By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1881. A bill for the relief of R. I. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1882. A bill for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Jess Willard Dean and his dependents; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1884. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Bradford; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1885 A bill to authorize the presentation to Edward R. Egan of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise A. Ellison; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keaton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of New York:

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of the estate of Peter G Fabian, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of the Grandview Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Babcock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

42. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Typographical Union, No. 94, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring the immediate revision of the Little Steel formula in order to bring wages in conformity with prices, and so memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to this effect; to the Committee on Labor.

43. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the adoption of House bill 451; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and true art Thy judgments; we therefore pray Thee to bow down Thine ear, for we are poor and needy. When we feel the sorrow and sting of sin, let the healing shadow of Thy Cross rest upon us, giving peace and comfort to the waiting soul. Thou who art the way out of every wrong and the escape from brooding regret, help us always to lift our feet in the royal march of Christian character.

We pray today for the triumph of faith, for the dominion of hope, and for the ruggedness of courage. Inspire us to overcome the trammels of smallness and local boundaries, and behold Him who surmounted every barrier and became the Son of Man for the salvation of all races. Enable us to make full proof of our calling by marking the lines of our conduct, by self-restraint, by living up to our ideals, and by the recognition that forgiveness is a higher law than resentment. O do Thou take away the things which are divisive and would hinder our union and mutual cooperation, that we may write in the life of our country chivalry of soul and the testimony of Jesus. Amen.

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

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 30, 1945.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052–a), I have designated Hon. ANDREW J. MAY, Hon. R. EWING THOMASON, Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS, Hon. DEWEY SHORT, and Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, as members from this committee to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy.

Very truly yours,
ANDREW J. MAY, *Chairman.*

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced yesterday that he would rather not recognize Members today or tomorrow to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, production last year of 620,000,000 tons of bituminous coal set an all-time record. Yet the consumption of coal in the war industry and the shortage of other types of fuel, such as oil, gas, and wood, in a winter of great severity created an unprecedented demand. Coal operators with whom I have conferred tell me that the best answer to the current coal shortage in 17 Eastern States is a 48-hour workweek in the bituminous coal fields.

According to the report received today from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the Department of Labor, the average number of hours worked in the bituminous coal fields in 1944 was 43.38, and the average of workdays lost by reason of absenteeism was 11.96. It will be observed that absenteeism among coal miners was considerably above the national average.

In World War No. 1 the first action taken by the Congress to assure full production was to suspend for the duration of the war the 8-hour day. In the spring of 1942, when the Smith-Vinson bill was pending before the Naval Affairs Committee and we were trying to win the war on the home front on the basis of a 40-hour workweek, I pleaded for an hour with the committee to write into the bill a provision suspending the 40-hour law for the duration of the war. It was a depression spread-the-work device wholly incompatible with an all-out war effort. We would not have before us today a compulsory work bill if we had adopted a 48-hour workweek when we entered this war. Our military program has suffered from our failure to do so; and if our farmers had not voluntarily worked a 60-hour week and longer, this would have been for us on the home front a hungry winter as well as a cold one.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a prayer of General Patton.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain communications from the American Legion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by William Henry Chamberlin, noted news commentator, entitled "By What Moral Right?" concerning the attitude of Russia toward the smaller nations of Europe. According to the views set forth by Mr. Chamberlin, it would appear that our Russian ally is not guided by the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from one of the leading papers of Nevada on the pending legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Director of the Emergency War Pipeline, Inc.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal, and further to extend my remarks and include a statement by Col. Lynn C. Barnes, district engineer of the United States Corps of Engineers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include in one an address delivered by me in New York City on January 23; in another an address delivered by me in New York City on January 24; and in the third an address delivered by me in Chicago, Ill., on January 27.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a poem.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the 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. 6]

Beall	Jennings	O'Brien, Mich.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Okla.	Powers
Dickstein	Kefauver	Sabath
Eaton	LaFollette	Satterfield
Eberharter	Mansfield, Mont.	Trimble
Gardner	Merrow	Wasielewski
Hart	Morgan	West
Hébert	Murdock	White
Heidinger	Norrell	Winter
Horan		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 401 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1752, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday we had completed the reading of section 1. Amendments are now in order to section 1.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make this inquiry for the benefit of Members on both sides of the aisle. It is my understanding the chairman has no disposition to rush this matter or to shut off debate. It appears there is a great number of amendments to be offered. For the benefit of a number of Members who have inquired of me concerning this matter, am I correct in understanding that it is not the chairman's intention to continue beyond 5 o'clock this evening?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it is not our intention to continue beyond 5 o'clock unless at that time something comes up which makes it necessary to continue further with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I thank the gentleman. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to be exacting in these matters. I want to go along with the membership as much as possible, but I do hope we can expedite the consideration of the measure without unnecessary delay.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended—

"(1) By inserting before section 1 the title heading:

"'TITLE I—TRAINING AND SERVICE IN LAND AND NAVAL FORCES';

"(2) By striking out 'this act' wherever appearing therein, except where it appears in sections 10 (a) (1), 10 (b), 10 (c), 15 and 16, and inserting in lieu thereof 'this title'; and

"(3) By inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'TITLE II—UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER FOR CIVILIAN AND WAR-SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

"'DECLARATION OF POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS

"'SEC. 21. The Congress hereby declares that in order to effectuate, on a voluntary basis, the total mobilization and most effective use of the civilian manpower of the Nation in support of the war effort, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive investigation and reappraisal of the civilian manpower of the United States.

"'SEC. 22. The Director of Selective Service is hereby directed (a) to provide for the registration and adequate occupational classification of all registrants liable for training under title I of this act, except those serving on active duty in the armed forces and those exempted or deferred from training or service therein by 5 (c) (1) or (d) of title I. This registration and classification shall be conducted through the local boards of the Selective Service System in conjunction with the War Manpower Commission, who shall furnish to such boards such expert, technical, and other assistance and personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"'(b) Upon request from the War Manpower Commission to require the local boards to furnish to the United States Employment Service a list of the names and addresses of registrants available for employment in war or war-supporting activities, including agriculture, for voluntary assignment of such registrants to civilian or Federal employment in furtherance of the war effort in accordance with the determination of essentiality and priority requirements made by the War Manpower Commission.

"'SEC. 23. The Director of Selective Service shall, as hereinafter provided, direct the local boards to conduct an investigation of the use of civilian manpower within their respective jurisdictions for the purpose of ascertaining whether the maximum and most effective use of such manpower is being made for the best interests of the war effort. The local boards shall use the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission to conduct such investigation, which shall include in-plant surveys whenever and wherever necessary to accomplish this purpose. For such purpose the War Manpower Commission may, wherever necessary, employ expert and technical personnel by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923. In the utilization of the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission, the local boards shall operate under the supervision, direction, and control of the various area directors and management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission where such are available. They shall report their findings forthwith to the Director of Selective Service and to the War Manpower Commission, together with a statement of the number of persons in their respective jurisdictions available for service in war and war-supporting activities; and said agencies shall forthwith make a full report thereon to Congress. Wherever any board and/or War Manpower Commission area director and the management-labor committee, acting together or separately, find indications of wastage or hoarding of labor or situations wherein labor is not being used to the best interests of the war effort in either Federal or private employment, the employers, the employees, and/or the employees' representatives shall be required to cooperate fully in such investigation and in the selection of skilled and other employees to be released for other employment. After determination that such worker can be more effectively employed in war work and that either the worker does not have good cause for refusing to accept such employment or the employer fails to furnish adequate justification for the retention of said employee, the War Manpower Commission shall thereupon require his release. In order to aid the selective-service local boards and the War Manpower Commission in the exercise of the additional duties required of them under this title, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may assign to such boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of such other agencies of the Government as he may deem advisable.

"'SEC. 24. The boards are hereby empowered to subpena persons to appear before them and give evidence upon such matters as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and for such purpose the provisions of section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence) are hereby made applicable to the powers of such boards.

"'SEC. 25. The Director of Selective Service shall prescribe regulations to provide the necessary traveling expenses and subsistence allowances during travel and until commencement of work of persons volunteering under this title for civilian or Federal employment or service in a locality other than that of their residence: *Provided*, That travel expenses and subsistence shall be computed in the same manner and on the same basis as under the standard Government travel regulations. On or after the date of a determination that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in the war effort, or on or after the date of his being involuntarily separated from such employment, he shall receive similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he was first allowed travel under this subsection (or, at his election, to his home if that is not farther distant), if application is made therefor within 30 days after such date.

"'SEC. 26. Any person who volunteers for service under this title, or who is required to relinquish regular employment to undertake such service shall, upon application to his employer within 40 days after the termination of such service, if it is determined that his services are no longer necessary in war or war-supporting activities, be entitled to be restored to his former position, or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make such restoration impossible or unreasonable. This section shall not require the reemployment of any such person by any State or political subdivision thereof, but it is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that such person should be restored to his position with such State or political subdivision or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay. Nothing in this section shall supersede any of the provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, as amended.

"'SEC. 27. Nothing in this title shall affect in any manner any of the provisions of section 5 (k), or any other provisions of title I.

"'SEC. 28. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.'"

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with inasmuch as the bill was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 days ago, and numerous copies are available to the membership here on the floor.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am for the substitute, but I object also. I want it read in full.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additonal minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which is offered in the nature of a substitute to the committee bill, seeks to avoid direct coercion of American labor. It would accomplish just two things. It would give the local draft boards the right to reclassify registrants and to provide jobs for them, or offer them jobs on a voluntary basis. It would permit the Federal agency to pay round-trip expenses for a man assigned to a job away from his home. It also gives the War Manpower Commission additional authority.

I believe it is recognized by us here, and by responsible people in Government, in industry, and in labor organizations that labor is being hoarded and wasted in many essential industries. I think it must be admitted that Government agencies and Government-operated plants are among the worst wasters of manpower. This amendment would give the Manpower Commission legal authority to survey all Government and private activities and to force full utilization of manpower. Both labor and management recommend this as the first essential toward solution of our manpower problem, and I believe the War Manpower Commission has been seeking just such legislation.

I do not question the sincerity of those who champion this committee bill, but I do believe that many of its advocates have become just a little emotional and sentimental about this legislation. I hope they will let their sound judgment guide their decision. Some of my colleagues have asked: What would you say to the ex-serviceman, the combat soldier over in Europe or down in South Pacific when he comes back and you tell him that you voted against a labor draft? I would answer by asking this question: What are they going to say to this combat man when he comes back from his fight against tyranny and totalitarianism to explain why you voted to shackle his father or his brother—10,000,000 of whom are doing a marvelous job in war industry.

I am convinced there is no real necessity for this legislation. Who sponsors it? Who asks for it today? The President has said he believes it is necessary. I do not question his sincerity; maybe he does believe it is necessary. War and Navy Department officials have spoken for compulsory legislation. J. A. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, also insists that labor conscription is necessary. This is the man who just a few weeks ago, according to the press, said that the Congress of the United States—you men sitting on this floor together with the Members of the Senate—were responsible for the ammunition shortage. On the other hand, labor and management both almost unanimously warn that coercion will hamper rather than help war production. Who knows more about the manpower situation in this Nation than the executives of the industries which must produce these munitions, planes, tanks, and weapons, or the labor organizations whose members do the work in the plants?

I have great admiration for Judge Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, but he is a lawyer; he was a judge on the bench when he came down here. It is his job to get production, that is true; but does he know anything about employing labor? Does he know anything about translating a blueprint into a tank or a gun? I could say the same for other witnesses who testified in behalf of this legislation. I frankly say to you, Mr. Chairman, I would rather trust the judgment of the men and women in labor and industry who have so far done such a miraculous job in supplying our men and women at the fighting fronts. It is said that General Marshall and Admiral King wrote letters supporting this draft legislation. I read the letter that General Marshall sent up here, and I challenge anybody to show me anywhere in that letter that he asks for this legislation. Of course, he asked for more men and more production. We are going to see that he gets both. He will get his 900,000 men by July, and he will get them without this legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. And the letter that General Marshall wrote to the President which was transmitted to our committee applied to the work-or-fight bill and not to this particular May bill now before the House. When General Marshall was invited to come down and testify before our committee, he was too busy to appear. That is how strong he is for the legislation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will support any legislation no matter how drastic it may be if it is shown to be necessary to our troops at the front; but I cannot support this legislation in the present form, because I am convinced it will do more harm than good.

Consider the joint report of the Department of Labor and the War Manpower Commission, released last month. It shows that there is no shortage of manpower. One million one hundred thousand workers left war industries last year, yet production was up. Other responsible estimates say as many as 1,500,000 people have left war plants. What has become of those 1,500,000 workers? They have not disappeared into thin air. Some, of course, have entered the armed services. A committee witness estimates that from 300,000 to 500,000 of them are now in uniform. That still leaves about 1,000,000 former war workers available. Most of those who left essential jobs in recent months did so because they shared the optimistic belief prevailing last summer and fall that the war in Europe was all but over. They can be brought back into essential jobs without coercion.

Mr. SHORT. Since the German counteroffensive by Von Rundstedt in the middle of December, over 100,000 of them have voluntarily gone back into war industries, 63,000 in the last 2 weeks of December, and over 50,000 during the first 2 weeks of January.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I understand that is true.

Here is another item in addition to that backlog of a million workers. The armed forces are releasing every month an average of 70,000 men. Many of those men are able to go into industry. They are eager to get jobs back home. I believe

it was Mr. Hines of the American Federation of Labor who testified before our committee, and you will find it in the hearings, that his organization had placed 41,000 in 1 month, 50,000 in another, of these returning World War No. 2 veterans in war industry.

It is variously estimated that we will need from 70,000 to 700,000 men in industry within the next 6 months. You may choose your own estimate, but I think the War Manpower figures are the most accurate available. They should know about the manpower situation; and they say that 300,000 will be adequate. I believe that one source alone, the pool of returning veterans, can just about meet the requirement as War Manpower Commission estimates it.

Now, much has been said about the IV-F's.

In the President's message he referred to some four million men now in this classification. Advocates of draft legislation want to reach that great group of men. We tried for days to find out exactly how many IV-F's there are in war industry, but nobody knows. It is known that 500,000 of that group are so physically handicapped that they cannot work in industry; that another million of them are actually employed in essential industry. That leaves some two and one-half million about whom we know nothing. It is assumed many are in nonessential industry. Also that many are plainly dodging their clear duty in this emergency. The assumption may or may not be correct. But assuming them to be entirely accurate, I do not want to draft men and chain them to their jobs, just to reach a few IV-F's who lack the patriotism to get into essential work. Please let me avoid even the slightest reflection on the patriotism of the men who have been classified IV-F's. I know many of them have tried their very best to get into the service and have been rejected. Many of them have appealed to me, and I have tried to help them get in. Maybe there are a few men who have been, as my esteemed chairman said, loafing around the pool rooms. Maybe there are a few neurotics and diabetics that the services could not take, because they would be liabilities in any capacity. But shall we draft all the labor in this country to reach those few?

This committee bill even goes further. It might get a few slackers, but it would give them benefits that the 10,000,000 men and women already in industry are not getting. It would give them the same rights and privileges given those boys in the infantry I saw fighting on the western front. What will the battle-front soldier say about this when he comes back? He will say, "You have given to the slacker over here the privilege that I have been given for combat service."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And with tremendously more pay involved.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. In addition to those benefits he would get the industrial rate of pay. He would receive transportation from home to job and back. I do not think this Congress wants to enact that kind of legislation. We have given you a substitute here that I think will reach this problem through voluntary cooperation. And it gives the War Manpower Commission the authority to force proper use of available manpower.

We had a witness before our committee who worked for the General Electric Co. at Schenectady. I was negotiating with the War Manpower Commission at the time he testified about a situation in Fort Wayne, Ind., where this company said it was short a few hundred men. While this witness was testifying he said there were 8,000 workers at the General Electric Co. in Schenectady out of work.

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

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In Fort Wayne, perhaps, they were short three or four hundred men on a very critical war item. This witness testified further that the Schenectady plant of General Electric was set up to do the same work that was short of manpower in Fort Wayne.

How can labor conscription ever correct such situations? Obviously, the answer here rests with the procurement agencies and management, which must improve production planning and scheduling.

Would it not be much easier to shift work than to move squads and battalions of workers in such cases? Possibly this is expecting too much cooperation from Government agencies.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I received a letter yesterday from a workingman who was discharged from the Kaiser shipyard at Vancouver, Wash., in which he stated that hundreds of men were discharged last week because they did not have work for them to do, and on the same day they hired 1,500 new green hands from Texas. Is the gentleman aware of what is taking place in some of these plants, hiring new men where they do not have a need for them?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is just exactly what this bill is intended to get at. It directs the War Manpower Commission to make a complete survey of the situation. I understand the War Manpower Commission is already staffed to do that very job.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. In corroboration of what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has just said, representatives of both the American Federation of Labor and of the C. I. O. testified that in many plants in different parts of the country where the Army and Navy have said there was a shortage of manpower, upon investigation, industry and labor both discovered that instead of there being a shortage there was really a surplus, and men and women were actually being laid off. This substitute bill will give us a scientific, thorough, exhaustive survey before we undertake any drastic legislative action.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think most of us know that the armed services do not utilize their available manpower to the fullest extent. I have a letter before me, received the day before yesterday from a Seabee in the Navy, stationed at Quoddy Village, Maine. In that letter he tells me there are 2,000 Seabees who have been in foreign service. They have slight disabilities. As you know, Seabees are skilled craftsmen. But 2,000 of them are sitting up there doing absolutely nothing. And this skilled man appeals to me to persuade the Navy Department to let them go out into industry and take these jobs crying for skilled labor.

While the example is not offered as typical of all service installations, it can be duplicated time and again. The inquiries of the special subcommittee of my Committee on Military Affairs, set up through my suggestion, prove how frequently both military and civilian agencies of government are hoarding and wasting manpower.

I urge you, therefore, to consider my substitute bill carefully. You are given an opportunity here to vote for a bill that both industry and labor would like to see enacted. I believe I can assure you that these people know better how to recruit industrial manpower and to fulfill our war needs than anyone else. I urge your support of my substitute.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: Page 6, after line 6, add a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to modify or otherwise affect in any way existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay or collective bargaining, or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions: *Provided*, That every person assigned to employment under this section shall have the right to join any union or organization of employees, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization as a condition of his employment if he should not freely choose to do so."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to ask whether this amendment is offered to the substitute or to the first section of the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered to the first section of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is being offered to the first section of the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that by the introduction of this amendment I have somewhat violently changed the

subject, at least potentially. It is necessary for me to offer it at this time in order that the Committee may pass upon it in accordance with proper parliamentary procedure. Section 1 of the May bill is at present open to perfecting amendments and this is the only opportunity for me to offer it. When section 1 is perfected then, as I understand, the question goes back to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment in order to clarify and strengthen this measure. I want it understood, however, that in the event it should be rejected by the Committee I shall still vote for the May bill. I believe from the bottom of my heart that our greatest objective is the approval of the May bill as reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. I think, however, the May bill in certain respects would be advantaged by clarification, and I have these thoughts in mind about it. It has been contended and charged very widely, for example, that the May bill is an antilabor bill; that it is an antistrike bill. It has been portrayed in that fashion far and wide. I am myself convinced that the committee in reporting it had no such intention. But doubts will arise about it and they should be done away with. As a matter of fact I have never believed it either wise or practical to attempt what is known as antistrike legislation. I do not believe it can be done effectively. I do not think it should be attempted. There are no such provisions in existing labor laws as would forbid strikes, and the omission of such provisions is, I think, wise.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it the opinion of the gentleman, as I understand it to be the opinion of the Committee on Military Affairs, that the May bill as it now is before the House, could not be used; that is, its penalty provisions could not be used in the event of a strike?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is my opinion and it is derived largely from the very able remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] in discussing that very question.

Mr. Chairman, we have an important body of law upon the statute books relating to employer and employee relationships, such as the National Labor Relations Act, and other acts. Under those laws provisions are made for the carrying on of bargaining between employer and employee. None of us wants to interfere with that. There are provisions in those laws with respect to minimum wages and maximum hours. I do not want anyone to rise in the event of the enactment of the May bill and state in view of the fact that a new element is introduced, we will say, in industry as a result of the operation of this bill, that those laws are in any way undermined.

