

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'ALESSANDRO:

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.

At his untimely death he had served his country in the United States Senate with extraordinary efficiency and consideration for its Members, regardless of party affiliation, for more than 47 years.

This service had included different posts, such as page, assistant in the Press Gallery, assistant to the majority secretary on the floor, majority secretary on the floor, and Secretary of the Senate since March 9, 1933.

He was an author of numerous articles relating to the history and current life of the Senate which were published in magazines and newspapers. Under his direction there were published valuable official documents, among others:

1. Development of United States Foreign Policy. Addresses and Messages of Franklin D. Roosevelt (S. Doc. No. 188, 77th Cong., 1942).
2. Domestic Stability, National Defense, and the Prosecution of World War No. 2. Legislative and Executive Background 1933-44 (S. Doc. No. 224, 78th Cong., 1944).
3. The Electoral College (S. Doc. No. 243, 78th Cong., 1944).
4. Enactment of a Law. Procedure on a Senate Bill (S. Doc. No. 155, 73d Cong., 1934, and later editions).
5. Factual Campaign Information (1944 and earlier editions).
6. Manner of Selecting Delegates to National Political Conventions With Information on States Holding Presidential Primaries (1944).
7. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States Introduced in Congress from December 6, 1926, to January 3, 1941 (1941).
8. Senate Election Cases From 1913 to 1940 (S. Doc. No. 147, 76th Cong., 1940).
9. Veto Messages, 1889-1941 (1941).

He was also the author of many articles relating to the history and background of the Senate published in magazines and in newspapers.

The memory of Colonel Halsey is treasured because he dealt with his fellow man with a gentleness and charm which was the natural expression of his character. His genuine friendship was helpful to many when they needed a friend, and it was a delight at all times to Senators with whom he served.

The Republican conference of the Senate expresses its profound sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Halsey, and to their son, Lt. Edwin A. Halsey, Jr. It directs that this memorial be sent to them, and requests unanimous consent that it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By its committee:

Mr. AUSTIN, of Vermont,
Chairman.
Mr. CAPPER, of Kansas.
Mr. WILEY, of Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution presented by the Senator from Vermont on behalf of the Republican conference will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last Monday when the Senate received the announcement of the death of the Secretary of the United States Senate I was unable to be present to join in the brief tributes which were paid to him on that day. I desire now in only a few words to express my feelings in regard to the public service and the public life of Col. Edwin A. Halsey and my profound sorrow at his premature and untimely death.

It is given to few men to serve in the public interest as long as Colonel Halsey served. Coming here as a page boy under the appointment, I believe, of his uncle, former Senator John W. Daniel, of the State of Virginia, he served in one capacity and another a total of 48 years, I think, continuously. In every position of

public trust which he occupied from the day when he came into this Chamber as a boy in knee trousers until he died last Monday he distinguished himself by devotion to duty, and by a high conception of his obligation to the Senate and to the country and to good government, no matter whether the station which he occupied was humble or high.

I believe that if any man exemplified the Christian virtues of fellowship and love for his fellow man, Colonel Halsey exemplified those virtues in an outstanding degree.

We all witnessed throughout the years his courtly attitude and his conduct toward Senators without regard to partisanship, and toward all the employees of the Senate, down to the page boys occupying a station once held by him.

In his activities in behalf of the political party of his choice, in his activities as a citizen of the State of Virginia, in his activities as a man, Ed Halsey measured up as completely to all the requirements and heavy obligations as any man who ever served the public within my knowledge or recollection.

I mourn his death as a public servant, as the Secretary of the Senate, but I mourn it as a friend also.

Always alert in his attention to the duties of the position which I temporarily occupy here, always alert to the physical, moral, and spiritual aspects of the high dignity of the Senate of the United States, his death is a severe loss to us in any capacity in which we may regard him. His place will not be easy to fill officially or personally.

For his memory we shall always cherish the greenest of recollections and appreciation.

May God bless his soul and keep him unto the eternal day.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and an agency of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] I make a report to the Senate of two Senators appointed by the Senator from Virginia, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to

visit West Point. The designation by the Senator from Virginia is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE.

To the Senate:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act approved May 17, 1928, I hereby appoint the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to represent the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

CARTER GLASS,
Chairman, Senate Committee
on Appropriations.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND CHAMPLAIN CUT-OFF—RESOLUTION OF BURLINGTON (VT.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate a letter from the executive secretary of the Burlington (Vt.) Chamber of Commerce in which it is stated that the board of directors of the chamber of commerce unanimously favor the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the Champlain cut-off. I ask that the letter embodying the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

BURLINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Burlington, Vt., January 27, 1945.
Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senator from Vermont,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by our board of directors at the meeting of Friday, January 26, 1945:

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway would open this Nation's ports on the Great Lakes to most of the freight-carrying vessels of the world, thus furthering the already favorable competitive position in world trade of our great industries of the Middle West; and

"Whereas the Champlain cut-off as an integral part of the seaway would considerably shorten distances, reduce hazards, and lower costs of shipping between Great Lakes ports and our east coast ports; and

"Whereas such a development would, in our considered opinion, encourage certain industries, requiring low-cost shipping for heavy or bulky raw materials or finished products, to locate in this area; and

"Whereas additional hydroelectric power might be made available in this area, thus making this location even more attractive to new industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this chamber go on record as urging the Congress of these United States to give further serious consideration to appropriate and enabling legislation in order that the project, including the Champlain cut-off, may become a reality; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered immediately to the Senators and Congressmen from Vermont."

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
Executive Secretary.

SEPARATION OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND THE R. F. C.—NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also wish to read a brief telegram just received from the president of the Vermont

State Farm Bureau, of Burlington, Vt. The telegram is as follows:

BURLINGTON, Vt., January 31, 1945.
Senator GEORGE AIKEN,

George Washington Inn.

Directors of the Vermont State Farm Bureau at Montpelier today recommended that the R. F. C. be separated from the Department of Commerce and that the R. F. C. be administered by a commission of three, the Secretary to be ex officio member of the commission. The directors further voted in favor of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

ARTHUR PAKARD.

I may state, Mr. President, that the Vermont State Farm Bureau is an organization of approximately 10,000 farm families in my State. I request that the telegram be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram presented by the Senator from Vermont will lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received resolutions adopted by the seventy-fourth annual meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture on January 12, 1945, which suggest a number of important recommendations with respect to the western-farm program. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR

Grimly we enter another year of global conflict. Our first and only immediate job is to win the war. We rededicate ourselves to this ghastly business as the only hope of a better world through victory that will secure lasting peace to a bewildered people. We again freely pledge all of our resources and utmost efforts to that end.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY MAKING

We again insist that producer representation and opinion be fully recognized in developing national and international policies concerning production and distribution of agricultural commodities, and that the farm industry be represented on any agencies dealing with these all-important problems, as well as at peace conferences.

WORLD TRADE IN WHEAT

In view of the fact that United States wheat exports from 1915 to 1940 averaged over 152,000,000 bushels annually, we are unable to subscribe to the proposal of the International Wheat Council that our share in the world post-war trade in this bread grain be limited to 72,000,000 bushels a year. Compliance with such terms would necessitate drastic restrictions on plantings throughout the main Wheat Belt of the Nation.

WORLD ADMINISTRATION

While recognizing the need for some international organization to guide world affairs, we strenuously object to the United States becoming the paying member of any group so formed. News which reaches the grass-roots indicates that other nations are long on plans and authority but hesitant on supplying cash to activate supervision. Let us be forever mindful of our own interests, for what is our country profited if it shall succor the whole world and lose its rightful heritage through impoverishment?

XCI—43

"FILLED" MILK

We hail as epochal the recent unanimous decision of the United States Supreme Court in upholding the State supreme court and the Kansas dairy law prohibiting sale within the State of milk in which vegetable oils have been substituted for natural butterfat. The successful prosecution of this case by the State board of agriculture gives a needed sense of security not only to dairy investors everywhere but as well to public health.

FARMS FOR RETURNING WAR VETERANS

Much is currently being said about establishing returning servicemen on farms. Such cases must, of course, be handled individually, but we think it prudent to warn that there is no new land not already included in our farms and that in general men and boys of farm background and experience will have the greatest chances of making a success of this vocation.

MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT

We endorse the proposed development of water resources in the Missouri River Basin under plans prepared and works constructed and operated by existing Federal agencies—the Army engineers and United States Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the several States, all of which are directly responsible to the people for their actions in these matters, and thus hold inviolate the fundamental principles upon which our federation of States was founded.

WATER USE

There is urgent need for legislation that provides a system for appropriation of water for beneficial purposes. A recent court decision left Kansas without any effective statutory procedure for the appropriation of water and without administrative procedure for the initiation and perfection of water rights.

We appreciate the work done by the Governor's committee on appropriation of water in studying this matter, and ask that the committee's proposed legislation be introduced into the legislature after the public has been informed of the provisions of the proposed bill, such publicity to be made through the Kansas press.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

Under war stress it has been impossible to keep Kansas roads and highways up to their normal condition or to add to the mileage already improved. We favor prompt, long-time planning to the end that these arteries of commerce be restored, extended, and made adequate and safe for post-war traffic.

Agriculture is a primary industry in Kansas and for that reason farm-to-market roads should be given primary consideration.

FLOUR ENRICHMENT

Kansas is the premier wheat-producing State—our mills turn out more flour than those of any other State; thus Kansas flour is an important article of commerce—in some form, it is eaten universally. While not chargeable alone to wheat products, certain elements are said to be lacking in the national diet, and bread is considered the most logical item to fortify in these respects. We favor such enrichment additions to Kansas flour as will adequately protect the health of consumers, and which, at the same time, will assure this Kansas wheat product its preeminent position in channels of trade.

PACKAGE WEIGHTS OF WHEAT AND CORN PRODUCTS

In order to establish uniform package weights for wheat and corn flours, corn meal, hominy, and hominy grits throughout the United States, we are in favor of Kansas legislation which will prescribe weights which may be offered for sale in unbroken containers. Net weights of 2, 5, 10, 25, 50,

100, and multiples of 100 pounds are proposed, and these should meet ready acceptance among consumers.

BUTTER SABOTAGE

We are amazed at the advice proffered by an economic counselor of the United States Department of Agriculture, who, in a recent agricultural outlook conference at Washington, is quoted as saying that it is time for this country to find another spread for its bread and use milk for its food value and not for butter. Butter is the balance-wheel of the dairy industry and provides a profitable market for millions of small producers who otherwise would be forced out of the dairy business because of a lack of available markets for whole milk. Substituting vegetable fats for butter is not practical from a Kansas dairyman's economic viewpoint. The counselor's plan is impractical. If the criticism is made on the grounds that there is not enough milk and butter to supply the demand, then the obvious answer is to produce more of both.

PREDATORY ANIMALS

Despite increased bounty payments made for coyote scalps, these predatory animals increase in number and continue to inflict heavy losses to livestock and poultry raisers of the State. We believe additional means of eradication should be authorized by the legislature if these pests are to be properly restrained—either an organized plan of co-operation between the State and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior, or else a State agency charged with the control of these predatory animals.

KANSAS SCHOOLS

We want Kansas to be a leader in education and we favor legislation which will broaden the tax base for elementary and high school support and thus insure better educational opportunities for Kansas boys and girls. We urge that the legislature provide ways and means to insure sufficient funds for our State schools of higher education, and that the various student fees be eliminated.

WHEAT VARIETIES

The wheat variety problem is growing in seriousness in Kansas and constitutes a direct threat to the reputation and future prosperity of the State's wheat industry. Revision, modification, or supplementing of present grade standards seems advisable.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

We believe that for the best interest of the Kansas farmer, daylight saving time should be abolished.

PROHIBITION OF THE TRANSPORTATION OF BEVERAGE LIQUOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter in the nature of a petition I have received, addressed to the War Mobilization Director, signed by Mrs. Fred Kirkpatrick and 22 other citizens of Dodge City, Kans., expressing views upon some policies now being followed.

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

JANUARY 20, 1945.

To the Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
War Mobilization Director,

Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned, parents and friends of sons in the armed services, commend your action stopping dog and horse racing as an aid to the war effort by conserving transportation and manpower.

We endorse your suggestion to restrict all large conventions to relieve our overcrowded

railroads by reducing travel and dim-out of electric advertising to save coal.

We observe the President's request for universal manpower control by law and also his order to General Hershey to draft farm labor.

Though working long hours the farm industry is now dangerously understaffed, farm foods, meats, canned goods, sugar, etc., cannot now be brought freely. Shoes, cotton goods, lumber, hardware, farm implements, and other elemental necessities are also scarce. However, it is possible to buy beer and liquor at all hours without restriction. Railroads and farm producers, have to date done a magnificent job but face the possibility of a break-down.

We, therefore, in behalf of our men under arms; respectfully petition; to aid the manpower shortage; to relieve overburdened carriers; to help our understaffed farms; that you immediately order all beverage liquor transportation stopped, just as you have stopped racing.

Mrs. FRED KIRKPATRICK.

(And 22 other citizens of Dodge City, Kans.)

REPORTS OF THE COMMERCE COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 23d ultimo,

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, reported it on January 31, 1945, with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 30) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS

Mr. BAILEY, also from the Committee on Commerce, on January 31, 1945, reported adversely the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 1) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, on January 31, 1945, reported favorably the following nominations:

Raymond M. Stone to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of Lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from December 16, 1944;

Sundry boatswains, gunners, machinists, and pay clerks for promotion in the United States Coast Guard; and

Electrician Rolla W. Sicafoose to be chief electrician in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from March 1, 1942.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; with an amendment (Rept. No. 31).

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

S. 298. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 32).

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

S. Res. 20. Resolution continuing Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by Senate Resolution 261, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 29, 1942, relative to the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; with amendments (Rept. No. 33), and, under the rule,

the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 1427. A bill relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 427. A bill to repeal section 3 of the act approved April 13, 1938, as amended, relating to hops; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 428. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 429. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; and

S. 430. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 431. A bill for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 432. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 433. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement that not less than 15 percent of the principal of insured mortgages upon farm property be expended for improvements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 434. A bill providing for Federal aid to States for the acquisition of toll bridges; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Gimm; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 436. A bill to equalize State old-age-assistance payments and to provide burial allowances under title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 437. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson; and

S. 438. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to partition certain lands in Cleveland County, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 439 (by request). A bill to authorize the appointment of graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or any of the five State Maritime Academies, to the line of the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 440, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 441. A bill granting an increase of pension to Tina Newlon; and

S. 442. A bill to increase the rate of pensions for widows of Spanish-American War veterans from \$30 to \$45 a month; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

S. 443. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of Casa Grande Valley Farms project, Arizona, pending disposal thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 444. A bill to reinstate Walter C. Smith with the rank of first lieutenant and to authorize his retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Herman Platt; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. This is a bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and I ask to have the bill printed in the Record together with an explanation of the purposes of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 440) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of August 4, 1939, entitled "An act to provide a feasible and comprehensive plan for the variable payment of construction charges on United States reclamation projects, to protect the investment of the United States in such projects, and for other purposes" (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That (a) for the purpose of providing for United States reclamation projects a feasible and comprehensive plan for an economical and equitable treatment of repayment problems and for variable payments of construction charges which can be met regularly and fully from year to year during periods of decline in agricultural income and unsatisfactory conditions of agriculture as well as during periods of prosperity and good prices for agricultural products, and which will protect adequately the financial interest of the United States in said projects, obligations to pay construction charges may be revised or undertaken pursuant to the provisions of this act; and (b) for the purpose of providing opportunities for settlement on productive, owner-operated farms by returning servicemen, emergency industrial workers, and others, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to investigate, plan, design, construct, settle, develop, operate, and maintain, in the humid as well as arid areas of the United States, projects for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing."

Sec. 2. (a) Subsections (c) and (g) of section 2 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, are hereby amended to read, respectively, as follows:

"(c) The term 'project' shall mean any reclamation or irrigation project, or any project for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, including incidental features thereof, authorized by the Federal reclamation laws, or constructed by the United States pursuant to said laws, or in connection with which there is a repayment contract executed by the United States pursuant to said laws, or any project constructed or operated and maintained by the Secretary through the Bureau of Reclamation for reclaiming lands by irrigation or drainage or other means.

"(g) The term 'organization' shall mean any conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, drainage district, or other organization, which is organized under State law and which has capacity to enter into contracts with the United States pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws."

(b) Section 2 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby

amended by adding thereto subsection (1) reading as follows:

"(1) The term 'water users' shall include the beneficiaries, as determined by the Secretary, of any project for reclaiming lands by drainage or by land clearing."

Sec. 3. Subsection (a) of section 8 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed in the manner herein-after provided to classify or to reclassify from time to time but not more often than at 5-year intervals, as to irrigability and productivity, or, in the case of other than irrigation projects, as to productivity alone, those lands which have been, are, or may be included within any project."

Sec. 4. Section 9 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto subsections (f), (g), and (h) reading, respectively, as follows:

"(f) In connection with any project for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, the findings to be made by the Secretary under subsection (a) of this section shall include also findings on (1) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to drainage or land clearing and probably be repaid by the beneficiaries of the project; (2) the classes of landholders and land users who can properly be regarded as beneficiaries of the project and the manner in which the construction charges should be distributed among them; and (3) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to Federal responsibilities in connection with the public health or other matters of general public benefit.

"(g) No construction of any project, division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, for reclaiming lands by drainage or by land clearing shall be undertaken until an organization, satisfactory in form and powers to the Secretary, or, where no such organization is in existence, individual beneficiaries of the project, whose qualifications and responsibilities are satisfactory to the Secretary, shall have entered into a repayment contract or contracts with the United States, in form and substance satisfactory to the Secretary, providing, among other things—

"(1) that the part of the reimbursable construction costs allocated by the Secretary to drainage or land clearing shall be included in a general repayment obligation of the organization or individual beneficiaries; that, where the contract is with individual beneficiaries, the repayment obligation shall be secured by a first lien on the reclaimed land or in such other manner as the Secretary deems to be in the best interests of the United States, but no lien so created shall render any land subject thereto legally ineligible as security for any loan otherwise authorized to be made or guaranteed by any agency of the United States for the repayment of which reasonable security exists, giving due consideration to the amount and terms of such lien; and that, where the contract is with an organization, the distribution of construction charges may be varied by the organization in a manner that takes into account the productivity of the various classes of lands and the benefits accruing to the lands by reason of the construction: *Provided*, That no distribution of construction charges over the lands included in the organization shall in any manner be deemed to relieve the organization or any party or any land therein of the organization's general obligation to the United States;

"(2) that the general repayment obligation of the organization or individual beneficiaries shall be spread in annual installments, of the number and amounts fixed by

the Secretary, over a period of not exceeding 50 years, and that, to the extent deemed appropriate and practicable by the Secretary, the amounts of the annual installments may be varied in accordance, as near as may be, with the normal and percentages plan provided in section 4 of this act;

"(3) that the first annual installment shall accrue, on the date fixed by the Secretary, in the calendar year after the Secretary announces that the construction contemplated in the repayment contract is substantially completed.

Any such repayment contract may include provisions requiring the observance on lands within the project of such farming practices as may from time to time be recommended or prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of preventing or reducing surpluses of those crops with respect to which national surpluses, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, have existed for the 3 crop years last preceding the execution of the contract, and such provisions shall remain effective as to crops for which national surpluses have been so determined to exist until such surpluses have ceased to exist for any 3 consecutive crop years: *Provided*, That no such provision shall be construed as disqualifying any person for the grant of any benefits, in connection with farming operations within the project, to which such person would otherwise be entitled by law. No such provision shall, in any event, be incorporated in any such contract without prior consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(h) In connection with the investigation, construction, or operation and maintenance of any project for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, the Secretary is authorized to utilize (1) in such manner as the President may direct, services, labor, materials, easements, or other property, including money, supplied by any other Federal agency, for which the United States shall be reimbursed in such amounts as the President may fix for each project, division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, within the limits of the beneficiaries' ability to repay costs, as found by the Secretary under subsection (f) of this section; and (2) such services, labor, materials, easements, or property, including money, as may be contributed by any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipal corporation, or other organization, or individuals, if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the acceptance thereof will not impair the title of the United States to the project works and will not reduce the probability that the project beneficiaries can meet the obligations to the United States entered into pursuant to subsection (g) of this section and the Federal reclamation laws. Moneys received and accepted under (2) of this subsection shall be and remain available for expenditure for the purposes for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for said purposes. Any project for reclaiming lands by drainage or by land clearing, upon which a report and findings have been submitted by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this section, and which the Secretary has certified to the President as having engineering feasibility, shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken pursuant to this act, notwithstanding that the estimated cost of project construction may exceed the total of the allocations made in accordance with this section, if the President has found that services, labor, materials, easements, and other property, including money, for the construction of the project should be made available to the Secretary by other Federal agencies to the extent found necessary by the Secretary to make up the difference between the estimated cost of project construction and (1) the part thereof

to be met by expenditures of moneys appropriated, or otherwise made available, for project construction on the basis of the allocations made under this section, together with (2) such services, materials, money, easements, and property, including money, as non-Federal agencies or parties have agreed to contribute and the Secretary has found acceptable under this subsection."

Sec. 5. Said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 20 reading as follows:

"Sec. 20. (a) All payments made to the United States under repayment contracts on account of reimbursable construction costs of projects for the reclamation of lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, including penalties collected for delinquencies in such payments, and all other receipts from such projects, except operation and maintenance collections, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. All charges collected for the operation and maintenance of any such project, including penalties collected for delinquencies in such charges, shall be available for expenditure for operation and maintenance of such project in like manner as if said funds had been specifically appropriated for said purposes.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary for the investigation, construction, operation, and maintenance of projects for the reclamation of lands by drainage or by land clearing, and to carry out the provisions of this act relating to such projects, which moneys shall be reimbursable to the extent required by the Federal reclamation laws. Out of funds appropriated for the Department of the Interior for the investigation of projects for the reclamation of lands by drainage or by land clearing, there may be made available to the Geological Survey and the Fish and Wildlife Service such sums, not exceeding the amounts appropriated therefor, as the Geological Survey or the Fish and Wildlife Service may require for the purpose of carrying out investigations of geological, hydrological, and biological conditions and other matters pertinent to such projects. The construction of projects for the reclamation of lands by drainage or by land clearing shall be undertaken, insofar as practicable, in the order of their relative priority of usefulness, as determined by the Secretary, to the end that preference shall be given (1) to projects that present the best opportunities for the settlement of returning veterans on productive, owner-operated farms, and (2) to projects that present the most favorable ratio of estimated benefits over estimated costs."

Sec. 6. Said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 21 reading as follows:

"Sec. 21. The Secretary shall establish the maximum size of farm units within each project for the reclamation of lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing in accordance with his findings as to the area sufficient in size to constitute a productive, owner-operated farm. No such project shall be undertaken until and unless the owners of lands whose individual holdings exceed the maximum area of a productive, owner-operated farm unit as so established shall have agreed for and in behalf of themselves, their heirs, executors, and assigns, by contracts in form, substance, and legal sufficiency satisfactory to the Secretary, (a) that they will sell such part of their lands as may exceed the maximum area of a single farm unit at the appraised value of such excess lands, as determined by the Secretary, without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project, and (b) that the Secretary shall have

an irrevocable power of attorney to sell in their behalf any such excess lands, not theretofore disposed of by said landowners, at the appraised value thereof: *Provided*, That any sales by the Secretary pursuant to such option shall, unless otherwise provided in writing by the landowners, be only for cash and only upon terms that will require the landowner to surrender possession of all of his excess lands at substantially the same time."

SEC. 7. Said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 22 reading as follows:

"Sec. 22. (a) For the purpose of assisting in the investigation, settlement, and development of projects for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, and for the purpose of assisting settlers on such projects in the solution of financial and other problems related to the establishment of a sound agricultural operation, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, with the State in which any such projects are located and any of its agencies or political subdivisions, and with private organizations that may be interested in the development of any such project.

"(b) In connection with any project for reclamation by drainage or by land clearing, the Secretary shall have the same authority with regard to the utilization of lands owned by the United States as he has in connection with other projects undertaken pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws.

"(c) In connection with the construction or operation and maintenance of a project for reclamation by drainage or by land clearing, the Secretary shall have with respect to construction and supply contracts, and with respect to the acquisition, exchange, and disposition of lands, interests in land, water rights, and other property and relocation thereof, the same authority, including authority to acquire lands and interests in land and water rights with titles and at prices satisfactory to him, which he has in connection with other projects under the Federal reclamation laws."

SEC. 8. This act, together with the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as herein amended, is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws, act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto. This act may be cited as the "Drainage and Land Clearing Act of 1945."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MURRAY in connection with the bill is as follows:

There are worth-while possibilities in a program for the reclamation of excessively wet lands in the United States. It is appropriate that such a program be combined with a program for the reclamation of logged or cut-over timberlands suitable for agricultural development. It is appropriate particularly in view of the fact that in many cases projects for reclaiming lands suitable for agriculture will involve both drainage and the removal of stumps and logs. In parts of the South, for instance, some of these projects will require preliminary drainage followed by a program of stump removal. In the Great Lakes States some of these projects will involve the reclamation of an area consisting in part of logged or cut-over timberlands and in part of bogged lands. This bill is an implementation of the suggestions made by Senators and Representatives that the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior ought to undertake projects for reclamation by drainage and for the reclamation of logged or cut-over lands within as well as without the boundaries of the 17 westernmost States. It may well be that some projects of this character could be undertaken very soon and completed in time to

make their contribution to the war food program. In any event, a number of important projects of this nature could be planned now and be ready for undertaking in the post-war period.

The argument has been advanced rather persuasively that the Bureau of Reclamation is authorized already to construct purely drainage works in the 17 westernmost States. There is doubt as to whether such legal authority exists. This proposed legislation would remove that doubt. It would serve the additional purpose of authorizing the Bureau, in the humid as well as in the arid areas of the United States, to construct drainage works and to engage in the reclamation of logged or cut-over timberlands suitable for agricultural production.

