITY CAUSED STRIKES

Three of the 50 strikes referred to resulted when white workers demanded and were not allowed to have separate toilet and sanitary facilities. I shall refer to but one, The Western Electric Co. case at Baltimore, which will serve to illustrate the policy and attitude of the F. E. P. C. with respect to social aspects of racial and segregation problems.

The Western Electric Co. was engaged in manufacturing wire and cable and had contracts with the Army and Navy. Partitions separating toilets for whites and Negroes had been removed and the employees filed a protest. A strike was threatened and the F. E. P. C. entered the picture. With a strike in the offing, what did the F. E. P. C. do to prevent it and solve the problem? That agency issued the following strike-provoking announcement:

> The Committee (F. E. P. C.) takes the position that in the circumstances of this case, where there are frequent and temporary transfers of workers from department to department, such installing of segregated duplicate facilities cannot but lead to discriminatory employment practice, and would be in violation of Executive Order 9346.

There, Mr. Speaker, is a concrete case where the F. E. P. C. held that to require separate toilet facilities for whites and Negroes "cannot but lead to discriminatory employment practices." As a result of that position and the fact that separate facilities were not provided, a strike occurred which lasted for 17 days and involved over 3,000 workers. The Government finally had to take over the plant.

Can it be said that the F E. P. C. did not there by its policy help to foment a strike that retarded the war effort and take a position in favor of a form of social equality?

THE DALLAS NEWS CASE

A number of cases could be cited wherein the F. E. P. C. has gone so far afield as to undertake to violate the constitutional right of freedom of the press by dictating to newspapers that they could not specify in their classified advertisements the color or nationality of people wanted for certain types of employment. But I shall refer in particular to the Dallas News case as an example. In that instance the News carried the following classified advertisement:

> Wanted colored man to work at night as a paper handler. Essential industry.

One Leonard M. Brin, the F. E. P. C. regional director at Dallas, acting for the agency, directed the Dallas News to desist from mentioning "whites" or "colored" in such advertisements. The News very properly challenged the legality of such a ridiculous decree, and the F. E. P. C. backed down on the ground, alone, that the newspaper was not a war industry. But by the terms of the pending bills to make the agency permanent, the war industry feature would make no difference whatever and such an order would stand.

SIXTY-FIVE PERCENT OF F. E. P. C. EMPLOYEES ARE NEGROES

Under the terms of the pending bills, the entire staff of the present agency, except for the Committee members who would have to be reappointed and confirmed, would be transferred to and would operate the permanent agency. Who are those people?

To begin with, it is important to note that of the 110 employees and Committee members, two-thirds of the total number are Negroes, and the average annual salary paid to each is $3,015—more than $1,000 in excess of what the average civil-service employee in this country receives. How does it happen, Mr. Speaker, that although Negroes comprise less than 10 percent of our population, 65 percent of the personnel of this bureau are Negroes? Is this not a case of discrimination against white people?

MANY F. E. P. C. EMPLOYEES HAVE SUBVERSIVE RECORDS

Let us take a look at the Committee. Four of the six in that group are whites, two are Negroes. One of the white men on the Committee is Boris Shishkin. He has been connected with the Washington Book Shop, found by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to be a Communist-front organization, and which was cited by the Attorney General as subversive.

Another member is Charles H. Houston, colored, who has been affiliated with a number of movements found to be subversive by the Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In view of this is it any wonder that radical papers, such as PM and the Communist Daily Worker, are so outspoken in favor of F. E. P. C.?

But let us take a look at the employees of the Bureau. In the office of the chairman, including himself, there are six employees, three of whom are Negroes. In this office the associate fair practice examiner is a Negro.

In the administrative office in Washington, there are 11 employed, everyone of whom, including the administrative officer in charge, is a Negro. Their decisions and activities may effect employment practices in private industry all over America. Being all Negroes and passing primarily on Negro complaints, can they be expected to be fair and unbiased? Yet that is the kind of an outfit that would be perpetuated and clothed with almost unlimited authority if the pending bills were enacted into law. Would it not be more proper to term it the "Unfair Employment Practice Committee?"