So this amendment is intended to make it absolutely clear that the act itself does not modify or affect in any way existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, or collective bargaining, or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any controversies or questions. Frankly I think it would be wise for the Congress to declare that. It would clear the atmosphere.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Of course, the gentleman knows that under existing law, particularly section 7 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, collective-bargaining agreements are authorized and provided for. In the event a labor organization has entered into a contract with its employees in a particular plant, plant A, for instance, if your amendment is adopted which provides that that man who is sent to plant A is not required to join that union, is that not an interference with a negotiated and concluded agreement, which does require each employee of a closed shop to pay dues when he enters?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If my amendment were adopted, there is no doubt whatsoever that for the duration of this war that contract would be suspended, in the manner covered by this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Please let me continue just a moment.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like clarification of that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the stress of war, may I remind the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], many, many contracts are suspended. In this very bill there is a provision to the effect that those who are assigned to work under its provisions shall be the beneficiaries of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. What does the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act do but suspend contracts?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act, amongst other things, protects a man who is drafted into the armed forces from the obligation to pay interest on a mortgage on his home which he has had to leave. That is suspension of a contract. The same way with the payment of his taxes. In a sense, that is suspension of a contract.

Hundreds and hundreds of industrial plants have had to suspend contracts when the Government has come to them and said: "No matter what you are doing under contract with your customers, you have got to stop doing that and go to work for the war." There is nothing new in this proposal that a contract may be suspended, in the interest of the war effort.

It strikes me that in view of the crisis which confronts us, no sensible man should object to the temporary suspension of a contract, which I have dealt with in this amendment. It would injure no one. It is a temporary matter. These employees who are going into these plants are temporary employees. In all probability a large number of them will be perfectly willing to join a union. Well and good. But if they do not, shall they be denied employment that the Nation requires of them? We come down to the fundamental question there, which I think should be made clear.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I just want to point out that in every case the suspension of a contract is in favor of the man who is inducted. So it would be under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It leaves him free to go in or not to go in. It protects his individual rights. That is the same principle we have followed in every other instance where we have suspended contracts in favor of the inductee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I proceed just a little while longer in this discussion?

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not offered in a spirit of hostility to organized labor. I cannot see how it would injure organized labor in the slightest degree. The bargaining power in a plant which is operating under a closed shop will still lie with the union; no power will be taken away from it whatsoever. The hours of labor will still be protected in accordance with the agreement between the union and the employer. The minimum and maximum wage provisions will all stand undisturbed, the union holding its position. The men who may go into war plants under the provisions of this bill will, we all know, be a small minority, comparatively, of all the people employed in a plant. Their advent in a plant will not be dangerous to the union in the slightest degree. No social gains whatsoever will be surrendered. But we must determine whether or not when a man is assigned to a job by the Government of the United States he shall take that job without conditions being imposed by somebody else. That is my plea.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The Selective Service Act is built upon the principle of the closed shop; so is this legislation. Under the closed shop we have made prodigious gains in production. The gentleman is asking that that be discontinued in plants producing war goods.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. KEEFE rose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I must yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman in the first portion of his amendment sets forth what he alleges to be protection of labor's rights, particularly collective bargaining; but as a realistic proposition the gentleman knows that there can be no collective bargaining unless there is a union which has a majority of the employees belonging to it. Collective bargaining becomes a mockery unless there is a collective bargaining agent for the workers. Experience shows that their only valuable agent is a labor

union; yet the gentleman would destroy the union by the last sentence of his amendment and thereby he nullifies all of the allegedly prolabor language in his amendment.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot agree with the gentleman from New York. When these new workers go into a plant they will find that the union, be it a closed shop or merely an organized plant, is in charge of collective bargaining; and the union will always have a majority of the employees. The question simply is: Shall we make a man pay a fee in order to serve his country where he is most needed? That is all.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. As a practical and realistic approach to the problem, may I ask the gentleman what would happen if John Jones, ordered to report to plant A to work under this proposed legislation, is asked to join a union but refuses, and the employer says to him, "I cannot hire you because you do not belong to the union." He then goes back to his draft board and says, "I have reported in accordance with your orders; now, what are you going to do about it"? There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment or in this bill which says to the employer that he must hire the individual that the draft board sends to him. Consequently, if he can be relieved of his responsibility because of his refusal to join the union and the employer refuses to hire him for that reason, then employee B, who does belong to the union, can quit his job, go right down to his draft board, and say, "I want to volunteer for service under this new plan," and he can then go back to the employer and get the benefit of the soldiers and sailors civil relief and say, "I do not have to belong to the union." Would that have the effect, in the gentleman's opinion, of destroying or making it possible to destroy unions operating in the war plants of this country?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think so.

Mr. Chairman, may I make a few observations in connection with the machinery provided in this act? It states here on page 5:

> It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

All right. That is all right so far as it goes. This registrant prefers in his own mind to work in a certain kind of job. He goes to a plant and he finds that he cannot be employed unless he joins a union. He goes back and reports that fact to the draft board but adds: "There is another plant which offers work which I think I would like." So he goes to that plant and there also meets the same reply. Unless I am mistaken, that man has complied with the provisions of this act. Nothing more can be done about it. He has been given his reasonable choice, but in the following out of the matter it becomes impossible. It is not his fault. I do not think the language at the top of page 5 deals with this situation with sufficient clarity and strength. I believe in asking a man where he would prefer to work. If he says, "I would rather work in the Smith plant," all right, he goes up there. He is assigned to that plant. When he gets there he should be employed. That is where he wants to go, that is where he is needed. That is the purpose of my amendment.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. Assume that this draftee presents himself for employment and he is told he must join a union. He says he will not join a union at all. Therefore he cannot work in that factory. The question I want to ask is this: The union has established its collective-bargaining rights and those rights are protected by law. No man can work there unless he does join the union. If the May bill without any clarification becomes law, as a matter of fact, there is an inconsistency between the law passed by the Congress establishing the union and giving it collective-bargaining rights, and the later law, the May bill, passed by the Congress. Would not the last law repeal the first law if it is inconsistent with the first law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all. There is no disturbance whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would not take the time of the Committee today for a moment if it were not for the deep concern I have about this legislation. If I did not think it vitally necessary for the war effort to pass a bill I would not take your time. In speaking upon this amendment and others that will be offered, for purposes that are mine I do not have to argue the merits of this amendment or others.

As far as the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana is concerned I cannot but think it is nothing more than a pious appeal for people to do what they have already been appealed to do. I want legislation. I think I know the temper of this House. I think I know that there are a hundred men in this House who are going to vote against any bill on final passage. I have watched this House operate. Some people say this is not needed; that legislation of this sort is not necessary. In 1941, a few weeks before Pearl Harbor, I remember honest, conscientious men and women said that we did not need to extend the Selective Service Act because in all probability we would not need an Army soon. I heard that argument made with respect to practically every measure brought before the House of Representatives during our years and months of preparation to defend ourselves. If their judgment had been taken, what would have been our situation at the time of Pearl Harbor? What would have been our situation 12 months after Pearl Harbor? I do not know. You do not know either, but I think it would have been pretty bad.

Any amendment placed on this bill that is going to lose it a large block of votes, whatever merits it may have, is a dangerous amendment. I am certainly not criticizing the author of this amendment because if there ever was a man in the House of Representatives who has stood 100 percent during the years for preparedness, it has been the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. But in my opinion, today, sir, you are assuming a tremendous responsibility; one that I do not like to see you assume.

I believe that the adoption of this amendment will lose this bill on a final roll call from 50 to 75 votes. I do not have to take a position on the merits of this amendment. That is not what I am talking about. If this amendment is adopted, then others will be offered, and then others.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have watched bills in this House. Many times I have seen committees of the House disclaim and disown their own bills when many amendments were adopted.

If this amendment is adopted, we may get into the gleeful pastime of adopting other amendments. I want to say this: I have seen men get up on the floor of this House and say they would support this legislation even though it was a mighty poorly drawn bill, and so forth.

Judge Patterson said he could operate under this bill as it is written. The Army and the Navy say that they can operate and do the job of getting the 900,000 men into the armed forces and the 700,000 men and women in industry that they say are vitally needed for replacements on the battle fronts and for places on the fighting line.

If this bill had never been brought to the floor of the House, that would be one thing. Even if the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, whom the boys out on the battle fronts look up to as their leaders in the Army and in the Navy, had not said that this is needed in order to prepare the instruments with which our men are to defend themselves and fight the enemy, what are these men, who have been on the battle fronts so long without relief, and who have already taken more at the front than any of us thought mortal men could bear, going to think if we do not pass a bill?

If this amendment is adopted, it is my opinion, as I say, that it will lose the bill on final passage 50 to 75 votes, and that is a sizable group. Then some-

body is going to offer the so-called F. E. P. C. amendment, and if that is adopted it will lose the bill 50 to 75 votes. Adding these to the number of Members who are probably going to vote against any kind of a bill and you have in the neighborhood of 250 Members who will vote against the bill. That is a responsibility which under the circumstances I do not feel like assuming.

It has been said that we in America are optimists. Men supposed to be well informed sat in my office in June 1943, and said that this war would be over by September of that year. When it was not over by September, they said certainly Germany could not live through another winter; but it did.

If you want a bill, if you want to satisfy the boys out there who are doing their part and more than their part, you had better vote down all of these amendments that will eliminate support and go on and pass it, so that the men who are at the helm of our destiny may go ahead and do the things they thing are necessary in order to win this war.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, we started the consideration of this bill today by the offering of a substitute amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. We now have before us for discussion the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to perfect the first section of the bill. I also wish to offer one or two amendments to the first section in order to perfect it. I wonder if we should first dispose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York before taking up anything further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. We should first dispose of the Wadsworth amendment.

The Chair understands that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has sent an amendment to the Wadsworth amendment to the desk. Does he wish to offer it now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to offer it at this time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, it must be perfectly apparent to every Member of this body that the further along this discussion goes the more confusing the issue becomes.

Mr. Chairman, I have carefully listened to all of the debates on the pending bill. Out of the welter of emotionalism that consideration of this bill has generated, a few basic conclusions may be stated.

First. Every Member of this body without exception wants to do everything possible to aid the courageous men and women who are fighting our battles at the front.

Second. Despite the political assurances given prior to November 7, 1944, that all was well, the hard, cold facts demonstrate the necessity for continued all-out production.

Third. Mistakes of judgment as to manpower and matériel requirements have been made.

Fourth. Present considerations of past mistakes and politically inspired distortion of truth will not in themselves relieve either the shortages of manpower in the armed services or relieve the bottlenecks of production.

Fifth. Our job now is to get on with the war effort, through the fullest and most complete utilization of all the productive capacity of the Nation.

Reasonable-minded men and women are in agreement thus far. Disagreement arises over the means and methods to be employed in achieving a common purpose. The proponents of the pending legislation point out the deficiencies that exist and contend that the enactment of this legislation will relieve the situation. They admit that free and voluntary labor acting in cooperation with the genius of industry have resulted in unparalleled production records. In the face of this admission so freely expressed by the proponents of this legislation, they still insist that compulsory conscription of labor is necessary, and thus have brought this bill to us for consideration. They say the bill is imperfect—that many of its provisions are not understandable. None of the proponents can give assurance that the enactment of this legislation will relieve our productive effort from a single element that has brought about the alleged shortages. They say we should have faith in the Commander in Chief and in the Chiefs of Staff and blindly enact this legislation because they contend the Commander in Chief has asked for it.

I want to give to the Commander in Chief and to those charged with the responsibility for successfully carrying on our war effort every aid and assistance. My responsibility as a legislator, however, compels me to ask some questions in order to determine the proper course to pursue. I cannot blindly, under the stress of temporary emotionalism, vote for legislation the proponents of which have up to date utterly failed, in my judgment, to justify. The simple question is, Will the passage of this legislation provide the manpower needed for the Army and the Navy relieve the shortages of manpower in industry and agriculture, and bring about the increased production necessary to relieve the admitted shortages? If I believed it would do this, I would unhesitatingly support it. Until I am so convinced, however, I cannot vote to substitute conscription and compulsion under threat of dire penalty, for patriotic, voluntary effort.

I have read the hearings in this matter. They all relate to H. R. 119, originally offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. The thesis of that bill was entirely different from that embodied in H. R. 1752, the bill now under consideration. We have no testimony in specific reference to the pending legislation, and nowhere, either in the hearings or in the record of these debates, is there to be found specific information as to how this legislation in operation will relieve the bottlenecks of which we complain. There is nothing in this bill that will eliminate the staggering waste of manpower and matériel which is admittedly present in much of our war productive effort. There is nothing in this bill that will relieve our productive effort from the costly waste of manpower involved in plant jurisdictional disputes. There is nothing in this bill that will give assurance of the utilization of the highest productive effort of the men and women presently employed in industry. There is nothing in this bill that will relieve our productive effort from the smothering effect of slow-downs, production ceilings, and so forth.

Because of these facts, no witness has been able to testify that the enactment of this legislation will actually and realistically relieve the situation of which we complain. General Eisenhower, General Patton, General MacArthur, Admiral King, and General Marshall have been crystal-clear in their demands that what they want is guns, ammunition, trucks, and supplies, and a direct approach to the solution of the problem of shortages which involves something far greater than the mere enactment of this legislation. What they seek is the instilling in the hearts and souls of the people on the production front in America of a consuming passion to produce without restraint and without restriction from any source. Labor has made a remarkable effort, which can be improved, provided we enact wise legislation. You cannot put into the souls of the people of America the desire to work and produce by the enactment of legislation. There is nothing that can supplant the will and the determination and the patriotic desire to produce under a voluntary free system in America. That is why labor and management have joined hands in opposing the enactment of the present legislation and why the arguments which were presented as they appear in the hearings have great compelling force.

On the other hand, because of the psychology which has swept the country, generated by the emotionalism of the appeals which have been made, I cannot see my way clear to deny any type of legislation and to say to the President, and General Marshall and Admiral King and General Knudsen, "No, we refuse to give any measure of relief." To maintain such an attitude, in my judgment, would be to fail to meet our responsibility as legislators. We have a system in vogue today based upon voluntary action and developed in the crucible of experience. That program is involved in the regulations of the War Manpower Commission, which have generally been accepted by management and labor-management committees as being the orderly solution for the immediate problem before us. I am one of those who believe that the Congress should adopt the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. This substitute removes most of the objections to the pending bill and puts some teeth into the present program of the War Manpower Commission. It proposes to

give statutory authority for: First, the establishment of employment ceilings; second, the use of controlled referrals to regulate hiring; third, authorizing compulsory release of employees in excess of the number permitted individual employers under manpower ceilings; and fourth, the enforcement of such regulations not against the employee but against the employer, through proceedings comparable to those used to enforce price ceilings, under the Price Control Act.

This program has the entire complete support of management and of the leaders of labor who have worked so diligently in the creation and stimulation of labor-management committees throughout the Nation. Those familiar with the operations of this plan know that it will, so far as legislative enactments can, help bring about the results which we so fervently hope to achieve. The implementation of the present voluntary plan of the War Manpower Commission will result in the utilization of the far-flung machinery of that organization which is now in operation throughout the country. It should cause no unrest in the ranks of organized or unorganized labor and will have the full and complete support of management.

Each of you received this morning from the National Manufacturers' Association a complete analysis of this proposal and they put their stamp of full and complete approval upon it. I can say to you that it is my understanding that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and its organizations fully endorse and support the proposals in the Voorhis amendment; and I know that many great labor leaders in the country support the provisions of the Voorhis amendment.

Here is a program that those who are interested in production instead of mere regimentation can support. Here is a program that will stand the test. Here is a program that clearly distinguishes between free labor and conscript labor. Here is a program that will get the job done. I sincerely plead with my colleagues to accept this substitute.

It will not do merely to delay by having further and more extended consideration and study, as is suggested in the Barrett bill, H. R. 1803. Time is of the essence in this matter. The shortages complained of must be relieved now and not 6 months from now.

All of the fears of confusion, regimentation, conscription, and compulsion that are found in H. R. 1752 can be eliminated, and under the provisions of the Voorhis substitute free American labor can go to work under proper restraint and stimulation and actually produce the implements and munitions of war that are needed.

The Barrett bill is better than the present bill, but I ask you to give earnest consideration to the proposal to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and there you will have a solution to many of the troubles that are bothering you in your thinking on this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the first proposition to be voted on by the Committee will be the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I wonder if we can get an agreement to limit the time?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means the amendment to the bill itself. The gentleman does not concede that is a perfecting amendment, does he?

Mr. MAY. No, but the gentleman offers it as a perfecting amendment. I understood it was originally offered as a perfecting amendment to the Harness substitute but upon further advice I understand it is an attempt to amend the original bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on that particular amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman refer to the Wadsworth amendment?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman not wait a few minutes before making his request so that debate can go on a little while to see whether we need 30 minutes or less?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request for the time being.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Wadsworth amendment, which provides that every registrant requested to accept employment shall have the right to join any union or organization of employees, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization if he should not freely choose to do so.

I believe that I speak the sentiment of the great unorganized American masses and practically all the men in the armed forces when I object to our Government, while attempting to place every male person from 18 through 45 years of age in some war plant, directing him to some closed-shop plant where, if he does not pay union dues, he does not work, and if he does not work he violates the law and has to go to jail under the terms of this measure. Having our Government send men to jail for not joining the unions is, to me, like throwing the Constitution out the window.

Why should free American laborers pay tribute to not only a labor union but a political organization such as the P. A. C., which has admitted before committees of this Congress to having made campaign contributions to defeat a goodly number of us?

I know there is one district in the United States, the Third District of Oklahoma, that is very much opposed to labor levying a tax on unorganized labor before they can work for their Government. I believe, if this question should be submitted to the voters of Oklahoma, that it would be overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 5 to 1.

The Wadsworth amendment, in substance, was adopted by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, then for some reason was later stricken. It is not new to this measure, and, as I view it, nothing is to be gained by sparring around and not getting down to the real issue, which is whether to give the unions the power of a government to levy a tax on the manpower of America, whether they wish to join a union or do not wish to join a union. It is outrageous that we should provide a penalty for violating some union regulation that would deprive a citizen of his liberty. I know I reflect the sentiment of the great part of the American people, and I am very much in favor of the adoption of the Wadsworth amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wadsworth amendment.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, known as the Wadsworth amendment, close at 2:20, and that 5 minutes of that time be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how will the time be divided?

Mr. MAY. The Chair will determine the allocation of time.

Mr. HOOK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Any analysis of the Wadsworth amendment will demonstrate conclusively that the amendment is not in the interest of protecting the fundamental rights of American labor. On the contrary you will find that that amendment will bring about the complete destruction of the organized labor movement in this country. The very last sentence of the amendment makes provision against requiring anyone to live up to the labor relations existing in any particular plant.

If we set up an exception because of refusal to join a union, then why not set up other exceptions, for instance, because one may not like the wages nor the working conditions of a plant to which he is sent? Is the gentleman from New York ready to grant an exception in that case? How about an exception for one who may not like the sanitary conditions in a particular plant? Are you going to permit him an exception under those circumstances? If you start making exceptions for those who are opposed to labor conditions which require union affiliations you might as well go right down the line and grant exceptions to meet the objections of everyone.

You say that the objective of this bill is to increase production and produce the material that is needed. If you are interested in production, and you want it, the best way not to get it is to adopt the Wadsworth amendment. It will cause chaos in industry. It will cause disruption. It will retard rather than advance production. Some gentlemen are going to support this amendment because of their antiunion bias. That, I can understand, for they are concerned less with production and more with the destruction of organized labor.

I can also understand the position of the gentleman who preceded me because

he has consistently opposed organized labor and its rights in this country. Therefore, I address my remarks to those who want to vote for this bill because of its expressed objective—to increase production. If you want to increase production, then certainly do not adopt this amendment. The adoption of this amendment will retard production because it will disrupt the existing relationship between labor and industry.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is a good lawyer and understands the labor problem. Does the gentleman feel that this bill as reported by the committee will increase production?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I believe that if this bill is enacted as is—and it could be improved by turning the administration of the law over to the War Manpower Commission—it will aid in increasing production which is so vitally needed in the interest of speedy victory. That is why I am going to vote for the bill. However, if you adopt this antilabor amendment, which is not necessary, which as a matter of fact will hinder production, then this will no longer be a bill to increase production. Then it becomes strictly an antilabor bill. Then you are using this crisis as a subterfuge to smash and destroy the organized labor movement in this country.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If you adopt this amendment, then we will be justified in voting against this bill, not alone from the standpoint of protecting the interests of labor but from the patriotic standpoint that this amendment will disrupt labor and management conditions as they exist and will disrupt rather than increase production. This amendment negates the objective of the bill. It defeats the very reasons for the enactment of this serious legislation.

May I add this further thought: When the gentleman from New York speaks about guaranteeing the right of collective bargaining and the laws with regard to wages and hours, he must bear in mind that you can talk of collective bargaining, you can talk of wages and hours, you can talk of the rights of labor, but collective bargaining, wages and hours, and the rights of labor become a sham and a mockery unless labor is organized and unless there is a union to protect and defend those rights.