The drainage of lands is a matter of engineering. The preliminary requirements are in no wise different from those governing the irrigation of arid lands, the construction of inland waterways, the prevention of floods, the conservation of water, or any other important engineering development. These matters all involve engineering and physical factors, the control of which may extend beyond the area immediately under consideration. Any great project of wet-land drainage is far above the plane of merely local ditching for the purpose of draining a few farms. If such work is to be prosecuted intelligently and purposefully, the actual construction must be preceded by topographic surveys, measurement of stream flow, consideration of necessary capacity of channels, both natural and artificial, and their permanence, investigation of geologic conditions, and study of all related phenomena. The actual development can be prosecuted only by an agency composed of competent engineers and others with a background of experience in such matters. The tragic mistakes that have been made in the past in connection with the construction of certain ambitious drainage projects—mistakes due in large part to ignorance of geologic and hydrologic factors and a failure therefore to make a thorough investigation of geological and hydrological conditions—should not be repeated. The best assurance obtainable that these mistakes would not be repeated would be to have the projects constructed under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior so that, by cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey, they could be planned and constructed with due regard for all appropriate factors.

The proposed bill provides for opportunities for cooperation among the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Agriculture in the planning and construction of these projects. Joint investigations by these agencies, in cooperation with the Geological Survey and State agencies, may well result in the uncovering of great possibilities for drainage and clearing projects, in certain areas. Along the Mississippi River, for instance, behind the flood-control levees constructed by the Corps of Engineers, lie many thousands of acres of lands. These lands are extremely fertile. They would be eminently suitable for the settlement of many families now engaged in farming poor lands. They would make desirable locations for returning servicemen.

The proposed bill provides for drainage projects and projects for the reclamation of logged or cut-over timberlands in accordance with established State land-use policies. Some of the States, in the forefront of which is Wisconsin, have adopted zoning policies and others are striving toward zoning policies which would prevent uneconomic development. The policies of the States should be respected and implemented. The highest degree of cooperation with State agencies is possible under the proposed bill.

Developments undertaken pursuant to this bill should be planned with due regard for

the preservation of the country's great wildlife resources. Assurance of such regard would be contained in legislation vesting authority to plan and construct these projects in the Department of the Interior, under the jurisdiction of which the Fish and Wildlife Service keeps a watchful eye on any group or movement threatening those important resources. The keen interest of the States in the maintenance of their own preserves should likewise be accorded full weight. The history of some drainage projects indicates that they have been more destructive of wildlife than productive of agriculture crops.

Sound planning and adequate construction are not enough. A proper regard for the ends to be served by these projects requires safeguards of an economic nature. The drainage program and the program for the reclamation of logged or cut-over timberlands must be such as to result in a healthy and stable farm economy based to the fullest possible extent on individual ownership of family-sized agricultural units. If these programs will not serve that purpose, they should not be undertaken. Legislation authorizing these programs should make adequate provision for reimbursement, to a practicable extent and in a workable manner, of construction and other costs. It should also contain assurance that these works shall not be constructed for the benefit of large acreages in the hands of a favored few. It should contain assurance that large acreages shall be subdivided into farms of reasonable size which shall be available at proper prices. It should make provision for land classification and for the prevention of speculation in lands. The reclamation law contains provisions of this kind. The Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior has had experience in their administration.

There may be those among the staunch friends of reclamation in the West who will have their doubts as to the advisability of the Bureau of Reclamation engaging in activities which would extend its jurisdiction to other areas. They should be assured that extension of that Bureau's activities beyond the 17 Western States would not result in any reduction of the Bureau's program in the West. On the contrary, the organization now devoted to that program would continue unimpaired.

Finally, this proposed legislation would assist materially in the preparation of plans for our returning servicemen. Many of these men were farmers before the war, and will want to resume farming. Many others will no doubt want an opportunity to become farmers after the war is over. To this opportunity they are entitled. The great areas now available for irrigation farming and those which will be available for irrigation farming in the future are not enough. By the enactment of this bill the Congress would make it possible to undertake now the preparation of definite plans for additional projects which would help serve the needs of these veterans and also of many people now engaged in the production of war necessities.

If and when this proposed legislation is enacted into law and the moneys therefor are appropriated, necessary investigations will be started promptly and recommendations for particular projects will be made to the Congress from time to time.

PRINTING OF LAWS RELATING TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the manuscript of the laws, agreements, Executive order, proclamations, etc., relating to the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, passed and proclaimed from 1890 to 1944, inclusive, to be known as Laws Relating to the Five Civilized Tribes

in Oklahoma, 1890 to 1944, prepared under Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed 30 additional copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and 30 additional copies for the use of the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 6)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the United States War Ballot Commission, with certain of the accompanying exhibits, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED PATENTS AND INVENTIONS OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND CONTRACTORS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the President has transmitted to the Congress and there has been referred to the Senate Committee on Patents the second report of the National Patent Planning Commission on Government-Owned Patents and Inventions of Government Employees and Contractors. This document is less than 50 pages in length, and, as chairman of the Committee on Patents, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITY—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Unity" delivered by the Vice President at the Democratic victory dinner in Philadelphia, Pa., January 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a message from the President of the United States read by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in a broadcast from the White House in connection with the observance of the President's birthday, which appears in the Appendix.]

CITATIONS BY THE KIWANIS CLUB OF NEW YORK TO CERTAIN NEW YORK NEWSPAPERS—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR HAWKES AND NICHOLAS ROOSEVELT

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by him presenting citations from the Kiwanis Club of New York to the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Sun, and the World-Telegram, and an address by Mr. Nicholas Roosevelt, assistant publisher of the New York Times, in accepting the citation, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR FRANCIS MALONEY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a resolution of the City Council of New Britain, Conn., and four editorials regarding the death of the late Senator Francis Maloney, which appear in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTH—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record two editorials

commenting on an address by Hon. James A. Farley in Birmingham, Ala., which appear in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Fight Now Shifts to Washington," from the Beaver Press, of Beaver City, Utah, issue of January 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEXTILE INDUSTRIES UNDER FEDERAL CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM THE PASSAIC (N. J.) HERALD NEWS

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "All Textile Industries Now Under New Federal Control" from the Herald News, of Passaic, N. J., Friday, January 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record numerous communications received by him on the subject of military airplane accidents, which appear in the Appendix.]

DEATH SENTENCES OF ASSASSINS OF LORD MOYNE IN CAIRO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a group of distinguished citizens, leaders in all walks of life, have appealed to the King of Egypt to commute the death sentence which was passed last week in Cairo on two young Palestinian patriots. Those who signed the appeal include Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader; Arturo Toscanini, the world famous conductor, humanitarian and anti-Fascist; and Rabbi Eliezer Silver, copresident of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States.

The appeal reads as follows:

Two sons of Israel in desperation over unconsolable plight of their brethren in Europe committed on Egyptian soil deplorable act of assassination. Regardless our unequivocal disapproval of this act, we believe that background of full gamut of agony, despair, and death of millions of Hebrews in Europe and continuing suffering of survivors in that inferno constitute sufficient reason for leniency. We therefore respectfully request Your Excellency to plead with His Majesty the King to commute death sentence to imprisonment, taking into consideration sufferings and youth of condemned. We believe such an act of mercy will be in tradition of great Egyptian civilization and will further good will and friendship of peoples of earth. Eyes of compassionate people everywhere are looking for His Majesty's gesture of justice and mercy.

Rabbi Eliezer Silver, copresident, Union of Orthodox Rabbis, and president Agudath Israel; Arturo Toscanini; John W. McCormack, House majority leader; Senator William Langer; Andrew L. Somers, Member of Congress; Sigrid Undset; Louis Bromfield; Judge William S. Bennett, cochairman, Emergency Committee To Save the Jewish People of Europe; Judge Oscar W. Ehrhorn, past president, National Federation of Church Clubs; Arthur Szyk; Konrad Beronovic; Dean Alfange, vice chairman, Liberal Party; Alix Wilf, executive director, American League for a Free Palestine; Harry Louis Seiden, cochairman, American League for a Free Palestine; Rabbi Benjamin Hendles, cochairman, National Council Emergency Committee; Rabbi Morris M. Rose, copresi-

dent, Union Zionist Revisionists United States of America; Isaac Zaar, member editorial board, Jewish Morning Journal; Mordecai Danzis, chairman, editorial staff, Jewish Day; M. J. Nurenberger, member editorial board, Jewish Morning Journal; May Lewis; Karin Michaelis; Prof. Johan J. Smertenko; Rabbi Baruch Korff; Mrs. John Gunther; Mrs. Louis Untermyer; Stella Adler.

Simultaneously a special appeal to the Egyptian Prime Minister was cabled by Dr. Syud Hossain, chairman of the National Committee for Indian Freedom.

This act of understanding and friendship toward the Jews of Palestine on the part of this prominent Moslem leader is both significant and encouraging in the light of the many tales which are being told of the strife and hostility between Moslems and Jews. I quote Dr. Hossain's appeal:

As chairman of the National Committee for India's Freedom and member of the Indian Moslem Caliphate Delegation in 1920, I earnestly and respectfully urge you to exercise clemency toward the young Jews, Eliahu Hakim and Eliahu Bet Souri, now under sentence of death. As a follower of Mahatma Gandhi I cannot condone violence, still less political assassination. But in this case there are powerful and just grounds to temper justice with mercy. These young men are obviously no ordinary criminals, but the victims of circumstances. They acted from no motives of personal gain or malice, but under instigation of desperation and bitter spiritual anguish. Crimes similarly committed by other young men, even during this war, have been treated with sympathetic understanding by civilized public opinion. In this case the extenuating factors are, if anything, more potent. The Jews have suffered more than any other single group in the present world tragedy of hate and violence, and these young men symbolize the sufferings, the bitterness, and disillusionment of their people. Alike on grounds of high political expediency and common humanity these two young men should be spared. Furthermore, clemency on your part, I feel sure, will meet with the warm approval of the peoples of India and Islam. It will also accord with the historic tradition of Egypt which gave asylum to the Jews in earlier centuries when also they were the victims of persecution in Europe. Fraternally and respectfully.

Dr. SYUD HOSSAIN.

Mr. President, I was very happy to sign this appeal. On January 15 I raised the question of the complete censorship which surrounded the trial in Egypt, which prohibited the publication of one word of what the two young men said were the motives which drove them to their desperate act. The trial lasted for 7 days, 6 of which were taken up by the defense. These included long hours in which the two accused made lengthy personal statements. All we know now is that the two young men are to be hanged, but as yet, even after the verdict has been passed, the American correspondents in Cairo have been prevented from cabling about the trial to their newspapers. So incensed were the American correspondents that they elected a special delegation which protested to the authorities in Cairo and asked permission to cable the arguments of the defendants, but this was denied.

Mr. President, it is a problem of elementary justice, not only toward the two youths; it is a problem of elementary justice in the interests of the tormented Hebrews of Europe, that the whole story be told; that their tragic situation and the callousness of the British Colonial Administration which slams the doors of Palestine in the face of these people and which has led to the dark, despairing act of the two youths, be brought to light for world judgment.

Mr. President, I wish to appeal to Mr. Churchill, the Prime Minister and leader of our great ally, not only to exercise compassion and mercy in this particular case, but to delay no longer the abrogation of the present British policy in Palestine which he himself so bitterly and strongly condemned in 1939, when it was first announced by the late arch appeaser, Neville Chamberlain, and which is directly responsible for the tragic death of Lord Moyne, as it is directly responsible for the tragic death of hundreds of thousands of innocent Hebrew men, women, and children in Europe.

LIBERATION OF AMERICAN PRISONERS IN LUZON

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this morning the office of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States has announced the liberation, under the direction of General MacArthur, of several hundred Americans who have been prisoners of war of the Japanese Government. Several of the boys liberated were from my State of New Mexico, several thousand of our New Mexico boys having been made prisoners by the Japanese in their conquest of Luzon. Surely the American people are entitled to rejoice in this announcement, and to entertain the hope that in the near future the other American youths who are now prisoners will also be liberated.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD D. MCKIM, JR.—KILLED IN ACTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I beg the attention of the Senate for 2 minutes while I read into the RECORD a letter which I think will mean much to the people of America, as it is an example of what has happened a great many times, not only in the one city where we are today, but in many of the large cities, and in many of the smaller places, reaching into every section of our land. The letter refers to the loss of a son in service.

Mr. President, it happens that this letter was written by a major general in the Marine Corps to the father of a boy who was killed in action. I am proud to have the opportunity of reading this letter into the RECORD this morning, not only for the reasons I have stated, but for the further reason that the father to whom the letter was addressed was a close associate and buddy of the Vice President of the United States in the First World War.

With the Senate's permission, I should like to read the letter into the RECORD. It is addressed to Mr. Edward D. McKim, Sr., 750 North Fairacres Road, Omaha, Nebr., is signed by Maj. Gen. G. B.

Ersine, United States Marine Corps, and is as follows:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
HEADQUARTERS,
THIRD MARINE DIVISION,
FLEET MARINE FORCE,
CARE OF FLEET POST OFFICE,
San Francisco, January 3, 1945.

Mr. EDWARD D. MCKIM, Sr.,
Omaha, Nebr.

MY DEAR MR. MCKIM: I have just learned that until now you have never received a letter from your son's commanding officer, and I should like to tell you how sorry I am that there has been so long a delay. May I extend my deepest sympathy to you in the great loss you have suffered; your boy was a splendid officer, and you have paid a heavy price for our victory at Guam.

Your son's company commander was killed within a few days of Edward's own death, but I have talked this morning with a number of men from his platoon who were with him constantly until the end. He landed shortly after H-hour on the 21st of July; the beach at that time was under intense fire, much of it from a group of three caves which the Japanese had heavily fortified. Your son gathered his platoon and proceeded to eliminate these positions one by one; his prompt, skillful, and courageous action doubtless saved us many casualties during the unloading operations along the beach.

The following day, as his company moved up into the line, your son was struck in the arm by a mortar fragment. It was a painful wound, but he refused to be evacuated and continued to lead his platoon throughout the days and nights of bitter fighting that followed. Once, when the Japanese had succeeded in penetrating our lines, he organized and led a counterattack which restored our positions.

By the 26th of July Edward's platoon had suffered heavy casualties, together with the rest of the company, but they had held fast against countless attacks and steadily pushed the Japanese back. That afternoon the men were ordered to dig in for the night and organize a defensive position. The sector was quiet at the time, and about 4:30 a. m. your son walked about 50 yards forward of the lines to inspect the stringing of some barbed wire. A few minutes later a machine gun opened fire from the left, wounding your boy. He was carried back to our lines and died almost at once, only a few minutes after he had been hit. I believe the end came too quickly for him to suffer.

Everyone to whom I have spoken has praised the care he took of his men, his coolness in action, and his fine leadership. He was determined, above all, to do his duty, and there can be no doubt that he did so splendidly. He will serve as an example to us all in our future battles, and his name will not be forgotten.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

G. B. ERSKINE,
Major General,
United States Marine Corps.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible thus to acknowledge the sacrifice that each and every one of the hundreds of thousands of lads is making, but this serves as an example of what they are doing, and because of the close connection of the lad's father to Vice President TRUMAN, I am glad to have had the opportunity to read the letter into the RECORD.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a motion made

on January 29 by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, which the clerk will report by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 17) continuing the authority for investigation of the alcoholic beverage industry and increasing the limit of expenditures.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the motion be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion will be passed over without prejudice.

The Chair announces that morning business is now concluded.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the motion is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business should be rejected, would it then be in order to move to proceed to the consideration of the George bill, or any other legislation on the Legislative Calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. PEPPER, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the pending motion, and in connection with the nomination of Mr. Wallace and the so-called George bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement released by me to the press.

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

The President was given his fourth mandate from the people last November. Henry Wallace was one of the many issues of the Presidential campaign. The country was on notice that in the event of his reelection the President intended to elevate Mr. Wallace to a place of high responsibility to assist in carrying forward the economic and social policies which the President had promised.

The action which the President has now taken and the nomination of Mr. Wallace which is now before the Senate should occur

sion no surprise. It is but the natural course of events. The question now arises as to whether the Senate shall undertake to exert its veto power over the President's choice.

I have always adhered to the view that the selection of the members of his Cabinet is the personal prerogative of the President; that he should be free to select his own counselors and advisers without congressional interference unless the person of his choice was manifestly unfit, by reason of mental incapacity or moral delinquency.

I recognize, of course, the responsibility imposed on all Members of the Senate by the constitutional provision that Presidential appointees to certain offices, including members of the Cabinet, shall be subject to senatorial consent and confirmation. It is not for the Senate to exercise veto power over Presidential nominations for the Cabinet except for the gravest causes. Approval, in the constitutional sense, of the President's appointment by no means implies commendation of the President's choice or concurrence in the views of the appointee.

With respect to Henry Wallace, his integrity is not challenged. He has had previous service as a Cabinet officer—as Secretary of Agriculture. He has been the nominee of the Democratic Party for the Vice Presidency of the United States, elected by the people to that office, and served out his term. At no time has there been any serious criticism of his conduct or service.

It is his social and political philosophy that is now called into question—his ideas plus the question of his business capacity and sagacity. These are matters that lie within the province of the President and for which he must accept full responsibility. I am not disposed to refuse to accede to the President's choice of Mr. Wallace, regardless of my personal disagreements with some of the ideas that he has expounded. I shall vote for his confirmation.

The question of the divorcement of the R. F. C. and its many subsidiary lending agencies from the Department of Commerce stands on a totally different footing. It is a matter of governmental organization, the determination of which is preeminently a prerogative of Congress, the legislative branch of the Government.

The merger into the hands of a single individual, first, of the power and duties and heavy responsibilities that are implicit in the headship of any of the regular departments of the Government, and second, the enormous power and responsibility and administrative labor that attaches to the headship of the Federal Loan Agency, is a dangerous arrangement that invites bad management by reason of the multiplicity of tasks. It is not a question of personalities. It is a question of efficiency and sound placement of responsibility in governmental administration.

The transfer of the Federal Loan Agency to the Department of Commerce that was done by Executive order, and with one man holding both posts, was a mistake. It ought never to have been done. The bill now before the Senate offered by Senator GEORGE does no more than seek to correct this mistake and prevent its repetition. A bill to do this is long overdue.

I believe this measure should be enacted and I intend to vote for it regardless of whether the pending nomination of Mr. Wallace is confirmed, rejected, or withdrawn. I believe that this measure should be enacted and the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries restored to the status of a separate agency of the Government, regardless of who may hereafter be appointed by the President to head the agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of

executive business. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.
Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

Mr. TAFT (after having voted in the affirmative). I change my vote to "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—41

Bailey	George	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gerry	Robertson
Bridges	Gurney	Scruggs
Brooks	Hawkes	Smith
Buck	Hickenlooper	Stewart
Bushfield	Hoey	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Capehart	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wherry
Connally	McKellar	White
Cordon	Millikin	Wiley
Donnell	Moore	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Austin	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Barkley	Kligore	Pepper
Billbo	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Saltonstall
Briggs	Lucas	Shipstead
Burton	McFarland	Taft
Chavez	McMahon	Taylor
Downey	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Mitchell	Tunnell
Fulbright	Morse	Walsh
Green	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	
Hayden	Myers	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Mead	Wagner
Chandler	Moses	Wheeler
Glass	Radcliffe	

So Mr. BAILEY's motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the vote by which the motion was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair recognized the Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio desires to make his motion to reconsider, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the vote be reconsidered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I second that motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to understand my viewpoint about the matter. I intended to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the George bill, in view of the defeat of the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Therefore, I insist on the right to make that motion at this time, having been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator yielded to me for the purpose of making the other motion, and I made the other motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair informs the Senator from Ohio that he is not precluded from making that motion at any time.

The Chair recognized the Senator from Kentucky. Unless he yielded for that purpose, he still has the floor.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the George bill, Senate bill 375, Calendar No. 27.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. On that motion, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that on this vote he would vote as I am about to vote, and therefore I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I neglected to announce, when the name of my colleague [Mr. HATCH] was called, that he is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "yea." Let me add that if he had been present when the vote was taken on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], he would have voted "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on account of illness. If he were present and were permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—83

Aiken	Green	Myers
Austin	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoe	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, S. C.	Scruggs
Burton	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Downey	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
George	Murdock	Wilson
Gerry	Murray	

NAYS—2

Stewart Thomas, Idaho

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Hatch	Wagner
Ball	Mead	Wheeler
Chandler	Moses	
Glass	Radcliffe	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Federal Loan Agency, created by section 402 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1939, shall continue as an independent establishment of the Federal Government and shall continue to be administered under the direction and supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator in the same manner and to the same extent as if Executive Order 9071, dated February 24, 1942, transferring the functions of the Federal Loan Agency to the Department of Commerce, had not been issued.

SEC. 2. All powers, functions, and duties of the Department of Commerce and of the Secretary of Commerce which relate to the Federal Loan Agency are hereby transferred to the Federal Loan Agency to be administered under the direction and supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator.

SEC. 3. The unexpended balance of the funds made available to the Secretary of

Commerce by Public Law 365, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 28, 1944, for administrative expenses of supervising loan agencies, shall be transferred to the Federal Loan Agency to be used for the administrative expenses of that Agency.

SEC. 4. No functions, powers, or duties shall be transferred from the Federal Loan Agency under the provisions of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or any other law unless the Congress shall otherwise by law provide.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on page 4, line 6, after the word "agency", I offer to amend the committee amendment by inserting the following: "(together with the respective personnel, records, and property, including office equipment, relating to the exercise of such powers, functions, and duties)." The amendment is merely to make clear what otherwise might not be clear.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to which the bill was referred and which has reported it favorably, I think it is appropriate for me to make a brief statement.

It will not be necessary to go into the matter at any great length. The text of the bill is simple, and its meaning is clear. I think that the passage of the bill is of great importance. I question whether there will be any great amount of opposition to it. The committee conducted thorough and interesting hearings upon the bill, and heard from its author, from Hon. Jesse Jones, and from Hon. Henry A. Wallace. There was some demand for further hearings, but the committee felt that the matter had been very thoroughly thrashed out, and so it reported the bill.

The objective of the bill is to take away from the Department of Commerce those agencies headed by the R. F. C. which have been chiefly described as the lending agencies. The bill would by no means affect all the lending agencies of the Government, but only those agencies which were transferred either in actuality, or by virtue of their functions, by the President under the First War Powers Act. The bill would establish them once again as independent agencies, and would separate once again the Federal Loan Administrator from association with the Secretary of Commerce, which association was authorized by the President.

With that statement, Mr. President, I believe it is appropriate for me to yield to the author of the bill, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and ask him to express his views to the Senate. He did so with very great eloquence before the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to go into an extended discussion of the bill because, by its terms, it is simple

and easily understandable. For the purpose of illustrating my good faith in introducing the bill, I merely invite attention to certain facts which are extraneous to the record.

I am aware that in some quarters, which are ill-advised and uninformed, a motive far different from that which I have had in mind has been ascribed to me in the introduction of the bill. It so happens that I was invited to sit in at the earliest conference of citizens and legislators which was held and which recommended and, in a measure, outlined the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. As every Member of this body knows, that occurred under the administration of Mr. Hoover at a time when there was increasing unemployment. There was an inability or an unwillingness on the part of banks to extend credit, and a collapse of business was threatened. Following the conference to which I have referred, there was introduced the bill which became the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. That act has been, of course, greatly expanded in the years since its enactment. However, its primary purpose has remained the same throughout its history. Certain amendments were made to the organic act itself in order to take care of unusual situations such as floods, destruction by cyclones, hurricanes, and other like catastrophes.

When the Reorganization Act of 1939 was passed the President was authorized by that act to transfer by order the functions of agencies of the Government, and he issued Reorganization Plan No. 1. That was in April 1939. Section 402 of that plan created the Federal Loan Agency, and brought it, as well as certain other corporations associated with or subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, within the jurisdiction of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. By the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1939 the plan would have become law in any event after it had been on file with the Congress for 60 legislative days unless in the meantime some affirmative act had been taken amounting to a disapproval of the order by the Congress; but on June 7, 1939, the President himself approved Public Resolution 20, Seventy-sixth Congress, which provided that plan No. 1 should take effect July 1, 1939.

It will be recalled by Members of the Senate who were then in service that a resolution had been passed authorizing the holding of two offices, to wit, the office of Administrator of the loan agencies and the Department of Commerce by one and the same person, to wit, Jesse H. Jones, but with the provision that only one salary, namely the salary provided for the Secretary of Commerce, should be received by him. At that time there were some of us who doubted the wisdom of permitting the two offices to be held by one and the same person. There was some discussion on the floor and in committee on that resolution, but upon the assurance that it would not serve as a precedent for future legislative action no opposition was actually offered. I may say, Mr. President, that some of us who doubted the wisdom of the ac-

tion taken at that time have subsequently given study to this matter.

Now I call attention of the Senate to the fact that the special committee of which the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman has had under study for some time the agencies of government, particularly the corporations created by the Congress and authorized by the Congress, and some legislation has been under study and, I may say, is in course of preparation.

It was believed by that committee—and I am a member of it—that many of the agencies were operating under very loose authority and without necessary legislative safeguards, restrictions, and limitations. Therefore, I had given study to this matter long prior to the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress. It had again occurred to me, and had been under consideration by me, that it would be advisable to introduce a bill to separate and to return to the administrator of the Federal loan agencies the various functions and organizations transferred to the Department of Commerce by the President under Executive order under date of February 24, 1942, under the First War Powers Act. Actually the then Secretary of Commerce was acting as the Administrator of the loan agencies and, of course, as Secretary of Commerce; but, for some reason, the President issued his Executive order transferring the R. F. C. and certain loan agencies enumerated in Plan No. I under the Reorganization Act to the Department of Commerce. So, Mr. President, the bill is designed to accomplish exactly what I think should have been permitted to remain as the legal status of these several loan agencies from the beginning.

I do not think it necessary to enter into a long discussion, because I am quite sure that all Senators have examined the various loan agencies, are familiar with the tremendous scope and power of those agencies, and have given consideration to the return of those agencies, all created by the Congress, to an agency directly responsible to the Congress and which can be reasonably controlled by the Congress itself.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the language in the report on page 5. At the end of the second paragraph on that page it says with respect to the powers which have been granted the R. F. C. and which may be granted in the future:

The greater the necessity for the exercise of extraordinary powers the greater becomes the responsibility of Congress for bringing the exercise of those powers more immediately under its scrutiny, and only by such action can the Congress discharge its direct responsibility for the Nation's welfare.

Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would care to make any comment as to whether or not the bill now before the Senate establishes any procedure where-

by greater scrutiny by Congress can or will be exercised of this agency?

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator that the bill does not, except that it takes the necessary first step, as I think, to return these agencies to an independent status, subject, of course, to such legislation as the Congress may enact.

I may explain, if the Senator will permit me, that I did not include what I believe to be very pertinent provisions in the bill, because I was of the opinion that the Commerce Committee, not being a legislative committee which could consider the various loan agencies or which had initially considered the loan agencies, should not be asked to go into the question of prescribing additional limitations or restrictions on these agencies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I recognize the soundness of that view, but I desire to ask the Senator whether it is his opinion that Congress should now consider, through the proper committee, the imposition of regulations and control whereby the Congress can exercise a greater degree of direction over the activities of these loan agencies?

Mr. GEORGE. I certainly do; I think it is imperative; and I may say that the Senator from Vermont, I believe, and the Senator from Virginia have both presented me with amendments which would subject the R. F. C. and the various other loan agencies to the scrutiny of the Comptroller General and require the Comptroller General to make an annual report. So far as I am concerned, I would not resist that type of an amendment even on this bill, but in the first instance I did not think it proper to ask the Commerce Committee to give consideration to the organic act of any one of the loan agencies, the Commerce Committee not having jurisdiction over them, but it did have, I think, clearly, jurisdiction over the Department of Commerce and over what should go into or be kept out of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that the adoption of any amendment or any provision which would extend to the General Accounting Office the power to audit the R. F. C. would not of itself provide Congress with the supervisory powers which, in my judgment, Congress should exercise.

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all; I did not mean to say it would be exhaustive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator did not.

Mr. GEORGE. But the amendments themselves contemplate a pretty rigid scrutiny by the Comptroller General, with a report to the Congress at stated periods, which would presuppose at least congressional scrutiny of the agencies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I wish merely to say that, in my judgment, this whole incident, and the pending bill particularly, present a challenge to the Congress. There can be no doubt that Congress has allowed these vast powers to gather around the R. F. C. in a manner which I am sure was not understood in its aggregate until the hearings upon the bill were conducted. If Congress now, having full knowledge of the vast powers

over our entire system which are vested in the R. F. C. and its affiliated organizations, should permit this matter to drift, it would be a very sad day, in my judgment, both for the Congress and for the country.

Mr. GEORGE. I fully agree with the Senator. I have no doubt that the members of the committees having legislative jurisdiction over the agencies themselves will take appropriate steps to tighten the control of the Congress over the agencies.

Mr. President, I have now said all I care to say regarding the merits of the bill. I merely wish again to emphasize the fact, which is a fact, that for some time I contemplated offering a bill of this character, which, but for the question of jurisdiction to which I have referred, would have been much more comprehensive than the bill actually now before the Senate.

I do not believe any Cabinet officer should be given the vast powers which are granted under existing law and Executive order to the Department of Commerce. I say that for the reason that the Cabinet officer himself becomes the actual adviser of this body. The Secretary of the Treasury has an all-powerful voice in the making of taxes, the enactment of revenue acts. Every other department sends in its opinions, as it should, of course, but it has a very strong influence in shaping and controlling the activities of Congress.

I do not believe any Government officer, I care not who he may be, should be clothed with this vast power, which so vitally affects the commerce, the industry, the finances, and, indeed the whole business of the country, and can so certainly influence its social and political life, as the Department of Commerce might today affect and influence our lives.

I therefore believe that the Congress owes the duty to the American people of taking this initial step, to be followed by other effective steps to constitute these lending agencies by congressional action in such a way that the Congress can better scrutinize, control, and direct their affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in view of the vote I shall cast on the bill, and my attitude on it. I feel that it is my duty to do so because I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency when the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was passed, during the Hoover administration.

As we all know, at that time the economic condition of the country had come to a pass where credit was unavailable from the ordinary sources of credit for legitimate business, for manufacturing industries, and for other purposes for which money is usually loaned. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up to bridge that chasm, and to function largely where private lending agencies were unable to function.

I do not have the act before me, but my recollection is that in the original law we provided that loans should be made with such security as practically to guarantee the repayment of the loans to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation,

so far as security could do so. It was set up originally as a lending agency, the Congress recognizing that the Government had sources from which to obtain money and credit which private institutions did not possess, or, if they possessed them, they were not in a position or were not willing to make the money available to the business world.

Later the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was amended, whereby the original rigidity of the security requirement was somewhat modified to provide that such security should be exacted of the borrower as to make it reasonably sure that the loan would be repaid.

I mention these things because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was not created as an eleemosynary institution. It was created as a lending agency, with restrictions thrown around it by Congress itself so as to make it reasonably sure that the money loaned would be repaid to the Government. That was regarded as wise, because the money loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was obtained either by taxes collected from the people, or by loans made by the people to the Treasury of the United States, from which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in part got its money, the rest of it being obtained by issuing bonds guaranteed by the Government. So that it was the same thing in a different garb.

The war came on, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was expanded, and Congress authorized the creation of subsidiary corporations, such as the Rubber Reserve Corporation, and the Defense Plants Corporation. Following the floods of 1937 I myself, in conjunction with the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Bulkley, introduced a bill creating the Disaster Loan Corporation, to make loans to those who had been damaged by the floods.

When the war came on, of course, the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries were inevitably and inseparably connected with the war effort. The power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries was expanded by Congress and by Executive order. That was inevitable, but the time will come, if it is not now here, when Congress must consider the whole picture of the function of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiary corporations. Congress, it seems to me, will be required to consider whether the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by any revamping of the law itself, or by any expansion of the Corporation's functions, or any adjustment or rearrangement of its facilities shall become an agency for dealing primarily with social questions rather than financial questions, admitting the inability of separating the two in a sense, because every time a bank loans money to a borrower it creates a social situation which may be to the advantage of the borrower or to his associates in business or to his employees. When we created the Disaster Loan Corporation for the benefit of the river valleys which had been devastated we undoubtedly affected the social welfare of people who were eligible to obtain loans and did obtain loans. But that was not the pri-

mary consideration. We made these loans through the Disaster Loan Corporation because banks were not in a position to do it, and because the terms of credit had to be a little more generous than a bank would be justified in giving.

So that I myself, having gone through the history of the R. F. C. on the Banking and Currency Committee, take the position that we must at a very early date consider what function the R. F. C. and its affiliates are to perform in the post-war period. It ought not to be left to chance. I think we must consider legislation of that sort, and, so far as I am concerned, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the loan agencies, I shall myself feel it incumbent upon me to urge at the earliest date that we decide what is to be the function of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all its affiliates.

Mr. President, I wish to say another thing. The President by order No. 1, under the Reorganization Act, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out, set up the Federal Loan Agency. Mr. Jesse Jones was made the head of that Agency. The President desired to appoint Mr. Jones Secretary of Commerce. According to Mr. Jones' statement in the hearing, he did not seek that appointment; he did not seek this double duty. Later on when it was again suggested, Mr. Jones replied—and as I recall he so stated in his testimony—that he could not hold both offices under the law. It was then that Mr. Jones was requested to take whatever steps were necessary to cause Congress to enact a law which would refer only to him by name, authorizing him, notwithstanding any law then in existence, to occupy the position of Secretary of Commerce at the same time he occupied the position as head of the Federal Loan Agency. That was back in 1940. The measure was promptly passed by both Houses, and I dare say that Congress was induced to pass it largely because Congress felt that Mr. Jones had done a splendid job as head of the R. F. C. and other lending agencies, and that if he was to be Secretary of Commerce also, Congress did not wish him to be required to give up the control of the lending agencies. I believe that confidence of Congress was justified, for I think, and I am not at all hesitant in saying so, that Mr. Jones did a splendid, outstanding job as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and as head of the lending agencies after they were consolidated and he was appointed Administrator.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The President of the United States also felt the same way, as indicated by the verbiage in his letter to the Honorable Jesse Jones asking him to resign, did he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. The President stated in his letter substantially what I have stated.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly. I simply wanted the Senator to bring that out.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President's letter speaks for itself, and I agree with what the President said concerning Mr. Jones' record. I have repeatedly so stated here on the floor, and it has been my attitude in the Banking and Currency Committee, as every member of the committee knows.

Two years ago the President issued an order transferring certain functions of the Federal loan agencies to the Department of Commerce or to the Secretary of Commerce. I have forgotten whether the order transferred them to the Department or to the Secretary, but I believe to the Department of Commerce. I am sure that in the President's opinion he had some good reasons for making that transfer, but I do not know what that reason was, because Mr. Jones, being both Secretary of Commerce and the head of the Loan Agency, occupying both positions by the consent of Congress, was in charge of both, and it was like taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another of the same pair of trousers.

Two years ago, Mr. President, I had occasion to express my opinion about the consolidation of the duties of the Secretary of Commerce, and also about the extra Vice Presidential duties of Mr. Wallace, who was at that time head of the Board of Economic Warfare. During the rather unfortunate newspaper controversy between Mr. Jones and Mr. Wallace about the purchase of critical materials, I was asked by a very high authority in the executive department of the Government what I thought about it, and I said what I thought, and I am going to repeat here what I said. I said that I believed that any man elected Vice President of the United States, the second highest office within the gift of the American people, ought to devote his entire time, so far as his official duties were concerned, to the performance of his duties as Vice President; that that was a full-time big man's job if it was looked after properly, and that therefore I did not believe the President ought to have made or ought to have retained Vice President Wallace as head of the Board of Economic Warfare.

I notice in the newspapers that the new Vice President has adopted that theory by saying that he is not going to do anything else except be Vice President, and since his retirement from the office, the former Vice President, Mr. Wallace, has in a newspaper interview, announced that he does not believe the Vice President ought to be saddled with any other duties except the duties of the Vice President. So we all agree about that.

At the same time I said I thought the job of being Secretary of Commerce was sufficiently important to occupy the entire time of any man. It is a Cabinet position. It is a high honor. That office deals with our industrial and commercial life, both domestically and internationally, and I believe that any man who is appointed to a Cabinet position, whether it be Secretary of Commerce or other Cabinet office, though the Secretary of Commerce was the position especially

under discussion, ought not to be "saddled," if that is the proper term, and using the quotation from the Vice President, with another job as big or bigger than that of being Secretary of Commerce. I thought that the Secretaryship of Commerce was a full-time big man's job, and that being Administrator of the Federal lending agencies was also a full-time big man's job, and that the two jobs ought not to be combined. That was my opinion 2 years ago; it is my opinion now, and that explains that my attitude respecting the George bill has not been induced by the appointment of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, I believe the George bill ought to be passed. I think it will be passed by the Senate by a very large majority, and I will say that I have every assurance from the other end of the Capitol that it will be taken up, if passed here, and promptly disposed of over there. What the President will do with it I am not in a position to say, but that is not our particular concern at the moment. In spite of the enthusiasm of those who think that as it is now constituted and created the R. F. C. and the Federal loan agencies, without any further enactment of Congress or without any restrictions, or without Congress charting the highway to be traveled by the R. F. C. and its affiliates, ought to constitute themselves, under present conditions, the sole and only post-war agencies for the doing of many things which we have in mind as necessary when the war shall end, I believe Congress would not be justified in sanctioning such action.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to express my complete agreement, Mr. President, with the policy which the majority leader has just announced.

I shall now ask the majority leader a question in order to satisfy a burning curiosity which exists on this side of the aisle. The majority leader is appearing in the Senate today with some covering over his left optic. A Democratic caucus was held this morning. None of the Senators on this side of the aisle were permitted to be present at that caucus. To satisfy the curiosity of some of us on this side of the aisle, I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky whether there is any connection between the condition of his left optic and the Democratic caucus held this morning?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will answer the Senator frankly. If the Republican Members of the Senate had allowed us on this side of the aisle to sit in on their caucus held the other day respecting Henry Wallace, we would have reciprocated by inviting them to sit in on ours.

Mr. REED. None of our Senators appeared in the condition in which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky appears today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope none of the minority members will ever appear on the floor of the Senate in the condition in which I appear at the moment. I probably look more like Dead-Eye Dick

than a United States Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kentucky knows how deeply I sympathize with him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will explain to the Senator why I am wearing this patch. The Senator may recall that during December I had an ulcer on the cornea of my left eye, which healed, and I thought there would be no further difficulty. Ten days or 2 weeks ago it recurred, and I had to resume my incarceration in the hospital. It has again healed, and I hope it will not again recur. However, the doctor told me that I ought to wear this patch on my eye to protect it from wind; and I thought I ought to wear it in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. I wished to give the background of my position on the George bill, which I intend to support when it comes to a vote. I hope it will be enacted into law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate. While I have the greatest respect and deference for the views of Senators who are supporting the pending bill, in the present state of the record I am not in a position to be in accord with those ideas. Without taking the time of the Senate, therefore, and without endeavoring to repeat the sentiments which I feel on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 375

As Mr. Wallace said in his testimony before this committee, it is obvious that the occasion for the introduction of S. 375 was the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce by President Roosevelt. Further, as Mr. Wallace said in his testimony:

"There are some who have suggested—perhaps in an effort to save my feelings or face—that this separation of the lending functions from the Commerce Department is desirable because of my alleged lack of experience in such field. Let me say that this talk does not fool me or the American public. You know and I know that it is not a question of my 'lack of experience.' Rather it is a case of not liking the experience I have."

Further in his testimony Secretary Wallace spoke of his own experience as follows:

"For 8 years I was Secretary of Agriculture. During that period the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration were under my supervision. During that period these agencies loaned over \$6,000,000,000. We made 11,500,000 separate commodity credit loans and 1,208,000 rural rehabilitation loans. We arranged the financing to permit 20,184 tenant farmers to buy their own farms."

In addition to this experience as Secretary of Agriculture for 8 years, Mr. Wallace was Chairman of the Supplies, Priorities, and Allocations Board in the most critical period of the defense effort. Later Mr. Wallace did pioneer work in setting up the Board of Economic Warfare. Mr. Wallace has traveled extensively through the United States, South America, Europe, and the Orient on behalf of the United States Government as Vice President of the United States. Mr. Wallace is admittedly one of the foremost students of

economics and political science in this country.

As Vice President during the last 4 years he sat in the meetings of the President's Cabinet; by virtue of his several positions he has been in intimate contact with the mobilization of the Nation's economy for the war effort.

No question has been raised as to Mr. Wallace's integrity, his intelligence, his industry, or his general competency. No single case of either bad administration, lack of foresight, or competence in the performance of any of the very responsible duties which have been under his charge, has been pointed out by the opposition. Indeed, the opposition has referred to no subject, no book, no statement, nor act of omission or commission on the part of Mr. Wallace which gives rise to the bitter fight which is being made in the Senate to keep him from being Secretary of Commerce and having general supervision of the lending agencies of the Government in the same way that Mr. Jesse Jones has occupied the office of Secretary of Commerce and exercised those supervisory functions for the past 4 years.

One cannot escape the conclusion, therefore, that as Mr. Wallace further said in his testimony:

"The real motive underlying these suggestions for stripping the Department of Commerce of its vast financial power has, of course, nothing to do with my competence to administer these powers. The real issue is whether or not the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its giant subsidiaries are to be used only to help big business or whether these powers are also to be used to help little business and to help carry out the President's commitment of 60,000,000 jobs."

"In other words the question is really one of whether this committee, the Congress, and the American public want these enormous financial powers utilized and invested in free America—in a prosperous America."

The bill then presents the issue which Mr. Wallace posed in the question "Shall we approach the problems of peace with the same boldness of conception, the same courage and determination, as we have approached the problems of war?"

Mr. Wallace presents simply, courageously, and clearly the policies which he would pursue in the performance of the duties of Secretary of Commerce as they now exist.

He takes as his premise the preservation and stimulation of free enterprise and the promotion of the well-being of all the people of America. He tells this committee that if he is confirmed as Secretary of Commerce with supervision over the lending agencies that he will administer the agencies in the spirit of those policies. To use Mr. Wallace's own words:

"For I can tell you here and now that if the R. F. C. is left in the Commerce Department, I will use its powers in the interest of all the American people."

And, Mr. Wallace says with equal candor:

"If the Congress does not feel that the powers of the R. F. C. should be exercised in such a way as to further the objectives which I have set forth here, then I respectfully urge the Congress to take the R. F. C. out from under the control of the Commerce Department."

In his statement of policies, Mr. Wallace specifically enumerates the economic bill of rights embodied in the President's message to Congress as follows:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom

from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

"The right to a good education."

Mr. Wallace then in his address to the committee commented upon and amplified the eight points in this bill of rights of the President, and disclosed his general views and ideas with respect to the implementation of each of those points. Nowhere did Mr. Wallace intimate that he would exercise any authority which was not within the scope of the statutes governing the lending agencies now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. Nowhere did he question the necessity of having the approval of Congress if he were to attempt to exercise any authority not now conferred upon the Federal lending agencies. In fact, unlike his predecessor, he stated that if he were in charge of the lending agencies he would come to the Congress and seek legislation from the Congress permitting him to carry out the specific policies and projects which he thought were in the public interest and within the scope of the lending agencies generally. Specifically, in contrast to the policy of his predecessor, he stated that he thought the lending agencies should be subject to the audit of the Comptroller General and under the general supervision of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Wallace, therefore, far from manifesting any desire to ignore the statutes or the sentiments of Congress has shown every respect for the laws by which he would be governed in the administration of this agency and for the opinion of the Congress in the performance of his duties.

Not only did Mr. Wallace affirm his belief in private enterprise but the burden of his whole address to the committee was to show that the lending agencies properly employed could be a great bulwark to private enterprise in the United States and in the world. He went further and set out specific suggestions as to how he would help private enterprise by making credit and capital available for foreign trade, for small business and for new enterprises, and for the stimulation of the economy of those parts of the country which heretofore have not kept pace with the more favored regions of the Nation.

The most severe critic of the former Vice President cannot find in his address to the committee one objectionable word, in our opinion.

On the other hand, he shows an understanding of our economy and the world economy which is sorely needed in one who is to direct the agencies under the control of the Federal Loan Administration. He shows an understanding of the principles which must govern our foreign trade, of the economic significance of full employment and of the lack of full employment in this country. He shows an understanding of the necessity of the free flow of investment capital essential to the progress of the Nation. He grasps the significance of education and of health as the firm foundation upon which the Nation can be strong.

Mr. Wallace made the statement to the committee that the first problem facing him was the winning of the war; second, the winning of the peace; and third, the providing of full employment for the people and adequate markets for the business and agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. Wallace proved himself to be a farseeing man by his efforts to build up stock piles of rubber as early as 1939, by the research program which the Department of Agriculture carried on in the field of rubber produc-

tion while he was Secretary, and by his activities in developing sources in South America for strategic and critical war material, even before the war.

Few men who have ever appeared under similar circumstances have more courageously and candidly opened their minds to a Senate committee than did Mr. Wallace to this committee.

Why then the bitter opposition to Mr. Wallace? Why are Senators determined, even before Mr. Wallace is to be confirmed, to strip the office of Secretary of Commerce of these lending agencies? What is the alleged lack of experience and lack of confidence to which Senators refer without giving any indication to what they have in mind? Why are some Senators determined to prevent Mr. Wallace from being confirmed as Secretary of Commerce with the lending agencies stripped from it? The only rational conclusion which one can arrive at, is that those who would strip the Secretary of Commerce of the lending agencies which are now supervised by him, are opposed to what Wallace stands for and believes in and are opposed to the objectives which he has stated will guide him in the performance of his duties.

We agree with Mr. Wallace and not with his opposition. We believe not only in Mr. Wallace's integrity and his competence and his efficiency, but we believe also in the objectives which Henry Wallace symbolizes. We believe in the America which Henry Wallace is trying to help build. We believe that the things Henry Wallace believes in are essential to the maintenance and the growth of private enterprise in America. We believe that only if the office of Secretary of Commerce and all the Federal lending agencies are administered in the spirit of what Henry A. Wallace believes in, and in the interest of furthering those policies Henry A. Wallace laid down to the committee, can we have a fully employed and a prosperous America.

We believe that if Henry Wallace had 1 year of opportunity as Secretary of Commerce to direct the policies of the lending agencies now under that office, he would do it with such administrative competence and such wisdom of policy that it would meet with the overwhelming approval of the people of the Nation and of the Congress.

Accordingly, we cannot conscientiously refrain from saying that stripping the office of Secretary of Commerce of supervision of the lending agencies, if Henry Wallace is to be the incumbent of that office, would be a tragedy not for Henry Wallace but for America and to a considerable extent for the entire world. The Nation needs Henry A. Wallace in this place. The farmers need him. All businessmen, large and small, need him. Both labor and capital need him. The President needs him. The Congress needs him.

The undersigned, therefore, earnestly hope that in its wisdom the Senate may not, either out of misunderstanding or out of any other motive, hurl a boomerang which will, possibly missing its victim, come back to do greater harm in the long run to the people's representatives and the people themselves.

We oppose at this time, therefore, the enactment of S. 375.

CLAUDE PEPPER.
THEODORE G. BILBO.
JAMES M. MEAD.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

JANUARY 31, 1945.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill because I have always been in favor of scattering power as much as it can be scattered; but so far as the bill accomplishing any real purpose is concerned, I do not believe that it would accomplish any purpose whatsoever.

The real difficulty with the R. F. C. is that its powers are grossly excessive. We gave unlimited power to the R. F. C. to go into any business having the remotest relation to the war—and that means any business. We gave it power to form corporations for that purpose. We gave it so many billion dollars that no one knows how many billion dollars it has. The laws are scattered through the books in such a manner that it is almost impossible to calculate the amount involved. I believe it has the power to borrow about \$14,000,000,000 and relend it. It probably still has about \$5,000,000,000 that it can lend for any purpose whatsoever.

When the bill which expanded it most came before the Senate for consideration in June 1940, former Senator Danaher and I opposed it. We succeeded in cutting down slightly the powers which were granted to the R. F. C. The R. F. C. came before Congress in May 1941, and again we endeavored in the Committee on Banking and Currency to hold its powers down as much as we could, but we were overridden. Finally a sort of compromise was reached.

The great difficulty in this whole situation is that we have given too much power to the R. F. C. As to the distribution of powers, there is no reason in the world for this bill except the desire to limit Henry Wallace, so that although he may become Secretary of Commerce, he may not also exercise the powers of the R. F. C. There is no other reason for this bill. Obviously it would not have been introduced except for that purpose. Mr. Wallace recognizes that fact. In his testimony before the committee he recognized that that was the only reason for the introduction of the bill.

Members of the Senate feel that Henry Wallace is not competent to administer the R. F. C. It is not a question of his competency to administer the Department of Commerce and the R. F. C. together. The only possible reason for this bill is that many Senators have no confidence in Henry Wallace, because they do not believe in his philosophy, and that by taking this power away from him they can in some way limit him. I believe that is a vain effort, because under the First War Powers Act we have given the President power to transfer and consolidate departments. Tomorrow, the moment Mr. Wallace became Secretary of Commerce, the President could place in his charge the Foreign Economic Administration, which has the export-import bank, which controls the United States Commercial Company, with a capital of \$1,000,000,000. The day after that he could tell whoever was in charge of the R. F. C. to give the United States Commercial Company another \$5,000,000,000; and a man appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate could not well refuse to carry out such an order.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator feel that the educational value of this nomination and all it has precipitated may make it opportune for the Congress to reconsider some of the vast grants and

transfers of power which the Senator has always questioned, and which I have always questioned? Perhaps Senators on both sides of the aisle who have given such enormous grants of power because of confidence in a man—which is a poor basis for legislation—may not be disposed to place some further restrictions on the powers both of the President and of other executive officers.

Mr. TAFT. I hope that may be the result; but that is not the result. Apparently the nomination of Mr. Wallace will be confirmed, if the Senate chooses so to vote, for the position of Secretary of Commerce alone, before any such reconsideration can take place. I am quite confident that it would require a fairly long time. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation involves the whole problem of how far Government is to continue in the lending business in the post-war period. That is a very involved and difficult question. I doubt very much whether it will be decided in the next 6 months or the next year. I hope such a study may be undertaken. I hope the present situation will promote the undertaking of such reconsideration. I believe we have reached the point where we could well repeal section 1 of the First War Powers Act, which was taken from the Overman Act of the First World War; but I do not believe that will be done. I have not seen any pressure on the part of the administration to cut down its own powers; and it is very difficult to organize against the administration to reduce its powers.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe we must distinguish between the administration and the Senate, in view of what is happening here today. It seems quite evident that a considerable majority of the Senate is disposed to take away some of the powers, or at least to prevent their transfer into the hands of the Secretary of Commerce. I think it is fair to point out that it was not possible, in the bill before the Commerce Committee, to go beyond what was done, because of the question of jurisdiction which is involved, and because the Commerce Committee clearly recognized that it had no right to enter the domain of the Committee on Banking and Currency. But certainly there is afforded an illuminating illustration of what may now be possible in view of changed circumstances.

Mr. TAFT. I can tell the Senator what would happen in the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any other committee, if a bill to limit the powers of the R. F. C., or otherwise reduce bureaucratic power were to be introduced. The chairman of the committee, under pressure from the administration, would postpone hearings from month to month. Finally there would be hearings, and then the committee would not be called together to act. In the end we might accomplish some results; but, as a practical matter, up to this time, at least, Congress has not taken away any powers that I know of. It is a very difficult thing to do practically.

When the price control bill comes up it will be pointed out that the post-war period is just as important as the war period, that it is still an emergency period, and that it will be a difficult matter.

I do not say it should not be done. I only say that, so far as we are concerned now, and in view of the nomination of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, what we are attempting to do is wholly vain unless we do what the Senator from Maine has suggested, namely, unless we repeal the War Powers Act, for Mr. Jones himself appeared twice before our committee, and said the R. F. C. does not determine policy. He said, "If the War Department tells us to build a war plant, we build a war plant. If the Navy Department tells us to build a Navy plant, we build a Navy plant. If the Foreign Economic Administration tells us to make a loan in South America, we make the loan; because," he said, "we do not consider ourselves a policy-making organization."