In the office of the Operations Section of F. E. P. C. there are seven Negroes and six whites. One of the six white men is named Emanuel Bloch, classed as the senior examiner. He is the same Emanuel Bloch who on March 16, 1942, addressed the citizens' committee in the interest of having Earl Browder freed. That citizens' committee which he addressed has been branded by the Attorney General as subversive. In addition, that same man was a sponsor of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, found by the Attorney General of the United States to be subversive.

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS SECTION

The F. E. P. C. has what is known as the Review and Analysis Section. There are 10 employees there, 7 of whom are Negroes. The Director of that Section, John A. Davis, and his two Associate Directors, are Negroes. Marjorie Lawson, an associate director, is, according to the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a member of a Communist-front organization known as the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, branded by the Attorney General as subversive.

There are two in the legal division, both of whom are Negroes. The chief counsel there is now the vice president of the Lawyers Guild, which, according to a report filed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, is subversive.

Another branch contains hearing examiners. There are six in that branch, five of whom are Negroes.

REGIONAL OFFICES

Under the national set-up, F. E. P. C. has 11 regional offices where complaints of discrimination are received and serviced, with many being sent on to Washington for review and final action. Seven of the 11 regional directors are Negroes.

Among these is Edward Lawson, regional director in New York, drawing $5,600 per year. Who is he? He is the same Edward Lawson who signed the Communist Party petition in New York in 1942 and participated in the All-Southern Youth Conference, an affiliate of the National Negro Congress. The latter organization was found to be subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

The field examiner, a white man, in the New York regional office, is named Samuel Risk. He also signed the Communist Party petition in New York in 1939–1940.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the C. I. O. and its political action committee are using every type of pressure and coercion on the Members of Congress in behalf of F. E. P. C.? Is it any wonder that the C. I. O. political action group, headed by Russian-born Sidney Hillman, supported by a board of directors including Harry Bridges and many others with Communist records, is making a fight in favor of this outfit?

PERMANENT F. E. P. C. PROPOSAL WOULD REGIMENT FREE ENTERPRISE

As a member of the House Committee on Labor, where since June 1 hearings have been held on these bills, after hearing witness after witness supporting the proposals describe the United States of America as a land of fascism and oppression, I have been made to wonder what induced so many millions of oppressed and opportunity-seeking people

to ever voluntarily come here in the first place. To listen to some of the social reformers testify, you would conclude that every immigrant to this country has been defrauded and misled.

I am made to wonder why many of these people who speak of our system of private enterprise with such bitterness and scorn do not—instead of trying to revolutionize our American way of life—seek a haven in some foreign country where the ideas of freedom and economic opportunity would be more to their liking.

I charge, Mr. Speaker, that the effect of the creation of a permanent F. E. P. C., as has been proposed, would be to completely revolutionize the traditional American system of free enterprise. It would substitute in its place a system of tyrannical regimentation. It would, by the use of bureaucratic coercion and intimidation, place this bureau in a position to stifle individual initiative in this country. It would deprive American businessmen who create jobs of that freedom of choice in the selection of employees, which right has been the backbone of the success of our competitive system of free enterprise. It would take from employers the right to exercise sound business judgment in choosing workers, upon the soundness of which judgment depends in many instances whether a business is a success or a failure. Especially would that be true of small businesses.

America, Mr. Speaker, is a land of keen competition. Because men are constantly putting to use better business acumen in selecting, training, classifying, and replacing, if need be, employees who are found to be more loyal and who will produce more than others, we have made progress and achieved a high standard of living. That is the way in which we have made progress. That is the American way. The proposed F. E. P. C. would stifle that traditional method.