Adopting the gentleman's amendment sets off dynamite that will blow organized labor to pieces. There will not be a single labor union in this country able to protect the rights of organized labor as well as the unorganized working people of this country.

The Wadsworth amendment is a union-busting amendment submitted to the Congress under the guise of a crisis. It does not advance the patriotic objective of the bill, it defeats it. The Wadsworth amendment would destroy organized labor, disrupt industry and labor relationships, and retard production.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, the so-called Wadsworth amendment, close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, the proponent of the present amendment said he could not see how it could be an antilabor menace. Because of his honesty, I can agree with him. He cannot, I believe, see the antilabor consequences in his amendment or any other antilabor move and I can, after 8 years of observation, realize the reason why. The only arguments I have heard by the proponents of this bill were based on passion and emotion. This, I believe, because of lack of sufficient facts to substantiate their claims for the need of this legislation. What happens? There is no provision in this bill which provides that an employer shall accept a registrant sent to him. And just as soon as the registrant is sent by the local board to the employer the employer can say, "No, I do not want that registrant. He cannot work in my plant." Where is he going to get a job? What are you going to do with the registrant? Let us see now what happens under this amendment. The employer can say, "That man belongs to a union. That man wants to join a union. I therefore will not accept him." Thus through the method of this amendment they could break down every union in the country.

This bill as proposed affects only males. How about the millions of women in this country who are very patriotic citizens and who have done so much in the war effort? Nothing is said about them. How about the minority groups?

Let me say to you that if manpower were properly utilized, if labor and industry and Government would get together as has been proposed, manpower utilization could be brought about so that there would be no labor shortage in this Nation. Oh, I hear them say, "You are short of powder, munitions, tanks, tires and so forth." There is no shortage of materials in this Nation. There is no shortage of materials at this time for the armed forces. I noticed that most of the men in the well of this House in arguing for this bill said that the shortage showed up on the western front after September of last year. Well, let me tell you why. It is not a matter of transportation. It is a matter of docking facilities. Over on the western front they had flotillas for docks and during the September storm those flotillas in large part were destroyed. Only one was left. They did not have the docking facilities to bring the materials in. But in this Nation you have an abundance of materials produced by free labor and free industry and it is about time that we, recognizing the fact that free labor and free industry have brought about the greatest production that has ever been known in the history of mankind, let us not destroy that by enacting this bill which will destroy production in America.

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

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I do not see the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], on the floor at this time. I expect to vote for this bill. I think that probably many Members will vote for this bill who voted against increasing the original service under the draft bill from 12 months to an indefinite period of time. I think it was a little unfortunate that the distinguished gentleman from Texas made reference to that in the way he did. Certainly he did not accurately state the position of many who voted then. Many of us who did not believe we should break faith with those whom we promised they might take a year of service and then go into the Reserve will vote for this bill. We will vote for this bill because when we get into war we believe in doing what it takes to win the war.

Everyone who knew the original Selective Service Act in any detail knew that the men who had taken their 12 months of training and immediately went into the Reserve were liable for Reserve duty 5 minutes after that first 12 months expired. The Army would never have been disbanded; whoever had 12 months' training had 10 years of Reserve liability. But lay that aside. The issue that we confront now is whether or not, being in the war for which we voted, stating that we would pledge all of our resources, we intend to carry it out when a situation arises that we are told this is what is needed.

I intend to vote for the bill with or without the Wadsworth amendment, but I am for the Wadsworth amendment. I think some Members in their appeal have put this thing on too low a level. The very idea that if the Wadsworth amendment should be adopted and should become law, a single loyal laborer would quit his war job because somebody might be put beside him who did not want to join a union. That is an insult to labor. If organized labor is destroyed in this country, if its position is weakened after this war, it will be because of the low level of the appeal that has been made by some of its so-called leaders.

There were a couple of war projects in my district. Some of the organizers came in and wanted them run on a closed-shop basis. They said these can never be built without it. I said if you will keep your hands off of the situation, the union men and nonunion men will go out there and work hand in hand to get them done on time. My people want to win the war. They want to back up their boys and make it possible for them to come home as soon as possible.

They did. They made a record on those jobs.

If we want to win this war in the shortest possible time, let us pass the legislation necessary to do it.

I remember a broadcast that came from the Southwest Pacific the morning after Mr. Byrnes had announced that possibly following VE-day there would be some let-down in production. This broadcast came from the men in the Southwest Pacific and said that there had not been such sadness in the camp since the war began, because they felt that when the priority war in Europe was over they would be forgotten. One reason why this bill should be passed is to send word to those boys who have been over there 3 years and more that they are not forgotten; that we are pledging all of our resources to the war on both fronts until both wars are completely won.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York, since it is my well-considered judgment that the bill should be so amended as to give men drafted for war work free choice whether or not to join a union. Without such amendment I fear Congress will establish a precedent which will come back to curse it; an indefensible precedent for the conscription, coercion, and drafting of men for union membership, requiring them to join a union or go to jail.

Such a law would be intolerable and unenforceable, and should not be countenanced. I am not unmindful of the fact that many defects in this bill, as we pass it, will have to be ironed out in conference. This House is not ab initio the court of last resort. So when we have done as best we may I shall vote for the bill, and hope for the best.

And, while I am at it, may I say, as I probably should not, that there are many things in this bill which I do not like. Could I dictate the policy or the strategy I would have something else and different. However, this bill in its broader aspects has the approval of those on whose judgment I must rely, namely, those responsible for utter defeat or victory, militarily, at home and abroad.

Stripped of all emotionalism and of the harangue and of the demagoguery which has accompanied it up to date, I shall vote for the naked bill with whatever warts are on it, and as an emergency war measure; sponsored by those who have proven their competence up to date, to direct our military and naval strategy and policy toward winning the war.

It seems to me that for me to assume to know more than they do as to what is necessary and as to what must be done, some way, would be a historical reversion matched by assumptions of Congresses heretofore in an undertaking to take away the management of the war from those to whom the power and authority has been delegated, which those who read history know has always resulted disastrously. So, as I said before, and for the reasons I have given, and for other reasons which I have not given, I shall vote for the bill to the end that those charged with the responsibility for the victory may have the credit therefor.

I am going to vote for the bill upon the basis that those who are running the fighting war abroad and at home, know what they are talking about, and to the end that victory may come at the earliest possible day at the least cost of lives and treasure. That is their great responsibility.

Those upon whose judgment I have a right to rely assure me that the passage of this bill will accomplish those things and is necessary in order to attain that which we have set out to accomplish.

I am listening to these people rather than to the pressure groups from big business or labor unions who might in my opinion better devote their attention to the production of matériel and to supplying the necessary ammunition to the Army and to the Navy to enable those who are running the fighting war to win it by supplying the boys on the fighting front with the weapons with which to defend themselves and us.

What a tragedy that there should be a necessity for such a law! We should be ashamed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 125, noes 169.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. WADSWORTH.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 142, noes 178.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: Page 2, line 14, after the word "farms", strike out the period, and insert a colon, and the following language: "*Provided, however*, That the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may not certify to the Director of Selective Service for the purposes of this section any plant, facility, or farm which discriminates in employment because of race, creed or color or which fails to file with the Director of War Mobiliation and Reconversion a declaration that it will accept for employment any individual without regard to race, creed, or color."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am bringing before you this amendment because I believe that this is the best and perhaps the only opportunity that we will have to pass upon legislation of this kind in this Congress. Our beloved Speaker has told us that he would like to have the bill which has been presented to you by the committee passed in its present form without amendment. I feel that we should amend the bill. I shall vote for the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] in preference to the committee bill, unless amendments are added to the committee bill. The committee bill can be improved upon and I hope we will not be limited to its present provisions finally.

The committee bill, as I see it, is not a sufficient piece of legislation. I think all of us saw in the Washington Post this morning the news item which stated:

> The Senate Military Affairs Committee started drafting a revised version of the May bill yesterday, which would return to the Office of War Mobilization, and through it other interested Government agencies, such as the War Manpower Commission, the responsibility of directing men into essential industry. The May committee left this power with selective service local boards.

Even before this House acts on this bill the Senate committee is already placing its stamp of disapproval upon it.

The issue, as I see it, covers two propositions. First of all, the Army services need 900,000 men before June 30. Those 900,000 men are going to be forthcoming, and, so far as the provisions of this bill are concerned, they will not add or substract one man from the armed services. They will be forthcoming, 150,000 by 17-year-old men who volunteer for the Navy before they become 18 years of age. Four hundred and twenty thousand will be inducted by Selective Service from men who are now I-A or who will become I-A by becoming 18 years of age, or for other reasons, between now and June 30, 1945. The other 330,000 will have to be taken from the farms and from industry. On the farms today there are 360,000 men under 26 years of age, of which we are told 180,000 can pass the physical requirements of the draft. That means a large number will come from the farms. In industry there are only 40,000 under 26 years of age who would go into I-A. They are, in part, doctors, chemists, skilled men, trained engineers that no selective-service board is going to take. About 60,000 are in the merchant marine. Some of them can be replaced by older men; therefore, we must look to the age period from 26 to 29.

So far as industry is concerned, I received a letter today from a member of a draft board in Springfield who told me that they have already put into I-A as many as they could of the men between 26 and 29. When they call these men in, after placing them in I-A, down comes the representative from industry and tells and shows and proves to the selective-service board that those men are just as essential today in that industry as keymen and cannot be spared as they were at the time the selective board deferred them. And they continue to defer them. However, the 900,000 will be forthcoming.

Then there are 700,000 who are going to be needed in essential war industries. That is the outside figure, and there are no supporting data for it. It is a guess

as far as anything in the hearings in the way of evidence is concerned. We are told by the Department of Labor, speaking through the C. I. O., and also I think through General Knudsen, or at least one of the witnesses for the Government, that "about 14.,000 are needed as of today." That was at the start of the hearings on January 10, and already 3 weeks have gone by and that crisis is already over, if there was a crisis on January 10 with reference to the shortage of manpower.

Another 154,000, which will bring it up to 300,000, will be needed by June 30, 1945, in essential industry, and those are all of the places that must be filled between now and June 30, 1945. Those will be forthcoming.

There will in addition be about 330,000 men needed to replace men who will enter the armed services. The testimony is uncontradicted in the hearings that these numbers will be forthcoming, and they will be forthcoming without much difficulty. For instance, we are told that more than half of the 700,000 involved represent women; in other words, as far as manpower is concerned, you can cut all of the figures more than in two. But make it 50 percent, and you need 350,000 men. Of the 350,000, 100,000 of these are young men who will become of age between now and June 30, 1945, and will not be eligible for induction due to not being physically fit. There are 100,000 taken care of.

Then let us look at the figures for those persons who are returning as veterans and going into industry. We are told, and again, these figures come from the Government, that in July they placed 50,000 veterans in jobs in industry, 62,000 in August, 60,000 in September, and 63,000 in October, and the 63,000 who were placed came out of the quota of more than 80,000 veterans who applied for jobs. The number of veterans who are applying for jobs is increasing month by month. But assuming that it was 60,000 a month, and basing it on the 6 months from January 1 to June 30, 1945, you have 360,000 men coming from the armed forces.

Labor and management have testified through witnesses that where more war orders are placed they work more efficiently. They will take up a lot of the jobs for which apparently the Army think they are going to need men merely by adding on extra hours of work. Today in industry they are not averaging even 48 hours a week. It is somewhere around 45⅔ hours a week.

If there is a manpower shortage at all, let us see where there is another manpower reservoir from which a sufficient number of men can be taken which would fill the bill without requiring so much legislation and so much worry. That group consists of the colored persons in the United States today. In the recent elections I think most of us went before the public and if we stood on the platforms of our respective parties, we stood for the proposition that there should be no discrimination against the colored people of the United States. As a matter of fact, to read the pledge of my own party platform, the Republican Party platform, adopted in Chicago, we find this short phrase:

> We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

The Democratic platform is not in that language, but it is to the same effect. Now let us see what is going on. I, like several others in the House, have introduced a bill to set up a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. I believe such a bill may be reported out of the Committee on Labor at this session. I talked with the chairman of that committee, and I find that there is little likelihood of a rule being given. That means that such a bill, if it were to be presented on the floor of this House and debated, would have to go through a discharge petition, and by the time the discharge petition is signed and it is ready for action, June 30, 1945, will have passed. If this emergency, on the basis of which we are voting for this legislation today, really exists, we ought to secure the benefits of this pool of manpower and the benefits of the work of these Negroes who are just as anxious to work as any white people. In my own home city of Springfield last week several hundred Jamaicans, colored people, were brought in to work in our factories and our mills, such as the United States Rubber Co.'s factory at Chicopee. More of them are going to come from Jamaica. I do not see why, if there are American colored people who want jobs in our industrial plants, they should not be given those jobs. For instance, so far as the jobs are concerned up in the Springfield area, and I think you will find it true in other areas, the lack of manpower, if there is any, and I doubt very much that it is as serious as has been portrayed, the lack of manpower is not in the skilled jobs. They are laying off, according to last Friday's Springfield Union, 200 skilled workers at the Smith & Wesson revolver factory. At the same time they are seeking men in other plants. What are they seeking them for? They are seeking them as common laborers in factories, I am told, in the tire companies, where they have to throw around big, heavy tires which it takes a man who is pretty near I-A to do. You are not going to use skilled operators for that kind of work. Therefore, no board or no manpower commission is going to take such skilled men and put them on unskilled work unless they have to. There is no apparent need for it.

In view of the fact that my party and the Democratic Party also have indicated they feel there should be no discrimination against the colored workers of America, I want this amendment to have your earnest consideration.

Let me call attention to page 349 and page 350 of the hearings. Mr. Llewellyn, of the United Auto Workers, testified—and you have the volume of the hearings before you—in answer to a question by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]:

> Based upon the manpower available—that is, if they will use the women and Negroes that are available—I think it can more than take up the slack.

That was in reference to manpower in the Detroit area.

Then he goes on to say——

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

Mr. CLASON. Not until I have finished.

He goes on to say:

> Mr. MARTIN. Well, is your study such that you could generalize to the entire Detroit area on the basis of your study of the Ford Motor plant and say that that condition prevails rather generally throughout the Detroit area?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. It does. It does as far as women and Negroes are concerned.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. And by that you mean most able-bodied men taken into the armed forces, from the Detroit industrial area, you would expect to be replaceable by Negroes and women?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. That is right.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Who are experienced workers?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. Yes; that is correct.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Who have been laid off?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. That is right.

That is the situation which applies elsewhere.

Let us turn to page 281, to the testimony of Mr. Philip Murray, and see what he has to say. What is his position? It is stated on page 281:

> I think that one of the things that I think is really disgraceful is to hear so many complaints about labor shortages while so many able-bodied women and Negroes are idle and want to work, and cannot get work in particular localities throughout the United States.

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. I continue reading:

> Mr. JOHNSON. You mentioned about the women. Now, is that true, that matter of discrimination against workers who are not white? Is that true to any great extent?
>
> Mr. MURRAY. You mean about the colored situation?
>
> Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.
>
> Mr. MURRAY. It is true, broadly speaking; yes.
>
> Mr. JOHNSON. In what parts of the country?
>
> Mr. MURRAY. Well, it is true particularly in the South. It is true in many sections of the North, and we can cite innumerable examples.

A lot of you people who are from the South have different problems than we have in the large industrial cities in the North. But up North we need this type of workmen. I would like to see them given an opportunity to work. In voting for this particular amendment anybody on either side will be voting in support of the pledge contained in his national party's platform.

My home city of Springfield has fortunately had few cases of discrimination against the employment of colored people. A few have been reported to me by individuals. The evidence shows that in Detroit and here in the city of Washington today such cases of discrimination run into the thousands, which indicates

the need for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend took most of his time in presenting arguments against the bill. When he concluded I was wondering in my own mind just how he was going to vote. He said that if the bill reported out of committee were amended—I presume to agree with his views—he might vote for it; otherwise he would vote for the substitute. That argument is difficult for me to follow.

Getting back to the amendment, it is hostile to the best interests of this bill. If I were an American of the colored race such an amendment would operate on me in a manner to make me feel resentful. We have a commission appointed by President Roosevelt through Executive order which is now functioning. This amendment cannot accomplish anything more than the present Commission can accomplish. What those Americans of colored blood and others want is a permanent condition, and this amendment does not bring that about. This amendment does nothing that is not already done by Executive order. If anything, this amendment, if adopted, might interfere with the operation of the Commission which is now functioning and which was established by Executive order.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. A bill is now pending before the Committee on Labor, one that was reported out in the closing days of the last session, dealing with this subject. That is the bill wanted by those who favor legislation of this kind. The pending amendment adds nothing to the rights of any American citizen no matter what his race, color, or creed may be, no right that does not already exist by law or Executive order. This amendment if adopted will interfere with the passage of this bill. This amendment is not necessary in this bill. On these grounds I oppose the amendment at this time.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the bill we are considering here, H. R. 1752, is a temporary statute and runs only until the 15th of next May, unless we extend the original Service Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. This amendment does not bring about a permanent F. E. P. C. It does not give any greater rights than already exist in the Commission appointed by Executive order, and, if anything, adoption of the pending amendment might interfere with the operation of the Commission that exists now as a result of the Executive order.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. Will he agree to bring to the floor that bill which will provide for establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission if I withdraw the amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that I would like to see him withdraw his amendment, but so far as the gentleman from Massachusetts now speaking is concerned, that bill is before the Labor Committee. It was reported out of the Labor Committee last year. The gentleman himself said that he believes the bill will be reported out of the committee again.

Mr. CLASON. It will not get to the House. It will not get out of the Rules Committee, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not say the gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, I do not believe the gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. As a member of the Rules Committee, I dislike very much to have the two gentlemen from Massachusetts determine what the Rules Committee is going to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts who is speaking has not undertaken to do that. I have made no comment as to what the Committee on Rules will do. My good friend from the Springfield section of the State is the one who made that statement.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will use his influence, perhaps we will not have any difficulty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, on the ground that adoption of this amendment would be hostile to the best interests of the bill, on the ground that this bill is necessary to be passed in the national interest of the country, on the ground that this amendment is a meaningless gesture, it is not permanent and the proponents of legislation of this kind fight for permanent legislation, on the ground that there is a commission already in existence now having jurisdiction and appointed as a result of Executive order, on the further ground that the adoption of this amendment might interfere with the work of that commission and that the amendment is unnecessary, I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Clason amendment close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

Mr. Chairman, I brand this amendment as a cheap partisan trick to play upon racial prejudice in order to defeat a bill which should stand or fall on its own merits. I, incidentally, am opposed to this bill for reasons which I will explain later. I do not believe that there is any sincere concern on the part of the proponents of this amendment for its passage. This amendment has erroneously been called a F. E. P. C. amendment. This it most emphatically is not. The F. E. P. C. is a committee set up by Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States. The passage of this amendment will not in the slightest help the Negro worker or the worker of any minority any more than he is being helped now. Under Executive Order No. 8802 administered by the Fair Employment Practices Committee there can be no discrimination in industry during wartime.

What we are interested in is a permanent F. E. P. C.—a permanent act of this Congress which will forever, in wartime and peacetime, rule out discrimination in public and private employment.

It is the cheapest and lowest form of politics to play upon any subject as delicate as is the subject of race in connection with legislation which is distinctly of a nonracial character. This bill should stand upon its own merits. It should be passed on its own merits or rejected on its own merits. It is a disservice to this country at any time to insincerely bring in the idea of race. If the Members on the other side of the aisle are so interested in the F. E. P. C. let them come forward, stand up, and be counted when the bill is reported out of the Committee on Labor.

I am against the May-Bailey bill for the following reasons:

First. The local selective service boards are not equipped to deal with the recruitment of manpower for war production.

Second. No provision is made for appeal from decision by the selective service board.

Third. The War Manpower Commission with its local labor management committees and farm committees now has the power to prevent workers from leaving essential war jobs.

Fourth. There is no provision whatsoever for appeal from arbitrary determination by a local selective service board that a worker should not leave his present war job, in spite of adverse working conditions.

Fifth. Although labor is to be drafted, there is no provision whatsoever for the drafting of industrial facilities and capital. Through the proper coordination of the procurement agencies, the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission, with their already existing labor-management-farm committees, we can "get the right man in the right place at the right time."

Sixth. Admiral King and General Marshall did not ask for this specific legislation. Mr. Batcheller, Chief of Operations of the War Production Board, said that current shortages were only 22 percent due to labor shortages.