It is true that Mr. Jones may have exercised a little restraint; he may have balked a little, and may have taken some matters to the President; but in the ultimate analysis, under present conditions the head of the RFC is obliged to accept the orders of the various departments which administer policy. So, if Mr. Henry Wallace had assigned to him, as he may have, the Foreign Economic Administration, and if he directed the R. F. C. to make a loan for a pipe line in Arabia, I have no doubt whatever that under the existing Executive orders the head of the R. F. C. would feel obliged to make such a loan.

So far as the real purpose of the bill is concerned, namely, to deprive Mr. Wallace of powers which the Commerce Committee does not think he is qualified to exercise, I say that purpose is not effectuated by the bill. Every argument against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace as R. F. C. Administrator applies equally to the question of the nomination and confirmation of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not also true that if the country is under the danger of the malign influence of the views of Mr. Wallace, it would be perfectly possible, regardless of whether he was in authority, for him to carry out those views if the President chose to use him in some such way as he has used Mr. Harry Hopkins, for Mr. Harry Hopkins, in Rome, has been announcing the foreign policy of the administration and the changes which have occurred, although, so far as I know the nomination of Mr. Hopkins in any capacity has not come before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if I may correct the Senator, let me say that Mr. Hopkins' name was before us. His name was presented to the Senate as Secretary of Commerce. His nomination was confirmed by a vote of 58 to 27. I think I can even tell the Senate the names of the Senators who voted against the confirmation of his nomination, namely, most of the Republican Senators and also the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the then Senator King of

Utah, and the late Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana. They voted against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins, at that time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say that I was referring to Mr. Hopkins in his present incarnation as sort of a combination of Rasputin and Colonel House and Svengali. So I think it should be made clear that we are not in any way whatever eliminating the evil influence Mr. Wallace has by his defeat for any office, but rather we would contribute to the aspects of martyrdom which undoubtedly will earnestly be urged.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, apparently the Senator has a new argument for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, namely, that although he is not competent to exercise the broad powers of Federal Loan Administrator, he will be a martyr unless we confirm his nomination. It seems to me that argument is wholly illogical. Certainly I never heard urged before the argument that we should confirm the nomination of a man to an office, although he is incompetent, merely because if we do not confirm his nomination he will be a martyr. As a matter of fact, if Mr. Wallace becomes Secretary of Commerce he will sit in all Cabinet meetings at the White House. But the Federal Loan Administrator will not sit in those meetings and Mr. Wallace's views as to what the R. F. C. Administrator will do will certainly be far more important in that position than will be the views of the man who may be made the Administrator under the set-up proposed by the pending bill.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio has spoken about Mr. Wallace's incompetence. From what the Senator from Ohio has said, I think it is evident that the question is not whether Mr. Wallace is incompetent. The proposition is that he is too competent; he is too able and too effective for the views which he holds. I realize that Senators may well differ with him respecting his views. But the question is not one of whether he is incompetent. If he were weak, if he were a bungler, if he had not been effective, if he had more or less failed and did not know how to do a job, and if his record did not show that he knew how to do a job, there would not be so much worry and so much distress and so much opposition about his nomination. It is because he is effective that those who do not share his views oppose his being placed in a position in which they know he will be competent and effective from his viewpoint.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator is going to vote to take away from him the powers of the Federal Loan Administrator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to be perfectly frank with the Senator. I should like to see Mr. Wallace have the

loaning powers. I do not favor the passage of the George bill, from the standpoint of taking away from Mr. Wallace the loaning powers. I have been in politics a long time, and I know there are times when it is necessary to make a virtue of political necessity. If I should vote for the George bill, it would only be because I am so anxious to see Mr. Wallace's nomination as Secretary of Commerce confirmed. I would do it because I knew that such a vote would be necessary in order to have Mr. Wallace's nomination as Secretary of Commerce confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator recognizes that a majority of the Senate is unwilling to trust to Mr. Wallace the powers of the Federal Loan Administrator which have so long been exercised by Mr. Jones.

Mr. HILL. I recognize that a majority of the Senate is unwilling to turn over to Mr. Wallace, effective and competent as I believe him to be, the administration of the lending agencies, holding the views he does.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on the question of the nomination and qualities of Mr. Wallace, I shall be glad to speak when the nomination is before the Senate. Apparently the administration and Mr. Wallace himself are afraid to submit his name to the Senate on the question of nominating him as Federal Loan Administrator. That is the reason for the present proceedings. That is the reason for the refusal to go into executive session. It is the reason for the motion the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] proposes to make, namely, to postpone for a month or more the question of the consideration of Mr. Wallace's nomination.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I must say that what the Senator from Ohio said about the futility of proposing to amend the R. F. C. Act because of his anticipation of what the chairman of the committee would do, namely, that he would not hold hearings, compels me to state that it seems to me that it is well to bear in mind that the chairman of a committee is the servant of the committee. I do not think any chairman has the right to "sit" upon any bill which a majority of the committee desires to consider.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, let me say that I did not intend in any way to reflect on the particular Senator who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No.

Mr. TAFT. I only wished to point out that the administration is far stronger in its control of the committees, in being able to block legislation, than it is in being able to force legislation of its own through the Senate. That is always a natural situation. Questions and considerations of committee procedure are necessarily far more largely a question of organization.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. My only suggestion was that it is very difficult to put through a bill against the administration, even

though possibly when the bill comes to a vote on the floor of the Senate a majority of the Senate is in favor of its passage. It is quite true that that should not be the condition, but it is the condition in every legislative body, and usually the only chance there is, to get at a proposition is when the majority party or the majority administration come to the Senate and request something. Then, of course, they must submit their proposition directly. I did not mean to reflect in any way on any particular committee chairman, but I simply refer to the condition of any legislative body.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I understood that when I referred to the chairmen of all committees, I do not think a chairman has a right to "sit" on a bill or on an amendment to a bill which has been referred to a committee, if a majority of the committee desires to consider the proposed piece of legislation. So far as I am concerned, with the pending bill as it now stands I am not satisfied. To a considerable extent it means what the Senator from Ohio has said it means. I understand amendments are to be offered to place the R. F. C. organization under the General Accounting Office. That should have been done a long time ago. As the Senator from Ohio has said, the R. F. C. is not a policy-making organization. The policies are left to too many Toms, Dicks, and Harrys to handle and shovel out the funds. I am not sure that the bill should not be referred to the committee for further study, and to rewrite it so as to safeguard not only the policy-making functions with respect to loans, but also to provide an independent audit by the General Accounting Office. Too many funds are shoveled out for many purposes. I doubt not the legality but the good sense of allowing the War and Navy Departments to call for billions upon billions of dollars and having some department hand the money out to them. It seems to me to be a very haphazard way of doing business. Perhaps that is the reason there is so much waste in public funds today.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I think we could well cancel perhaps four or five billion dollars of the R. F. C.'s loaning powers, but there would be strenuous opposition if such a proposal were made.

Mr. President, I repeat that the real purpose of the bill obviously is to take away from Henry Wallace the powers to which reference has been made. I am willing to vote for the bill. I was the only Senator who expressed doubt when we passed the bill giving to Mr. Jones the right to exercise both powers. Nevertheless, the functions are very similar. If we were to assign the R. F. C. to any department it would be to the Department of Commerce. I shall vote for the bill only because I believe it to be wise not to repose too many powers in one man; but I think, without question, that the bill shows an entire lack of faith in the ability and philosophy of Mr. Henry Wallace.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I do not believe any human being, whether it be Mr. Wallace, Mr. Jones, or anyone

else, is qualified to handle all the money which is in the control of the R. F. C. I think the power is altogether too great to entrust to any one individual. I am hopeful that some of the amendments which I understand will be proposed will, to a large extent, remedy the difficulty, but I still believe that the bill should go back to the Commerce Committee for entire revision of the policy which is involved.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the problem presented in the Commerce Committee was one of jurisdiction. All the grants of power under the R. F. C. were considered in the Banking and Currency Committee. The only reason the pending bill came to the Commerce Committee was that it proposed to take away powers now exercised by the Secretary of Commerce, over whom our committee has jurisdiction. But any attempt to invade a field which was not then occupied would have been an encroachment upon the jurisdiction of other committees, so I think the Senator from Georgia and the committee were entirely in accord. We could not go beyond the immediate objective of the George bill, which was to divorce the R. F. C. powers from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand the accuracy of what the Senator has said; but I think it would be perfectly proper to send the bill back to the committee for revision, and to put in additional safeguards in order to protect the funds. To my mind it is unheard of that thirty or forty billion dollars should be handed out merely because someone in authority says "We must have \$5,000,000 for this and \$5,000,000 for that," and Jesse Jones says, "We must hand it out to them because they determine policies and we only give them the money." It seems to me that such a proposition is ridiculous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is printed and lying on the desk an amendment which I had intended to offer to the pending bill. The amendment would call for a simple audit of the agencies and corporations created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. However, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment which would go considerably further than the one which I had intended to offer, which calls for a simple audit of those agencies at the end of the year by the Comptroller General. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is in better form and is more satisfactory than the one which I had intended to offer. I hope that the amendment which he is about to offer will be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment as amended has been agreed to. It will be necessary for the Senator from Virginia first to ask for re-

consideration of the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The committee amendment as amended is before the Senate.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 5. (a) The financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the current fiscal year.

(b) A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit of each corporation and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus, or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the several corporations, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The report shall also show specifically every program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

(c) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations as provided in section 5 (a) of this Act may be paid out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for the purpose: *Provided*, That by agreement between the General Accounting Office and said corporation the expenses of said audit may be paid from funds of such corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour has expired.

There being no unfinished business before the Senate, the consideration of the bill which was taken up on motion earlier today will be continued.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I inquire of the Senator whether this amendment has been prepared in consultation with the Comptroller General or his office?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that it has been.

Mr. GEORGE. And it can be administered without undue interruption of the corporate functions of the various loan agencies?

Mr. BYRD. The amendment does not cover, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, any question involving the making of loans except to report to Congress any loans illegally made, but does cover the auditing of loans after they are made.

Mr. GEORGE. It simply covers the auditing?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; it does not give the Comptroller General the right to deny the making of loans, but anything that is done that may be of an illegal character, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. The Comptroller General would merely report to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire if the auditing will cover the transactions which have taken place during the past several years?

Mr. BYRD. No; the auditing is to start with the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. MURRAY. It would seem to me, inasmuch as the R. F. C. has not been subjected to audit or examination and has not been required to make any report, that the audit ought to cover transactions which have occurred during the past several years.

Mr. BYRD. The R. F. C. has not been audited by the Comptroller General; it has been audited by competent auditors, and the reports, as I understand, are made at certain periods to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but, because of the confidential nature of some of the reports on account of the war, they have not been made public.

Mr. MURRAY. Would the Senator be agreeable to having his amendment amended so as to make it apply to past transactions?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that I would have no objection to that, but the R. F. C. was organized in 1930, and it would be a vast undertaking to audit all its transactions since that time.

Mr. MURRAY. I suggest that the audit should not go back further than to cover the period of the war effort so as to include the loans and transactions during the past several years. I know of some loans which have been made in connection with which the facts would seem to indicate that there was a reason

why there should be an investigation and an audit.

Mr. BYRD. So far as I am concerned, I would have no objection to it if the experts are available. I think the R. F. C. should have been audited from the very beginning.

Mr. MURRAY. I suggest that the date of the audit be fixed as of the commencement of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator have any objection to making the provisions of the amendment applicable to the present fiscal year rather than waiting until the next fiscal year?

Mr. BYRD. I think that is an excellent suggestion, and, after I make my statement, if the Senator will prepare the amendment he has in mind, I shall be very glad, so far as I am concerned, to accept it.

Mr. AIKEN. In connection with the matter brought up by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] it seems to me that the Comptroller General would necessarily have to go somewhat into the past in order adequately to carry out the provisions of the amendment for the present, would he not?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Many of the loans were made of course some time ago and are still outstanding.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he has a copy of his proposed amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I hand the Senator a copy.

Mr. President, in explanation of this amendment I should like to state that there are 56 Government corporations, and that 20 of them are audited by the Comptroller General and 36 are not required to be audited by law or have not submitted to audit by the Comptroller General.

I should like first to read to the Senate a list of the Government corporations which are now audited: The Commodity Credit Corporation is audited; the Export-Import Bank is audited; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is audited; the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is audited; the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., is audited; the Federal Public Housing Authority is audited; the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Co. is audited; the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation is audited; the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the Institute of Inter-American Transportation; the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., the Inter-American Navigation Corporation, Prencinradio, Inc., the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Smithsonian Institution, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the United States Housing Corporation, the Virgin Islands Company, and the Welfare and Recreational Association of Public Buildings and Grounds, Inc., are all audited. The corporations mentioned constitute the 20 which are now audited.

It is proposed by this amendment to require that the other 36 corporations,

the names of which I am about to read shall be audited in the same way that every other agency of the Government is now required to be audited by general law. The 36 corporations include American President Lines, Ltd., Banks for Cooperatives, Cargoes, Inc., Colonial Mica, Copper Recovery Corporation, Defense Homes Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, Disaster Loan Corporation, Electric Home and Farm Authority, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Home Loan Banks, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Federal Land Banks, Federal National Mortgage Association, Inland Waterways Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Panama Railroad Co., Petroleum Reserves Corporation, Production Credit Corporations, Puerto Rico Cement Corporation, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, RFC Mortgage Company, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, Rubber Development Corporation, Rubber Reserve Company, Steel Recovery Corporation, Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, apparently, is audited, but the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., is not.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the Senator's amendment does not cover the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is different from the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. The Tennessee Valley Authority is already audited.

Mr. HILL. It is already audited under an act of Congress, as the Senator recalls. I was wondering, as the Senator's amendment is now drafted, whether there would be any danger of its language being construed to cover the Tennessee Valley Authority. Has the Senator given any thought to that?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot conceive that there would be, for it is already audited.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is already audited under a special act of Congress. The Comptroller General, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Congress really entered into an agreement for the auditing and how the audit should be made. I notice the Senator's amendment prescribes certain details perhaps with reference to the audit of the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries. I may say that I am in favor of the Senator's amendment, but, not knowing its effect, I should not want to do anything to repeal, modify, or change the special T. V. A. Act.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that I understand the Comptroller General thinks that the audit of the T. V. A. is now satisfactory, and this amendment will leave it to his discretion as to what kind of an audit shall be made. It does require, however, that every corporation be audited in accordance with the terms of the amendment.

Mr. HILL. But it is the Senator's opinion that the T. V. A. would not fall under the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. That is my opinion, un-

less the Comptroller General desired to utilize this amendment instead of the present law.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senator from Virginia aware of the fact that the management and control of the Board of Economic Warfare, as it existed prior to the changes instituted 2 years ago, audited their own accounts and were in full control of their finances without any outside agency, such as the General Accounting Office, having anything to do with it at all?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is correct about that. In addition to those corporations I have already mentioned as not being audited, the Textile Foundation, Inc., is not audited, the United States Commercial Co., which is one of the corporations the Senator has just referred to, is not audited. Others are the United States Spruce Production Corporation, the War Damage Corporation, the War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., the War Hemp Industries, Inc., War Materials, Inc., and the Warrior River Terminal Company. That is a list, Mr. President, of 36 agencies of the Government which have the power to make loans. The total authority of the various corporations, of which 20 are now audited and 36 are not, is \$33,207,000,000, as of March 31, 1944. Some of the authorizations have been increased since that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me add that the sum mentioned nowhere near represents the amount of money which these corporations handle in their purchase and resale, particularly at this time, of essential materials of war.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is entirely correct about that, because this is a revolving fund. The great danger and menace of these corporations is that Congress authorizes certain corporations to borrow certain amounts. The funds have been used as revolving funds to be expended for other purposes.

Let us take, for example, the R. F. C. The R. F. C. up to this date has actually loaned \$45,000,000,000, from an original authority of about fifteen to sixteen billion. In other words, it has pyramided three times by reason of the fact that the payments which come back to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are then loaned time and time again as often as they come back.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me add again that these corporations have done an enormous business in buying and selling strategic materials at one price and reselling to the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission at a marked-up price, so that they have financed themselves by many hundred million dollars of additional sums, the aggregate of which nobody knows. I think the Senator will find that in the case of rubber alone the rubber which is sold by the Rubber Reserve Corporation—which controls all the rubber anyway—to the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission is marked up 17½ cents a pound above the price at which it is sold for civilian consumption. There have been witnesses before the Commit-

tee on Agriculture and Forestry who have testified that there is also a mark-up in the price of alcohol, and, for aught we know, there may be a mark-up in the price of steel and aluminum and everything else bought by these corporations and resold to the Army and Navy. Therefore, in effect, if they do not get the money they want from Congress, they are enabled to finance themselves from the appropriations to the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission, and no one in the Congress feels like objecting to the amounts which those agencies request. We have no control over that situation whereby subsidiaries of the R. F. C. buy at one price and can sell to the War Department at three times that price if they see fit to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the situation referred to by the Senator from Vermont is much more fortunate than one whereby the R. F. C. would make loans on such a plan that the Government would lose money rather than make money on the transaction. After all, this fund is not only to promote the war effort, but to aid business, and there is no reason why the Government should not make the loans on substantially the same lines as those on which private banks would make them. I know the Senator does not mean any criticism by what he has said, but I should much prefer to have profits shown as a result of the operations than to have a deficit shown because the loans were insecurely financed or poorly managed.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would be perfectly possible to show innumerable cases in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made unfortunate loans to private industry, and then the War Department or the Maritime Commission or the Navy Department bought the plants on which the bad loans were made, at prices in excess of the value. So the Defense Plants Corporation, which made the loan in the first place, is always in the black by reason of throwing loans over onto some other agency.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be true, but, taking the over-all picture, it is a good one. I have also read recently of many concerns going to banks to obtain capital in order to enlarge so that they could fulfill Government orders and requests, and the banks would not agree to make the loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation would then make the loans and resell them at a profit to the very banks which refused the original loans. So that the very magic of Mr. Jones' name and his prestige in the business world has given loans a standing without which they would not have had any chance of being financed, if the Government had not first entered the field. Therefore, my interjection into this colloquy is only to compliment over-all good management of the concern, without endorsing each loan, because it has been conducted in such a way that the taxpayers, who put up the original sum, have not had the

sums they advanced depleted. That is a splendid picture, as against one showing that, whereas \$17,000,000,000 might have been the initial fund, only \$12,000,000,000 remained, and the other \$5,000,000,000 had gone down the rat hole. So, while there may be a profit, if we are going into the business of financing private industry, we should never do it at a loss, unless in some extreme case of national defense, where there is no other alternative, and the necessities warrant it.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator. One other policy has been adopted with the corporations which, in my judgment, is unfortunate; that is, that the Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, is paying subsidies out of a fund that is supposed to have been granted to the Corporation for the purpose of lending. Of course, it is nonrecoverable. The R. F. C. has likewise paid very considerable amounts for subsidies which cannot be recovered.

My judgment is that these corporations should be confined strictly to their lending authorities, and not be permitted to make what is equivalent to an appropriation, to be made out of funds provided to these corporations for loans. The loans should be made on a businesslike basis, and should be recoverable.

In connection with what the Senator from Maryland has said, I should like to point out that the R. F. C. has only about one-half the lending capacity of these various corporations. When we speak of the corporations, our thoughts go to the R. F. C., which is the most gigantic banking organization the world has ever known, with facilities to borrow \$17,000,000,000, and then to reloan the funds as they are paid back, making them into a revolving fund.

As a matter of fact, the other corporations have in the aggregate about the same lending capacity as the R. F. C.; in fact, they have a little more. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, has a \$3,000,000,000 lending capacity, but I see a billion and a half more has been recommended, making it four and a half billion dollars. That in itself is one-third as large as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation fund.

Mr. President, of course my amendment in no way completes the obligation the Senate and the Congress have to restore to Congress the control over these vast appropriations. A proposal will shortly be presented by the Senator from Nebraska and myself in an attempt to go further and restore to the Congress the authority to control these corporations in an effective way so as not to interfere too much with their operations. That is very difficult legislation to prepare, but the pending amendment will secure for Congress information with respect to what these corporations are doing, which is not now fully available, and is very difficult to obtain.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to ask to make an interpolation dealing with the situation raised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator

from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in connection with the discussion of this very matter. As the Senator from Virginia knows, I am in most cordial sympathy with his proposals, which provide for long-delayed auditing and accounting.

There was in the course of a public discussion on the radio a challenge regarding the so-called Dawes loan of \$90,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the suggestion was made by one of the Members of this body that there was something irregular in connection therewith. In justice to Mr. Jesse Jones, who was the Administrator then, I secured from him a statement of facts, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, indicating that that loan, which was made not only for the benefit of the bank, but for the benefit of 100,000 depositors, was completely paid back, and there was also a profit of some five or six million dollars.

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

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1945.
Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your request for information as to the status of the \$90,000,000 loan to the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, which was made June 1932, beg to advise that cash collections have been \$98,600,000, with remaining collateral to the approximate value of \$5,000,000, a total recovery of \$103,600,000.

The expense incident to the preservation of the collateral and the administration of the loan has been approximately \$3,500,000. This is equivalent to collection of the principal of the loan, plus expenses, and approximately \$10,000,000 interest.

Sincerely,

JESSE H. JONES.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope it will be the pleasure of the Senate to adopt this amendment providing a long-delayed audit of the transactions of these various corporations. The amendment has been worked out in cooperation with the Comptroller General. I emphasize again that it does not give to the Comptroller General the power to reject or to disapprove of the loans made by the corporations. I do not think that would be practicable. It requires an audit of the loans after they are made, of the expenses of the various corporations, and of the losses which occur, as well as any profits.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has suggested that the auditing begin as of July 1, 1941. I personally have no objection to that suggestion, though I do not know whether it would necessitate a large amount of work when probably the accountants are not now available.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not accept the amendment, because I can foresee the trouble the bill will run into in the House if the amendment is adopted. If anyone wants to examine the R. F. C. back to the date of its origin, that is all right; but let it be done as an examination, and not as an audit made at this late date. The adoption of such an amend-

ment as this will certainly invite opposition. I had hoped for the adoption of the simple proposal of an audit beginning with the current year. I think that is quite proper. That would not result in the raising of any question as to jurisdiction by any committee which has jurisdiction with respect to the creation of these various organizations or which has reported measures creating them. It seems to me it would be ample to begin the audit with the current year.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator from Montana that the clerk of the committee has just informed me that the Accounting Office has stated they would not have the accountants necessary to make the audit going back beyond the current year.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will say, if the Senator will permit me, that I am proposing a further amendment to the second paragraph of the amendment with reference to the reports of the audits, which would provide that the audit covering transactions prior to July 1, 1945, shall be made at the earliest practicable date, so that we would not place any burden on the General Accounting Office which it could not perform.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean the reports covering the present audit?

Mr. MURRAY. No; the audit that will go back to the year 1941-42.

Mr. BYRD. While I have no objection whatever to going back to 1941, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that that would place such vast work upon the General Accounting Office that they could not keep up the current audits. It applies to all the corporations. The Senator's proposal would require the General Accounting Office to make reports, of course, on the corporations which are already audited, and there are 20 of them, and as the Senator no doubt knows there is a great scarcity of expert accountants who are capable of making such audits.

Mr. MURRAY. It would be within the power of the General Accounting Office to determine when and how they would make the audit, but they would not be required to finish it, or to report the audit until they had the personnel with which to do so.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator's amendment reads:

The audit shall cover all financial transactions occurring after July 1, 1941.

That would be a mandate, in my judgment for the Comptroller General to start back in 1941.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. He would have to start back 3½ years ago, which would prevent us from getting the current audits. I think it was a great mistake that Congress made no provision to require these audits sooner, but if we go back too far then the current audits will be delayed.

I should like to perfect my amendment along the line suggested by the Senator from Georgia, that the audit start at the first of the current fiscal year. The amendment offered by me provides that it start at the first of the next fiscal year. The suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, if agreed to, would

make the audit start on July 1, 1944. I wonder whether that would satisfy the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. No; it seems to me that it is important that an audit and an investigation of all the transactions should be made, and that the public should know what has transpired during the years I have indicated. It seems to me the bill would be imperfect if it did not cover that period.

Mr. BYRD. I think it ought to be done, but does not the Senator agree with me that if, at this particular time, we undertake to audit all the transactions 3 or 4 years back we will not keep up the current audits which we are very anxious to do?

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am in full sympathy with the objective of the Senator from Montana, but I am wondering if an audit beginning July 1, 1944, for the current year, would not give a pretty plain indication of what had been going on in the previous 3 years. Congress would know pretty well from the audit of the current year, it seems to me, whether it would be advisable to go back any further. Personally I would favor the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, but I would not want to jeopardize what the Senator from Virginia proposes to do by insisting upon that amendment.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would it not serve the purpose of the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Montana both if the audit were to be made permissive up to July 1, 1944, and to be made mandatory from July 1, 1944, on? Then, if the accountants were available, the Accounting Office could go back and make the audit over the previous years. If the accountants are not available, they could at least keep the audit current from now on. The Senator from Montana could have his amendment so worded that the Accounting Office would do the work if they could find the personnel to do it. In that case the purpose of both Senators would be served and no harm would be done respecting the current audit.

Mr. MURRAY. I will say that I have no desire to place any impossible burden on the General Accounting Office, but it occurred to me that it was very important that an audit of this character should be made, even though it requires a considerable amount of work to go back over past transactions.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator from Montana be willing to accept the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland that the audit be made permissive before July 1, 1944, and mandatory after July 1, 1944? That is a year sooner, I will say to the Senator, than I had proposed.

Mr. MURRAY. I will accept that.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia. Does the Senator from Georgia think the suggestion made by the Senator from

Maryland is a good one, to make the audits permissive prior to July 1, 1944, and mandatory thereafter?

Mr. GEORGE. I think we are likely to have the whole thing thrown out in the House if that proposal is adopted, because it would look like an investigation. I think the House committees will insist on saying in each instance whether the audit should be made going back that length of time, and I think we will become involved in a squabble about it, and the result will be, I am afraid, that the proposal will be thrown out. I have no objection to the audit being made at any time over the whole period of the life of the corporation, but this does not seem to me to be a very appropriate time to provide for it. I had hoped that a simple audit, starting with the current year, would be provided for; that would not create any friction in the House, and I believe the House would accept such a provision.