Under our system every person, black or white, has a chance to show his worth in the field of activity where he is better able and more suited to work and produce. It is true that there is not in this country that brand of economic equality that there is in Russia. The Russians have their own system and they have a right to choose their own system. But does the fact such a system may be satisfactory to the people of Russia mean that we in America, under a democratic system of government, should adopt a plank from Russia's economic system with respect to the equality of economic opportunity? It is also true there is not in this country state socialism and governmental paternalism as there has been in Germany. Yet the proposed F. E. P. C. is a bold step in that direction. Ours is a system of competition, a system of hard work where as a general rule you get the job and keep it or get another or a better one if you are suited for the job and can deliver the goods. I prefer that system. But the F. E. P. C. bills would change that and allow an employee to depend on a bureau in Washington rather than efficiency to hold his job or secure a promotion.

WHAT A PERMANENT F. E. P. C. COULD DO

Mr. Speaker, the proposed permanent F. E. P. C. would be operated by a commission of six men, each receiving $10,000 per year.

That commission would have the power to legislate by making rules and regulations that would have the force and effect of law, and which by the terms of the pending bills would hardly be assailable by Congress. This is another bold attempt to allow a bureau to usurp legislative functions and break down the separation of the powers of the three branches of our Government. This is a bold attempt to subject our people to a government of men rather than of laws.

F. E. P. C. COULD SEARCH WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE

Another assault on the Constitution by these bills is the provision, clearly unconstitutional, which would give to this bureau, acting itself or through an agent, the blanket authority, with no hint of need for probable cause or even a search warrant, to enter an office or a place of business and there make copies of private papers, where the individual whose place is searched has been the object of a complaint by a disgruntled job seeker claiming discrimination. If objection should be made to the demands of the intruder, such could be classified as "interference," and by the terms of these bills, subject the one who objected to imprisonment for a year and a fine of $1,000.

F. E. P. C. COULD WRECK A BUSINESS

By the terms of these bills a man employing as many as five people and engaged in interstate commerce—and the Supreme Court has held most businesses are—may have but scant freedom of choice in selecting another clerk. Suppose, for example, one is engaged in a ladies ready-to-wear business, within the scope of these bills, and advertises for a clerk. What could happen? Suppose a Negro woman and a white woman should apply. Suppose the man hires the white woman and the disappointed Negro woman complains to the F. E. P. C. that she has been discriminated against because of her color. The store operator denies discrimination and says he hired the white woman because she is acceptable to his customers, whereas the Negro woman would not be and, if employed, would probably cause his business to be a failure.

Now, who would pass on that issue? Who would decide if there were discrimination? Who would resolve the contest? Would it be for a jury in a local court to decide the question of whether that man's business investment would be a failure? Oh, no. That question of fact under these bills would be finally resolved by the six members of the F. E. P. C. sitting in Washington. Oh, but they say that action could be reviewed by a Federal circuit court of appeals. That is true, but appellate courts give much credance to fact-finding agencies that see and hear the witnesses Moreover, in the State of Texas, for example, such an appeal would have to be taken to the nearest circuit court, which sits in New Orleans. Such an appeal would take much money and time, and the harassed businessman would probably be broke long before he could hope for a review, with perhaps a thousand cases ahead of his. If the F. E. P. C. should hold the Negro was discriminated against, these bills provide the bewildered employer could be ordered to pay her back wages from the date she applied for the job.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; these is contained in these bills the death knell for the traditional American right to use one's own good judgment and common sense, even in a small business, in the selection of employees.

REFORMERS ARE DOING DISSERVICE TO NEGROES

It is true the Negroes were brought here without their consent from the dark jungles of Africa. During the past 75 years tremendous economic progress has been made for them and by them in the South where most of them live. There they are, in the main, happy and content. Free schools have been provided. Working opportunities to fit their social status and abilities have been afforded them. Even now, with the Negroes comprising less than 10 percent of our population, 7.2 percent of workers in war industries are Negroes. No race has made so much progress in so short a time.

But now we have the outside influences creeping in and trying to do by propaganda, force, and coercion what only time, education, and experience can hope to do—that is, the further elevation of the Negro's standard of living and economic progress. Much of that agitation is undoubtedly Communist-inspired. Many of them seek to force social equality upon the South and to outlaw the time-tested methods of orderly progress.