And finally, I am opposed to this bill because it fundamentally negates the entire American tradition of the freedom of contract. I will never subscribe to the philosophy that the end justifies

the means. We are out to win this war, but not just another victory. We want to win a permanent, people's democratic victory. We cannot gain a moral victory with immoral means. This bill is immoral. It is totalitarian. Its passage would mean that in the "land of the free and the home of the brave" we have reverted to slavery, not just of the blacks but of the entire American working class.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Clason amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 113, nays 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 6, line 6, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "except that registered male nurses performing duties comparable to the duties performed by members of the Army Nurse Corps female or the Navy Nurse Corps female, when inducted into the land or naval forces, shall be inducted only as commissioned officers."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that a point of order has been made against this amendment for several reasons. Over the country during the past few days we have heard nothing on the part of the authorities but a demand for nurses: Nurses needed in our armed forces; nurses needed in the hospitals in every community in the land; nursing facilities are very greatly needed. Yet today the proponents of this bill refuse to consider the drafting of male nurses into some sort of service to the country at large. This bill could provide that. I know that the issue will come before this House before too long regarding the possibility of getting nurses from somewhere. There are 6,000 male nurses in the armed forces of the United States. They have not been recognized. No commissions have been allowed them. However, in some situations male nurses are just as important as women nurses. They have been found in some cases in this ghastly war to be imperative to the service in attending the wounded men at the front.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is the gentleman aware that the Army Nurse Corps under the law is a female corps?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I understand that, but I think it is time that consideration be given to commissioning male nurses. I know a great many persons in my district have written me on the subject. They advocate that some recognition be given to men who perform the same nursing duties as women in the military services of the United States. I think the time has come when we should consider this problem. I know the gentlewoman will agree with me that they have some place in this whole program.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it is a most interesting matter for the gentleman to bring to the consideration of the Congress. I hope he will bring it up again when the nursing situation is brought before the House.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentlewoman. I know her interest in the nursing situation will bring about some consideration of this problem.

There is one more point in support of this argument. In some of the intense battles in which the armed forces have been engaged it has been necessary for male nurses to be brought up to the front and put into places women should not be permitted to go. Unfortunately, there is no provision for commissioning these men, in spite of the fact that they have been inducted into the armed services as buck privates and have no opportunity to show their nursing ability.

I am sorry this amendment cannot be considered. I think it should be considered before this debate is over. It seems strange that in spite of all the need there is for nurses, according to the War Department, no action seems to be forthcoming. We can get all the nurses we want here today by drafting male nurses and making it possible for them to be commissioned and recognized as such, just as women are.

This action will be a lot more popular than drafting women, and more satisfactory to the women themselves.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 2, line 4, after the word "reconversion", strike out the comma, and in line 5 strike out the words "or the agency designated by him."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be interested in the vote on the Fair Employment Practice Commission bill when it ultimately is reported out of committee. In view of what has been stated here on the floor this afternoon, I believe all of us who are in favor of such legislation will be entitled to have it brought to the floor of the House for a vote. I certainly shall be looking for the support of those who spoke against my amendment as being out of place in this bill, when the time comes.

As far as this amendment is concerned, when this bill first came to the committee for consideration it was provided that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion should be personally responsible for any regulations or orders issued under this law. Thereafter, in the course of the discussions, an amendment was offered which appears in the first six words on page 5, "or the agency designated by him." We were told straight to the point that the purpose of those words was to take away from Mr. Byrnes or whoever might happen at the time to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion the responsibility behind the issuing of any regulation or order.

One of the things that I find fault with and that I find the people back home find fault with today is the ability of persons to delegate to others in Washington duties for which they ought to be responsible. I feel that those words ought to be stricken out and the language left just as it was written in the original bill, so that Mr. Byrnes or whoever may be the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall be responsible for any regulation issued. Otherwise it may be Mr. McNutt, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Jones, or Madam Perkins, and no one will know who issues the regulation or why it should be carried out. If Mr. Byrnes does it, then we will know, and I think we will all be more willing to follow the rule or regulation laid down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 5, line 5, after the word "work", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That so long as the provisions of this subsection shall be in effect all contracts and subcontracts for the production of war material for the United States shall be subject to renegotiation and for this purpose, regardless of the provisions of any other law, all powers to renegotiate war contracts which were in effect on December 31, 1944, shall remain in effect and shall be so employed as to effectively remove the profit from war contracts and to provide net earnings to contractors in an amount not to exceed what would constitute a fair rental payment to the contractor if the Government were leasing the facilities employed by such contractor from him."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been drawn for a very simple purpose. If this amendment is adopted it will make of the bill before us an equitable measure. Member after Member has addressed the Committee and made an appeal for the support of this bill on the ground that in the declaration of war we pledged all our resources to the prosecution of the war. This bill provides for the requirement that people should work in war plants. As I stated in my remarks a couple of days ago, I believe that without question in time of war the Government of the United States has the same right to require of any citizen service to his Nation in another capacity as it does in the capacity of service in the armed forces provided the Government does not require of one individual that he work for the private profit of another individual. In my judgment this bill does require that. If my amendment is adopted it would not be true. For under my amendment, although the ownership and operation of the plant would remain as it now is, renegotiation would be continued and it would be the instruction of the Congress that that renegotiation

should be carried on in such a fashion as to recover all profits from war contracts. But it would leave to the contractor a net earning equivalent to what a fair rental upon his facilities would be if in fact the Government were renting those facilities from him. This amendment would take the profit out of war. If we mean what we say about pledging all resources to the war or if we desire at all equality of sacrifice, no objection will be raised to this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I do not want this proposal to be confused with my substitute amendment to the bill which I cannot offer, of course, until later. This present amendment is offered in the event that that substitute fails of adoption, which I earnestly hope it will not. Of course, if the substitute is adopted it will take the place of the May bill. But if the May bill remains the bill upon which we must finally vote, then I want it to be an equitable bill. I want it to be such a bill that we can go to the people of this Nation and say, "Yes; we drafted men for the armed forces and therefore we are drafting labor, but we are also asking of property a corresponding sacrifice on the home front by taking the profit out of war."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending bill for two reasons: First of all, this is a manpower bill, in the form of an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] attempts to extend the Renegotiation Act, within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, and relates to war contracts rather than to personnel.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM). The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there any portion of the bill in the opinion of the Chair, which relates to the question of compensation to be paid to workers, who would be drafted to work under this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised whether there is anything in the bill about compensation. There is something relating to travel pay, but nothing as to compensation, in the recollection of the Chair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It occurred to me that if there were something that could be so construed, the question of profits might be related to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not believe the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYTER: On page 5, in line 5, insert:

"(5) When a registrant volunteers for or is ordered to employment pursuant to this paragraph, the employer shall have a duty to accept such registrant for employment unless the employer has a reasonable belief that such registrant is not qualified for such employment."

Renumber the remaining paragraphs on page 5.

Mr. RYTER. The purpose of this amendment is to plug and remove a clearly unjustified condition that now remains in the bill in favor of employers.

The proposed bill, without this amendment, imposes a duty and responsibility upon labor without imposing a similar and collateral duty on the employer. Under this bill a laborer must volunteer or be ordered to take employment; but having volunteered or having been ordered to take employment, there is no guaranty offered to him that the employer must extend to him the employment that he seeks. The employer then is given a free hand and may, with impunity to himself, do the very thing that the employee may not do, under a law which imposes a severe penalty and jail sentence.

The absence of such provision in this bill may also have the effect of curtailing the number of reasonable choices that would be extended to the employee under the law; and in order to impose an equal responsibility and duty upon labor and industry alike, I urge favorable consideration of this amendment.

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

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, as this debate goes on and the different amendments are discussed I am more firmly convinced that this bill will hinder, not help, the war production of this country. We were just discussing, for instance, the proposed so-called F. E. P. C. amendment. I happen to know something about the F. E. P. C.; I was a regional director of the F. E. P. C., and I will say to the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], that there is discrimination as to race, creed, color, religion, and national origin throughout this Nation. Right here in our own Capital City, too, notwithstanding his cry to the contrary. Discrimination? Yes. How about the Capital Transit Co. that has refused to hire qualified Negroes to run their busses and streetcars while you people stand upon the streets shivering and the people who want to get to work in the war agencies here in Washington lose time every day? How about Houston, Tex., where there are two schools for the training of welders: One, the Todd-Houston Shipbuilding Co. and the Brown Shipbuilding Co., which trains only white welders, and the Government school that trains all, regardless of race, creed, or color. The Government school trained thousands of skilled welders and because of their color, because they were Negroes, they could not be hired in either plant; they had to leave Texas and go into the war industries up North because they were discriminated against because of their race. Let me illustrate by the following facts:

UNDERUTILIZATION OF MINORITY WORKERS IN THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

War Manpower Commission reports that the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry will need 99,000 additional workers. Yet many shipyards refuse to employ Negroes except as unskilled laborers. Although Negroes constitute 12.4 percent of the total employees in this industry, they are generally not upgraded to do welding, riveting, or other skilled tasks. The pattern varies widely. Some shipyards use Negroes in a great variety of skills. Others refuse outright to use them. The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., of Mobile, Ala., using Negroes for skilled jobs, announced recently that its Negro workmen had set a record in constructing a new 22,000-ton oil tanker which was built in 61 days. The Delta Shipyard Co., in New Orleans, recently hired more than 100 Negro welders.

On the other hand, discrimination is practiced by the following companies:

Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Co., Evansville, Ind.: This company, making vital LST landing craft, employs more than 17,000 whites but only 700 Negroes. The company refuses to promote or hire Negroes as welders despite critical need for welders.

St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., Jacksonville, Fla.: This company employs 12,000 whites and 1,500 nonwhites, yet refuses to employ Negroes as learners or apprentice welders because of the opposition of the local metal trades council which has a closed-shop contract.

Bethlehem Fairfield Shipyards, Baltimore, Md.: This plant, employing about 35,000 persons, has refused to hire Negro women in any capacity other than as janitresses. When pressed to hire Negro women as well as white women, it stopped the hiring of women altogether. W. M. C. estimates that there are 3,000 to 5,000 Negro women available for shipyard work in Baltimore, some of whom have been trained in Government schools at Government expense for semiskilled work in shipyards.

Richmond Shipyard, Richmond, Calif.: The Kaiser Co. operating this shipyard is unable to employ Negroes in skilled jobs under the jurisdiction of the International Association of Machinists because Local 824 of that union refuses to admit them. The International Association of Machinists has a clause in ritual which bars the admission of Negroes.

Todd-Johnson Shipyards, New Orleans: This company has 4,000 employees, of which only 460 are Negroes employed only as laborers.

Todd-Pacific Shipyards, State of Washington: Less than 1 percent of its staff are Negroes, although Negroes constitute as much as 10 percent of the staff of other west-coast shipyards.

Lake Washington Shipyards, State of Washington, employs 5,000 employees, but only 33 Negroes.

Brown Shipbuilding Co., Houston, Tex.: This company employs 14,000 workers, of which 1,100 are nonwhites used exclusively as laborers. Despite a need for skilled welders and a paid training course given by company, it rejects skilled Negro welders, including graduates from United States financed vocational school for Negroes.

Todd-Houston Shipbuilding Co.: Total employees 17,000, 1,500 nonwhites. Negroes are used only as laborers or helpers. Company refused to hire Negro welders although 1,500 trained in a free Government defense school. Rejected graduate welders leave Texas for west coast or east coast. Three hundred graduates of welding school still available in Houston.

Todd Galveston Dry Docks: Total employees 3,400; nonwhite, 1,000. Negroes never used above helper classification in last 25 years, despite intense effort to recruit new workers. Experienced Negro "helpers" used to break in white inexperienced "mechanics."

DISCRIMINATION IN STREET TRANSIT AND TELEPHONE INDUSTRIES

The War Manpower Commission, in a recent survey of 700 cities having local transit systems, found that less than 25 companies employ Negroes on platform positions—that is, as motormen, or bus or streetcar conductors. The majority of the companies employ Negroes only in service occupations, as track walkers and as helpers in garages and repair shops. In the industry as a whole, of a total of 300,000 employees, about 20,000 Negroes, or 6.7 percent, are employed. Some of the principal cities in which Negroes are denied platform positions are: Washington, D. C.; Baltimore, Md.; Louisville, Ky.; Kansas City, Mo.; Oakland, Calif.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Gary, Ind.; Indianapolis, Ind.; St. Louis, Mo.

The telephone industry, with perhaps one exception, does not employ Negro women as telephone operators, the sole exception being the New York Telephone Co. Some of the major subsidiaries of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. which discriminate against Negro women are: New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Pittsburgh Telephone Co.; Chesapeake & Potomac Co. of Baltimore; Ohio Bell Co.; Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., offices at St. Louis, Topeka, and New Orleans; Southern California Telephone Co., offices in San Diego and Los Angeles.

F. E. P. C. ST. LOUIS DECISIONS

Following public hearings held in August 1944, the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice issued a series of seven decisions finding that seven St. Louis companies engaged in discriminatory employment practices against Negroes. A summary of the findings follows:

1. McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Co.: This company manufactures small arms ammunition, employs more than 2,000 persons. Although it employs more than 500 women and has a critical need for more employees it refuses to employ Negro women. Latest W. M. C. figures indicate that there are 4,000 Negro women seeking employment in St. Louis. In addition, the company confines Negro men to janitor and unskilled laborers' jobs regardless of their qualifications.

2. St. Louis Shipbuilding and Steel Co.: This company is engaged in the manufacture of warships and employs about 1,300 persons but employs Negroes only in custodial jobs.

3. Bussman Manufacturing Co.: This company manufactures fuses and other war material, employs about 1,400 persons, refuses to employ Negro women, although it has employed 1,100 white women.

4. Amertorp Corporation: This company manufactures torpedoes for the Navy. Although one-third of its employees are women, it refuses to employ Negro women.

5. Carter Carburetor Corporation: This company is engaged in manufacturing essential war material. It refuses to employ Negro women although it has many white women in its employ.

6. Wagner Electric Corporation: This company manufactures electrical equipment for the armed forces. It employs 2,500 persons, of whom 1,600 are white women. It refuses to employ any Negro women.

7. U. S. Cartridge Co.: This company is engaged in the manufacture of small arms ammunition, employs more than 10,000 persons but arbitrarily restricts the percentage of Negroes to 10 percent, the population ratio in St. Louis. When the company reaches the top of the Negro quota, it refuses to hire any more Negroes although it needs manpower.

If this bill is adopted, you will freeze those people down there into common labor and their skills will not be utilized in the war effort. That is why I say to you this bill will hinder the war effort and not help it.

How about the case of the boilermakers? How about the railroad cases? How about cases right down the line where they have been discriminating against people because of their color, their race, or their creed?

Mr. Chairman, it is about time we looked at this thing from the viewpoint of whether it will injure or help the war effort. Do you mean to tell me that the blood of one man is more precious than that of another, whether he be Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant, white or black? The black man stops a bullet just the same as the white man, and a black man can use a machine just as well as a white man. A black man can turn out war-production materials just as well as a white man. Then why stymie them? Why freeze them in jobs where their skills will not be utilized? Let us give them the rights of citizenship to which they are entitled. This bill will hinder war production. It will create slave labor. When the Communists and the Bourbons lie down together I am suspicious, because they both believe in slave labor. Defeat this bill and save democratic America. Keep America free so that the boys will not have fought in vain.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: On page 4, line 6, after the semicolon add the following: "*Provided, however*, That such regulation shall give full consideration to title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is, I believe, essentially noncontroversial. Under the wording of subparagraph 4 which runs from the middle of page 3 to the top of page 4 of the bill, the Director of Selective Service is given the right to promulgate rules and regulations with respect to returning veterans who have been discharged from the service under the G. I. bill of rights. A great many of those veterans have already been assigned to various schools and universities throughout the United States; in fact I know that here in the District of Columbia in the month of September some 600 men were assigned to different schools and universities in order to carry out our promise that the returned veteran would have the right to continue his education.

Section 4 cuts directly across the privileges that have already been granted to returned veterans and allows the Director of the Selective Service to assign these men to jobs in industry if he sees fit.

The amendment I have offered merely states that in the promulgation of these regulations he shall give full consideration to title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, namely, that he shall take into full consideration the promise of an uninterrupted education which we have given to returning veterans. It affects them only.

I am told that the War Department has no objection whatever to this amendment. I am told also that undoubtedly the rather hazy wording of this paragraph can be cleared up at a later date when the matter comes to conference between the two bodies of Congress, but it seems to me in carrying out the statutory obligation that we have we ought to make it clear that as far as the returned and discharged veterans are concerned, we are not going to abrogate what we have already put in their bill of rights.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the matter, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted it will be impossible to take any of these men who have been honorably discharged and place them in work provided for in this bill.

Mr. HERTER. It would not make it impossible but in the drafting of the regulations full consideration would have to be given to the promise that has already been made.

Mr. MICHENER. That "full consideration" is just some more language that is indefinite and that can be toyed with and interpreted in different ways. If we mean those men are not to be taken by virtue of this law then why do we not say so?

Mr. HERTER. The reason for not saying so is that a situation might arise in the case of some individuals who have returned to complete physical fitness who have had only a very brief tour of duty in the armed forces and have been discharged and have not yet elected to go into a university or into a school to continue education where they might well be directed into a factory which is essential to the war needs.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is true, then here are two boys who come home together, afflicted in like manner. One of them immediately enters school. The other man goes home to rest for 2 months. In the meantime we pass this

bill. There would then be a differentiation between the treatment accorded those two honorably discharged soldiers afflicted in the same way.

Mr. HERTER. I do not think so. Under any sensible regulations that might be issued, these men would have to be exempted.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not remember particularly the language in the other bill to which the gentleman refers, but, if I recall correctly, it seems to me that the serviceman has a limited time in which to elect to go back to school. If that be the case and he is assigned to industry by the selective-service board, he would lose all rights given him. I believe the gentleman should withdraw his amendment, bring it in in proper form to insure against that and so that the returning soldier may be assured of an education.

Mr. HERTER. I may say to the gentleman that as far as the entire paragraph is concerned the wording of it is very loose. That, I believe, will be admitted by members of the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman's amendment seek to extend the G. I. benefits to those who may be drafted under this bill, or does it seek to protect the returned and discharged veteran in the benefits to which he would normally be entitled?

Mr. HERTER. It would preserve to the discharged veteran his rights under the G. I. bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the Committee on Military Affairs considered this very question in connection with the provision which we put in the bill that protects discharged veterans who are asked to and do take jobs in a war industry. We preserve their rights under the 90-day provision that has been inserted in the law.

We leave it to the discretion of the Selective Service System to make whatever regulations are necessary in order to protect the interests of the veterans. If this amendment is agreed to, it will relate only to the subject of those in the schools, whereas the bill is written so that the selective-service people can protect all of their rights, including those in the schools. This amendment is not necessary and does not help the situation at all.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Under the G. I. bill of rights the specific right granted to the veteran to elect to continue in uninterrupted education can be abrogated completely by selective service under the language as it now appears in the bill.

Mr. MAY. I do not think that Selective Service, not being authorized by the G. I. bill to do so, can make any regulation that would affect the provisions of that act. They can regulate only pursuant to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act, and consequently the amendment which the gentleman offers, while I am wholly in accord with the idea advanced, does not help the situation at all.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is my understanding that a somewhat lengthy bill dealing with the entire subject that the gentleman from Massachusetts is interested in has been submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs only a day or so before this bill was reported, and the provision in this bill which leaves it up to the Selective Service to define and write regulations was not put in this bill for the only reason that by the time this bill gets to conference, if it does, then complete regulations covering the entire matter can be written into the bill.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman will agree that the rights of the returning servicemen should be preserved, even though the language in this bill is broad enough, so that they will be protected.

Mr. MAY. If there is any question about it, when it comes to conference, I, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs will stand 100 percent for the veterans, because I have always done that and will continue to do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure of that, but his rights should be protected at all events.

Mr. MAY. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HERTER) there were—ayes 110, nays 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 4, line 6, after the semicolon insert "and the Director shall exclude from the mandatory provisions hereof those veterans who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to do just one thing. As you read the language at the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4 it says that the Director of Selective Service may by regulation exclude certain veterans.