Mr. MURRAY. If it is merely permissive it seems to me that it should not precipitate any trouble in the House. The General Accounting Office will determine whether or not it has the personnel to engage in the examination or audit of the accounts as far back as 1941, and if it does not have the personnel it is not required to make the audit.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I propose to perfect the amendment offered by me. In the last sentence of subsection (a), after the words "begin with the", I propose to strike out "first" and insert "current"; and after the words "fiscal year", to strike out "commencing after the enactment of this act." I understand, Mr. President, that I have a right to perfect the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. It would mean, then, that the audit would begin with the current fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification of the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the last sentence of subsection (a) in the Byrd amendment, after the words "begin with the", it is proposed to strike out "first" and insert "current"; and after the words "fiscal year" to strike out "commencing after the enactment of this act", so as to make the sentence read "The audit shall begin with the current fiscal year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Butler] to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it is important that all Government lending corporations be audited, but I wish to point out that only a very small fraction of the job is done when we require an audit. An audit in no way limits the powers of the corporations. I doubt very much if the corporations have exceeded their legal powers. It is desirable to see that there shall be no dishonesty. It is desirable to see that the R. F. C., for in-

stance, does not go beyond its powers; but its powers are so broad that that is hardly possible under the present circumstances. It seems to me that the mere passage of this bill ought not to excuse us from going ahead and attempting to delimit the Corporation.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the bill should contain the further provision that every Government corporation should be required, as Government departments are required, to submit at the beginning of the year a budget of what it expects to spend and for what it expects to spend the money. Possibly Government corporations cannot be held down to as close restrictions as apply to Government departments, but something ought to be done to see that the program is submitted to Congress and approved in advance.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska and I have prepared such legislation, to be introduced today, but we are not offering it as an amendment to this bill, because it is very complex in character. We want to have it thoroughly discussed and referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. TAFT. I am delighted to hear the Senator's statement.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator will find the situation fully protected.

Mr. TAFT. There is one further question of policy. In my opinion, no Government corporation should be formed under any State law, and no such corporation which is formed hereafter should proceed without a charter approved by Congress, in which the powers of the corporation are fixed by Congress, and not by a charter filed in Delaware, New Jersey, or some other State, where charter powers are very liberally granted.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator feel that this amendment is a step in the right direction?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but it is only the least important of the steps in that direction. I think the other steps are more important than this. I am in favor of this provision.

Mr. LANGER. It should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. TAFT. It should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I am not satisfied with this bill, but in view of the statement of the Senator from Virginia that the proposed changes are so complicated that it is difficult to legislate on the floor of the Senate, I gladly accept his explanation.

The formation of corporations in Delaware by the Federal Government to handle public business has evidently been done for the purpose of getting away from the authority of the Congress. I understand that fifteen or twenty corporations have been incorporated under the laws of Delaware. For years that State has been looked upon as furnishing a corporation privileges, rights, and power to do anything it might wish to

do. It seems to me very reprehensible for the Federal Government to incorporate a business under such legislation as is permitted in Delaware and thus enable it to get away from the authority of the Congress.

I look with a great deal of anticipation to the future. I hope the Senator from Virginia will bring in some amendments, with the sanction of the appropriate committees, to see that these funds are better protected. I do not mean to cast any reflection upon the administration of Jesse Jones. It has been said here that he has admitted that he has nothing to do with the policy. Whenever a request is made for several billion dollars, he deems it his duty to furnish the money. That is a peculiar way to transact business. I doubt if it could be excused even during war. There should be some policy by which demands upon all these funds could be approved or disapproved. I hesitate to vote for this bill; but under the circumstances I shall do so, although I think possibly the most important thing is yet to be done.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator. The Senator understands that the pending amendment relates only to auditing, does he not?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand that.

Mr. BYRD. The legislation which he desires is being prepared and will be introduced within the next week. It is very difficult legislation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall look forward to such legislation with a great deal of pleasure and hope.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator's amendment require all corporations of the Government to be audited?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; just as other agencies of the Government are audited.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is every agency included in the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall vote for it with a great deal of pleasure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Guffey	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burton	La Follette	Smith
Bushfield	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Taylor
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tobey
Cordon	Magnuson	Tunnell
Donnell	Maybank	Tydings
Downey	Mead	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Mitchell	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Murdoch	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been requested—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a moment? I failed to offer a perfecting amendment providing for expenses. I ask unanimous consent that it may be offered and read at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. That is agreeable, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, and will be read by the clerk.

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

(c) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations as provided in section — of this act shall be paid out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for the purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask either the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia whether the amendment, as perfected, would require the General Accounting Office to audit in advance of a loan?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Kentucky was absent at the time when that point was explained. The amendment does not provide any authority to require a preaudit in advance of a loan.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wished to make sure of that point.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; Mr. President; as I have said, the amendment does not give authority to the Comptroller General to disallow a loan in advance.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia. I was unable to be on the floor at the time when his amendment was under discussion. There are

several agencies of Government which lend money which now are paying for their own audits. They are required to pay the General Accounting Office an amount of money sufficient to defray the cost of making the audit. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would not have the effect of repealing those provisions of law.

Mr. BYRD. The amendment provides that the Comptroller General may utilize existing organizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that. The General Accounting Office, however, audits the Farm Credit Administration, but no appropriation is made for the General Accounting Office in that connection, the theory being that the Farm Credit Administration is a business administration or organization and should be audited anyway, and it is required to pay for its own audit.

It occurs to me that some of these other organizations should be required to pay for their own audits. If they are set up as business organizations they should pay the expenses of their audits. I know of no reason why special appropriations should be made to pay for the expense of making the audit by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that not all the audits are paid for by the corporations concerned. Some of them now are paid for by the General Accounting Office.

I have no objection to having the Senator modify the amendment so as to have it provide that those already paying for their own audits shall continue to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. It occurs to me that we should have one policy regarding the matter.

Mr. BYRD. I think so, too. We have not heretofore required an audit of all of the 56 corporations, and we must make some provision to finance the cost of these new audits. If the Senator thinks the corporation should pay for its own audit, I have no objection to having that done, so long as the audit is made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Please understand that I am heartily in favor of the Senator's amendment. I was one of a handful of Senators who voted in favor of providing for an audit when the matter was previously before the Senate; but it seems to me that if these institutions are supposed to be operating along business lines, the corporation or concern itself should pay for the audit, rather than to have it necessary for the Congress to make a special appropriation of funds from the Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that it seems to me that some of the 56 corporations are not operated along business lines.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps I should say that in theory they are operated along business lines.

Mr. BYRD. I would not like to see the amendment rejected because of that point. The amendment was suggested on the part of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should not object in respect to the 56 corporations. But if

the amendment had the effect of repealing other laws which now provide that Government corporations shall pay for their own audits, that would be a different question.

It seems to me there should be one fixed policy in respect to all these corporations, regardless of whether they are in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or in the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that it is my understanding, and I think it is a fact, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all its subsidiaries and affiliates already are subject to an audit of their own, and already have the funds with which to conduct such audit.

The amendment would merely provide for an authorization so that the Committee on Appropriations could work out that matter, as I imagine, in determining whether additional funds should be appropriated for that purpose, or whether sufficient funds are now available.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that, but as I understand the amendment—let me say that I was not able to hear it very well when it was read—it provides that the expenses shall be defrayed by appropriations to the General Accounting Office and such necessary appropriations are authorized.

If the R. F. C. is now paying for its own audit, I think it should continue to do so, even though an appropriation for that purpose is authorized to be made to the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am in general agreement with the Senator's understanding, but I do not know that on the floor of the Senate we can work out the details of an arrangement to make such funds available to the R. F. C. and its affiliates in making their own audits. Certainly there should not be any duplication of appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. But certainly we are dealing with a considerable sum of money in this connection, because when we changed the law so as to provide that the Farm Credit Administration should pay for its own audit, that had the effect of reducing the appropriations for that agency by some two and one-half million dollars annually, which was the cost of making the audit of the Farm Credit Administration alone.

Other Government corporations operate on a much vaster scale than does the Farm Credit Administration, and the cost of making audits of them undoubtedly will run into millions of dollars a year. If they are now paying the expenses of having audits made by private auditors, it certainly occurs to me that the General Treasury, which does not receive a great deal of consideration in these times, should not be charged with the expense of having the audits made, and the obligation should not be transferred from the corporation upon which it now rests over to the General Treasury, with the resultant necessity of making an appropriation for that purpose.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest to both Senators that the language will cover the purpose of the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if it is changed to read as follows:

The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations as provided by section — of this act, shall be paid out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, unless previously otherwise provided, and appropriations of such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would take care of those that are now paying for their own audits, but it still would not provide any over-all policy which would apply equally to all the corporations which have been organized by the Congress.

Mr. BYRD. The language is merely an authorization. Could not the policy be worked out in an appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it could if the amendment did not make it mandatory for the General Accounting Office to have appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. BYRD. An amendment was heretofore agreed to making it mandatory to have audits made. It would seem that we could finance them in some way.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am entirely in accord with the attitude which the Senator has taken. I was one of a corporal's guard which supported him with regard to a similar amendment 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. BYRD. Perhaps it would be satisfactory to change the word "shall" to "may."

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be satisfactory if a provision could be framed which would give some authority to pay the costs.

Mr. McKELLAR. By changing the word "shall" to "may" the Appropriations Committee would have charge of the matter and they would see to it that no duplication took place.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Virginia in paragraph (c), after the word "act", by striking out the word "shall" and inserting the word "may"; and by changing the period at the end of the amendment to a colon and adding the words: "Provided, That by agreement between the General Accounting Office and said corporation the expenses of said audit may be paid from funds of such corporation."

Mr. BYRD. I accept the amendment of the Senator from Georgia as a modification of my amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Would the modification suggested by the Senator from Georgia mean that the agency must agree to an audit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it would mean that.

Mr. BYRD. The amendment heretofore agreed to would make it mandatory.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it could be worked out in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BYRD. Is there any question in the Senator's mind that the money would be made available?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all. In other words, there is no question that the audit would still have to be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment the Senator from Virginia has offered as paragraph (c), unanimous consent having been granted that the amendment might be offered at this stage in the consideration of the bill.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

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

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

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that, if he were present and voting, he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McCARRAN (when Mr. SCRUGHAM's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—74

Alken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hoy	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McClellan	Tobey
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Cordon	Maybank	Walsh
Donnell	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Morse	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	Myers	Wilson
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

NAYS—12

Chavez	McMahon	Murdock
Guffey	Magnuson	Pepper
Hill	Mead	Taylor
Langer	Mitchell	Tunnell

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews	Glass	Scrugham
Ball	Hatch	Wagner
Chandler	Moses	Wheeler

So the bill S. 375 was passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky when he intends to have a call of the calendar. There are two naval bills which will take a very brief time and which the Navy Department is anxious to have considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be possible to call the calendar this afternoon provided the procedure which I am about to suggest does not take too much time; but I think we ought to clean up this situation before we proceed to the consideration of other business.

Mr. WALSH. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Capt. Victor Bradley Vare, Jr., Army of the United States, to be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, in the Regular Army, with rank from August 26, 1944;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army;

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law;

Angus J. Gallagher, of Ohio, for appointment as administrative officer in the Selective Service System under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; and

Blynn T. Shafer, of Ohio, for appointment as assistant chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended;

Brig. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming, of Louisiana, for appointment as State director of selective service for Louisiana under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

NOMINATION OF FRANK C. WALKER

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the Executive Calendar, I send to the desk a favorable report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on the nomination of Gen. Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

COL. ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of the

military record of Col. Elliott Roosevelt, as compiled by the War Department. I do so in view of the fact that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has reported the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt to be a brigadier general, and the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt to be a brigadier general will come up on the call of the Executive Calendar the next time the Senate has an executive session after today.

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

COL. ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

I. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONS

A. Appointed captain, Specialist Reserve, September 23, 1940.

B. Transferred in grade to Air Reserve, February 21, 1941.

C. Promoted to major, Army of the United States, on March 26, 1942, to rank from March 1, 1942.

D. Promoted to lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States (Air Corps), August 6, 1942.

E. Promoted to colonel, Army of the United States (Air Corps), March 22, 1943, effective on February 23, 1943.

F. Promoted to colonel, Army of the United States, March 11, 1943.

II. SERVICE

Colonel Roosevelt was called to extended active duty on October 7, 1940, in the grade of captain, and reported to the Materiel Command, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. On April 24, 1941, he was transferred from Wright Field to the Twenty-first Reconnaissance Squadron at the Newfoundland Air Base, and began a survey for the establishment of ferry routes across the North Atlantic. This duty took him to Greenland, Iceland, and England. On September 10, 1941, he was ordered to Kelly Field, Tex., to take a course in navigation, and from there to Brooks Field, Tex., as a student in an aerial observer's course. Upon completion of this latter course on December 15, 1941, he was ordered from Brooks Field to duty with the Sixth Reconnaissance Squadron, Muroc, Calif. On February 26, 1942, he was assigned to the First Photographic Group and proceeded overseas for duty in North Africa. Since that time Colonel Roosevelt has been on continuous duty overseas in North Africa, Sicily, Italy, the United Kingdom, and France, commanding photographic reconnaissance units. At the present time he is commanding the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Reconnaissance Wing, European Theater of Operations, with an approximate strength of 5,000 officers and men.

III. DECORATIONS AND COMMENDATIONS

A. The Distinguished Flying Cross awarded December 23, 1942, while a member of the Third Photographic Group, Twelfth Air Force by command of General Doolittle (citation attached).

B. "Commander of Oulissan Alaoulte" awarded January 23, 1943, by the Sultan of Morocco.

C. Air Medal awarded May 8, 1943 by General Spaatz (citation attached).

D. Letter of commendation dated October 12, 1943, from the commanding general, Army Air Forces to Colonel Roosevelt commending him for his work in reorganizing the reconnaissance program of the Army Air Forces (copy of letter attached).

E. Legion of Merit awarded December 25, 1943, by General Eisenhower (citation attached).

F. Letter of Commendation dated September 28, 1944, signed by Lieutenant General Bradley, commanding general, Twelfth Army Group to the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Wing (reconnaissance) commanded by Colonel Roosevelt

commending this unit (copy of letter attached).

(NOTE.—Colonel Roosevelt, to date, has a total of 1,100 flying hours. Of these 1,100 hours, 300 have been on combat missions. Colonel Roosevelt has recently piloted single controlled planes on 303 combat missions. A single controlled plane has but one pilot. And on each of these flights he has been the pilot.)

HEADQUARTERS, TWELFTH AIR FORCE,
A. P. O. 650, December 23, 1942.

GENERAL ORDERS NO. 10—AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

Under the provisions of AR 600-45, as amended, and pursuant to authority contained in circular No. 6, Allied Force Headquarters, October 19, 1942, the Distinguished Flying Cross is awarded to the following-named officer in the name of the commanding general, European theater of operations:

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, lieutenant colonel third photographic group, Twelfth Air Force, United States Army. For heroism and extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flights. As a member of parties making aerial surveys of important ferry routes, Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt participated in long and dangerous flights over Arctic, sub-Arctic, and equatorial regions, many of them being over water and uninhabited areas. On one expedition Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt was the only member who made every operational flight. As a result of his experience and energy, he has been of great assistance in the establishment of ferry routes. As commanding officer of a photographic group assigned to the American forces in north Africa, Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt personally participated in many flights deep into hostile and heavily defended areas acting as observer, navigator, photographer, and radio operator. He made these flights voluntarily with complete disregard for his personal safety, as he well knew the extremely vulnerable characteristics of his unarmed airplane. The efficiency of his photographic group as proven by the valuable information it has obtained, is due in a large degree to the ability, leadership, and inspiration of Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt. His courage and skill reflects credit both upon himself and the military service.

By command of Major General Doolittle:

HOYT S. VANDENBERG,
Brigadier General, United States
Army, Chief of Staff.

Official:

P. M. WHITNEY,
Colonel, Adjutant General's
Department, Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, NORTHWEST
AFRICAN AIR FORCES,
A. P. O. 650, May 8, 1943.

GENERAL ORDERS, NO. 70—AWARD OF AIR MEDAL

1. Under the provisions of AR 600-45, as amended, and pursuant to authority contained in Circular No. 50, Headquarters NATOUS, April 5, 1943, the Air Medal is awarded to the following-named personnel, Air Corps, United States Army, residence as indicated, in the name of the commanding general, north African theater of operations, for meritorious achievement while participating in five sorties against the enemy.

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, colonel, Benbrook, Tex.

By command of Lieutenant General Spaatz:

E. P. CURTIS,
Colonel, U. S. A. A. F.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

WILLIAM W. DICK,
Colonel, A. G. D.,
Air Adjutant General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, October 12, 1943.

Subject: Commendation.

Through: Commanding general, Northwest African Allied Air Forces.

To: Colonel Elliott Roosevelt, commanding officer, Northwest African Photo Reconnaissance Wing (Prov.).

1. The careful and thorough work you have performed in the reorganization of the reconnaissance program of the Army Air Forces is most pleasing to me and I desire to commend you for your contribution to this important project.

2. Your practical experience has been of inestimable assistance in establishing plans and procedures for the use of Reconnaissance Units in the field and in setting up new tables of organization based on the actual needs of present-day warfare. Your advice and counsel have also been most helpful in revising our training program in this country, forming the present Reconnaissance Command of the Third Air Force and setting up the necessary staff branch in this headquarters.

3. The thorough knowledge you have of these matters and your wholehearted cooperation at all times reflect great credit upon yourself.

4. A copy of this letter will be made a part of your efficiency record.

H. H. ARNOLD,
General, United States Army,
Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

HEADQUARTERS, NORTH AFRICAN
THEATER OF OPERATIONS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
A. P. O. 534, December 25, 1943.

GENERAL ORDER, NO. 164—AWARD OF LEGION OF MERIT

Under authority contained in section IV, War Department Circular No. 131, dated June 3, 1943, a Legion of Merit Medal is awarded in the name of the President to each of the following-named individuals:

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, Colonel, Air Corps, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services from November 1, 1942, to October 30, 1943. By his dynamic energy and inspiring zeal, he built the small photographic and reconnaissance group which he commanded, into a photo reconnaissance wing which controlled the preparation of photographic intelligence for all planning staffs and operations in the theater. His keen insight into the invaluable aid of aerial photography, and the knowledge of its practical application, enabled him to make an outstanding contribution to the success of the Tunisian and Sicilian Campaigns, and of the initial operations in Italy. Entered service from Benbrook, Tex.

By command of General Eisenhower:

E. L. FORD,
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

H. V. ROBERTS,
Colonel, A. G. D.,
Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, TWELFTH ARMY GROUP,
A. P. O. 655, September 28, 1944.

Subject: Letter of Commendation.

To: Commanding Officer, Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photo Wing Reconnaissance, A. P. O. 634, United States Army.

Through: Commanding General, Eighth Air Force.

1. It is desired to express the appreciation of Twelfth Army Group for the outstanding work which has been accomplished by the officers and men of your command.

2. The A-3 and A-3 Progress Sections have at all times been ready and able to execute exacting requests from the Army Group for aerial photos, mosaics and the reproduction

of prints. The officers and men of these sections have appreciated the fact that in practically all instances, due to the rapidly moving situation, the time element has been a vital factor, and have exerted themselves to the utmost to meet the commitments in time to have their work be of value.

3. By their untiring efforts the laboratory section of the Wing has produced vast quantities of prints which have proved of great value to the Army Group. It is especially desired to bring to the attention of each officer and man the importance of the work which has been accomplished by them.

4. The Seventh Photo Group has accomplished at considerable loss in planes and personnel, the flying of many hazardous missions in a manner which reflects great credit upon their own unit and Photo Reconnaissance Aviation as a whole.

O. N. BRADLEY,
Lieutenant General, United States
Army, Commanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

HENRY A. WALLACE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce, which nomination had been adversely reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the further consideration of the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce be postponed until the 1st day of March next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to speak to my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. The Presiding Officer was about to put the question. I did not understand that the Senator from Kentucky desired to speak.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to speak to the motion very briefly, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. President, in view of the action taken by the Senate on the George bill, which has been overwhelmingly passed, it seems to me that the further consideration of the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce should be postponed for a sufficient length of time to enable the House of Representatives to act upon the George bill and to enable the President to act upon it.

There are Senators, I think, on both sides of the Chamber who will vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce alone, after the separation of the lending agencies from that Department, but who will not vote for the confirmation of his nomination with the lending agencies still retained in the Department of Commerce. In order that those Senators who wish to vote in that way may have an opportunity to do so, I think it desirable, and it is fair to those Senators, fair to the Senate and fair to the President and to Mr. Wallace and also to the country, that they should be given an opportunity to cast that sort of vote if the contingency arises that they can do so without the question being tangled up with the lending agencies.

I have, I may say, the assurance of authorities of the House of Representatives that if the George bill passes the Senate it would be promptly taken up and disposed of in the House of Representatives.

As we all know, the President is on the verge of a very important conference that may hold the fate of our Nation and the world in its hands, and I am sure that no Senator is desirous to do anything that would be misinterpreted by the Nations who will be engaged in that conference or be misinterpreted by other nations of the world as to the attitude of our own Congress in regard to the President's full authority and his backing by us in dealing with other nations in this important conference.

I have every reason to believe that the House of Representatives will act upon the George bill promptly and favorably.

I took it upon myself a few days ago through the White House to inquire what would be the President's attitude toward the George bill in the event it passed both Houses. I have just received through the White House a message which I desire to read to the Senate. It seems to me that in this message the President has acted wisely and in a fashion that shows his desire to cooperate with the Congress in the situation which now confronts it. I will read it. This is a message, just received by me from the White House, which was sent, of course, to be transmitted to me in response to my previous inquiry in order that I might inform the Senate and the country and especially the Congress. It is in quotations, and is as follows:

In 1942, when I transferred certain functions of the Federal Loan Agency to the Department of Commerce by Executive order, I provided that they should be returned to that Agency 6 months after the conclusion of the war or sooner if the President or Congress should decide upon an earlier date. Therefore, should the Congress return these functions to the Federal Loan Agency at this time by the George resolution, I would approve the measure.

It seems to me that that is a categorical and definite answer to the inquiry, so that the Congress will have no doubt and the country will have no doubt about what the President will do in the event of the final passage of the George bill. I think, in fairness to the President and to the Congress and to Senators who are willing and who desire to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace purely for Secretary of Commerce that the motion I have made to postpone further consideration of his nomination until March 1 gives ample time for the other branch of Congress to act on the George bill and for the President to act in accordance with what he says he will do when the measure reaches him.

That is all I have to say about it. I hope that the Senate may vote upon the motion I have made without undue delay.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to acquiesce in the desire of the majority leader to postpone consideration, because I think a vote under present circumstances would be a confusing vote to take, one very difficult, perhaps, for some Senators to decide on.

I merely wish to give notice that I am just as much opposed to the confirmation of Mr. Wallace after the powers are taken away from him as before they are taken away from him; I think it makes no difference whatever. I am quite willing that the battle on Mr. Wallace should be postponed until the first of March, when the Senate will have full time to consider the remarkable repudiation by the great majority of the Senate of Mr. Wallace's qualifications to hold any important office in the Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I happen to be one of those who have looked with disfavor upon the nomination of Mr. Wallace, not because of lack of appreciation of his delightful personal qualities, but because of his philosophy of government, as it has been disclosed in his speeches and his writings—a philosophy with which I am at complete odds. I think the suggestion made by the majority leader is a wise one, and I hope it will be acquiesced in at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader what his attitude would be if on March 1 the George bill had not become a law. My object is to be assured that before we vote on the nomination which it is now intended shall be postponed, we shall be assured that the bill which has just been passed will have become an act, signed by the President. Of course, I accept the President's assurance. Would the Senator agree to support the motion on March 1 in the event the bill had not become a law at that time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I not only will support it; I will make it.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to postpone the consideration of the nomination of Henry A. Wallace until March 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond M. Stone to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant.

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

ANTONIO RUIZ

The bill (S. 72) for the relief of Antonio Ruiz, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Antonio Ruiz, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his two minor children, the late Samuel Ruiz and the late Rosalie Ruiz, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by them when a United States Army airplane crashed into their home in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

JOHN T. COOPER

The bill (S. 76) for the relief of John T. Cooper, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John T. Cooper, postmaster at Hartselle, Ala., in the sum of \$179. Such sum represents a shortage in such account caused by the loss of such sum from the money-order cash drawer at such post office during the night of October 24, 1940.

PERKINS GINS

The bill (S. 167) for the relief of Perkins Gins, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the statutes of limitation, so far as they bar the cotton linter claim of Perkins Gins, a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., formerly the claim of Perkins Oil Co., also a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., arising out of purchase contract numbered 3418, entered into by the said Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn., predecessor of said Perkins Gins, of Memphis, Tenn., on September 16, 1918, with the United States of America be, and the same are hereby, waived and revoked.

SEC. 2. That the said claimant is hereby authorized to file within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act its said claim and have the same adjudicated by the Court of Claims of the United States.

GALEN E. WALTER

The bill (S. 243) for the relief of Galen E. Walter, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Galen E. Walter, Pony, Mont., who allegedly sustained an injury on May 9, 1942, while employed as a forest guard at the Gallatin National Forest, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim within 6 months from date of the approval of this act: *Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

LINDON A. LONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 77) for the relief of Lindon A. Long, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$3,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lindon A. Long, of Dothan, Ala., the sum of \$3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Emile Long, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Dothan, Ala., on June 3, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OSCAR GRIGGS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 177) for the relief of Oscar Griggs, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$4,505.14"; and on line 8, after the words "by him", to insert "and for medical and hospital expenses incurred", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oscar Griggs, of Lauderdale County, Tenn., the sum of "\$4,505.14, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him and for medical and hospital expenses incurred when he was shot on the night of December 29, 1943, by members of a party of soldiers of the United States Army, when, in the performance of his duties as sheriff of Lauderdale County, Tenn., he was attempting to quiet a disturbance by such soldiers in the town of Ripley, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENEFITS TO DISCHARGED MILITARY OR NAVAL PERSONNEL OF ALLIED OR ASSOCIATED NATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 294) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit certain benefits to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the best explanation of the bill I can offer is to refer briefly to the report of General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who recommended the bill. He says:

The proposed legislation would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon request of the proper official of the government of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war, to furnish, in his discretion, to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any such government at such rates and under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, medical, surgical, and dental treatment; hospital care; transportation and traveling expenses; prosthetic appliances; education, training, or other similar benefits; and to make medical examinations, social investigations, and other reports pertaining to such persons. Under the bill any agreement entered into pursuant to this authority shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the Government of the Nation requesting the same and that any amount received by the Veterans Administration as reimbursement for such services shall be credited to the appropriate appropriation of the Veterans Administration for the fiscal year during which expenditures were made pursuant to this act.