These agitators and their fellow travelers are not realistic and don't want to be. They are doing a decided disservice to the colored people of the South. Under the guise of preventing discrimination they are undertaking to array the black against the white, and in their ruthless methods can but arouse racial hatreds and bitterness, which can only work to the disadvantage of the colored race.

MUST BE REALISTIC IN DEALING WITH NEGRO PROBLEM

I say again, they are not realistic. Many of them view with contempt the reality of the fact that there is a natural God-made social barrier that separates the two races. Abraham Lincoln recognized that fact, and said so in no uncertain terms. While there are occasional exceptions, the Negroes in general are simply not qualified for doing what these social reformers who are supporting these bills would by force of law have them do. As proof of that deficiency on the part of the great majority of colored people, we need but to examine the records of the National Selective Service. Of the first 3,000,000 men examined for selective service, the records show that out of each 1,000 Negroes examined, 176.7 were afflicted with syphilis, while but 11.7 out of each 1,000 white men were so afflicted; 36.5 Negroes out of that 1,000 were afflicted with other venereal diseases, while but 3.4 whites were so disabled.

Of each 1,000 Negroes examined, 108.9 were disabled because of mental and educational deficiency and mental diseases, while out of a similar number of whites only 53.8 were unacceptable for a like reason.

These conditions are unfortunate and corrective measures should be taken, but they are nevertheless real. And a Negro-dominated bureau in Washington cannot by orders and decrees remove those and many other impediments and practical problems that militate against an arbitrarily imposed coequal, and uniform treatment of the Negro and the white.

WHAT ABOUT THE CONSTITUTION?

Mr. Speaker, what has become of the American Constitution? What has become of the due-process clause that is supposed to mean something and protect people's property rights in this country? What has happened to the constitutional protection against unreasonable searches and seizures? What has become of the sanctity of contract rights about which the Constitution speaks? When has the constitutional freedom of the press become such a mockery? When has there been a change from the constitutional requirement that the Congress—not a bureau such as the F. E. P. C.—shall do the legislating for the government of the people?

F. E. P. C. IS ATTEMPT TO CREATE NEW ORDER IN AMERICA

In these pending bills to make F. E. P. C. permanent, Mr. Speaker, in the altruistic name of legislating against discrimination, a bold attempt is made—and I am not referring to the authors of the bills—by one fell swoop to revolutionize the American system of competitive free enterprise.

Here is an attempt to substitute force and governmental paternalism for common sense, business acumen, and experience.

Here is an attempt to bypass and nullify every segregation law in the land and to virtually prohibit others from being enacted.

Here is an attempt to force upon the American people a new order and exchange private initiative for bureaucratic compulsion.

Here is an attempt, while our gallant men are away on the beach heads of Normandy and in Saipan, and on a hundred other battle fronts, struggling and giving their lives for the survival of freedom, liberty, and the American way of life, to uproot those basic pillars of American democracy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, we have had the pleasure this evening of listening to a very masterly and, I might say, masterful address by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY]. We, of Pennsylvania, feel very proud of him for devoting his extraordinary talents and his ability in gathering this tremendous amount of research in order to collate all these facts which he presented to us this afternoon. I particularly want to compliment the gentleman for the masterly manner in which he delivered that address. I think it is a great contribution to the welfare of this country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me from Hon. Paul V. McNutt, under date of June 8, 1944.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1475. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service;