All I am asking is that these men who have already honorably served, some of them overseas for long periods of time and through several major engagements, some of them who have already been once drafted for service—who have already once had their homes broken up—shall not again be subjected to a draft for labor with the consequent breaking up of new homes, many of them established through the assistance provided by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

As far as the voluntary phase of the bill is concerned, I think the record will show that 75 percent of these returning veterans able to work are going into war-supporting industries. I think it is only fair, and it cannot hurt this bill in any way, shape, or form if the committee will accept this amendment, to exclude from this labor draft these men who have honorably served in the armed forces during this war.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman's amendment and think it ought to have approval.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is opposed to the adoption of this amendment for the very reason that it is far-reaching, much more so than it has no doubt been regarded by the gentleman who offered it. There are thousands and thousands of men who have been discharged from the armed services after very short periods of service. If this amendment should be adopted, it would prohibit the Selective Service System from considering these men either for work duty or for service in the armed forces a second time. It is not anticipated that the Selective Service System will induct very many of them, but it would be precluded from using them for manpower, however much they wanted to work.

We protect those who do go into an actual war job by providing a limitation on the time in which he is to seek a new job. Further, if he has seniority rights in the job which he left to go into the service originally, those seniority rights are protected by this legislation when he returns or when he ceases to work in a war job.

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

Mr. Chairman, supplementing the words that have already been said by the distinguished chairman of this committee, I call attention to the fact that thousands upon thousands of these veterans who have been released from service were released on their own request. They were released in order that they might return to their homes to enter essential industries. This was made one of the terms of the release of several hundred thousand of these veterans. To say now to those men who have been released at their own request and have returned to essential industry that "You may not serve the Nation in an essential industry when you have been released from the service for that very purpose," presents a rather anomalous situation. They want to serve in essential industry, they are serving in essential industry, they were released from service in order to serve in essential in-

dustry, and they should continue to serve in essential industry.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Would not the gentleman agree that a man who has been discharged from the service and is entitled to compensation for injuries or wounds, and so forth, which means a compensable amount of 10 percent or more, should be exempted from the terms of this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with the gentleman. I have thought that a man who wears the Purple Heart ought to be exempted. He has done his full share of duty to the Nation. On the other hand, that situation would not be reached by this amendment. This amendment would merely complicate the situation. I think it can be reached by regulation, as we outline in the bill. I believe it should be reached in that way.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman from Louisiana and the chairman of the committee both will make that statement here on the floor of the House in order that it may be some measure of compulsion upon the Director of the Selective Service System when it comes to making the regulations. I should be delighted to hear the gentleman from Kentucky confirm that statement.

Mr. BROOKS. I will do my full part in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan: On page 5, line 16, after the word "civilian", strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert: "Activities engaged solely in the production or distribution of war material shall, in lieu of being ordered to make application for, and to accept, employment in such activity, be ordered to make application for, and to accept employment in another activity, not so engaged, selected by the local board."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively simple amendment to which I hope the Committee will not object because the purpose of it is twofold. First, to exempt the true conscientious objector:

(a) From working in a plant whose entire output goes to the armed forces;

(b) From working for a carrier or distributor who transports or distributes products to the armed forces only; and

(c) From making a product used only by the armed forces.

And, second, to force the conscientious objector to accept employment not contrary to the above as ordered by the local board, thus not allowing him to pick and choose what he will do.

This amendment is designed to deal solely with a very unfortunate situation existing in three conscientious objectors' camps in the United States that are under direction of the Selective Service System. One of them happens to be in my district about 1 mile from Germfask. General Hershey's office tells me they are without legal authority to cope with a most distressing situation which a recent American Legion convention has by formal resolution described the camp at Germfask as a cesspool of iniquity.

I want to read a letter at this time which I just received from the judge advocate of the Michigan Department of the American Legion, the Honorable Richard J. Nebel, of Munising. It is as follows:

I have just returned from the mid-winter conference of the Upper Peninsula Association of American Legion Posts and the fifth zone of the State of Michigan comprising the Legion posts of the Upper Peninsula, 40 in number.

It was brought to our attention that the so-called objectors' camp located 1 mile from Germfask in Schoolcraft County, near Blaney Park, is running without control of any officials. There are approximately 65 objectors—there are actually about 100—of which it is estimated not over 8 are really religious objectors. The rest are crackpots of all descriptions, principally of communistic leanings, who are permitted to send out literature, distribute same, interfere with the few real conscientious objectors, spoil food, destroy Government property, threaten and assault the camp manager, invade surrounding territory causing the people of Newberry, Manistique, and Munising humiliation, shame and disgrace by their conduct, and in general deporting themselves in an unpatriotic manner.

We were told that both Newberry and Manistique had forbidden the inmates of this camp to enter their confines. Of course, there is no law for that. But the point is that the Government of the United States should not permit this humiliation upon the citizens of the Upper Peninsula and cause them to take the law into their own hands.

This camp was built with the idea of having the inmates work on the Seney Federal Wildlife Reserve. Mr. Johnson, the superintendent of the reserve, is a high-grade type of patriotic citizen, a veteran of the last war. I have every confidence in him. I believe that this matter should be investigated at once. There isn't any question that gross indecency and sexual perversion are taking place, that Government property is being destroyed, that the camp is entirely out of control, and that greater crimes will ensue unless this camp is put under the protection of the War Department and properly run by the military police.

Of course, that is impossible under the law. The letter reads further as follows:

Either that should be done or immediately ship that crowd of subversive inmates to prisons for prison confinement and discipline.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we do have a very, very serious situation up there. General Hershey's office tells me they are absolutely without any power to control it.

I believe General Hershey's office feels that this amendment which I have suggested to the pending bill would be entirely in order and would give them the control they need over this camp. I hope no objection will be raised to it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you how dangerous this situation is up there in Germfask. I want to say right here and now that some innocent people are apt to suffer as a result of bloodshed unless those in charge of this camp are given some control over them. If the membership will read my remarks in the RECORD yesterday, on pages 616–618, they will learn more about this distressing situation than I have time to discuss here today, but I warn you, unless conditions change at Germfask, and change fast, some of our good, law-abiding citizens up in that country are apt to take the law into their own hands, they are apt to personally injure or perhaps kill some of these inmates, who have been deporting themselves so disgracefully, and the first thing you know one or more of these inmates is going to be seriously hurt and then, of course, it would not be he who will be hauled up in court but is apt to be some citizen whose patience has run out.

We are not used to that type vermin in our midst, and if need be our otherwise law-abiding citizens up in that country will deal with them straight from the shoulder. The trouble is this sort of tripe are backed by the American Civil Liberties Union and its seemingly inexhaustible stream of lawyers hired by funds ample enough to carry their cases to the highest courts of the land. On the other hand, you cannot expect either our local prosecuting officers, operating on a very limited budget, or even our Federal district attorneys to clutter up the courts with a bunch of cases involving such riff-raff.

The situation is so serious, Mr. Chairman, that this American Legion group, recently assembled, is on record with this formal resolution which they have sent me and which I read to you now:

Be it resolved, That the Attorneys General of the United States of America and of the State of Michigan take steps to immediately investigate the deplorable conditions that exist at the so-called objectors camp at Germfask in Schoolcraft County and bring and institute proper legislation to remedy this cesspool of iniquity; and be it

Resolved further, That our Congressmen and Senators from the State of Michigan be requested to cause an investigation of Camp Germfask with the principal purpose of putting this camp under proper control.

Moved by William Kuivenen and supported by Art Gilbert. Carried.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, recently my attention was directed to the rising tide of resentment and criticism among veterans of World War No. 2 because of the issuance of an indistinct, cheap, and unworthy discharge button which has been issued so as to protect these patriotic sons and daughters against the unwarranted and irresponsible jibes of some thoughtless people who should know better and should

guard their expressions. Instead of serving this intended purpose of identifying our returned and honorably discharged veterans, a cheap plastic imitation of what ought to be a real mark of distinction and honor does just the opposite.

The reasons are obvious; the discharge button is too small, indistinctive, and inexcusably cheap. Instead of being made of bronze or other suitable metal, it is a gilded plastic mold, about on par with products heretofore made in Japan. Just why the War Department singled out the veterans for a penny-pinching policy is unknown and unexplained, but I believe that Members of this House ought to ask the question and insist that immediate remedial steps be taken by the War Department to issue a badge, a medal, or call it whatever you will. It should, however, be substantial, distinctive, and worthy of the patriotism, valor, and sacrifice of these citizens who have given more than their share for America in the conflict on the battlefields and who are now giving more on the production line to back up their buddies at the front. Remember that beneath the toil-greased shirt may be found the indelible scar of a German or Jap bayonet or bullet. Penny-pinching is not in accord with the attitude of the American people, especially when applied to our veterans.

I trust the War Department will take cognizance of these remarks and will exercise proper discretion in correcting an irksome and a humiliating problem.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the Congress. This has met with great resentment on the part of many of our returning servicemen and I trust some proper action will be taken to remedy the situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to join my colleague from Michigan in his remarks. I have had similar complaints. I think something should be done by the War Department or Veterans Administration to correct it, in order that these men may have a proper insignia to distinguish them.

Mr. DINGELL. I am grateful to my friends for their expressions in this matter. In my city of Detroit there is brewing a storm of protest right now because of the cheap, plastic, insignificant, little emblem that has been given, that does not serve the purpose. Something should be done. Whenever we give discretionary power to the War Department they should use it properly for the benefit of the veterans.

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

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming may be authorized to speak for an additional 5 minutes, due to the fact that he was the author of the bill that is offered as a substitute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The distinguished gentleman from Texas said that the Harness amendment was nothing more than a pious appeal to the people of America. The production of free enterprise and free labor in America has amazed the world. That production has enabled us to put the tools of war in the hands of our boys on every battlefront, and in addition we have been able to give valuable assistance to both Britain and Russia. I am convinced that if we appeal to the patriotism of the American people we can accomplish more through voluntary action than through any compulsory method. It seems to me that any benefit that might come from the May bill would certainly be offset by the compulsory proposals of that bill. Free labor in this country will do the job if but given the chance.

The Harness substitute for the committee bill proposes to use the facilities of the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission to solve this problem. In the first place, the draft boards of America are required to call up every man from 18 to 45 years of age except those presently in the service for the purpose of adequate occupational classification of each registrant. Those not now engaged in war activities or war-supporting activities or in other essential work will be called upon to state in writing whether they will voluntarily respond to a call from the proper governmental agency to work in the war effort.

A few weeks ago we were told that 300,000 men were needed in the war plants. They now state they will need 700,000 before July 1. What do they need 700,000 men for? They say they need 300,000 in the critical industries of this country, 200,000 for war-supporting industries, and 200,000 to arm the French. But bear in mind that at this moment they need only 150,000 in the critical industrial plants. The rest of them are anticipated to be needed between now and the end of June. In addition to that, they propose to take 200,000 men from industry and place them in the Army. The total requirement, therefore, between now and the end of June amounts to 900,000 men for essential war industry.

Where are we going to get them? In the first place they are pointing the finger at the IV-F's. It is estimated that are four and one-half million IV-F's. Two and one-half million are estimated to be employed in war plants today. Five hundred thousand IV-F's are maimed and disqualified from working in industry; but there are a million and a half able to work in industry and it is my idea that if they are called before the draft boards, 99 percent plus of those IV-F's will go anywhere or do anything on a voluntary basis. A million and a half men went back from the war plants last summer when high Army people told us that the war against Hitler would be over by the end of 1944. These men can also be channeled back into war industry on a voluntary basis. They went to work in the war plants voluntarily before and they will do it again. In addition to that, in the next 5 months 300,000 men will be discharged from the Army other than for casualty reasons. From those 3 items we have a pool of over 3,000,000 men to call on for volunteers.

My bill in addition to all these things will require the draft boards of the country and the management and labor committees of the War Manpower Commission to investigate every defense plant in America to determine the wastage and hoarding of manpower. In these cost-plus-a-fixed-fee plants millions of man-hours are wasted. There is our great reservoir of skilled workers—9,300,000 of them. Engineers have said that conservatively we can eliminate 10 percent of those people—900,000 men—and carry on the work more efficiently. The War Production Board itself has stated that they can take from 500,000 to 800,000 men out of munition work in this country without interfering in the least with production.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Will not the gentleman from Wyoming who is really the author of the bill which has been offered as a substitute for the committee bill explain to the House how the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission will cooperate to bring about these results?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The Selective Service System under the Harness amendment is required to work under the supervision and control of the area director and the management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission. They would send consultants into every one of those plants. They could hire outside technical help and go to the plants to find out if there is any wastage or hoarding of labor and in addition to that we are appealing to the working people of America to come in and give that information voluntarily to the draft boards. I am convinced there are millions of people working in the defense plants in this country who will go before their boards and voluntarily give them information about such scandalous wastage of labor that will rock the Nation. But if necessary they can subpena either management or labor to disclose the facts.

When they find evidence of surplus labor the War Manpower Commission can enforce the release of those men for work in critical plants. The amendment under consideration provides that the local draft boards and the management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission shall conduct in-plant surveys in every one of these defense plants and rout out the unnecessary labor in those plants. They will apply manpower ceilings on noncritical industries. High engineering authorities in this country say that from this pool of 9,300,000 men

employed in munitions work that conservatively 10 percent can be selected from those plants and used in the critical industries and not interfere with their production in the least.

The War Manpower Commission has 25,860 employees. They have 1,550 local United States Employment Service offices scattered over the country. They have 500 expert utilization consultants. They have made over 5,000 utilization surveys and have accomplished splendid results. In one plant alone the War Manpower Commission was able to reduce the labor requirements by 15,000 without impairing production. An outstanding example of this is the solution of the heavy rubber-tire problem. The War Manpower Commission was convinced that better utilization was possible in Akron where most of the heavy-duty tires are made. Twenty-four utilization consultants were assigned to survey the five major plants. As a result of findings accepted and approved by management and labor leadership, immediate improvement in output occurred and within 60 days tire production was increased 35 percent without an increase in manpower.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I suppose I come from one of the greatest production centers in the country, the Detroit area. I have appeals from both labor, management, and industry that there is no manpower shortage in that area and that there is no necessity for this legislation. The job can be done on a voluntary basis.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One of the most serious things in this May bill is not its effect on labor but is the fact it says to the little businessman in this country: "Liquidate your business, which we will need after the war, and get yourself some kind of a job either in Government or in an industry that is essential or you go to the Federal penitentiary or you will be fined." I hope the gentleman can assure us in what I want to know. Can the gentleman assure us that there is nothing in his bill that will force men to liquidate their business in the way that the May bill does?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Absolutely, and it will be wholly unnecessary because the Manpower Commission and every engineering company in this country that has examined into the situation states they can get the men right out of the war munition plants and under the volunteer system there will be an abundance of manpower that will not seriously interfere with civilian economy.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I am in favor of the gentleman's substitute; however, I am concerned with section 25, line 21, which states:

> On or after the date of a determination that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in the war effort or on or after the date of his being involuntarily separated—

And so forth. Who will determine when his services are no longer needed? Could a draftee under this bill be retained in some innocuous position, such as dusting off shelves or writing up price tags, doing something that will not contribute to the war effort in an industry that has been declared essential? Who will determine when he is to be released?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The War Manpower Commission will release the men and may I say to the Committee that, in my opinion, is a very important part of this bill. The War Manpower Commission has the power under this bill to go into these various plants and when they find that there is a wastage or hoarding of labor, then they will call upon management and upon labor and labor's representatives to cooperate with them in the selection of men out of that plant to be released. The bill provides that if the man cannot show good cause or if the employer cannot show justification for retaining him, then the War Manpower Commission can order the release of that man and the skilled men not needed in these defense plants will be sent to a critical plant. I have never heard of a man quitting work in a defense plant because he was required to work too hard but I have heard of hundreds who quit because there was no work at all. This is a home-front problem and this bill looks for labor and management working together to solve the problem. In this instance both management and labor oppose the draft system and favor a voluntary plan, and I submit that in this problem they are peculiarly qualified to give us the best counsel and advice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Harness substitute and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes to the committee.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Harness substitute and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes to the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute motion. I move that all debate close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana that all debate on the Harness substitute and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana) there were—ayes 130, noes 140.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 146, noes 137.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky as amended by the substitute.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. By virtue of the action just taken, the debate on this amendment is scheduled to end at 10 minutes after 5.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the proposed work-or-fight legislation has been offered to the American people just 3 years too late. If we ever needed it, the time was in December 1941. Then we stood totally unarmed, completely unprepared to fight the war into which we were plunged. Today, after 3 years of conflict, our Nation has produced the greatest output of military supplies and equipment in the history of mankind. We have done it without a National Service Act. It has been done by the American people without the exercise of military compulsion.

To pass this legislation now is equivalent to saying that industry and the workers of our country have not met their responsibilities. Who can say this in the light of the achievement already recorded? Neither the administration nor the military leadership is offering any complaint of a lack of essential supplies. There is nothing but a conjecture that by the middle of 1945 we may need additional thousands of men for both the service and for our factories.

I find here a contradiction. The President's message to Congress was predicated upon a belief that the war in Europe would be over by the middle of this year. If that is true, we shall not need to continue the process of large-scale inductions indefinitely into the future. We should be able to maintain our armies and our allies fighting in the Pacific without the need of additional thousands of employees because the supplies which are now used to fight the European war could be sent on to the Pacific.

But apart from this contradiction in the administration's proposals for selective service as opposed to the anticipation of the approaching end of the European war, there is still another basic objection to the proposed legislation.

To assure a supply of 700,000 workers and 900,000 additional soldiers, the proposal before us would place 18,000,000 men under Government control. That control is justified for military service to preserve the Nation. It is unjustifiable for the purpose of compelling work for private employers under the American tradition.

I am opposed to placing power in the hands of any administration, no matter what administration that might be, which vastly exceeds the need expressed by that same administration.

No man would use a 14-inch cannon to hunt a duck. The Federal Government is asking for a cannon, when by its own admission it does not need one. If the power is to be granted to the Federal Government with the understanding that it will not be used, it should not be asked. Moreover, it should not be granted.

Our people have come a long way in the last 3 years. They do not want their lives regimented any more than is absolutely necessary for the winning of the war. We might have been sold on a National Service Act after Pearl Harbor. We cannot be stampeded into such legislation after Rome, Paris, and Warsaw.

According to statistics, there are employed in industry today approximately 16,000,000 people.

I am convinced that with better planning and more hard work on the part of both management and labor, the productivity of these 16,000,000 people can be increased from 10 to 20 percent. This would more than offset today's estimated manpower shortage.

Not only do I think that from an overall standpoint we have enough manpower—I think that with few exceptions we have enough facilities.

It seems to me just too bad to start now, in the middle of our full-scale fighting effort, to make large quantities of new machine tools, build new plants, start new housing projects, move people by the thousands around the country, in the face of a transportation shortage, and go through all of the motions that will be reflected in increased output only a year or year and a half from now.

That is no answer. We cannot win the war today on what we can produce in the latter part of 1945 and in 1946. There is not time for that sort of planning to achieve the desired result. The need for increased output is immediate. Our fighting men are asking for more shells and more guns today.

The solution does not lie in new machines and new plants and new housing and mass transfers of people. The solution lies in more output per plant, per machine, and per worker.

Management of industry and management of labor, you are being challenged by the generals and the admirals on our fighting fronts. You, Mr. Industrialist, can meet this challenge by tightening up your controls, your planning, and your scheduling.

You, Mr. Labor Management, can meet this challenge by adhering to your no-strike rules, by reducing absenteeism, and by persuading your members to produce at 100 percent.

There is an answer to the manpower situation, and it is a simple answer.

The answer is work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it my understanding that the chairman of the committee will move to rise at about 5 o'clock.

Mr. MAY. I told the gentleman this morning that if we were not close to a conclusion of the bill we would rise about 5 o'clock. I will try to keep my word. That is the reason I wanted to close debate earlier, so that we could get rid of this amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] would agree that we might quit at 5 o'clock and we will have 5 minutes on each side tomorrow to conclude the debate on this amendment.

Mr. MAY. Well, if we have that time left, of course, it can be equally divided. I want the last 10 minutes of the time for the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Well, if the gentleman would move to rise at 4:45 that would leave 15 minutes and we will take 5 minutes and you can take 10 minutes.

Mr. MAY. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, there has been much law discussed and there has been much impassioned oratory on this bill, but it simmers down simply to two points. On one side we have the President and his military aides asking for this bill and on the other side we have American labor and management saying it not only is unnecessary but very liable to hurt production in the war effort. Those who say this bill should be passed have a feeling that we need compulsion. Those who are opposed to it say that we do not. Those two arguments add up to zero. There is only one good argument for passing this bill that I have heard. It was expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], who is Speaker of this House. It was expressed yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It is simply this, it is the effect on the morale of our troops which the defeat of this bill may have.

I would like to call attention to the fact that this is not the first time the President of the United States has called for the conscription of labor. I would like to quote to you a part of his language contained in the veto message on the Smith-Connally Act of June 25, 1943, when he said:

> I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in the plants in possession of the United States.