General Hines also points out that under section 202 (14), World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish transportation, medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies and appliances to such troops, but the proposed legislation is intended to establish a reciprocal agreement under which the Veterans' Administration may in its discretion make these payments to the veterans of nations now allied with us, but at the request and at the expense of the foreign governments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator feel that sufficient safeguards are contained in the bill through the provision for repayment? I ask the question because I observe in lines 6 and 8, on page 1, a broad degree of discretion is extended to the Veterans' Administration. The power which is granted is to be exercised by the Administrator "in his discretion," to quote the words of the bill, and he is then empowered, in line 8, to make such rates

and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary.

I call attention to that, Mr. President, because it is an example of a type of legislation which has been followed in the past by Congress to a rather extraordinary degree. It is my feeling that the time has come—certainly if it has not come, it is rapidly approaching—when Congress should hesitate to extend discretionary powers to any executive agency without greater scrutiny than has been practiced in the past.

Mr. GEORGE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. The whole purpose of the proposal is that the Administrator may in his discretion do certain things; but on page 2 of the bill it is provided that—

Any agreement entered into pursuant to the authority of this act shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the government of the nation requesting the same.

So that it completely relieves our Government of any obligation. It is discretionary with the Veterans' Administration whether the Administrator shall undertake to make these payments to the discharged veterans of any Allied nation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But in no event would the payment be made at the expense of the Government of the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. That is true; and it would not be made unless General Hines first had with the foreign government an agreement which was satisfactory to him. I think it can be said of General Hines that he is a most excellent administrative officer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 294) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, upon request of the proper officials of the government of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war to furnish, in his discretion, to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any such government, at such rates and under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, medical, surgical, and dental treatment, hospital care, transportation and traveling expenses, prosthetic appliances, education, training, or other similar benefits, and to make medical examination, social investigations, and other reports pertaining to such persons. Any agreement entered into pursuant to the authority of this act shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the government of the nation requesting the same. Any amount received by the Veterans' Administration as reimbursement for such services shall be credited to the appropriate appropriation of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year during which expenditures were made pursuant to this act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the committee report on Senate bill 294 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 11) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 294) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill would authorize the furnishing of certain veterans' benefits to former members of the armed forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war. Such benefits would be furnished only upon request of the Government of such nation and upon its agreement to reimburse the United States for any expenses incurred by it in furnishing such benefits.

The purposes of the bill are outlined in further detail in the following letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1944.
The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: There are forwarded herewith two copies of a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes," with the request that same be introduced and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon request of the proper officials of the government of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war, to furnish, in his discretion, to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any such government at such rates and under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, medical, surgical, and dental treatment; hospital care; transportation and traveling expenses; prosthetic appliances; education; training; or other similar benefits; and to make medical examinations, social investigations, and other reports pertaining to such persons. Under the bill any agreement entered into pursuant to this authority shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the government of the nation requesting the same and that any amount received by the Veterans' Administration as reimbursement for such services shall be credited to the appropriate appropriation of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year during which expenditures were made pursuant to this act.

Under section 202 (14), World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish transportation, medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies and appliances to discharged members of the military or naval forces of those governments which were associated with the United States in World War No. 1 and who come within the provisions of laws of such governments similar to those of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and to utilize similar services, supplies, and appliances provided for discharged members of the military or naval forces of those governments in furnishing such benefits to the discharged members of the military or naval forces of the United States living within the territorial limits of such governments and entitled to benefits under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator. Following enactment of Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, as amended, this authority was modified by a provision contained

in paragraph VI, Veterans' Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended by Public Law 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, October 17, 1940, limiting the furnishing of hospitalization and medical treatment in foreign countries to veterans who are citizens of the United States and who are temporarily sojourning or residing abroad for disabilities due to war service in the armed forces of the United States. Similarly, under title III, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, loans may not be guaranteed for veterans residing outside the United States, nor are unemployment allowances under title V thereof payable except to veterans residing in the United States.

Subject to this limitation on the furnishing of hospitalization and medical treatment, guaranty of loans, or unemployment allowances to veterans of the armed forces of the United States while residing in foreign countries, there is sufficient authority under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to contract for furnishing any of the services or benefits provided thereunder to such beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration. However, there is no authority similar to that provided in section 202 (14), World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for furnishing similar services or benefits to discharged members of the military or naval forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2. The proposed legislation would grant such authority and permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish to discharged members of the military or naval forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in the present war, who may be residing in the United States, certain services and benefits at the expense of the government of such nation requesting the same.

The legislation herein proposed by the Veterans' Administration is deemed desirable and its consideration at an early date is recommended.

Request for reciprocal agreements with respect to veterans' benefits has been made by the Dominion of Canada which has recently established under the Department of Veterans' Affairs Act of October 18, 1944, a Department of Veterans' Affairs, the minister of which is empowered thereunder, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, to make regulations with respect to reciprocal or other arrangements with the government of any country for furnishing similar benefits, services, and supplies to persons who served in the naval, military, or air forces of any such government.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

FURNISHING OF WAGE INFORMATION TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AGENCIES

The bill (S. 184) to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage record information to State unemployment compensation agencies, was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think this is an important bill, of which we ought also to have some explanation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is rather an important bill, but it has one very simple objective, and all its provisions point up to that one objective. It authorizes the Social Security Board to furnish wage records to State unemployment compensation agencies. It is intended to be for the benefit of the

States, because some of them, at least, do not have these records. They can obtain them from the Social Security Board. The Social Security Board is in position to furnish them at a very nominal expense, and the bill provides that they be furnished at a very low or nominal expense, but in no event to exceed the actual cost of the service to the States. That is the sole purpose of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 184) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"FURNISHING OF WAGE RECORD INFORMATION TO STATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 1108. The Board is authorized, upon request of any agency charged with the administration of a State unemployment compensation law and to the extent consistent with the efficient administration of title II, to furnish to such agency, for use by it in the administration of such law, information from or pertaining to wage records, including account numbers, maintained by the Board in accordance with section 205 (c): *Provided*, That such agency agrees to make payment therefor in such amount, if any (not exceeding the cost of furnishing such information), and either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Board. A State agency may make such payment by authorizing deductions from amounts certified by the Board under section 302 (a) for payment to such State. The amount received from, or deducted from the payment to, any State in accordance with this section shall be covered into the respective appropriations, as determined by the Board, from which the expenses of furnishing such information are paid."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee on Senate bill 184 may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 10) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 184) to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment compensation agencies, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Social Security Board to furnish State unemployment commissions with wage data, including account numbers, upon the request of States and upon their agreement to reimburse the Federal Government for the actual cost of this service, either by direct payments or by authorizing deductions from grants for administrative expenses. The Board would be authorized to eliminate the charge in cases where the amount involved is too small, or the administrative inconvenience in determining the cost is too great, to warrant the making of a charge for the service.

Further explanation of the need for, and purposes of, the legislation are set forth in the following letter from the Acting Federal Security Administrator:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, January 4, 1945.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a legislative proposal to authorize the Social Security Board to furnish old-age and survivors insurance wage-record information to State unemployment compensation agencies.

The Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Board has wage-record data for all persons covered under title II of the Social Security Act. The States also maintain records which contain this type of information for all employees covered by the State unemployment-compensation laws. Substantially all of the data in the State records is contained in the Federal records, the employer being required to furnish this information to both the Federal and State Governments.

This procedure is burdensome for the employer and costly for the Federal Government, since State expenses for administering unemployment compensation are paid by the Federal Government.

During the last fiscal year the total expenditure of the 51 State agencies for the collection, processing, and use of State wage records amounted to approximately \$3,000,000. The Social Security Board can furnish reproduced wage cards to these agencies for approximately \$433,000 annually. While the States would have some continuing static cost with respect to the maintenance and use of wage records, it is estimated that the annual net saving in Federal grants of administrative funds to the State agencies would be between \$2,000,000 and \$2,500,000. There would be also an incalculable saving to employers from the elimination of the necessity of reporting wages to State agencies.

The principle of State compensation for the use of these Federal records was approved by the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies in October 1944 in the following resolution:

"Whereas there are economies in the processing of reports by an exchange of services between bureaus of the Federal Government and State agencies; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the conference that legislation is favored authorizing State agencies to accept Federal funds for services rendered Federal agencies and Federal agencies to accept reimbursement for services rendered State agencies."

The proposed bill would authorize the Social Security Board to furnish the State unemployment compensation commissions with wage data, including account numbers, upon the request of States and upon their agreement to reimburse the Federal Government for the actual cost of this service, either by direct payments or by authorizing deductions from grants for administrative expenses. The Board would be vested with the discretion to eliminate the charge when the amount involved was too small, or when the administrative inconvenience in determining the cost was too great to warrant the making of a charge for the service.

The proposal is, I believe, particularly timely because many of the State legislatures are expected to consider the enactment of measures this winter to extend employer coverage under the State unemployment compensation laws to employers of one or more, in line with the coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system. If the States give retroactive wage credits to employees of these small employers, such employees will receive much-needed protection against the hazards of unemployment during the reconversion period. However, it would be both costly and impractical to

require small employers to file wage reports for prior quarters. Use of old-age and survivors insurance transcripts in this interim period to determine the benefit rights of such employees would be highly desirable.

The proposal would also have the advantage of permitting the States to destroy old records which they are required to use only on rare occasions, thus saving costs of storage and maintenance. In cases of fire, moreover, such as occurred in the Montana agency, use of the Federal records offers the only adequate and economical solution.

I shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the proper committee for action.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Acting Administrator.

BROADCASTING OF NONCOMMERCIAL CULTURAL OR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The bill (S. 63) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting, after section 329 of such act, a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 330. It shall be unlawful for any person, or any person representing an organization or group, to interfere with, intimidate any person or persons, hinder, extort, delay, prevent, or conspire with other persons for the purpose of hindering, delaying, interfering with, or stopping the production or transmission, by means of any radio station of any noncommercial education or cultural program presented by any academically accredited and tax-exempt educational institution, prepared and planned for presentation by radio or in the process of being transmitted by radio stations, and it shall likewise be unlawful for any person as a part of a group or organization to threaten or intimidate any other person for the purpose of preventing by group action the operation of any broadcasting station while preparing for or in the operation of broadcasting such noncommercial educational or cultural programs, unless such interference, work stoppage, or group action is part of a general action for other purposes and is of general and broader nature or purpose than to prevent or interfere with the broadcasting of such noncommercial educational and cultural programs: *Provided*, That such radio station or stations have agreed to broadcast such programs and that no service, money, or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid or promised to, or charged or accepted by, such station from any person for broadcasting or agreeing to broadcast such program and no service, money, or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid or promised to, or charged or accepted by, the persons producing or participating in such program from such station or from any commercial sponsor for services rendered in producing or participating in such program.

"DEFINITION

"To conspire," for the purposes of this section, shall mean to plan with others, to hold meetings for the purpose of planning, to take action as the result of a plan or purpose—such as united stoppage of work at a radio plant, or to write communications urging interference by action or by word of mouth to induce action for the purpose of interference."

PHILIP KLEINMAN

The bill (S. 311) for the relief of Philip Kleinman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Philip Kleinman, of Salem, Oreg., the sum of \$495 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him in securing medical and hospital treatment of his physical disabilities attributable to injuries sustained by him, in the course of duty, while he was a member of Company G, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

HARRIET B. RICKARDS

The bill (S. 312) for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds available for payments of adjusted-service credits and the installments due to dependents of deceased veterans, as provided in the act of May 19, 1924, as amended, the sum of \$385.80, to Harriet B. Rickards, of Seattle, Wash., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the proceeds of seven checks drawn during the fiscal years 1937 and 1938 to the order of Mary Ellen Butler, the deceased mother of the said Harriet B. Rickards, such checks having been for value received, properly endorsed by the said Mary Ellen Butler and her right to the proceeds thereof transferred to the said Harriet B. Rickards prior to the death of said Mary Ellen Butler on August 23, 1939, though not presented for payment prior to such date: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

G. F. ALLEN

The bill (S. 315) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in an amount not to exceed \$709.51, for items suspended or disallowed.

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of former disbursing clerks of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, for items suspended or disallowed, not to exceed the amounts stated: M. V. Bates, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Lansing, Mich., \$33,774.03; Ivan Car-

rico, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Charleston, W. Va., \$8,376.77; W. F. Cramer, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, District of Columbia, \$58.62; T. A. Dillon, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Indianapolis, Ind., \$127.50; O. Kannglesser, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Albany, N. Y., \$21.47; D. E. Love, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Santa Fe, N. Mex., \$93.80; L. S. McCracken, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, San Francisco, Calif., \$234.70; S. S. Ogdon, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Jefferson City, Mo., \$11.43; J. W. Reynar, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Raleigh, N. C., \$300.08; F. R. Shaw, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Jefferson City, Mo., \$55.01; L. V. Witcombe, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Harrisburg, Pa., \$16,800.75.

Sec. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and all former disbursing clerks operating under the Division of Disbursement for the amounts of all suspensions and disallowances raised and not covered by sections 1 and 2 of this act, or which may be raised, against the said chief disbursing officer and former disbursing clerks on account of payments made in accordance with vouchers certified by duly authorized certifying officers during the period December 16, 1933, to March 31, 1942: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud on the part of the said chief disbursing officer or disbursing clerks in connection with such payments.

Sec. 4. No charge shall be made against the certifying officer responsible for the certification of vouchers pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933, and any charge heretofore made against any such officer, shall be removed, for the amount of any payment for which credit shall be allowed under sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, where the head of the department or establishment concerned, or his duly authorized representative, shall certify to the Comptroller General of the United States that the payment appears to have been made without fraud on the part of the certifying officer.

Sec. 5. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of W. O. Woods, former Treasurer of the United States, and W. A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States, for sums not to exceed \$1,164.93, and \$63,334.51, respectively, representing unavailable items in their accounts as former Treasurer and Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That any recoveries heretofore or hereafter made in respect of any of the foregoing items, may, in the discretion of the Comptroller General of the United States, be applied to offset unavailable items of a similar character hereafter arising in the accounts of the former Treasurer and Treasurer, respectively, upon a showing that such unavailable items have occurred without fraud on the part of the former Treasurer or Treasurer.

Sec. 6. There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$10,224.08, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of \$30 shall be credited to the account of T. A. Dillon, former Treasury-State disbursing clerk, Indianapolis, Ind., disbursing symbol 45-01-30, to the extent necessary to adjust an overdraft resulting from an overpayment by check No. 6,432,824, dated August 23, 1938; (b) not to exceed the sum of \$1,728.46 shall be credited to the Treasurer's account to the extent necessary to adjust unavailable items resulting from certain shortages, the amount of a check paid on a forged endorsement, the difference between the value of a stolen package of currency and the amount recovered, and

the value of three checks which were lost in the Office of the Treasurer of the United States after payment; and (c) not to exceed the sum of \$8,465.62 shall be credited to the account of Edwin H. Dressel, superintendent, United States mint, Philadelphia, Pa., to the extent necessary to adjust an unavailable item representing the contents of a bag containing gold coins the absence of which from a vault in the Philadelphia, Pa., Mint, was discovered during February 1937, such coins having a face value of \$5,000, and increment of \$3,465.62 resulting from the reduction in the weight of the gold dollar.

G. F. ALLEN

The bill (S. 317) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, for the sum of \$1,000, base pay, and \$49.30, overtime, a total of \$1,049.30, paid by him to Dr. Paul S. Taylor, of Berkeley, Calif., as compensation in excess of \$5,000, plus overtime, for personal services rendered during the period from July 1, 1943, to June 13, 1944, and to cancel any claims against the said Dr. Paul S. Taylor and the pay-roll certifying officers of the Department of the Interior for the excess compensation so paid.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is further authorized and directed to allow, out of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for salaries in the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the claim of the said Dr. Paul S. Taylor for the sum of \$375, base pay, and \$18.11, overtime, a total of \$393.11, representing the balance due him for compensation for personal services which he rendered during the period from June 14, 1944, to June 30, 1944, as a consulting economist of the Department of the Interior.

MRS. AMY McKNIGHT

The bill (S. 335) for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Amy McKnight, widow of George McKnight, a former employee of the War Department at Fort Peck, Mont., whose death on February 20, 1936, is alleged to have resulted from pneumonia contracted while in the performance of duty prior to February 12, 1936, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to receive and consider her claim under the remaining provisions of the said act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

FURLOUGH OF OFFICERS BY SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The bill (S. 219) to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of

officers by the Secretary of the Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1442, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 228), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "and Marine Corps, and any officer of the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating as part of the Navy. This section shall not apply to reserve officers of such organizations," so that said section when amended shall read as follows: "The Secretary of the Navy shall have authority to place on furlough any officer on the active list of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and any officer of the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating as part of the Navy. This section shall not apply to Reserve officers of such organizations."

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The bill (H. R. 621) to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report to accompany House bill 621.

There being no objection, the report (No. 19) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 621) to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled, "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize a permanent increase in the number of students in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps from 7,200 to 14,000 and to authorize a temporary increase to 24,000 until the expiration of 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war.

The Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps was established by act of Congress approved March 25, 1925, and authorized an enrollment of 2,400 students. Between 1926 and 1940 units were established in 11 universities. An act approved September 11, 1940, changed the limitation from 2,400 to 7,200 students. At the present time 6,500 students are enrolled and units are established at 27 colleges or universities.

The Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps is an economical method of producing Reserve officers and the product is a well-trained naval officer, fully capable of taking his place in the fleet when the need for his services arises.

Departments of naval sciences and tactics are set up in the universities to provide essential naval training throughout a college course of normal length. In peacetime each student devotes approximately 4 hours per week to naval work during his 4 years in college. This is exclusive of outside preparatory time. The students participate in one or more practice cruises during which he receives practical instruction of his winter academic studies.

The curriculum of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps course embodies navigation, ordnance and gunnery, marine engineering and electricity, seamanship, and communications. The students also study naval history, aviation, and military and international law.

Upon graduation all students who have successfully completed the 4-year course in naval science and tactics and are physically qualified are given commissions as ensigns in the Naval Reserve or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. A limited number are also commissioned in the line and staff of the Regular Navy and the Marine Corps.

The Navy Department informed the committee that graduates of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps have distinguished themselves as officers in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and during the last few years have proved an invaluable addition to the strength of the Naval Reserve in active service.

During the present war, the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps was inadequate to meet the increased needs for naval officers, and the Navy V-12 college training program was adopted. At the present time there are 131 undergraduate colleges in the V-12 program with a total enrollment of approximately 50,000 students. On July 1, 1945, it is expected that there will be not more than a total of 30,000 students and that this number will be reduced considerably thereafter. The committee was informed that no more students will be enrolled in the Navy V-12 program and that it is the intention of the Navy Department to reduce and finally eliminate the V-12 program and consolidate it with the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units. It is believed that the expansion of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps can best be accomplished by converting to this program the best facilities now in use by the V-12 program. This conversion of facilities would proceed progressively as the V-12 program is curtailed. Under this expansion the trainee complements at present Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps colleges would be increased and new Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units established at certain universities and colleges. Those institutions to receive new Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units fall into two classes:

(a) Institutions with enrollments sufficiently large so that a peacetime Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps can be supported, and

(b) Smaller colleges which have no commitments to the Army for Reserve Officers' Training Corps units and which have been enthusiastic and successful in administering the V-12 program.

If the bill is enacted into law, Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units will be established in approximately 23 additional colleges or universities, making a total of 50.

The committee is of the opinion that it will be necessary to maintain a large Navy in the post-war era, and that the additional officers required, over and above the graduates of the Naval Academy, can best be obtained from graduates of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

A similar bill passed the Senate of the Seventy-eighth Congress on December 14, 1944.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

SIGURDUR JONSSON AND THOROLINA THORDARDOTTIR

The bill (S. 314) for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolína Thordardóttir was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jon Sigurdsson as attorney in fact for his parents, Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolína Thordardóttir, of Hafnarfjörður, Iceland, for and on their behalf, the sum of \$4,070.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, Thordur Sigurdsson, who was fatally injured when shot by an enlisted soldier in the Army of the United States on November 8, 1941, at Hafnarfjörður, Iceland: *Provided,* That the claimants accept such sum in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "facilities", to insert "including housing for civilian employees," and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,500,549,500" and insert "\$1,500,539,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report to accompany House bill 626 printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 23) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "facilities", insert the following: "including housing for civilian employees."

Page 2, line 15, strike out the figures "\$1,500,549,500" and substitute therefor "\$1,500,539,500."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the appropriation of \$1,500,539,500 for the establishment or development of naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent works as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land.

The bill also provides that the approximate cost indicated for each category required, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed \$1,500,539,500. This flexibility is necessary in order to permit the authorizations herein contained being effectively carried out, thus allowing for changes as the military situation may develop.

The bill as submitted by the Navy Department is divided into 12 categories, each category representing the work under the cognizance of the various bureaus and offices of the Navy Department. The break-down of the bill into these categories is as follows:

Summary by activities

Ship-repair and laying-up facilities.....	\$230,222,000
Fleet-training facilities, amphibious and operational.....	12,000,000
Aviation facilities.....	59,416,500
Storage facilities.....	19,950,000
Marine Corps housing and training.....	14,190,000
Ordnance facilities.....	65,500,000
Personnel training and housing facilities.....	40,022,000
Hospital facilities.....	28,519,000
Shore radio facilities.....	3,230,000
Naval Research Laboratory.....	225,000
Miscellaneous structures and facilities.....	41,265,000
Advance-base construction, material, and equipment.....	926,000,000
Total.....	1,500,539,500

In view of the confidential nature of a considerable number of projects submitted by the Navy Department it is not considered advisable or desirable to publish in this report a confidential break-down of the various individual items making up the total of the bill.

The committee was advised by the representatives of the Navy Department that the items submitted had been thoroughly screened by the field and in the Department and that reductions had been made from the original submissions by the field in the amount of some \$340,000,000, representing approximately 40 percent of the total of the bill. The committee was further advised that all of the projects submitted had an important bearing on the prosecution of the war and were considered essential in order that the necessary training, storage, aviation, Marine Corps housing, ordnance, personnel, hospital, radio, and research facilities be provided for the support of the fleet.

A brief description of each of the categories of the projects is as follows:

SHIP-REPAIR AND LAYING-UP FACILITIES, \$230,222,000

The projects under the heading fall into the following classes:

(a) Expansion of west coast naval repair facilities to handle the work expected to develop out of the war in the Pacific.

(b) Improvement of existing naval facilities to permit their most effective use for the work of ship repair. This includes the conversion of existing shipbuilding facilities.

(c) Accommodation of vessels of the Reserve Fleet.

These projects are required to develop the repair facilities commensurate to the magnitude of the program as visualized for the fiscal year 1946 and includes the rearrangement and conversion of the various yards and stations to increase the repair output and to provide those additional facilities found necessary in the present operations of the yards. There is included under this heading an item of \$99,850,000 to provide berthing and maintenance facilities for inactive ships. These consist of piers, wharves, services, shop facilities, and limited custodial housing for ships placed in inactive status so that they can be properly maintained for instant recommissioning.

FLEET TRAINING FACILITIES, AMPHIBIOUS AND OPERATIONAL, \$12,000,000

The projects provided under this heading are based not upon an expansion of the training facilities but upon expected changes to be made in the methods of training brought about by the development of new weapons and the changing technique of combat. The successes of our Navy over the Japanese have been due largely to our better developed weapons and our superior training in the use of these weapons. It is considered essential that all personnel entering the combat area

have the best and most up-to-date training that it is possible to provide.

AVIATION FACILITIES, \$59,416,500

During the current fiscal year and in previous years it has been necessary to forego the construction of many important facilities, because of limitations of material and labor markets. Projects in the present bill will round out the stations with facilities necessary for increased efficiency of operation, but which it has not previously been possible to provide. Some of the facilities now required are needed to replace construction accomplished under pressure during the early days of the war from materials that have not withstood the test of time. The changes, in the character of warfare, including jet propulsion, rocket projectiles, and greater emphasis on flight fighting and air support of ground troops, require additional facilities for both operational and base training. Lessons learned from combat experience require constant change in technique. Such changes are rapidly reflected in short facility requirements and the program submitted by the Navy Department is based on the fulfillment of these requirements.

The House Committee on Naval Affairs reduced the authorization for aviation facilities from \$74,500,000 to \$59,416,500, a reduction of \$15,083,500. This amount was intended for the construction of a naval air field at or near Annapolis, Md., for the training of midshipmen. Several members of the House Naval Affairs Committee were of the opinion that this project required further study before they could give their approval.

STORAGE FACILITIES, \$19,950,000

The projects submitted under this heading are those considered by the Department to be absolutely necessary to take care of storage and warehousing of supplies and equipment which must be kept in stock and readily available for shipment to various units of the fleet and shore establishments as the needs arise. It is essential that adequate storage facilities be provided, so that no lack of material and supplies will exist at times when they are critically needed. The provision of storage facilities is a constantly changing problem and continuous supervision is maintained to make the most efficient use of existing facilities as well as to anticipate future requirements.