H. R. 4659. An act to authorize the Soil Conservation Service to lend certain equipment; and

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution making appropriations for grants to States under the Social Security Act.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4070. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4559. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 21, 1944, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will meet on Wednesday, June 21, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., on all resolutions providing for temporary admission of political and religious refugees.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be an executive session of the Committee on the Public Lands on Wednesday, June 21, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 or rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 52. Resolution continuing investigation of plate fractures on welded ships. (Rept. No. 1685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3704. A bill to provide pay and allowances for temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve during periods of disability resulting from injuries sustained, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 605. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4911, a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1689). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 592. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on Education of the effect of certain war activities on colleges and universities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1688). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 5062. A bill to authorize certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5063. A bill to prohibit any Government agency from contracting with an alien or with any corporation, partnership, or other business association any officer of which is an alien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5064. A bill to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5065 (by request). A bill to require examination and laboratory tests for syphilis, gonorrhea, and tuberculosis of all applicants for marriage licenses before the issuance thereof in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5066. A bill to permit Federal employees to serve as election officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 5067. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, so as to permit foreign service of members of the Women's Reserve under certain conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5068. A bill to provide that temporary appointments as commissioned or warrant officers in the Army of the United States of enlisted men or warrant officers of the Army of the United States on active duty shall be deemed to have been accepted upon the dates such appointments are made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 5069. A bill to remove certain discriminations against Government employees in the payment of overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5070. A bill prescribing new postal rates for air mail other than the first-class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 5071. A bill to amend the act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1103) entitled, "An act to permit payments for the operation of motorcycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5072. A bill to create a board to be known as the National Symphony Orchestra Trust Fund Board, to define the duties of said Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5073. A bill for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gabriela Redondo Ayson; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5075. A bill for the relief of John Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5076. A bill for the relief of the persons named; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Judge N. Singleton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5883. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Rev. W. W. Sylvester and 32 other citizens of Brentwood, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5884. Also, petition of Mary Henderson and 40 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5885. Also, petition of Josephine B. Crook and 30 other citizens of Lebanon, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5886. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Morris and 40 other citizens of Louisville, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5887. Also, petition of Charles L. Thomas and 46 other citizens of Staunton, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5888. Also, petition of George C. Cassens and 59 other citizens of Rockland, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5889. Also, petition of Esther Bothswell and 53 other citizens of Fergus Falls, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5890. Also, petition of Mabel B. Hall and 53 other citizens of Utica, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5891. Also, petition of Dr. E. H. Stahly and 51 other citizens of Northville, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5892. Also, petition of Thomas N. Todd and 47 other citizens of Winchester, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5893. Also, petition of Grace E. Staton and 40 other citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5894. Also, petition of Adeline G. Porter and 39 other citizens of Albion, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5895. Also, petition of Cora Redick and 53 other citizens of Spencerville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5896. Also, petition of Dr. C. I. Armstrong and 25 other citizens of Houghton, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5897. Also, petition of Eulalie Aldrich and 39 other citizens of Castile, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5898. Also, petition of Mrs. E. B. Snyder and 40 other citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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.

5899. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of Joe Henretta, of Bradford, Pa., and 634 other citizens against the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, and any bill like it, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or distribution of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5900. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution from Local Union No. 152, Progressive Mine Workers of America, Harrisburg, Ill., signed by Harry Gee, president, and Dennis Moore, recording secretary, petitioning the Congress to amend the Social Security Act to the end that any person working in a covered industry, who becomes completely disabled, shall, upon proper proof of such disability, receive the same benefits for the remainder of life as if such person had reached the age required for retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5901. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Carolyn Bennett and numerous citizens of Mount Ayr, Iowa, in the interest 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.

5902. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of W. M. Adair, and 488 other citizens requesting necessary action and endeavor in order to keep the Japanese and people of Japanese parentage, who have been removed from southern California, from returning; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5903. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Kosciusko County, Ind., in opposition to the May bill (H. R. 3947) providing universal military or naval tra ining for all male citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5904. Petition of sundry citizens of Milford, Ind., and vicinity, in opposition to the May bill (H. R. 3947) providing universal military or naval training for all male citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5905. By Mr. ROLPH: California Senate Resolution No. 28, relating to the market and price paid for newly produced gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5906. Also, California Senate Resolution No. 27, relating to continued deferment of boners in meat-packing industry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5907. Also, California Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 asking 160-acre limitation be removed in Central Valley; to the Committee on Flood Control.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

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

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

O God, whose spirit searcheth all things and whose love beareth all things, for this hallowed moment turning from our divisive loyalties and our party cries we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit, realizing our oneness in Thee. In the sincerity and truth with which we deeply desire to open our hearts to Thee, so we would broaden our sympathies with our brothers, Thy other children.