In that message he asked for the power to conscript all labor, meaning men and women, up to the age of 65 years, who went on strike in Government-operated plants; and then he said in the next paragraph that the only alternative to that was universal service. Now he asks for the power to conscript labor for the purpose of increasing production. If that is what he wants it for, I think the American people should listen to those who are engaged in production.

I hold in my hand several telegrams, copies of which no doubt have been sent to every Member of this House, from the leaders of the organized labor groups, including in my case the California State Federation of Labor and the Los Angeles Central Labor Council. Not taking those messages as finally conclusive, I determined to call one of the leaders of industry in my general area on the telephone, a man who is responsible for the production in an enormous shipyard and who is engaged very actively in the war manpower question. I asked him if he had read this bill. He replied that he had. Then I asked him what effect he thought it would have on production. Listen to what he said: "It would insert into our plant a miscellaneous group of people, most of whom did not want to be there in the first place, and it would therefore badly upset production."

He said: "In the second place, we must consider the effect on the persons who are now employed here. This type of legislation will take the starch out of them."

That is from one of the largest production men in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to my unanimous consent granted, I include three telegrams as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 30, 1945.*
Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

For reasons expressed in my letter of the 26th please oppose the May bill and support substitute H. R. 1803 as introduced as after a lapse of 80 years we cannot restore involuntary servitude and expect to solve our problems.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 30, 1945.*
CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

California State Federation of Labor is vigorously opposed to May conscription bill and requests that you support the noncompulsory substitute, H. R. 1803.

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary, California State Federation of Labor.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 30, 1945.*
Congressman CARL HINSHAW,
Washington, D. C.:

Two hundred and fifty thousand members of the American Federation of Labor in this area through their elected delegates have unanimously expressed complete disapproval of the May conscription bill providing for slave labor. We urge support of the noncompulsory substitute bill H. R. 1803 and again respectfully ask that you oppose the May bill.

W. J. BASSETT, *Secretary,*
Los Angeles Central Labor Council.

BURBANK, CALIF., *January 31, 1945.*
Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The San Fernando Valley Central Labor Council respectfully requests you to oppose May conscription bill and support substitute H. R. 1803.

CARL M. HAYES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Under authority granted to extend my remarks I include the following:

Mr. Chairman, what is wrong today—so wrong that we need to give compulsory powers to the President to force

men to work in war industry? Last summer while people were making up their minds whom to vote for, the war was seemingly almost over. Even Mr. Churchill joined in the general optimism and said the war could end in 1944. We in Congress were urged to prepare legislation for post-war reconversion and for the disposition of surplus property. There was urgency given to that legislation. The War Production Board even made some material allocations to civilian goods production in plants that were engaged in war production. Cut-backs were made in war production in some categories. Tires were allocated to civilian use and gasoline was made available, rationing restrictions were eased materially, and there was much public discussion over how soon our boys would be returned to their homes at the war's end. Could those actions have been for the purpose of creating a happy and grateful state of the public mind because an election was soon to be held? I am unwilling to believe it. I am unwilling even to think that the war effort could have been so sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. For if that were true, Mr. Chairman, it would necessarily follow that no confidence could be placed hereafter in any statement made by the heads of this administration. And that is not all. Mr. Chairman, the evidence is damning, because the election results had barely been finally determined when the clamps began to descend again on the civilian economy and then set-backs struck our armies in Europe. Had our armies advanced too fast for supplies to catch up with them? What military commander does not know the necessity of keeping his logistics in close coordination with his tactics? That is strategy.

What is the evidence on this bill? It can be summed up in two sentences. The President and his military chiefs say they have to have the power to conscript labor to conduct the war. Labor and management in war industry say it will impede production if anything, but at least it will not aid production.

Impassioned orators on this floor say that to defeat this bill will cause a serious lowering of morale among our boys on the fighting front. That is the only valid argument I have heard that adds up to more than zero. It is an important argument, too. But the other arguments add up to exactly zero. They counterbalance each other. That is to say, the bill should not have been born at all. If it had died a-borning, there could not now be the question as to any effect its defeat might have upon the morale of our boys at the front.

Is this the first time the President asked outright for the power to conscript labor? No. Let me quote to you the President's own words in his veto message on the Smith-Connally Act. He said this on June 25, 1943:

> I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in plants in the possession of the United States.

In that message he asked for the power to conscript all labor, meaning men and women, who went on strike in Government-operated plants, and said the only alternative was universal service. Now he asks that power to increase production. In other words, he wants the power to conscript labor and industry and agriculture.

This bill is a long way short of the President's desire. It merely puts on a little compulsion. It does not invoke the Articles of War. It applies only civil penalties. But the President is willing to accept this slice if he cannot get his whole loaf.

What can be the matter with the Military Affairs Committee of this House. Why does the committee bring in a little bill like this one. Is it reluctant to bring in a bill giving the President the full power to conscript all men and women between the ages of 18 and 65 years? If, as members of the committee say here on this floor, we must support the Commander in Chief and the military heads by giving them everything they ask for, including all the powers they want, then why does the committee now come here with this bit of crust instead of the whole loaf that the President demands?

There can only be three reasonable answers to that question.

First. That the committee members themselves are unwilling to grant those powers to the President.

Second. That the committee believes that such a measure would be roundly defeated on the floor of this House if it were brought here, which means that the country itself would not stand for it.

Third. That the boys in the fox holes would be deeply disheartened by the knowledge that our country had gone totalitarian, the very thing they are fighting, while they were not here to prevent it.

Mr. Chairman, our boys abroad want strikes stopped. Does this bill stop strikes? The committee says it has nothing to do with strikes or prevention of strikes.

Mr. Chairman, our boys abroad are running short of some important items, we are told. Will this bill increase production? American industry and labor say "No." They are the producers and should know best.

Mr. Chairman, our military leaders say they need replacements. Will this bill bring them replacements? The Selective Service Act already gives them the power to draft replacements.

Then what does this bill do anyway? This bill gives the President power to use compulsion upon every male between 18 and 45 to stay in whatever war-production job he may hold, or to take whatever job may be offered him. Does it make him actually work if he does not want to? No. It just makes him resentful and less liable to do his utmost.

What is the right answer to this production problem? Is it compulsion? No; the right answer is leadership, and a wider use of fixed-price contracts or bid contracts.

Where is the voice of such leadership? Where is the voice of the duly elected Commander in Chief? Is it raised? No. Why not? Is he just a little ashamed of having allowed the workers in our war factories to get the idea that they had better hustle back to their peacetime jobs before somebody else got there first? I wonder. But this is the time for leadership—not the whip. American workers do not need a whip, Mr. Chairman. All they need is to be told the truth—the unvarnished truth—and they will do their part with a will. Let the Commander in Chief call upon them to redouble their efforts and they will respond.

I am sorry this miserable bill was brought to this floor. I am sorry that it did not die a-borning in the fertile mind of its distinguished author.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is here—and the only good argument I can find to vote for it is the effect that its defeat, now that it is here, could have upon the morale of our boys who are facing our enemies. They have been misled into believing that this type of legislation will increase productive effort at home.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Harness substitute, H. R. 1803. If that fails I shall vote for the Voorhis substitute. If that fails it is my present intention to vote against H. R. 1752, the May bill.

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

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, what we are interested in is getting greater production. The Barrett substitute if you will bear with me and give me your attention whether you are against our position or not, the Barrett substitute provides that you give an opportunity to volunteer to everyone not now working in essential war plants; and this will touch maybe 5,000,000 men. Is there anything wrong with that? If the draft board calls them in and asks them to sign up in their own community whether or not they are willing to go anywhere the draft board wants them to in essential war industry, do you not think that the power of public sentiment there on the decentralized home front will get 10 or 15 or 20 percent? I think 75 percent of them will volunteer for essential war work. And it answers the question that the gentlewoman from Illinois propounded. There is a very thin line in the services left for civilian production in this country; it is thin on the farm, and among the little business people. The purpose of the Barrett bill is to protect that necessary home front and not thin that labor market further unless it is absolutely necessary to the war effort to do it. How do we protect that home front? We protect it and we look forward to greater war production because the second arm of the bill for the first time implements the selective-service boards in connection with the War Manpower Commission and instructs them to go into these defense plants and determine whether or not there is a hoarding and a wastage of labor. If they determine there is a hoarding and wastage of labor in these plants, then to the plants that have a

shortage after the declaration is made these people will be transferred.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said that there is no compulsion after you have declared a labor shortage. Let me say to you men who are in favor of implementing the War Manpower Commission that three of the most able men of the War Manpower Commission helped us write this bill, and they told us it would do the thing they wanted to do, the thing that the administration would not permit them to do. They showed us charts and graphs where when they were able to get into these plants, convinced us that they did find a hoarding of labor and that this bill would help to get greater production.

With reference to compulsion, may I say that after a thousand men are found in plant A that are not needed, they are then referred to plant B where there is a shortage. What is the compulsion? The compulsion is in the fact that the War Manpower Commission has control of the priorities for material for all the plants of this Nation and every man employed in these war plants practically has to be employed through the U. S. E. S. The compulsion comes about in this way: When he is declared surplus and the suggestion made that he go elsewhere to work, if he refuses to do so and is of military age and qualification he may be taken into the military service. If he is without that category then he can no longer get unemployment insurance, and he cannot get a job in any other plant because he must enter through the U. S. E. S. That is the compulsion that the War Manpower Commission is working under now, and it is entirely effective and efficient.

My thought is that you cannot solve the labor problem in the country unless you find out where the shortages are and where the overstaffing is. There are 600 engineers and consultants down there now; yes, many thousands of them working for the War Manpower Commission. They have the facilities and training. They can make the decision, and they, in conjunction with the selective service draft boards of this country, working together, may determine the surplus, declare that surplus and the compulsion that must be resorted to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, what is the proper way to get greater production? A great many of you people have been priding yourselves on being leaders in social legislation. You are throwing all that out and turning the clock back. You are now voting for fines and jail penalties. You are assisting the powers that are trying to get more men in these overstaffed war plants the same as you are going to drive them into the understaffed plants, all without investigation. Certainly that is not the right way to reach this manpower problem. In private business you would not implement people to drive more men out of the thin lines of service, off the farms, and away from the small business of this country, destroying the home front by driving more men into plants that are already overstaffed. There are 18,000,000 people working in the United States war effort today and there is no question but what at least 10 percent of them could be released from their present services and turned over to plants in which a shortage exists. You would get the skilled mechanics that are now on the pay roll of the Government because the Government is paying the bill, taken and put into those areas where labor shortages exist rather than bringing in the unskilled rookies at the expense of the civilian economy of the country and adding billions of dollars to the war debt.

There is no rhyme nor reason for passing the May bill, but, in my judgment, there is a sound argument for passing the Barrett substitute.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the National Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and many other laboring organizations have endorsed the Barrett substitute. These are the groups who must provide this extra production. They say it can be done under the provisions of the Barrett bill. They say it cannot be done so effectively under the May bill with its fines, jail sentences, and compulsion. These organizations are right. The Members of Congress will act wisely if we follow their advice.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debate both pro and con on H. R. 1752, known as the National Service Act, and sometimes called the work-or-fight bill. There is nothing in this bill that will make a man fight; it should be called work-where-the-Government-wants-you-to-work-or-go-to-jail bill, or it could be called a bill to do away with voluntary enterprise in America. We want to do everything to help win the war, and I think we must decide whether or not, in our opinion, this bill will help production and bring an early victory. I personally do not feel it will. I believe the passage of this legislation, H. R. 1752, as it is now written, will cause confusion among the workers and employers, lower the morale of our soldiers and civilians, and in this way prolong the war.

We are told General Marshall, Admiral King, and other leaders want this bill. We have a high regard for and great confidence in General Marshall, Admiral King, and all of our military leaders. They are wizards in military and naval tactics, but I do not feel they have sufficient knowledge of how to operate a farm or an industry. They are not trained in the production field; they are trained in the tactics of war. I believe that General Marshall, Admiral King, and all military leaders want production, not simply the May bill or any other bill. They want our boys at the front to have the necessary food and equipment, so when a drive is started they can continue on to victory and not have to stop and wait for supplies.

One point that impresses me is that no one seems to know just how many men are needed for production—some say 148,000 and others as high as 700,000. If no greater number than indicated in these figures is needed, why not obtain them from the 3,000,000 people who are now on the Federal pay roll? I firmly believe the number needed to give this necessary increase in production can be taken from the Federal bureaus which are so overstaffed, and can be placed in essential industry without hindering the efficiency of the bureaus and departments from which they are taken. I feel the biggest hoarder of manpower is the Federal Government itself.

This bill is not wanted by labor or industry—the two groups which are responsible for, and have the greatest knowledge of, production. I certainly would not want to place Green, Whitney, Murray, Crawford, and other labor and industrial leaders in charge of our military tactics, and neither would I want to place our military leaders, Marshall, King, and others, in charge of production.

This compulsory labor bill would give the Director of War Mobilization the right to tell you and me that we would have to resign our present positions and work for someone else, although we may have no knowledge of the work we would be assigned, and this work might be hundreds of miles from our homes and families. Are these the principles of a republic? Is this what our sons and daughters are fighting for?

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this bill, as it is now written, which would place us under the dictates of one man, is a "dictatorship" bill, and should be defeated. Let us forget our greed for power and unite to produce, in order to win the war and return our boys and girls home to a free country at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if I were convinced the passage of the so-called May bill would shorten this war by 1 day or 1 hour, or save the life or prevent the injury of one man in the armed forces, of course I would support it. I resent implications from certain quarters that a vote against this bill, or vote for any other measure, is letting anyone down.

Our distinguished majority leader says we must view this legislation from the interests of the United States of America. That is exactly what we are trying to do. Everyone on the floor of this House wants to do what is right for our fighting men and for our country. There is no argument about that. General Marshall and Admiral King say they are going to need more men and also more material of certain kinds. We want them to have it and we will see that they get it.

Mr. Chairman, there are some of us who feel this measure will not do the job and that there is a better approach to the subject. This is not a work-or-fight bill. It says in substance that men between 18 and 45 not permitted to join the armed forces are compelled to work

in certain designated plants, operated by private concerns, for profit, or be jailed or pay fines. It also provides, however, that in addition to transportation expenses, that after he is put into a job he will be endowed with all the rights and privileges of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. What is the volunteer worker who has faithfully performed his duties going to feel when this man who takes a job under compulsion and works alongside him? But, worse than that, what is the soldier on the battle front and the man on the high seas, the fellow who has lived in fox holes and in the muck and mud for 2 and 3 years—how is he going to feel when you tell him you supported a bill giving this fellow a job with a big wage and then endowed him with the rights and privileges designed especially for the service men and women of this country? If you can explain that away, I would like to hear you do it.

Mr. Chairman, labor and industry have been commended over and over, through the press and by men in high places in Government, for the marvelous job in the production of war materials of all kinds. American free labor has outproduced all other countries in the world combined. Incidentally, the May bill does not apply any compulsions to industry.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] made a splendid address in support of the May bill. He dramatically talked about the Government tapping the boy on the shoulder and compelling him to join the armed forces. I wonder if we might not go a little further and tap governmental agencies and find whether they may be able to get along without a lot of unnecessary employees, as well as eliminate a lot of activities not necessary at this crucial time. Why not tap industry on the shoulder and ascertain if there is hoarding in certain places, as alleged many times on the floor of this House. Find out if cost-plus is wasting manpower in some of our plants as has been charged by Members of this House. You do not cover that in the May bill. Why not tap the distillers who are right now working under a 30-day "holiday" granted by the Government to use their thousands of employees and consume five and a half million bushels of corn to make alcohol for liquor. You know about it. How do you justify it? Tell me. Why not ask the distiller who is making big war profits whether this is his best contribution to the war effort? If you want to be sentimental, or rather reasonable, look around and tap a lot of others who are in nonessential activities; yes, cocktail lounges and a lot of other places where money is lavished and wasted while men are fighting and dying in Europe and the South Pacific today. I say to you it is a shame and a disgrace, and you know it. Cut out a lot of nonessential activities that employ thousands of people and you will have a problem of finding jobs for them. The problem is mismanagement and maldistribution.

Mr. Chairman, only a few months ago, men in responsible places in Government declared the war was almost at an end. People thought it was practically over. We were told of huge surpluses of material. Many plants were shut down. Industry and labor were praised for the wonderful accomplishments. We talked of reconversion and surpluses, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this is the war of every American citizen. Of course, we have had unexpected reverses. Tell us about them and be plain about it. We do need replacements. We need certain material and need it badly. We need an immediate mobilization of industry, agriculture, business, and labor, and all the rest of them. Congress should demand that representatives meet now with those responsible for providing men and materials. Tell them what you want and you will get it. They did it before, and they will do it again. After 3 years under our present system, its a little late to try this sort of legislation. Use the machinery we have, and add the provisions of the amendment I have submitted, or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and there will be no occasion for the adoption of the May bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the so-called Barrett substitute which has been offered by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. I am for that substitute primarily because it represents to my mind an effective approach to the solution of the problem with which we are dealing. It is an effective approach because it proceeds on the way of the voluntary method that has done so much for us already. It provides specifically for certain actions on the part of the local draft boards calling into play, too, the efforts of the War Manpower Commission to search out in the various localities the wastage of labor, the hoarding of labor, and the improper use of labor, yes; and then to point the finger at those situations to bring about the full utilization of available manpower in essential war production. Beyond that it provides that upon certain findings there is vested in the War Manpower Commission the right of compulsory release of employees. That has to do with the matter of manpower ceilings about which we have heard so much and which many believe is the most effective statutory approach to the problem.

There is another thing on which I would like to comment. I said in a talk I made here yesterday that to my mind the employers of the country ought to know more or as much about how to solve this problem as any other group in the land. The employers by and large are organized in the N. A. M., that is the National Association of Manufacturers. Now, the so-called friends of labor frequently complain of the N. A. M. in right bitter tones. I think it fairly can be said of the May bill that it strikes not at the employer but at the employee. It might well be that an employer not motivated by patriotic and just instincts might say, "Well, I would like to have the men frozen in my plant. I would like to have the Government by compulsion drive men into my plant if I need them." So I say that the N. A. M. and the employers generally of the country cannot be said to have a selfish interest in their opposition to this legislation. But they are opposed to it. They ask us to turn it down. There is no particular reference to the Barrett substitute or the substitute that may be offered by the gentleman from California. But in their recommendations I find much to support the voluntary method expressed in the Barrett substitute.

I want to read a few paragraphs from a release and statement made by the N. A. M. and its president to the Committee on Military Affairs in the other body in response to a letter addressed to them on this legislation. It bears out my contention that the passage of the May bill will decrease and not increase production.

This is what they say:

> We realize that the mere phrase, "work or fight" has immense appeal to a public bent on victory. We recognize as well that to those with sons and daughters in the thick of battle it seems only just. Management also has sons and daughters at the front and is as anxious for victory as any other group of citizens. However, our experience in the so-called miracle of war production causes us to point out that ill-considered pressure legislation to get 300,000 workers would backfire badly and could ruin the production efficiency of the hard-working millions in war production.
>
> The net of such legislation would be a gain of 1 to 5 percent more workers at the expense, in the considered judgment of management, of a 15- to 20-percent slump from current production—the exact reverse of what is sought and is at a cost far too high for a psychological experiment. Instead of forcing labor through such legislation and creating strife among the good producers, the association has suggested legislation to Congress that would enable the Government to place a ceiling on civilian employment, the only big source of trained help. Workers thus released from civilian production would have a choice in war jobs without creating the compulsion complex in employees, which might generate a national slow-down of dissatisfied workers.
>
> The public popularly hold to the belief that if you can conscript to fight, you should be able to conscript for work.
>
> Yes; you can conscript for work. But this is not the issue. The point is what will bring the most production.
>
> Managers of American industry have been extremely reluctant to embrace any form of compulsory labor. This has been based on its long experience in dealing with American workers and because this experience has convinced management that compulsory labor does not produce as efficiently as freemen. The record of production since Pearl Harbor justifies this belief.
>
> Arguments have been advanced that compulsory-service legislation is needed to boost the morale of our armed forces; or that it is needed to mobilize or punish a minority of Americans who may not be contributing their full share in the war. Our position is that such legislation will not help war production, whatever else it might do for national morale either overseas or at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, there is only one test as to whether this legislation—H. R. 1752—should be enacted into law. That test is very simple; it is the same test I have previously urged must be applied to other proposals of

this kind: Will it increase production and help win the war?

The working people of America, in every industry contributing to our war effort, have patriotically responded to the emergency by producing both the requirements of war and the necessities of life on an ever-increasing scale to meet those requirements.