MARINE CORPS HOUSING AND TRAINING, \$14,190,000

The construction projects under this heading during 1946 are necessary to provide the essential training and housing facilities to keep the Marine Corps in the best possible fighting trim and to develop a unit ready in all respects to meet the enemy. The items submitted have been examined thoroughly by the Commandant of the Marine Corps and have been sent to the committee as being essential for training activities of the Marine Corps for the coming fiscal year.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES, \$65,500,000

The items presented to the committee under this heading fall into four general groups; namely, research, production, storage, and handling, personnel. The scope of these groups may be summarized as follows:

(a) The need for additional facilities or completing new facilities for the development of new and novel ordnance and improvement of existing ordnance designs.

(b) The need of increase in production facilities for new types of ordnance and the need for alteration of production facilities to improve safety.

(c) The need of increase in storage facilities to keep the material reserve for the maintenance and replacement of naval ordnance in service, including battle damage replacements, and the ammunition for the increase both in number and type of weapons and to

provide an enlarged supply line to keep an adequate flow of this material. This category likewise includes such items as improvements in rail facilities, transfer depots, and the like.

(d) The need to increase personnel housing and recreational facilities in isolated areas and to obtain facilities enabling replacement of personnel by mechanized equipment in the face of dwindling civilian manpower and because of heavier production and distribution demands.

Each item included in this category has been thoroughly screened by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance before submission in this bill. The Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance has stated to us that each item in the bill is considered essential for the effective and efficient prosecution of the war. Some of the items presented—for example, ammunition storage—were couched in general terms because the Bureau of Ordnance, while foreseeing the need for storage in the capacity set forth, cannot at this time determine precisely where the storage should be constructed nor the exact type of buildings which would be required. Nevertheless, the experience of the Bureau indicates definitely that the funds requested are necessary to meet the present program.

PERSONNEL TRAINING AND HOUSING FACILITIES, \$40,022,000

The items included in this category have been determined by the Bureau of Personnel to be essential and are as modest as possible to carry out its mission of housing and training of the officers and men of the Navy. The items submitted are those necessary to round out existing installations and to provide minimum requirements for rehabilitation and retraining of personnel returning from combat and for housing of families of naval personnel. The maintenance of morale among persons serving in naval forces is dependent upon the provision of housing for families in localities where such accommodations do not exist. This need is especially acute on the west coast. The rehabilitation of personnel suffering from malaria, filariasis, and battle fatigue is an important project and vital if such personnel is to be returned to normal usefulness either in military or civilian life. The authorization requested is a minimum one but essential to the preservation of morale.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES, \$28,519,000

The estimates submitted by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for inclusion in this bill embrace major repairs to the existing naval hospital plant, the provision of additional facilities in connection with the rehabilitation program for patients and the acquisition of an additional 10,000 beds to provide a total of 90,000 beds in the continental Navy hospitals at the end of the fiscal year 1946.

SHORE RADIO FACILITIES, \$3,230,000

The projects included under this category contemplate a continuation of the program started last year and the items submitted are toward this end. The items include facilities for precision frequency measurement and control of naval shore transmitters, for aeronautical communications and safety devices involving electronic applications, and for preparation, storage, and shipment of communication publications. Other projects, though important, have had to be held up for lack of engineering talent to process them. These projects are included in the requested estimates and are designed to develop the shore communication services to a high point of efficiency.

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, \$225,000

The items submitted under this heading are to provide housing for scientists and other technical personnel in the Naval Research Laboratory now located on the Chesapeake Bay, where suitable housing does not exist and where it is essential that adequate housing be provided to properly house the high-grade technical and scientific men now engaged in technical research.

MISCELLANEOUS STRUCTURES AND FACILITIES, \$41,265,000

The items submitted under this heading are those essential to the upkeep and maintenance of the shore establishment, including power, sewer, water, fire protection, communication, and other miscellaneous facilities not covered specifically in other categories and which are essential to the satisfactory operation of the naval shore establishment. These projects vary greatly in magnitude and are required to meet changing conditions and to provide for unforeseen failure in services wherever they may occur.

ADVANCE-BASE CONSTRUCTION, MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT, \$988,000,000

These funds are required to provide the necessary material and equipment for overseas construction where the combat areas may exist or be extended.

Vice Admiral Horne appeared before the committee and stated that the Navy Department felt this sum was the minimum needed to permit it to successfully prosecute the war.

Since July 1, 1940, the Congress has authorized appropriations to the Navy for naval public works projects totaling \$7,143,247,361.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

GRANT TO CANTON, OHIO, OF LAND WITH- IN UNITED STATES NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT

The bill (S. 213) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for use as a public highway, under such conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip of land containing approximately one and forty-four one-hundredths acres, 25 feet in width off the north side of the northwest quarter, section 18, township 10, range 8, Canton, Stark County, Ohio, and extending from Raff Road, southwest, west to the township line between Canton and Perry Townships.

Sec. 2. That if any part of the above-described lands hereby granted to the city of Canton shall be used for any other purpose or purposes, or shall cease to be maintained by the city of Canton for the purpose for which granted, such part shall revert to the United States.

GRANT OF EASEMENT TO OAHU RAILWAY & LAND CO.

The bill (S. 216) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in and over a 40-foot strip of land at Pearl Harbor Navy

Yard in Halawa, Ewa, Aahu, T. of H., containing approximately 227 $\frac{7}{1000}$ acres, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department, in consideration of that company's waiving and relinquishing any and all claim to compensation for the taking by the United States of the company's right-of-way easement over and across approximately 257 $\frac{7}{1000}$ acres of land described in condemnation proceedings pending in the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii entitled "United States of America, petitioner, against Certain Lands at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, and Oahu Railway and Land Co., a corporation, defendant," being civil No. 403.

EXCHANGE OF LAND AT EASTPORT, MAINE, AND CONVEYANCE OF ROAD- WAY EASEMENT

The bill (S. 217) to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the city of Eastport, Maine, all right, title, and interest in and to the following parcels of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, Maine, metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the War Department:

Parcel 1: A parcel of land containing eight and ninety-four one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying south of the southerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being that parcel of land formerly owned by Andrew J. Malloy and being bounded on the south by the northerly right-of-way line of Deep Cove or Barrett Road, on the east by a parcel of land formerly owned by Mrs. E. B. Townsend and on the west by a parcel of land formerly owned by David C. MacNichol.

Parcel 2: A parcel of land containing nine and eighty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying south of the southerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being that parcel of land formerly owned by Mrs. E. B. Townsend and being bounded on the south by the northerly right-of-way line of Deep Cove or Barrett Road, on the east by the westerly right-of-way line of said road, and on the west by the easterly line of a parcel of land formerly owned by Andrew J. Malloy.

Parcel 3: A parcel of land containing nine and fifty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying between the southwesterly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Co. and Maine State Highway Numbered 190, being bounded on the northeast by said right-of-way line and on the northwest by two parcels of land now or formerly owned by C. H. Bishop and W. J. Murphy, respectively.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of War, in consideration of the transfer hereinabove authorized, is further authorized, on behalf of the United States, to accept from the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the United States, all right, title, and interest of the city in and to the following-described parcels of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, State of Maine, metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the War Department.

Parcel 1: A parcel of land containing five acres, more or less, adjacent to the northerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being bounded on the east by a tract of land now or formerly owned by R. C. Emery and on the west by a tract of land now or formerly owned by Melinda Taylor.

Parcel 2: A parcel of land containing fifteen and twenty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying west of the westerly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Company and east and south of a large parcel of land now owned by the United States of America.

Parcel 3: A parcel of land containing four acres, more or less, lying between the easterly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Company and the westerly right-of-way line of Indian or Carlow Island Road.

Parcel 4: A parcel of land containing nine and five-tenths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying easterly of that parcel of land described in section 3 hereof as parcel 1, being bounded on the north by the southerly shore line of Passamaquoddy Bay, on the west by a parcel of land belonging to the United States of America, and on the southwest by the northeasterly right-of-way line of Indian or Carlow Island Road.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of War is further authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the city, a permanent easement for roadway purposes, in, over, and across the following-described parcel of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, Maine, a metes and bounds description of which is on file in the War Department:

Parcel 1: A parcel of land containing twelve and eighty-three one-hundredths acres, more or less, lying in the northwesternmost corner of Moose Island, and being formerly owned by heirs of Anderson.

Sec. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have broken my glasses, and for the time being I am deprived of sufficient sight to read a bill dealing with an exchange of land in Maine.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will gladly loan the Senator my glasses, though his eyes are younger than mine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator, but I cannot compete with the Senator in respect to the matter of good eyesight.

On page 4 of the calendar, Order No. 24, there is a Senate bill authorizing, apparently, the transfer of land from the city of Gulfport, Maine, to the United States. There is no city of Gulfport in Maine. The city in question in Eastport, Maine. May I be advised with respect to that matter?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will advise the Senator that the bill provides for the transfer of lands to the city of Eastport, Maine.

Mr. WHITE. And is the city of Eastport named in the body of the bill?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, in both the bill and the report on the bill the name Eastport, Maine, is used.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Maine that the clerk advises the Chair that the bill refers to "Eastport," and not "Gulfport." The bill has been passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS AND ORDERS FROM BRAZIL

The bill (S. 221) to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a

third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson are hereby authorized to accept from the Government of the United States of Brazil such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems as have been or may be tendered them, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution.

LEASE BY NAVY OF CERTAIN LANDS IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 218) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after "one-thousandths", to strike out "(0.258)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease for a period not to exceed 25 years, upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, to the Southern California Telephone Co., a corporation, organized under the laws of the State of California, a parcel of land situated in section 32, township 9 south, range 6 west, San Bernardino base and meridian, consisting of two hundred and fifty-eight one-thousandths of an acre, more or less, comprising a part of the United States Marine Corps training area, Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, San Diego County, Calif., and a parcel of land situated in Pueblo lot 1311 of the Pueblo Lands of San Diego County, Calif., consisting of an acre, more or less, comprising a part of the United States Marine Corps rifle range, Camp Matthews, in said county and State, the metes and bounds descriptions of which said lands are on file in the Navy Department, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of repeater station facilities: *Provided*, That when the lands shall cease to be used for said purposes, the lease shall be automatically terminated and the lands shall revert to the United States.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the United States all instruments necessary to accomplish the aforesaid purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the calendar.

INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF EXEMPTION FROM S. E. C. REGULATIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not like to be impatient with Senate committees, but ever since last August the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has had before it a very simple proposal contained in a bill which I introduced at that time, to increase from \$100,000 to \$300,000 the exemption from S. E. C. regulations for the registration and control of the issuance of securities. The measure has the approval of the S. E. C. It is greatly in the interest of small business which finds it difficult to comply with all the requirements of the S. E. C. in respect to the financing affecting it. There seems to be no reason in the world why the bill should not be passed, yet ever since last August it has been reposing in the pigeon holes of the Committee on Banking and Currency,

I have twice written the distinguished chairman of the committee asking that he give some attention to the bill. I simply wish to assert that I am pretty nearly through waiting, and I give notice that unless there can be some sort of action within a reasonable time, I shall offer the bill as an amendment to some other pending measure in the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection I will say to the Senator that the bill to which he refers was introduced last August and was not acted on in the last session because for a good portion of the time thereafter the Senate was not in session. It has been impossible for me, for various reasons, to attend very many of the sessions of the committee since the Senate convened in January. I will take the matter up with the chairman as soon as possible and see if some action cannot be obtained.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. There is no reason in the world why there should be any controversy over the measure, but I am sure the able Senator from Kentucky will sympathize with me in my impatience over the long and, as I believe, unreasonable delay.

Mr. BARKLEY. I can sympathize with and appreciate any Senator's impatience, because I am afflicted in the same way myself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am glad to have the sympathy of the Senator from Kentucky.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the business of the day having been concluded, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1945:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Raymond M. Stone, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from December 16, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM APRIL 11, 1943

Vincent R. Murphy

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

George O. Jaquith, June 14, 1943.

Philip H. VonFraenkel, June 22, 1943.

Adrian R. M. Sears, July 10, 1943.

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS, WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Evert R. Sharp, March 19, 1941.

David P. Andross, March 19, 1941.

John W. Simcock, June 19, 1941.

Edward D. Williams, September 24, 1941.

Daniel L. Martin, May 4, 1942.

William J. Whitehead, June 29, 1942.

Dan G. Frank, June 29, 1942.

Hubert P. Mills, June 29, 1942.

Charles D. Moody, July 23, 1942.

James M. McCracken, Jr., August 25, 1942.

John D. Miller, August 31, 1942.

Robert J. McDairmant, October 12, 1942.

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTER, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM JULY 1, 1940

Charles H. Kretz, Jr.

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS, WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED
Charles M. Quinn, Jr., February 7, 1941.
Solon G. Hale, June 19, 1942.

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1944

James V. Bartlett.

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS, WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Waldron M. McLellan, February 7, 1941.
Thomas P. Cocke, February 7, 1941.
Robert E. Thomas, Jr., February 7, 1941.

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Wallace B. Chesterfield, March 31, 1941.
Edward J. Nemecek, February 1, 1942.
Milton Hausman, March 16, 1942.
Edwin A. Glasson, June 1, 1942.
Edwin J. Madden, June 8, 1942.
Earl V. Harrington, August 23, 1943.
William M. Marking, December 6, 1943.
Harold N. Klaser, December 20, 1943.
Frank W. Taylor, January 10, 1944.
Paul H. Wells, Jr., January 10, 1944.
Jack F. Flood, January 17, 1944.
Traver R. Hamilton, July 20, 1944.
James B. Lepley, February 2, 1944.
Ray E. Stevens, Jr., March 20, 1944.
John W. Hazlet, May 1, 1944.
Arthur B. Chevalier, May 15, 1944.
Arthur E. Gustavson, May 15, 1944.
Robert L. Holle, May 24, 1944.
Dennis H. R. Frutiger, June 1, 1944.
Wilbur O. Martin, August 6, 1944.
Don L. Maxfield, August 7, 1944.
Howard C. Hester, August 21, 1944.
Cozier W. Gilman, Jr., September 25, 1944.
Hugh A. Phares, Jr., September 25, 1944.
Edgar H. Lechner, September 26, 1944.
Richard K. Thompson, Jr., September 30, 1944.
William F. Cahill, October 31, 1944.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

John H. Reeder	Lars A. Sande
Roland M. Sykes	Ludwig Ehlers
Charles H. Bartlett	Viktor Svensson
Ashley H. Calder	Thomas F. Sullivan
Theodore A. Bratz	William U. Fulcher
Elmer M. Chandler	Floyd D. Overhauser
John Donnelly	Edward J. Williams
Robert Chivas	John M. Joseph
William M. Prentiss	Charles Ehmann
Ora Doyle	Leonard M. Cannon
Walter A. DeVine	Ragnar Andersen
Alexander C. Cornell	Neils C. M. Johnson
Roy Stockman	Hans A. Jensen
Elroy B. Dunphy	George M. Walker
Marion M. Mitchell	Elmer J. Uebel
Thomas A. Cosgrove	Frank Bronski
Michael J. Selbert	George H. Lybrand
Charles W. Radke	Arthur I. Roberts
Almer T. Hovland	Ray Thorp
William E. Long	William J. Dongian
Joel A. Osterberg	Thomas J. Lusk
Norman D. MacLellan	Sheldon A. Russell
Olaf L. Laveson	

TO BE CHIEF GUNNERS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

Louis E. Rattan Leonard T. Toner
Robert L. Addy Winfield S. Nevins

TO BE CHIEF ELECTRICIAN, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

Rolla W. Sicafoose

TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

Wilmer R. Bomberger, Ralph J. Davidson
Jr. Francis E. Harris
Chester M. Galutia Harry J. Reynolds
Harry V. Winebar

TO BE CHIEF CARPENTER, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

George A. Merritt

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERKS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

John R. Harris John C. Collins
Richard Hewitt Linnie Thompson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

We have heard with our ears, O God, and our fathers have told us what Thou hast done in their times of old; may grace be given us to follow in their train. Unto Thee will we pay our vows, for in Thee do we put our trust; may we never be put to confusion. Mercifully grant that in Thy wisdom our influence may be against selfishness and hold our Republic on the foundations of freedom and justice for all.

As we approach Thy footstool, Heavenly Father, we pray Thee, give comfort to the poor and the distressed in those storm-swept sections of our land; be with those who are bereft by accident or in need and let the Master's rule of life prevail in human hearts and homes. Deepen our concern for the countless unfortunates and for those who wear the chafing yoke of hard service. Be most gracious unto those men who live and die for freedom with love for home in their hearts. Guard our President with Thy providence and endue him with wisdom and understanding as he meets issues pertaining to human destiny. O fill all hearts with praise and gratitude, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Social Hygiene Society of the District of Columbia.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON asked and received permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and received permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks made by me yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a manuscript entitled "America, Italy, and the Atlantic Charter." The Government Printer informs me that the cost thereof will be \$121.40. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida [Mr. SIKES] had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that that may be canceled and that he may be permitted to speak for the same time on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Post-Dispatch.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an address before the Court of Common Pleas on the naturalization of citizens.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a presentment by the Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Brigadier General Bliss, of the War Department.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a copy of a telegram relating to Poland.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

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

There was no objection.

THE MAY BILL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House today, as I see it, is How can we best uphold the hands of our military leaders and back up our boys in the front lines? Will the passage of the May bill help to do those things? Will the passage of the May bill tend to increase or tend to decrease production? Practically every responsible labor leader in the Nation says the enactment of the May bill will tend to slow down production. Practically every responsible manufacturer says the same thing. They are the men who have performed miracles of production during the past 3 years. We have been lauding the results they have brought about. Do they know their stuff? Should we listen to them?

We are told that a vote against the May bill is a vote of lack of confidence in our leaders, General Marshall and Admiral King. I do not agree with that statement. I believe a vote for the May bill is a vote of lack of confidence in American industry, covering both labor and management. This is a question of production we are dealing with, not a question of military strategy. It is a question of production strategy, if you want to call it that, and our production leaders should know most about that.

In my maiden speech in this House 8 years ago I called John L. Lewis a labor racketeer, the greatest labor racketeer we had in the Nation. At that time he was organizing his C. I. O., dividing the ranks of labor into two hostile camps. A little later in another speech on the floor I compared John L. Lewis with Sam Gompers, the "grand old man of labor." In that speech I eulogized Gompers and criticized Lewis. I urged Lewis to go to the fountainhead of the trade-union

movement and get a new baptism of the real religion of labor as preached and exemplified by Gompers. The policy of John L. Lewis was always a policy of "rule or ruin," while Gompers' policy is summed up in the following words taken from one of his speeches:

One fact stands out in bold relief in the history of mankind's attempts for betterment. That is that when compulsion is used, only resentment is aroused, and the end is not gained. Only through moral suasion and appeal to man's reason can a movement succeed.

Perhaps Members of Congress can learn something from the words of Sam Gompers, "when compulsion is used, resentment is aroused, and the end is not gained." I shall vote against the May bill, because I do not think its passage will tend to stimulate production, and I shall vote for the Harness substitute because I think its passage will tend to increase production.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a quotation.

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

There was no objection.

HARNES AMENDMENT TO THE MAY BILL

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. G. Luhrs, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Association, representing a million two hundred fifty thousand men, has issued the following statement in support of the Harness amendment to the May bill presently under consideration by the Committee of the Whole, which is as follows:

We support H. R. 1803 as a substitute for the May bill and still maintain that there has been no evidence introduced justifying compulsion. We still believe that voluntary procedure and with a close check of the hoarding of men in industries, will solve the problem and by doing it that way it will maintain the morale, loyalty, and patriotism, whereas the other will be destructive of all three.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Chapman	Judd	Powers
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Sabath
Cravens	Kefauver	Satterfield
Dawson	LaFollette	Sheridan
Dirksen	Larcade	Sumner, Ill.
Eaton	Lewis	White
Fernandez	Murdock	Winter
Gwynne, Iowa	Norrell	
Heidinger	O'Brien, Mich.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 401 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, 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.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if I believed H. R. 1752, known as the committee or May bill, or any substitute bill offered as amendment thereto which contains force or compulsory provisions, would save one life, produce one more tank, gun, or shell, or shorten this cruel war by 1 day, it would have my support and vote. Because I do believe that it will not increase production but, on the contrary, will retard production and injure our war effort, I shall vote against it.

A little more than a year ago we were informed by some of the highest ranking officers, military and civil, in our Government that every schedule for the production of the implements of war had been fully met, with one exception. The miracles had been accomplished. One, the speed by which the Nation changed from peace to war production. Second, the amount of war material provided. Industry and labor wrote a new chapter in production to carry on war never before equaled in the history of the world.

It amazed ourselves and baffled our enemies. It had been achieved by the voluntary and patriotic response of the Nation. Compulsion or force was absent. Loyalty and devotion to country and home spring from the human breast. They are born of the spirit. They can neither be legislated nor created by force of law. The best national service act we have ever had or can have—and I hope always will have—is the determination of a free people to remain free.

The proposed legislation before us would place chains on free hands. It would discourage millions of our workers who are nobly doing their part and destroy those values of the human soul which shape the destiny of the Nation.

This is a war between freedom and slavery. To place shackles on all our people, whether engaged in or out of defense work, is to establish here what our armed forces are fighting to destroy abroad. The record of production thus far exhibits to an astonished world, that the torch of freedom and self-government is still burning fiercely within the American people. Nothing will ever destroy that precious jewel as long as we live as a free people.

The bill before us intimates lack of production and manpower shortage. If production lagged, it has been occasioned by an overoptimistic view of our own military strategists on the termination of the war.

The allegation of manpower shortage is emphatically denied by both labor and management. A recent visit by a Senate committee to the Norfolk Navy Yard and its findings show conclusively that in a Government-established war-production plant there was no manpower shortage. It did find manpower wastage, and their report was nauseating, to say the least, to every loyal American.

I believe a better coordination of our Government agencies charged with the responsibility of war production with the industrial and labor forces will provide the answer for increased production. Involuntary servitude must not be injected into our scheme of life.

From labor and management in my district has come the most forceful denial of manpower shortage. Industry, in response to my inquiry of sometime ago, is against the legislation now under consideration, and both assert there is no necessity for it. From the Pontiac (Mich.) Manufacturers Association I received the following reply:

Answering your question in regard to manpower shortage, we do not think that a national service act would be the American way of working ourselves out of the difficulties.

Pontiac and Detroit, Mich., are large industrial and production centers.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I believe the interests of our country and our courageous and heroic fighting men and women will be best served by voting against the bill before us and all amendments which involve force or compulsion.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side, 5 minutes, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the brief time allotted to the consideration of the Harness-Barrett substitute, I prefer not to yield. In summarizing the arguments for those who are supporting the Harness substitute, which is actually the Barrett bill, H. R. 1803, I want to briefly tell you what the substitute does and then present to you, with your indulgence, the arguments in behalf of the substitute,

which I think are effective arguments against the May bill.

First. The substitute for the first time gives us a complete and adequate occupational classification of our manpower between 18 and 45 by the local draft boards.

Second. For the first time we will call on those whose services are unnecessary in other essential industries to volunteer for work in critical plants.

Third. It empowers the War Manpower Commission to establish manpower ceilings so that nonessential industries cannot overstaff their force.

Fourth. It requires intensive investigation and in-plant surveys of hoarding and wastage of labor in cost-plus-fixed-fee plants. It requires management and labor to cooperate in such investigation and in the selection of employees to be released for work in critical plants. It gives the power of subpoena to the local boards and authorizes the War Manpower Commission to release selected surplus skilled employees.

It has been said on this floor that it is absolutely necessary to pass a bill. I do not agree with that attitude toward legislation. "A good bill or a bad bill, pass a bill," we are told. "We hope it is good, but good or bad, for the effect it will have on the armed services, pass a bill." The May bill has been referred to throughout the press as a work-or-fight bill. Is it? It is a work-or-jail bill. The men it attempts to reach are the men who have been rejected by the armed forces as unfit to fight and so we are going to not draft them and put them in the armed forces—they do not want them; instead, we are going to draft them and put them into war plants or put them in jail.

The benefits extended in the May bill to these new draftees for labor put a premium on the little bit of "slackerism" that has been found in the United States; and, thank God, there is very little, but whatever small amount of "slackerism" there may be it will now be paid by the Government a premium.

Compulsory labor is not effective labor; industry and management agree wholeheartedly on that. I believe we all agree, proponents and opponents of the May bill, proponents and opponents of the Harness substitute, that hoarding in many plants throughout the country is prevalent. The Barrett-Harness substitute eliminates hoarding and effectively enlists labor for war work. The May bill may well accentuate hoarding because it drafts additional labor without doing anything effective to stop labor hoarding.

For the many who profess their devotion to the cause of free organized labor this is a test vote—do not forget it.

For those who profess and proclaim their devotion to the cause of free and independent small business, this is a test—do not forget it.

For those who profess their devotion to the traditional system of American free competitive enterprise, this is a test—do not forget it.

For those who profess their determination to protect at home the free institutions which our fighting men are fighting for, this is a test—do not forget it.

To those who have proclaimed the need of over-all conscription or a National Service Act—I say to you that the May bill is a mockery—why should we draft a part of labor without drafting all of labor; why should we draft labor at all without drafting management and capital?

What wise words were spoken in 1940 when a prominent labor leader said to labor that if you draft Roosevelt for a third term he will draft you.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is agreed by all that this is one of the most difficult and complicated problems we have had to face. Your committee found it to be so when we considered it for approximately 3 weeks. In my opinion the debate here has emphasized the fact that it is a very highly complicated and involved problem. I do believe that the debate here on this measure has been one of the best we have experienced within the last few years. In view of the complicated nature of the bill I find it hard to believe that members of the committee will vote for a substitute, write legislation on the floor, which has not been considered by a committee, which has not been given consideration by those who have been in contact with the problem and know what is involved in this highly technical and controversial measure.

I call your attention to the fact that the Barrett bill, which is now before us as the Harness substitute, was offered in the House on Monday of this week, January 29. Is it possible that the House is going to adopt in toto a provision which was introduced after consideration of this bill had been authorized? I cannot believe it will be adopted without consideration or any deliberation or any consultation by those who are interested in solving a very difficult question affecting the war.