Forgive us for praying that Thy kingdom might come and then, by our own selfish stubbornness, barring the way when it has sought to come through us. Deliver us from the hypocrisy of giving lip service to the golden goals of Thy kingdom as if we looked for it without in others and not in our own hearts. Grant us a fundamental fealty to the common good, expressing itself in divergent attitudes and convictions which are the glory of our national heritage, yet putting above all partisan advantage the weal and welfare of the commonwealth to which we solemnly pledge our supreme allegiance. With the wrecks of nations which have broken Thy law of love smoking in ruins before our eyes, let the purifying stream of Thy mercy cleanse our national life lest our destruction be determined and we go the way of the nations that have forgotten God. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 20, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

STATEMENT BY OLIVER LYTTELTON, BRITISH MINISTER OF PRODUCTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the time of our entry into the war and even before I supported measures on the floor of the Senate which I thought were helpful to the people of England in their struggle for liberty. At no time during this world crisis have I ever raised my voice against any military or naval strategy; neither have I joined issue with any man in the diplomatic corps or the Parliament or any man high in public life in England upon any statement that has been made. In fact, what I have said has always been in praise of the English people in their battle against tyranny.

But, Mr. President, sometimes circumstances alter all occasions. On last evening when I read in the press the statement made by Oliver Lyttelton, the British Minister of Production, I confess that I was not only shocked but greatly disappointed to learn that a man standing so high in the official life of Britain could make such a miserable mistake.

Oliver Lyttelton, in speaking before the Chamber of Commerce of America, said in his original remarks that—

> Japan was provoked into attacking the United States at Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty on history ever to say that America was forced into the war.

Mr. President, regardless of any correction or additional interpretation, regardless of the fact that Mr. Lyttelton may say that what he said was a matter of expression and not of intention, the original words will cling to all peace-loving Americans as one of the most incredible and stupefying statements that have been uttered by any man high in public life of the Allied Nations. Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of oriental history knows that Japan deliberately prepared herself for world conquest. She planned to attack this country and did, just as she planned to, and attacked other countries in the past. She knew that under no circumstances would we make unjustifiable concessions to her in the southwest Pacific and the Far East which might imperil our security in the years to come.

Had the statement of Mr. Lyttelton originated from the bureaus of Axis propaganda, we would have thought little or nothing of it. In fact, we might expect such utterances from radio Tokyo or radio Berlin. It is the job of the Axis propagandists to probe for a weak spot or a soft spot in American emotion. We all know that the only hope of the Nazis and the Japs is to divide and conquer. It is with the deepest regret that I am constrained to say that the statement made by Oliver Lyttelton strikes a hard blow at unity which is so vital to a complete and early victory. What Lyttelton said must have given Hitler and Tojo renewed hope in their desperate attempt to exploit what little discontent there is in this country over the progress and conduct of the war.

Mr. President, I commend the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, for his rebuke of Lyttelton for the ugly slur that was placed against this Nation, but as a United States Senator I go even further: I say that those who have control of the British Government at this hour cannot afford to permit such an irresponsible character to continue in high public office for the good of the Allied cause. For the sake of continued unity, for the sake of continued success on the battlefields and on the sea lanes of the world, in the interest of saving the lives of American boys, the resignation of Lyttelton should be requested.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had receded from its amendment to the bill (S. 1588) for the relief of the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, a minor.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of O. W. James;

H. R. 2855. An act for the relief of the estate of John Buby;

H. R. 3102. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle; and

H. R. 3661. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 272. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, Jesse M. Knowles, and the estate of Lee Stroud;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor; and

H. R. 4115. An act to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945,