The field of shipbuilding, with which I am intimately acquainted through my service on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, is but a single example of their great effort. In the month of December 1944 alone our American shipyards delivered 145 merchant ships of more than a million and a third deadweight tons. During the year 1944 they constructed 1,677 ships with an aggregate capacity of 16,343,436 deadweight tons. The shipbuilding industry has revolutionized shipbuilding and established all-time world records little dreamed of even during the present decade.

Repressive, repulsive, and coercive legislation will not increase production. This record to which I have referred was made by free and untrammeled American labor.

This problem cannot be solved by emotional speeches such as those to which we have listened during the past few days. It can only be solved by cold, hard facts of which this House is not sufficiently informed.

Mr. Chairman, I have been told by the very best of authority that Britain is now building ships for neutral Portugal for that country's post-war trade. Further, I am under the impression that much of the material going into those ships has been furnished by this country on lend-lease. This is going on while we are standing here debating the passage of legislation that will tend to destroy the morale of American workingmen.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because it is contrary to principles this country has maintained and fought for in every major war in which it has been involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support and vote for this bill, H. R. 1572. To do so would be the fatal error of going in the opposite direction from our real objective. Every American wants to do everything possible to support our men on the fighting fronts, even if it calls for total conscription of all materials, machinery, and manpower. This bill does nothing of the kind, nor any part of it. On the other hand, our fighting forces would not want us, and none of us want, to do anything that will destroy our production efficiency and at the same time destroy the fundamental freedom they are fighting for and wish to preserve at all costs. This bill will do just that. That is the real issue in this legislation. It is the fight between the supporters of a foreign, modified, and reformed communism known as state capitalism and the supporters of American private enterprise.

The New Deal procrastinations, indecisions, conflict of authority, clash of personalities, lack of understanding, delays, and failures are again upon us since Donald Nelson was exiled and banished to China. They were the bane of our production effort when Sidney Hillman was at the head of our Office of Production Management. The Truman committee blew the lid off this deplorable situation with the result that Mr. Roosevelt was forced to desert his state-capitalism friends and turn to private enterprise, to Donald Nelson, to bring order and success out of chaos and failure. And what was the result?

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

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. For the gentleman's information I call his attention to a statement by former Senator TRUMAN which deals with this subject and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

From the moment Donald Nelson took charge there was begun a record of production for war which outstripped all the other nations, allies, and belligerents together, and which excited the wonder and admiration of the entire world. To what did this proponent of free enterprise ascribe this success? This Chairman of the War Production Board said, "We call our secret weapon the initiative, intelligence, and 'know-how' of the free American workers."

Thus for nearly 3 years the American private enterprise system showed its superiority over the foreign New Deal theories. But the New Dealers banished Donald Nelson to China, and in a few short months here we are again in confusion and chaos with his successor, and they propose a freak compulsory labor law. Its freakishness is beyond description. But just take one feature. Because of a few slackers it proposes to brand millions as such, and then force them to work, giving them travel allowances, veterans' employment rights, and the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, all of which are denied the voluntary workers with whom they must mingle.

If this would not breed discord and confusion and seriously interfere with war production, I ask what would.

Many other convulsive features can be cited, but it is unnecessary. The bill has none of the earmarks of an aid to production for the war effort, and all the earmarks of socialization, regimentation, and destruction of the American way of living. We may expect, and are experiencing, until another election is in the offing, a tremendous resurgence of the State capitalism New Dealers to regiment the American people under the guise of patriotism. In the whole range of administration activity their actions do belie their tongue.

It was just called to my attention that even in the sugar situation the administration is giving the lie to its hue and cry of a shortage of labor by a regulation of December 26 last.

Shortly after sugar rationing was instituted, O. P. A. issued instructions calling for the pasting of sugar ration stamps to a gummed sheet. The original provision, however, exempted all retailers who did not take in a minimum of 250 stamps per week. This eliminated most of the small independent and delicatessen type of retailers. Subsequently, however, as the manpower and help situation became more acute, all distributors were eliminated from this requirement.

The regulation of December 26 now calls upon everyone to paste their sugar ration stamps to the gummed sheets. The small independent retailer has more than he can handle in reports, regulations, and so forth, and is compelled to spend a great deal of time in filling out these regulatory reports. I am advised that the larger chains estimate that in order to fill these requirements, it will be necessary for them to hire between 40 and 50 people each. Probably a survey of the whole country would show that several thousands will be required merely to fix the sugar ration stamps to the gummed sheets, and literally tens of thousands of independent retailers will have to stay up into the wee hours of the night complying with this present senseless regulation of O. P. A.

O. P. A.'s explanation is that this step is necessary and required because gangsters are now counterfeiting sugar ration stamps, which as you know, are good for 5 pounds of sugar.

It is, therefore, necessary for them, in order to check these violations, to have the stamps affixed to sheets so that they might be examined by the regional offices to determine the counterfeits. They estimate they will be able to save at least 100,000 tons of sugar.

Inquiries have been unable to locate anyone at O. P. A. who has actually seen a counterfeit ration stamp. They say it is impossible for them to advise retailers as to the description of these stamps.

Here is another example of unnecessary Government control merely for the sake of regimentation. If there is counterfeiting of sugar rationing stamps, this does not seem to us to be the proper method of correcting the situation. O. P. A. has the authority and control from the sugar refiner through to the retailer. The method of correcting a condition, such as alleged exists, would be in starting with the refiner rather than the retailer. Rather than to be pressing for a national service act, it would appear to be more sensible to examine into the demands and uses of manpower where it is unnecessarily being wasted.

We do well to examine this and similar legislation carefully, for the New Deal, with its thousands of adherents in key positions, its ability to exert pressure in every domain of our national effort, even the Army and Navy, is constantly busy at its objectives, which are opposed to the best interests of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, the type of man you are going to force into war work by the adoption of H. R. 1752 will not prove a very willing nor a good worker.

Military leaders ask for volunteers when there is a tough job to be done, although they have the power to force any

man to perform any duty that they might deem necessary.

I do not think the American people need to be harnessed and compelled under the threat of reprisal to man the jobs and keep our fighting forces supplied with the tools of war. The American people do not respond to force of threat and reprisal. No liberty-loving people will. But I do think that they will respond willingly and effectively as volunteers.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a choice today between the American way of doing things which, despite temporary set-backs, has proven most efficient and successful in meeting the problems of fighting and winning this war, than the "decree" methods of force and threat of punishment, the demand for blind obedience of the leadership in the name of the state. We have seen that system fail again and again and again. We have seen that system lead to strife and human misery again and again. Twice in the last 25 years that system has plunged the world into war. And having that choice, Mr. Chairman, why choose the way that has failed? Why choose the way of our enemies—Germany and Japan?

I urge the defeat of H. R. 1752—May bill—and the adoption of H. R. 1803—Barrett bill.

The well-being of our fighting men comes closer to me, perhaps, than to all but one other Member of this House. I would have five of the best reasons in the world for voting for this bill if I thought, for one moment, that it would help in the slightest way my five sons who are in the armed forces or assist in the least in bringing them home sooner.

But I do not think that it will do that. On the contrary, there is good reason to believe that this measure violates the thirteenth amendment which says that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist within these United States." And I believe, further, that we are in effect capitulating to the Fascist military and totalitarian methods of our enemies, just as they predicted we would.

Finally, I firmly believe that we would be imposing upon all Americans those very conditions that exist in Europe and thus defeat the very purpose we are fighting to abolish.

We Members of Congress have a very grave duty to perform. We must keep faith with these boys whom we have sent to fight in the four corners of the world. We must constantly guard against the type of legislation that will weaken our system of government and our way of life, for the preservation of which they are giving their lives.

Again I urge the defeat of H. R. 1752 and the adoption of H. R. 1803.

On the title page of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives there is inscribed this quotation from Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice:

BASSANIO. And I beseech you wrest once the law to your authority: To do a great right, do a little wrong.

PORTIA. It must not be; * * * 'twill be recorded for a precedent, and many an error, by the same example, will rush into the state.

I urge the defeat of H. R. 1752—May bill—and the adoption of H. R. 1803—Barrett bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the tentative understanding that was agreed to here today, which I do not believe was in the form of a unanimous consent request, I now ask unanimous consent that debate on the Harness amendment and all amendments thereto on tomorrow be limited to 15 minutes of which 5 minutes is to be allotted to and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], the remaining 10 minutes to myself to be allocated for the committee's closing argument.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thought that was the understanding we had.

Mr. MAY. I am stating it for the RECORD in the form of a consent request.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters that were published in my home-town paper.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain statistics at the point in the RECORD where I discussed the so-called F. E. P. C. amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Edgar A. Hawley, Chicago Negro Chamber of Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks made today a statement from a former Member of the other body, together with copy of a letter.

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

There was no objection.

ALLISTER COCHRANE, 43 YEARS OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago today Allister Cochrane, a young man from Detroit, was called upon as a substitute to report the debates in this House. From that day, Mr. Speaker, without interruption, Mr. Cochrane has continued to render invaluable and faithful service to the House of Representatives. He has endeared himself to every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle in this and every one of the 23 Congresses he has so ably served, from January 31, 1902, down to the present.

It is doubly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we should pause for a few moments today to pay our respects and to acknowledge our indebtedness to this faithful servant of the people. In addition to marking the forty-third anniversary of Mr. Cochrane's employment by the House, this day also marks the seventy-sixth anniversary of his birth. It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Cochrane cannot be present today to receive our personal felicitations but he is now at home recovering from a severe surgical operation. Fortunately, I am informed that his recovery is such that he expects to resume his duties as Official Reporter of Debates in the near future. I am sure I speak for every Member of this House in saying that we rejoice in the prospect of his early return.

Mr. Cochrane came to this House January 31, 1901, as a substitute reporter, and served in that capacity for two sessions. He was then appointed Official Reporter of Debates by Speaker Cannon of Illinois. At the time of his initial appointment he was employed as official reporter for the circuit court of Wayne County in Detroit under Judge Carpenter and had obtained a leave of absence from that position to accept a special assignment in Washington. He was called in as a House reporter suddenly and without an opportunity to

prepare, but, in the opinion of his early associates, he "handled the job like a veteran" from the first day, and he was induced to continue his service.

From that time he has served under 10 Speakers, including Speaker Henderson, namely, Cannon, of Illinois; Clark, of Missouri; Gillett, of Massachusetts; Longworth, of Ohio; Garner, of Texas; Rainey, of Illinois; Byrns, of Tennessee; Bankhead, of Alabama; and the present incumbent, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

In addition to reporting debates in the House, Mr. Cochrane was called upon to render like service at international conferences and special congressional proceedings at times when the House was not in session. Outstanding among these special assignments was the Hague International Conference of 1907, and the famous Lorimer trial in 1911–12.

I deem it a very special privilege, Mr. Speaker, to be able to call these facts to the attention of the House. Like most of the Members of this House, especially those of us who have had the honor of serving here for any length of time, I have always held Mr. Cochrane in the highest esteem and have admired him for his unfailing devotion to the Congress and to our great Nation. Without employees like him the American Congress could not function effectively, and it might well be that its reputation as the greatest parliamentary body in the world would never have been acquired.

As members of this great deliberative body we are continually in the debt of our tried and faithful employees—every one of them, from the newest to the oldest, from the humblest to the highest. Mr. Cochrane, who has served this House longer, with few exceptions, than any present employee, typifies in the highest degree the loyalty, the industry, the efficiency, and the devotion of congressional employees as a whole.

We in Michigan are proud indeed of the fact that Mr. Cochrane, although born in Canada, was raised and educated in our schools, and, in the best of American tradition, worked his way through the Detroit College of Law, from which he was graduated in 1898.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call Allister Cochrane my friend. On this his seventy-sixth birthday, and his forty-third anniversary as a reporter of debates in the House, I salute him and wish him a complete and early recovery from his present illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain telegrams and letters in connection with the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an extract from the Detroit Free Press.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE PUERTO RICAN SITUATION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the significance of my subject, I wish to read some brief but revealing quotations from the writings of a widely discussed public servant who at this time does not directly hold office in the Federal Government but nevertheless occupies a position of influence which is a genuine concern of Congress.

Here are the quotations—six of them:

1. For we have a century and more of development to undo. * * *

2. The first changes will have to do with statutes, with constitution, with government. We shall be changing once for all, and it will require the laying of rough, unholy hands on many a precedent. * * *

3. It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis; it is literally meant. * * *

4. It is a logical impossibility to have a planned economy and to have businesses operating its industries, just as it is also impossible to have one within our present constitutional and statutory structure. * * *

5. Complete economic planning is possible only when there is public ownership and control of the means of production. * * *

6. The most hazardous situation to a man of family is to have the fee simple ownership of land.

Mr. Speaker, here are the philosophy, thoughts, and the purposes of a man who, over a decade ago, vowed that he would "roll up his sleeves and make over America." This man who wishes to undo the progress this country has made under the American system, who wishes to destroy our precedents, who advocates a planned and controlled economy, and hopes to eliminate private enterprise and the private ownership of farm land—this man is Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell.

And these were not mere empty words, for it was not long thereafter that Dr. Tugwell was given the opportunity to put into practice some of his theories of government and economics, and he became one of the original administrators of a planned economy. It is unnecessary for me to recall to your mind his record, first, in connection with the Rural Rehabilitation Administration, and, later, with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in which scarcity of production was adopted as the remedy of our current agronomic ills. You will recall also that, within a comparatively few years, the Tugwellian program was rejected as being entirely too extreme and too foreign to the American philosophy of government, and he was retired to private life.

But the retirement was short lived, for he soon was brought back into public life and again was given an opportunity to effect his plans for a socialized economy. This time his efforts have not been felt directly by the American people, and there has been no general outcry against his practices for the reason that our people have neither known of his activities nor experienced the regimentation which his ideologies entail.

Technically, he does not appear in the Federal picture, since he has been operating in a sphere geographically outside the United States, but he nevertheless is functioning, as of old, under the American flag. And in a comparatively short space of time he has succeeded in his plans for economic regimentation on a scale far more comprehensive and complete than he ever could have dared to propose for continental United States.

Lest you think that he has forgotten or forsaken his plans for remaking the United States, let me remind you that he obviously still hopes to make a comeback in the national picture. In discussing one of the most fundamental phases of the planned economy he now is perfecting in Puerto Rico, Dr. Tugwell said, "It has obvious implications for the South," referring to the Southern States of our Union. The plan in question, Mr. Speaker, calls for Government ownership and operation of the Nation's productive farm land.

In connection with a study of the effect of the law which limits corporate holdings of farm land in Puerto Rico to 500 acres, Dr. Tugwell was sent to that Territory in March 1941 as special representative of Secretary Ickes, whose Division of Territories and Island Possessions has the general responsibility of administering Federal matters affecting the island. While there, he was in close touch with the leaders of the Puerto Rican Legislature which enacted two of the laws which form the initial steps in his totalitarian program. Although he denies any responsibility for them, by their very nature the conclusion is inescapable that his was the brain which started the wheels in motion.

Subsequently, in August 1941, Dr. Tugwell became the appointed Governor of the Island of Puerto Rico, as successor, with the exception of a brief interim appointee, to Admiral William D. Leahy, admitted by most Puerto Ricans to have been the best of all American Governors. This appointment gave Dr. Tugwell the wide-open opportunity to achieve his life's ambition, and the developments of the past 3 years indicate that he is well on the road to success. As Governor, he is the representative of the Government of the United States in Puerto Rico and, as such, should refrain from involvement in local matters of political partisanship. However, even before his appointment, he developed a close working arrangement or alliance with one of the major political parties and began his program for government socialization. By the clever, but improper, expedient of distributing government appointments to the partisans of his ally, he was able to obtain enactment of legislation necessary to round out his program. Already, in the opinion of many responsible Puerto Ricans, the Tugwell administration has seriously impaired much of the good that America has done in Puerto Rico during the 45 years that those people have been under the American flag. Having failed in his determination to undo the century of development here in the United States, he has, in the minds of many, succeeded in undoing the half century of American development in Puerto Rico.

No one can be mindful of certain recent laws of Puerto Rico and not come to the conclusion that there has been developed the nucleus for the most fantastic, fascistic system of government imaginable. It is unbelievable that such a system would be allowed to exist anywhere under the American flag. And yet it does exist, and the reason is that those in the Federal Government who are directly responsible for Puerto Rican affairs are either too preoccupied with wartime responsibilities to recognize what is happening or else tacitly approve the scheme. Certain it is that the American people would want to have no part of it.

But what are these enactments which embody the heart of the Tugwellian philosophies and give lifeblood to his declaration that complete economic planning is possible only when there is public ownership and control of the means of production? The plan is amazingly simple to have come from so complex a mind. By the comparatively simple device of some five or six public corporations or authorities, all manner of economic life on the island is placed in jeopardy by the threat of being brought under governmental control, domination, or outright operation.

The first of these was the land authority, created by the Puerto Rican Legislature in 1941, which has an annual administrative budget of $200,000, and an appropriation of 2,000,000, with authority to issue its own bonds, guaranteed by the people of Puerto Rico in the ultimate amount of many millions of dollars. Moreover, the funds available to this and other of the new authorities can be, and in some cases already have been, increased far beyond these totals by the insular legislature.

This authority is controlled by seven members, all of whom are appointed by the Governor. It is authorized to put an end to large landholdings by corporations, partnerships, or trusts, and to create new landowners and provide means for farmers and slum dwellers to acquire lands. Immediately one notes a striking similarity between the rural rehabilitation program, fostered by Dr. Tugwell here in America in the middle thirties, and this resettlement program inaugurated in Puerto Rico. Under authority of this law, several thousand acres of land have been purchased by the government, subdivided into small plots of 5 and 10 acres and assigned to those individuals who are in desperate economic distress, but who also qualify from political considerations.

But more important, still, the lands of two large companies have been purchased by the land authority and are today being operated by the authority itself, through so-called lessees who actually are nothing more than employees of the government. The authority has announced its intention to acquire, this year, the lands of a half dozen more organizations, totaling perhaps 100,000 acres in all. According to official statements, these lands are not to be divided into small farms, but are indefinitely to be owned, cultivated, and operated by the government itself, through the land authority. Thus, each worker on these thousands of acres of sugar land, and every field manager and superintendent, is to be, in effect, an employee of the government or solely dependent on one political group for his rice and beans and for his very livelihood.

The next of the schemes was the creation of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, which has an appropriation of nearly a half million dollars and authority to borrow up to five million. This authority is governed by a board composed of the Governor and two other public officials, both of whom are appointed by the Governor. It has the authority to conserve, develop, and utilize the water resources of Puerto Rico; to acquire by purchase, lease, and condemnation, water- and power-development properties; to produce, develop, and sell water or electrical energy, and to determine, charge, and collect rates or fees for the use of its facilities. Already, under the authority of this law, all privately owned power companies with but two minor exceptions have been arbitrarily taken over by the government and placed under government control and operation.

The next of these government agencies is the planning, urbanizing, and zoning board, consisting of three members appointed by the Governor and having an annual appropriation of $100,000. The power of this authority is to prepare and adopt a master plan for the development of Puerto Rico, including the character, location of the land, minerals, water, vegetation, and animal life; present and possible utilization for mining, power, irrigation, flood control, navigation, drainage, domestic and industrial use of water, fishing, recreation, and general welfare; and of residential, commercial, manufacturing, recreational, transportation, communication, institutional, governmental, and public-utility facilities, and operations by whatsoever desirable categories. The recommendations of this board, after being approved by the executive council, which is composed of the Governor and six other Puerto Rican officials, four of whom are appointed by the Governor, have the force and effect of law unless nullified by an act of the local legislature. As its name indicates, this board is where the planning and the scheming are done and where the program is prepared for imposing the heavy hand of government on all manner of human endeavor.

Next on the list of public corporations is the transportation authority, created in 1942, which has an appropriation of $1,000,000 and authority to borrow up to $5,000,000, and is controlled by a board composed of the Governor and two other persons, both designated by the Governor. This authority has the power to develop, improve, own, operate, and manage all types of transportation facilities and services in, to, and from the island of Puerto Rico and may exercise all rights and powers necessary or convenient for carrying out such purposes. This is not a governmental agency to regulate the rates and the services of a public-transportation system comparable to our own Interstate Commerce Commission. This is an arm of government empowered to own and operate any and all kinds of transportation whether by rail, by ship, by airplane, or by bus, and powered either by steam, electricity, gasoline, or any other source of energy. Under this authority the government has already acquired or intends to acquire motor bus lines, the railroad system, trolley systems, and even some taxi organizations. In short, it provides authority for government ownership of all modes of transportation.

Further on the list is the communications authority, also created in 1942, with an appropriation of a hundred thousand dollars and a bonded authority of $5,000,000. It is controlled by a board of directors of five persons who are chosen by the Governor and two other persons, both of whom are designated by the Governor. It is empowered to develop, improve, own, operate, and manage all types of communication facilities in, to, and from the island of Puerto Rico and is granted all rights and powers necessary or convenient for carrying out such purposes. Here again it is not a question of regulating the rates and services of communication companies, as is done by our own Federal Communications Commission. This is Government ownership of every kind of communication, whether by telephone, telegraph, cable, wireless, or radio. Already the Government owns and operates the telegraph system on the island and is now in the process of purchasing the telephone system. Soon it will have in operation, no doubt, Government radio transmission stations and will be in a position not only to dictate what types of programs will go out over the air but to determine what each program itself shall be. Not only is this actually Government ownership of all communications but it also very definitely is an opportunity to perpetrate an infringement of the right of freedom of speech.

Another of the new ventures is the enlargement of the authority of the Public Service Commission so that the commission now has power to regulate every company and person engaged in the manufacture, processing, or refining of sugar and has the same powers to examine into affairs of the sugar companies that it formerly had over ordinary public-utility companies. In addition, it has the power to fix prices, standards, rates, and manufacturing conditions; to determine cutting and grinding periods; to inspect accounts of sugar companies, and to determine the value of sugar properties. While the power of this commission is not as broad as that of some of the other authorities, there is sufficient latitude in the power to regulate the sugar industry, so that to all intents and purposes it amounts to Government control and domination of the industry which directly and indirectly accounts for about two-thirds of Puerto Rico's employment and more than half its total income from private sources.

Now comes the Development Bank, created in 1942, with an appropriation of $500,000 and controlled by a board of directors chosen by the executive council, which is composed of the Governor and six other persons, four of whom are appointed by the Governor. As originally conceived, the bank has

the power to accept government and other deposits, to loan money, and to issue bonds, promissory notes, and other obligations.

It has the power to act as agent of every kind of life, fire, accident, casualty, automobile, and other insurance; to manufacture, purchase, or acquire, hold, own, dispose of, invest, trade, or deal in goods, merchandise, real and personal property of every description; to acquire, hold, use, sell, or assign letters patent of the United States or any foreign country, as well as licenses, inventions, improvements, processes, copyrights, trademarks, etc.; to control, to supervise any undertaking constructed or acquired, and to govern the rendering, sale, or exchange of transportation facilities; to carry on any other business necessary, manufacturing or otherwise.

Not only is the bank authorized to engage in the usual banking pursuits but, in addition, it is empowered to carry on any kind of business enterprise, either on its own account, or through agencies or instrumentalities created by it. This bank, coupled with the Development Company having an annual appropriation of $500,000 and a borrowing capacity of $5,000,000, again dominated by persons selected through the influence of the Governor, is in a position to regiment, either directly or indirectly, the entire economic life of the island. There is not a conceivable type of business activity in which the government, through these instrumentalities, could not engage, and the top man is the Governor—Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell.

Further than this, information comes to me that the insular government has immediate plans to engage in all types of insurance activities, the operation of steamship lines, the appropriation of all private banks and consolidation with the Development Bank, the acquisition of all sugar mills, the operation of air lines, the reorganization of the judiciary to remove all judges and court officers who are not in sympathy with the present-day trend there. There are proposals to require the division of profits with employees, the fixing of rents at 6 percent of the assessed values of the properties, and many other plans for so-called social justice. It is reported that the government is contemplating taking over all the rum distilleries on the island—the goose which has laid the golden egg for Puerto Rico—as will later be shown.

Mr. Speaker, living under a government such as exists now in Puerto Rico, it is small wonder that the thinking people of the island are genuinely frightened. Not only does new capital refuse to invest in needed enterprises to give employment to the people, but many of the investors who have been established there for years are liquidating their holdings and coming to the mainland where they can obtain the kind of protection they thought they would have when they invested in Puerto Rico in the first instance and expected to be given the kind of treatment America had given to her continental citizens. Moreover, to date, those who are withdrawing their funds from Puerto Rico for the most part are not the outsiders—continental Americans—but native Puerto Ricans. The island's own people are the ones who are fearful of the Tugwell program. Viewing the situation in Puerto Rico as it exists today, one can readily understand the claim that Governor Tugwell has undone a half century of development in Puerto Rico.

No doubt there are some here who would assert that it should be of no concern to us if this is the kind of government the Puerto Ricans desire and that we should not undertake to dictate to them. Those persons are correct to some degree, but most certainly we do have not only the right but the duty to interfere when it is known that the funds which finance all these socialistic schemes come from the American taxpayer. Who is to protect the interests of American people but we here in the Congress? Maybe Puerto Rico should have the right to do these things, but not with our money. Under the law, the customs receipts on foreign goods sold in Puerto Rico are rebated to the treasury of the island. So is the internal revenue tax on rum which, in normal times, approximated three million dollars but which has steadily increased in past years, until in 1944 it approached one hundred million dollars. In one form or another—as rebates, relief appropriations, and the like—the United States Government has spent in Puerto Rico or made available to it more than half a billion dollars since 1900. I repeat, it is our money, money from the Federal Treasury, which Dr. Tugwell is using for this far-flung social experiment which he has perpetrated on the people of Puerto Rico and hopes to transplant in the 48 States at the first opportunity.

What a beautiful picture this represents for any public official sharing Dr. Tugwell's concept of life and government. He has the ideas, the local government has put the stamp of legislative approval upon them, and the United States is footing the bill with the huge rum tax and other concessions. Even Mussolini in the heyday of his career would have been green with envy. National socialism has been nurtured in Puerto Rico to a degree comparable to the national socialism that is known as communism in Russia, fascism in Italy, falangism in Spain, and nazi-ism in Hitler's Germany—the system that we imported from Europe and adopted in part as a New Deal in the United States. It is an utter negation of the republican form of government guaranteed under our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a direct, though remote, responsibility for the welfare of the 2,000,000 inhabitants of Puerto Rico, virtually all of whom are citizens of the United States. It is with genuine reluctance that I feel compelled to bring this situation to your attention this afternoon, for I would much prefer that the people of Puerto Rico should work out their own destinies without undue interference or dictation from us. In the past, the Congress has given to Puerto Rico generously of our material resources but has given them little, if any, of what might be termed spiritual guidance in matters of economics and government. The Organic Act of Puerto Rico, adopted nearly 30 years ago, established a Puerto Rican Legislature and gave to the people of that island the authority to enact such laws as might be thought desirable, subject only to a veto, either by the Governor, by the President of the United States, or by the Congress. In times past, numerous acts of the legislature have been vetoed by the governors, and on occasion, they have been vetoed by the President but, as yet, none of the Puerto Rican legislative enactments have been nullified by the Congress.

In this instance, of course, it cannot be expected that the Governor would veto the very laws which he was instrumental in having adopted. I have awaited action by the President, but there has been none; and, in fact, the Department of the Interior, which has administrative Federal responsibility for the island, has indicated its approval of Governor Tugwell's regime. Consequently, convinced as I am that this program is both foreign to the American philosophy of private enterprise and of constitutional government, and harmful to the eventual best interest of the people of Puerto Rico, there is but one course for me to follow and I cannot allow further time to pass in bringing this serious matter to your attention.

It would be far preferable for us not to be critical of the practices followed by the Puerto Ricans. But this is an unusual situation. This program was not initiated by the Puerto Ricans in the first instance. The program is the product of the ideology believed in and advocated by the Governor who, nominally at least, is the representative of our Government on that island. It is entirely natural for the Puerto Rican to believe that Dr. Tugwell has the support and approval of our Government. While it may be that he has the endorsement of this Government as judged by the silence of those who have authority to speak out, I assert that Dr. Tugwell does not reflect the thought of more than a small segment of the population of this country.

The time has come for Congress to direct its eye to what is happening down there. We owe it not only to ourselves but, to a vastly greater degree, we owe it to the Puerto Ricans who, a generation ago, through the misfortunes of war, quite unwillingly came under the American flag. The immediate course which we should follow is, to my mind, threefold. First, Governor Tugwell should be replaced. Legislation to this effect is now pending before the House. Second, the set of laws which were enacted under his guidance and which border on communism should be annulled either by the Puerto Rican Legislature or by this Congress, preferably by the former. Third, Congress should guide the use of all rum tax revenues over and above the largest amount received by Puerto Rico in any one year prior to the war, to insure that these special funds will be used in a way that will improve the welfare of the people, as was originally intended, instead of being dissipated on socialistic programs which work against their interests.

But, sir, this is not enough. Puerto Rico needs our help, not from the standpoint of dictation or control, but rather

from the broader viewpoint of cooperative counsel and advice. Many, many things must be done if the fear, the poverty, and the insecurity of the people is to be overcome. It comes with little grace for us to criticize the so-called colonial practices of other nations when we are guilty of such neglect of and indifference to our own external problems. I am confident that, given proper thought and careful handling, the relationship between Puerto Rico and ourselves can be vastly improved, economic conditions can be made better, and social and cultural and educational opportunities on the island can be improved. Moreover, the people can be given genuine hope for a brighter future, in which they can anticipate either complete independence for themselves or some other type of association with us which will preserve the close feeling of unity which many Puerto Ricans have with us and which will be, at the same time, mutually advantageous to both peoples.

Our duty to Puerto Rico and our own people requires that this serious problem be faced soon and with candor and vision.

As a first step, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Congress take appropriate action to constitute a new Federal office charged with responsibility for studying and administering the affairs of Puerto Rico and other dependencies, including those which may come within the sphere of this country at the end of the war.

At the present time we have no unified policy with respect to the administration of Territorial or colonial affairs. Congress never has taken the time to give this exceedingly ticklish problem the thoughtful study it demands. Instead, we have been content to adopt piecemeal measures which are no credit to this Nation. The problem admittedly is a difficult one, but that is all the more reason for setting up the machinery needed to solve it.

Unless we make adequate provision for resolving this problem, we face a repetition of the costly failure in Puerto Rico, where we aimlessly have provided funds to the extent of more than half a billion dollars in the last 45 years without providing any permanent help to the people of the island and without effectively meeting the obligations of the United States to the island and its people.

Already I have introduced legislation calling for the formation of an agency within the Federal Government, charged with responsibility for seeing that the Puerto Rican problem is satisfactorily dealt with and that the affairs of other Territorial areas are administered in an intelligent and enlightened manner. Congress must meet this problem head on before very long. Much grief and international embarrassment can be avoided by starting to work on it at once.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SPONSORS OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a list of Members of the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced the equal rights resolution which proposes to write the following amendment into the Constitution of the United States:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification.

I am privileged to announce that the following 74 Members of the House, representing 31 of the 48 States of the Union, join me as sponsors of the resolution and will give it their cordial support:

FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama; RICHARD F. HARLESS, of Arizona; JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona; FADJO CRAVENS, of Arkansas; W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas; CLAIR ENGLE, of California; JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of California; CHET HOLIFIELD, of California; CARL HINSHAW, of California; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California; JOHN PHILLIPS, of California; ED. V. IZAC, of California; PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, of Delaware; J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida; PAT CANNON, of Florida; JOE HENDRICKS, of Florida; DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida; COMPTON I. WHITE, of Idaho; WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois; EARL WILSON, of Indiana; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, of Iowa; JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky; JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana; H. STREETT BALDWIN, of Maryland; THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., of Maryland; GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland; ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan; MARION T. BENNETT, of Missouri; WALTER C. PLOESER, of Missouri; D. LANE POWERS, of New Jersey; HARRY L. TOWE, of New Jersey; LEONARD W. HALL, of New York; LEO F. RAYFIEL, of New York; ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, of New York; JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, of New York; BERNARD W. KEARNEY, of New York; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of New York; GEORGE F. ROGERS, of New York; HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina; ZEBULON WEAVER, of North Carolina; WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota; CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, of North Dakota; P. W. GRIFFITHS, of Ohio; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio; VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma; HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY, of Pennsylvania; DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania; JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., of Pennsylvania; DANIEL K. HOCH, of Pennsylvania; JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont; RALPH H. DAUGHTON, of Virginia; HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia; JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., of Virginia; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia; FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming; FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., of New Jersey; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine; JAMES H. TORRENS, of New York; JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, of New York; ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., of New York; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; EMORY H. PRICE, of Florida; SAMUEL A. WEISS, of Pennsylvania; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, of Massachusetts; RICHARD WELCH, of California; and OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas.

This is the eighth time I have introduced the equal-rights amendment in as many successive Congresses. At the request of the ladies who had battled so heroically for the equal-suffrage amendment through much travail to final victory, I find introduced the equal-rights resolution in the Seventy-second Congress on January 11, 1932. It was known as House Joint Resolution No. 197 of that Congress.

As a newspaperman I had sympathized with them in their fight for suffrage and with my pen and my voice I have fought with them. When they decided to take the next step toward the emancipation of women, with equal rights as their objective, I found myself no less sympathetic with them.

In the next, or Seventy-third, Congress, I introduced the equal-rights resolution and obtained for it the honored place of House Joint Resolution No. 1 of that Congress.

It now takes its place again as House Joint Resolution No. 1 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Its primacy on the calendar of resolutions introduced in Congress is in keeping, I believe, with its importance from the standpoint of social welfare and the national interest. It is the natural and inescapable corollary of the amendment which gave women the right of suffrage. If women are entitled to the status of citizens, as they are under the equal-suffrage amendment, they are entitled to the rights of citizens. That is irrefutable logic.

The discriminations against women in the constitutions and laws of various States are no less grievous now than they were when I first introduced the equal-rights resolution in 1932. The equal-rights amendment, if adopted, would bring to full fruition the age-old struggle of women to attain the complete stature of position and influence to which they are entitled as creatures of God, under all of the canons of justice. It would do this by repealing at one swoop an almost infinite variety of State enactments and local ordinances that discriminate against women in various ways and forms. It would truly place woman on an equality with man and that is where she belongs. If women are capable of working at the forges and lathes of the defense plants of our country; if they are good enough to serve with infinite devotion as WAC's and WAVES and SPARS in the black hours of our history, when the fate of freedom and all we hold

dear is trembling in the balance, certainly they are good enough to be entitled to enjoy equal rights with men under the laws of the land, and the refusal of that right is a scarlet stain on our flag.

When the resolution was first introduced and the ladies who proposed it began their long struggle to secure its adoption, there was no dawn of hope to hearten them as there is today. Jeers and not cheers were their portion. But recently there has come a realization to many homes of this country that the proposal is one of intrinsic merit, that it is in the interest of good government and that its adoption would make the Constitution a rounded and completed instrument of equality and justice. As this feeling has grown, the amendment has made distinct progress, securing a favorable subcommittee report of the Judiciary Committee of the House and a favorable report of the full Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

But the most epochal development in the advancement of this amendment occurred last summer when both of the national political conventions adopted planks approving the amendment and going on record in favor of submitting the resolution to the States for ratification in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. I submit for the RECORD the text of these planks as follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT PLANKS

FROM REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, 1944

We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women.

We favor job opportunities in the post-war world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex.

FROM DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, 1944

We favor legislation assuring equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

We recommend to Congress the submission of a Constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

I invite the attention of my colleagues in Congress to these solemn platform pledges. I decline to be cynical as to the future. I have faith to believe that these promises will be redeemed. We now have a fine opportunity to demonstrate to the country and to the world that political platforms are binding after the election as well as during the campaign.

VETERANS' DISCHARGE BUTTONS

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is a rising tide of resentment and criticism among Veterans of World War No. 2 because of the issuance of an unworthy discharge button which has been issued so as to protect these patriotic sons and daughters against the unwarranted and irresponsible jibes of some thoughtless people who should know better and should guard their expressions.

Instead of serving this intended purpose of identifying our returned and honorably discharged veterans, a cheap plastic imitation of what ought to be a real mark of distinction and honor does just the opposite.

The reasons are obvious: the discharge button is too small, indistinctive, and inexcusably cheap. Instead of being made of bronze or other suitable metal, it is a gilded plastic mold, about on par with products heretofore made in Japan.

Just why the War Department singled out the veterans for a penny-pinching policy is unknown and unexplained, but I believe that Members of this House ought to ask the question and insist that immediate remedial steps be taken by the War Department to issue a badge, a medal, or call it whatever you will.

It should be substantial, distinctive, and worthy of the patriotism, valor, and sacrifice of these citizens who have given more than their share for America in the conflict on the battlefields and who are now giving more on the production line to back up their buddies at the front. Remember that beneath the toil-greased shirt may be found the indelible scar of a German or Jap bayonet or bullet. Penny-pinching is not in accord with the attitude of the American people, especially when applied to our veterans.

I trust the War Department will take cognizance of these remarks and will exercise proper discretion in correcting an irksome and a humiliating problem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. MILLS), indefinitely, on account of important official business.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution providing for a study of certain phases of old-age and survivors insurance under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Rules.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, February 1, 1945, to begin hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

150. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

151. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

152. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

153. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement to the effect that no exchanges pursuant to the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C. sec. 869), were consummated during the calendar year of 1944; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

154. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting recommendations for amendments to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

155. A letter from the Director, Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting the second quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive papers. House Report No. 46. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1808. A bill to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 37. A bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 685. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign

Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1633) for the relief of Raymond Crosby, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1893. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion, for purposes of calculating benefits under such act, of time spent in vocational rehabilitation by veterans injured while in the armed forces; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1894. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1895. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7–17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of the basic crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1896. A bill to provide proper observance of Victory Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1897. A bill to waive the charge for migratory-bird hunting stamps sold to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES of Washington:

H. R. 1898. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims with respect to the taking of lands in the southeast portion of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 1899. A bill to establish a system of unemployment insurance in the maritime industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1900. A bill to provide uniform dependency allowance for veterans of the Regular Establishment and other veterans who receive pension or other monetary benefits for service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1901. A bill to authorize the naturalization, and the admission into the United States under a quota, of Koreans and descendants of Koreans; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1902. A bill relating to the trial of the issue of just compensation in the case of condemnation of property for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1903. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Missouri Pacific Railroad Co. (Guy A. Thompson, trustee) to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Ouachita River near Camden, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1904. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1905. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 1906. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to cause to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of the official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1907. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1908. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, sex, color, lack of color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Rocky Brook Mills Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Frank Lore and Elizabeth Vidotto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Bernard Oxenhandler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Maurice J. Symms; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Joseph Margavio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1916. A bill granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Chappelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of John R. Jennings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1945

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

Eternal God, giver of all spiritual grace, author of everlasting life, we come today with a strange yearning, for there is a lonesome place against our sky. Thou knowest that upon our spirits is the sadness of farewell as we think of a loved, familiar, stalwart form who will walk with us no more. We mourn the passing from our side and sight of one who seemed to gather into his own noble bearing the long traditions of this shrine of a people's faith and hope. We think in tender recollection of one who literally gave his life to public service, who from early youth in the ascending roles of duty built the strength of his manhood into the vast concerns of this body. Now he has answered the one clear call. On this very afternoon, when all that is mortal is being lowered to rest in his native soil, in our hearts we would honor his cherished memory, "who more than self his country loved, and mercy more than life."

We remember that the daily petition of the sessions here was the most sacred religious altar of his own devotion. We think of him entering this Chamber at the daily call to prayer, standing here for so many years at noontide, years of peace and of war, in times of calmness and of contention, listening with reverent heart and bowed head as the divine sovereignty was recognized and divine help implored for the deliberations of this Chamber where his highest joy was centered and whose faithful servant he was.

Now that we shall see his face no more, in grateful remembrance we recall his genius for friendship and the qualities of mind and heart which lifted his human understanding and sympathies so far above mere partisan interests and loyalties. It stills our hearts to know that—

"He cannot be where God is not,
On any sea or shore;
Whate'er betides, Thy love abides,
Our God, forevermore."

In the name of that One who conquered death and is the resurrection and the life. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, a Senator from the State of Nevada, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 29, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

THE LATE COL. EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Republican conference and the committee appointed by it, I desire to present a resolution relating to the passing of Colonel Halsey. It is as follows:

Whereas Col. Edwin Alexander Halsey, the Secretary of the Senate, died on the 29th of January 1945, the Republican conference of the Senate, in session on that day, thereby saddened, and affected by a sense of great loss: Therefore

Resolved, To express hereby, and record, the esteem and honor in which its members collectively perpetuate his memory:

Edwin Alexander Halsey was born at Fern Moss, Tye River, Nelson County, Va., September 4, 1881.