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

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. With reference to legislation affecting the manpower of the Nation, I want to say that anything that stops short of outlawing the closed shop and strikes against the Government fails to do complete justice to the people fighting this war, but certainly, in view of what Admiral King and General Marshall have said and what we know as to the stress of the moment, it is inconceivable that this committee would substitute for the pending measure which carries such a limited amount of force, such a meaningless amendment, which is nothing more nor less than a refuge for people with tender feet.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, it is quite significant that this substitute has been offered and is supported by those who have consistently opposed all legislation on this subject. It is also quite significant that those organizations and individuals who have opposed all legislation are now flooding you with telegrams to substitute the Harness amendment for the bill which the committee has reported to you. I think there is high justification for the remarks that our Speaker made yesterday that the Harness substitute constitutes nothing more than a pious appeal to people who have been appealed to on many occasions.

It has been said that many thousands of people have gone back into industry during the month of January. That is also highly significant because on the 6th day of January the manpower proposal was filed in this House and when it became known throughout the country that we did propose to utilize our manpower, people have voluntarily gone into industry.

Under the May bill two opportunities for volunteering are provided with compulsion for those few recalcitrants who refuse to abide by what is to the best interest of the Nation. They may be forced into industry. You will continue that voluntary shift from nonessential to essential occupations only if the May bill is adopted. To defeat this measure or to bring out another pious appeal will put a stop to the volunteering which is going on now, the result of the pendency of this legislation, and that will be continued unless this bill is adopted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us the real necessity for this kind of legislation. Is it because we are short of matériel for the armed forces? Is it because we are short of manpower to produce that matériel?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me answer the first question.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Let me call attention to one other thing. The gentleman was on the western front a few weeks ago when he heard these soldiers ask for different kinds of equipment. I hold in my hand a Surplus Reporter magazine from the Treasury Department which shows 184,000 gasoline cans that they say they are short.

Mr. KILDAY. I decline to yield further. I think one of the greatest blows to democracy and our ability to function in time of war was displayed on the floor the other day when the gentleman from Alabama was forced to make known on the floor of the House, and for public consumption, the exact stock piles that we have on hand of critical materials. I wonder how much effort our military intelligence would have had to put forth to get the same information as to the German supplies. I wonder how many lives of American boys would have been sacrificed in securing that information, yet to overcome such statements as the

gentleman has just made on the floor it became necessary for that secret and confidential information to be disclosed.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made here that this has been requested by the President of the United States, General Marshall, and Judge Patterson but that they know nothing with reference to production. They formulated the production program, they placed and distributed the orders and have been responsible for the tremendous production efforts. True, because they were properly placed and properly distributed, and they did know what was involved in the production effort. We are handling quite an unpleasant task, true. Oh, I remember back in August 1941, we had a very difficult and unpleasant task when we were considering the lengthening of the term of service under the Selective Service Act. I compliment the gentleman from Indiana on the energy he expended in preparing his speech and marshaling his facts, but he could have saved that energy by reading the report in which he joined. In that report opposing extension of the term of service of men inducted he said:

The President in his message of July 21, 1941, to the Congress on this subject declared "that the danger today (to our national safety) is infinitely greater" than it was a year ago. Gen. George C. Marshall in his testimony before our Committee on Military Affairs likewise states "that a national emergency now exists." However, neither the President nor the Chief of Staff would elaborate upon this broad general statement. No specific evidence and no definite data were offered to substantiate their contention. When pressed to give reasons for his blanket and dogmatic statement General Marshall said "unfortunately, it is not in the public interest to make a public statement of all we know."

And again:

With all deference to both the President and the Chief of Staff, it is our opinion that the crisis today is not as grave as it was 1 year ago or when the selectees were first inducted into the military service.

That was 4 months and 6 days before the attack on Pearl Harbor, and with exactly the same language now used in opposition to this bill. The argument would seem to be here now that we should accept General Marshall's evaluation of the strategic problem, but that he knows nothing about production. In August 1941 they refused to follow the recommendation of General Marshall on the matter of strategy. It was as appealing an argument that was made then as is made here now. It was so appealing, in fact, that we were able to lengthen that service by only one solitary vote in this House. At that time our national security hung in the balance, just as General Marshall and the President have stated in connection with this bill.

If you are interested in promoting the war effort, if you are interested in getting the ammunition to the front, I hope you will vote down the Harness substitute and adopt the bill reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana) there were—ayes 125, noes 154.

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

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HARNESS of Indiana and Mr. MAY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 177, noes 187.

So the substitute 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: Strike out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 1752 and insert the following:

"That (a) the Congress hereby declares as among the purposes of this act (1) to permit the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) to reduce wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; (3) to channel available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort; (4) to make available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) to promote the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

"(b) The Congress further declares that the effective mobilization and allocation of our available manpower necessitates cooperative action by all Federal departments and agencies responsible for production, procurement, and manpower in determining the relative urgency to the war effort of various products and services and in establishing and maintaining a proper balance between the war production in any given area and the manpower available to that area.

"(c) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to modify 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.

"(d) The Congress hereby directs that to the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

"Sec. 2. The hiring, rehiring, and solicitation for the purpose of hiring or rehiring, of individuals by employers, and the acceptance of employment by workers, shall be conducted in accordance with the following subsections of this section:

"(a) An individual who at any time during the preceding 60-day period (or such longer or different periods as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall prescribe) was engaged in an essential or locally needed activity may be hired only if, (1) such individual is hired for work in an essential or locally needed activity or for work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission, and (2) such individual presents a statement of availability from his last employment in an essential or locally needed activity or is referred by the War Manpower Commission or is hired with its consent as provided herein.

"(b) An individual shall receive a statement of availability from employment in an essential or locally needed activity if, (1) he

has been discharged or his employment has been otherwise terminated by his employer; or (2) he has been laid off for an indefinite period or for a period of 7 or more days; or (3) continuance of his employment would involve undue personal hardship; or (4) such employment is at a wage or salary or under working conditions below standards established by State or Federal law or regulation; or (5) such employment is at a wage or salary established or approved by the National War Labor Board (or other agency authorized to adjust wages or approve adjustments thereof) as warranting adjustment or consideration for adjustment, and the employer has failed to adjust the wage in accordance with such level or to apply to the appropriate agency for such adjustment or approval thereof; or (6) such employment is with an employer who the War Manpower Commission finds, after notice and opportunity to appeal, has not complied with this act or with any regulation or order thereunder, and who is continuing his noncompliance after such finding. Statements of availability shall be issued promptly to individuals entitled thereto on such forms and in accordance with such procedures as the Chairman may by regulation prescribe.

"(c) If an individual is employed at less than full time or at a job which does not utilize his highest recognized skill for which there is a need in the war effort, the War Manpower Commission shall upon proper application refer him to other available employment in which it finds that the individual will be more fully utilized in the war effort.

"(d) To the extent necessary to provide manpower in the numbers and kinds needed for war production and essential civilian services in situations of manpower shortages, the Chairman may by regulation (1) provide that any or all categories of individuals in any or all areas, activities, or occupations may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission or in accordance with arrangements approved by the War Manpower Commission; (2) establish fair and reasonable employment ceilings limiting the number of workers or of specified types of workers which may be employed in any establishment or place of employment during specified periods; and (3) require the release by an employer of any or all categories of individuals in his employ whose services are urgently needed elsewhere in production or service of more importance to the war effort.

"(e) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the referral of individuals pursuant to this act and governing the making of arrangements with public or private agencies, organizations, or persons for the hiring of individuals pursuant to subsection (d) (1) of this section: *Provided*, That such regulations shall include the following referral standards:

"(1) To the greatest degree consistent with war needs, workers who may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission shall be given freedom of choice as to the jobs they wish to accept, and employers shall be given freedom of choice as to the workers they wish to employ.

"(2) Good cause for refusing a referral to a job without prejudice to further job offers shall include (i) any case in which the worker, if he accepted the job, would be entitled to a statement of availability or be eligible for a referral on grounds of underutilization of skill or less than full-time work; (ii) any case in which wages or working conditions in the offered employment are not reasonably comparable to those prevailing for similar employment in similar establishments in the community; and (iii) any case in which his acceptance of the job offered would, over an objection presented in good faith by the worker, require him to

join or resign from, or refrain from, joining a labor organization.

"(3) The decision to refer an individual shall be based on qualifications essential for performance of or suitability for the job, and shall be without discrimination as to race, color, creed, sex, national origin, or, except as required by law, citizenship.

"(f) (1) No employer shall release a worker on grounds that this act or any regulation or order thereunder so requires until after the War Manpower Commission has advised the employer that the worker shall be released. The War Manpower Commission shall so advise the employer only after the worker has been interviewed by the War Manpower Commission or afforded reasonable opportunity therefor, and a determination has been made either (a) that suitable work is available to the worker, the worker does not have good cause for refusing referral to such work and an employer to which the worker has been referred by the United States Employment Service has agreed to hire the worker, or (b) that the worker has been afforded a reasonable opportunity for an interview and has failed to report for the same, or (c) that the worker has refused without good cause to apply for or to accept suitable work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission.

"(2) In the case of any individual whose employer has been required to release him from a position (other than a temporary position) in his employ under the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder and who thereafter (a) has accepted employment or employments to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission and has continued therein as directed by the War Manpower Commission, (b) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (c) makes application for re-employment within 10 days after notice by the War Manpower Commission that he is no longer required in war work, such person shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay under conditions and with rights and privileges similar but subordinate to those prescribed by section 8 (c), (d), and (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

"(g) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the establishment of employment ceilings pursuant to subsection (d) (2) of this section. Such ceilings shall be based upon a consideration of (1) the extent to which the employer is utilizing his available work force, (2) the relative importance to the war effort of the product or service in which the employer is engaged, and (3) the extent and nature of manpower shortages impeding the successful prosecution of the war.

"(h) No employer shall advertise or otherwise solicit for the purpose of hiring any individual if the hiring of such individual would be subject to restrictions under this act except in a manner consistent with such restrictions and with such regulations as the Chairman may prescribe in order to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 3. The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him by the War Manpower Commission under this act or any regulation or order thereunder is unfair or unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in the regulation, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable such regulation shall provide for tribunals so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management and labor interests in the locality.

Such regulation shall contain reasonable provisions for the representation of any individual or other person by the labor or trade organization of which he is a member or any other representative freely chosen by him.

"Sec. 4. No provision of this act shall be applicable to (1) the employment of an individual in agriculture; (2) any Territory or possession of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii; (3) employment by a foreign, State, county, or municipal government or their political subdivisions or their agencies or instrumentalities, or to the hiring of any of their employees unless such foreign, State, county, or municipal government or political subdivision or agency or instrumentality has indicated its ability and willingness to conform with this act; (4) employment in the legislative or judicial branches of the Federal Government; or (5) persons while in active service in the armed forces of the United States.

"Sec. 5. (a) There is hereby created a War Manpower Commission which shall be under the direction of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission (herein referred to as the "Chairman"). The Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$15,000 per annum. All the provisions of this act and of any regulation, rule, order, or other requirement prescribed thereunder shall be administered by the Chairman. The Chairman may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix the compensation of such employees in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Chairman in any case in any court.

"(b) The War Manpower Commission shall be composed of one representative of each of the following departments and agencies, to be designated by the respective departments and agencies, subject to the approval of the Chairman: The Department of War, the Department of the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the War Production Board, the United States Civil Service Commission, the National Housing Agency, the Selective Service System, and such other executive departments and agencies as the President shall determine. The Chairman shall consult with the members of the War Manpower Commission in carrying out his responsibilities under this act.

"(c) The Chairman shall appoint a National Management-Labor Policy Committee to be selected from the fields of labor, agriculture, and industrial management and shall consult with the members thereof in carrying out his responsibilities. The Chairman shall also provide for the appointment of regional and State or area management-labor committees whose members shall be similarly selected and who shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of this act. Members of any such committee may be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. These committees shall be utilized by the Chairman in connection with hearings and appeals provided under section 3 of this act.

"Sec. 6. The Chairman, in carrying out the provisions of this act, is authorized—

"(a) to issue, amend, rescind such rules, regulations, orders, or other requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any rules, regulation, order, or other requirement under this act may contain such classifications and differentiations with respect to individuals, employers, occupations, establishments, activities, and localities, and may

provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as, in the judgment of the Chairman, are necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act;

"(b) to delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority vested in him under this act to such officials, employees, or other persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose;

"(c) to accept voluntary services in connection with the administration of this act, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such property, equipment, and supplies as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(d) to utilize the services of any and all departments, agencies, officers, and agents of the United States, and to accept the services of State and local agencies and their officers and employees in carrying out any provision of this act and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to reimburse such State and local agencies and their officers and employees for services rendered for such purposes.

"Sec. 7. (a) The provisions of sections 2 (a), 3, 4, 6, and 7 of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable under this act, except that the words "subsection (a)", wherever they occur in those provisions, shall be replaced for the purposes of this act by the phrase "this act."

"Any person who, in violation of the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder, willfully hires, rehires, or solicits an individual, or accepts employment, or fails to comply with an employment ceiling, or to release individuals, or fails to submit information or permit inspections, or investigations, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to the penalties provided for violations of the provisions of sections 2 (a) (1) and (2) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III, 'Priorities Powers' of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended.

"(b) The President shall prescribe the extent to which any wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of this act, or any regulation or order of the Chairman thereunder, shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other Government agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

"(c) Precedence shall be given by the courts to the trial of cases arising under this act.

"Sec. 8. As used in this act—

"(a) 'Agriculture' means those farm activities carried on by farm owners or tenants on farms in connection with the cultivation of the soil, the harvesting of crops, or the raising, feeding, or management of livestock, bees, and poultry, and shall not include any packing, canning, processing, transportation, or marketing of articles produced on farms unless performed or carried on as an incident to ordinary farming operations as distinguished from manufacturing or commercial operations.

"(b) 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"(c) 'Essential activity' means any activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it is—

"(1) an essential war activity, including the production, repair, transportation, or maintenance or equipment, supplies, facilities, or materials required in the prosecution of the war by the United States;

"(2) an activity required for the maintenance or development of essential war activities; or

"(3) an activity essential to the maintenance or development of the public safety, health, welfare, or interest.

"(d) 'Locally needed activity' means any activity other than an essential activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it contributes to the prosecution of the war in a critical labor-shortage area, and meets standards prescribed by the Chairman to insure the full utilization of manpower.

"(e) 'Employment,' 'work,' 'hire,' 'rehire,' 'employ,' 'employer,' or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

"Sec. 9. The provisions of this act and all rules, regulations, orders, and other requirements thereunder shall remain in force during the continuance of the war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

"Sec. 10. There are 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 act.

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this amendment in the nature of a substitute has been printed as has the bill H. R. 1779, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment which I have offered is, as the majority leader has just stated, printed in the form of a House bill, H. R. 1779, and it also appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 602 under date of Tuesday, January 30. Any Member who desires may read the text of the bill at that place in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, my substitute will provide for giving statutory authority and certain enforcement powers to the system of manpower availability which is now in effect, which has been developed through the months by the cooperation of management, labor, Government, and other elements of the population, but which is up to this time operating without statutory authority, without any power of enforcement. My amendment will make it enforceable in areas where it may become necessary and only to the extent necessary. This system has already been put into effect in a number of places in this Nation. I have here a clipping telling the way in which it was put into effect in Pennsylvania where a ceiling was placed upon employment in a certain brewery industry, and the men formerly working in the industry were transferred into essential war production. It seems to me desirable in the first place that if we can solve this manpower problem on the basis of the machinery now operating it would clearly be of

great advantage from the point of view of getting speedily the increased war production we want over a proposal to substitute a brand new program involving the putting of all the work into the Selective Service System which has had no experience in the channeling of workers into employment and which will inevitably have to use these other agencies. This will mean duplication of effort and further complexity. In the second place, and most important of all, my proposal will avoid what seems to me to be the element in the May bill that is positively dangerous, namely, a situation where you take an individual and compel that individual to work not for his Government but for a private employer in a profit-making enterprise. That, it seems to me, is a fundamental objection to this legislation.

As I said before in the House, the only thing that is more serious—and I emphasize the fact I do think it is more serious—is the drafting of men into the Army of the United States and sending them off to fight a war. In my opinion, that takes precedence over this other wrong. Nonetheless, if we can accomplish our purposes without having to commit an act of violence to something that is very close to the very basis of American life and government, let us do it.

The machinery under my substitute would be as follows: It would give mandatory power to the War Manpower Commission in areas where manpower shortages existed to enforce ceilings on employment in industry. It would give mandatory power to this Commission, under my substitute, to say that there shall not be a hoarding of labor, that there shall not be more people employed in a given industry or plant than are actually needed in that industry. Over and over on this floor Members have gotten up and emphasized that that was one of the major faults at present and one of the most important things to be corrected. My substitute goes directly to that problem. The May bill, I respectfully submit, does not. The very machinery of my substitute is to give power to the War Manpower Commission to say that as long as this war lasts and our men are dying on the battle fronts of the world, we are going to produce less fancy furs or fancy clothing or liquor, we are not going to have as much entertainment, we are not going to have as fancy service in hotels.

In areas of labor shortage it is possible for the War Manpower Commission to say that no one shall be hired in that area except upon referral to the War Manpower Commission. In other words, they can say first: "You have got to release workers from nonessential industries"; and, second, "Those workers in becoming reemployed have got to go through the War Manpower Commission," which means they will be referred to various places of employment where they are most needed for war production. But it will use existing machinery and no man would be compelled to work for the private profit of another.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this proposal would recommend itself to any person who is sincerely desirous

of accomplishing in the most rapid possible manner the main objective of increased war production. Under my proposal we would be able to gain the end of actually and certainly being able to shift workers from nonessential occupations into war production and we could do it without the loss of one of the most precious things in American life, namely, the will of free men to do their job for their country, not because they are compelled to do it but because they want to do it. If we can preserve both of those things at once, Mr. Chairman, let us do it.

Now, my bill is not a bill without compulsion. It has penalties in it. It has penalties against three things. It has a penalty for violation of a ceiling, it has a penalty against a man who in a tight labor area takes a job without being referred to that job by the War Manpower Commission, and it has a penalty against an employer who solicits a worker or hires a worker without referral in areas of shortage where the War Manpower Commission has declared that these mandatory provisions shall go into effect. They do not go into effect every place. They go into effect in areas of manpower shortage.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Does this provide for a ceiling in war industries where there is hoarding of labor at the present time?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It does. I refer specifically to the following provision in my substitute:

The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the establishment of employment ceilings pursuant to subsection (d) (2) of this section. Such ceilings shall be based upon a consideration of (1) the extent to which employer is utilizing his available work force.

And that applies to all industries, essential and nonessential as well. You have the power to do these things. A plant cannot have more workers unless it needs them. You can say that to a shipyard or an aircraft company which has a surplus of labor as well as to a nonessential employer.

The penalties provided by this bill are the same as the penalties provided for in the War Powers Act for violation of priorities and allocation orders. The penalties are applicable to the three types of violations that I spoke of a moment ago. I hope that is clear. Under my substitute, violations are misdemeanors; under the May bill they are felonies. Some of you who are attorneys will know the difference between those two things.

I am as earnest and sincere as any Member on this floor to see and do everything we can that will shorten this war by 1 day or get one gun to a soldier, if it need be. If I did not believe that the proposal I have brought forth here would do that, I would not offer it. May I preface it by saying that I have not perfected this substitute alone. It has been carefully drawn, I assure you, not by me but by people who have done an excellent job of drafting, and it is right.

The bill, furthermore, comes to you today with the recommendation on the part of people most experienced in the work of actually performing a production miracle for which America has been responsible, who say that they believe that this approach to the problem is a better approach than running the risk of compulsory labor.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. May I ask the gentleman, referring to the language at the top of page 8 of his bill, line 4, subsection 2, if that language is broad enough to enable the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to take a man out of one newspaper and put him into another, on the ground that the first newspaper is better equipped for news coverage?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman, with all due respect, that this does not cover the newspaper business, because I do not think he could say that that was in a field where he could do that. I think he could put ceilings on employment on all newspapers, but I do not think he could do what the gentleman says; not for a single moment.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. The other day a group of us were talking to General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, and he stated that he could put into the armed services anybody between the ages of 18 and 45, except that there was a limitation in the Draft Act permitting the departmental heads or the heads of agencies of the Government some latitude. Would this reach any surplus or hoarding of manpower by the Government itself?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman wants to know whether this would reach the hoarding of manpower by the Government itself. On page 9, section 4, there are enumerated types of employment and geographical areas where this bill would not apply. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill does not apply to employment in the legislative or judicial branches of the Federal Government, which means it does apply in the executive branch of the Government. That is the answer to the question.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What remedy does the bill provide in cases of hoarding of manpower, whether by the Government or industry?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just covered that, I may say to the gentleman. He will find that the whole machinery of this bill is to operate by the imposition, compulsory if needed, of ceilings upon employment; and ceilings can be placed upon employment and enforced under this bill in order to prevent hoarding or waste of men and women's labor and to require employers to utilize employment to the best possible extent.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it places plenary powers in the hands of the War Manpower Commission, headed by Mr. McNutt, to do that which in the discretion of Mr. McNutt should be done to accomplish the purposes of the May bill; limited, however, only by the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not quite sure that I understand the gentleman's question. But may I say this. Certainly my substitute does not give Mr. McNutt the power to draft that the May bill gives. It gives him by law the very powers he now exercises by Executive order, and adds enforcement power. There is nothing in this bill that is not the result of working out by trial and error methods and by real consultation with the labor management committees that have been associated with this. The safeguard with regard to referral, the safeguard with regard to fixing of ceilings, the enforcement powers, and all the rest of them, are things that have been worked out in practice in this country over the past months and, therefore, it seems to me, should be considered even more deeply.

The essential thing in connection with the question just asked by the gentleman from Michigan is that we are enacting into law here now and giving mandatory enforcement powers to what already has been set up by Executive order without mandatory enforcement powers. That is about what we are doing.

I should like, if I may, to run through this bill. I am going to begin at the bottom of page 2, and I am going to read very briefly some parts. This is from the section on purposes:

The Congress hereby directs that to the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use made of existing hiring channels—

In solving the problem.

We come to the enforcement section, which is section 2. That is the heart of the bill.

The first provision is that no individual who was engaged in an essential or locally needed activity may be hired by anybody else unless he gets a referral from the War Manpower Commission and a statement of availability. That is the system that has been in effect, but under this it would work, and you could control turn-over by that method.

The bill states in the next subsection, (b), the circumstances under which

statements of availability shall be granted, and sets fair and just circumstances and reasons why a man may come and ask for a referral from one job to another, if his reasons are good and if he is going to continue to be employed in war production.

Then it states, and I ask the gentlemen who have asked me about hoarding to notice this:

If an individual is employed at less than full time or at a job which does not utilize his highest recognized skill for which there is a need in the war effort, the War Manpower Commission shall upon proper application refer him to other available employment in which it finds that the individual will be more fully utilized in the war effort.

Now I take up the main provisions of the bill, which I want to read to you:

To the extent necessary to provide manpower in the numbers and kinds needed for war production and essential civilian services in situations of manpower shortages, the chairman may by regulation (1) provide that any or all categories of individuals in any or all areas, activities, or occupations may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission or in accordance with arrangements approved by the War Manpower Commission; (2) establish fair and reasonable employment ceilings limiting the number of workers or of specified types of workers which may be employed in any establishment or place of employment during specified periods; and (3) require the release by an employer of any or all categories of individuals in his employ whose services are urgently needed elsewhere in production or service of more importance to the war effort.

If my substitute is adopted, we can pass a bill which can solve the manpower problem and whose passage can be hailed not only by our men overseas as a means of helping to meet their needs but by labor and management and all the rest of the people on the home front as an endorsement of the efforts they have so far made, as an implementation of those efforts with the power of government, and as, I believe, the best available solution of this problem.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. How will the gentleman's bill get at the individual who is not now engaged in any war activity?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. By means of employment ceilings upon employment in nonessential activities in areas of manpower shortage.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In other words, the gentleman's bill will only penalize those who are already working in war industries and will not get at the individual who is not working?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; that is not true. What I thought the gentleman had reference to was the women at home now who might be drawn in. They are the people that the bill, I admit, would not reach. But it would reach every person who is now employed throughout the Nation in every nonessential activity. The only sizable group of people it will not reach are the housewives who are still at home.

I submit there are not many people in America today who are in that situation, and I think that small number, almost all of whom are women in my opinion, who might not come under the terms of this bill, is utterly insignificant compared to the gain for a nation which goes directly at the problem by the method of my bill, which avoids the necessity of drafting one man to work for the private profit of another. It therefore can get at this problem without sacrificing the moral values which I believe are most important to production itself and of course of great importance to the individual.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In the first paragraph of section 2 of the gentleman's bill, subsection (a) it says, "An individual who at any time during the preceding 60-day period was engaged in a war activity." Where in the gentleman's bill does it cover a person who in that preceding 60-day period was not engaged in such activity?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Certainly it does.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Where does the gentleman's bill cover that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman mean where a person is not engaged in any industry at all and was not working at all?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As long as they are women who are staying at home, it does not cover them. I explained that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am referring to a man subject to the draft.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Any man subject to the draft is subject to the draft. That is the first point. Any person who is working any place in this country is covered by this bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Suppose he is not working?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The bill makes it possible to impose a ceiling on employment requiring manpower referral for work in some essential war occupation.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has well stated the comprehensiveness of his bill. I say it is much more comprehensive than the committee bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The committee bill only takes in registrants between the ages of 18 and 45. The gentleman's bill takes in all those in that category who are now either in essential or nonessential industry and in addition it takes in all of those over the age of 45 who are in essential or nonessential industry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman's bill will affect many more people than the committee bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have risen to take this time in order to refute the statement made by my good friend the gentleman from Indiana in reference to the shortage of matériel, especially of critical materials at the present time. I desire to call the attention of this body to the fact that there is a lag in production of critical materials and that this lag in production has existed for some time. It has become increasingly acute in the last few months. I want to call the attention of this body to the fact that on November 30, at a press conference, the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, made this statement in reference to the shortage of ammunition:

This situation has been and is extremely complicated and equally critical and bids fair to be more so, unless production rates in the United States are greatly increased.

Mr. Chairman, within 10 days after that statement was made by the Secretary of War here in Washington, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower from his headquarters in France behind the enemy's lines made a special plea to the people of the United States to increase the production of ammunition which he said was sorely needed by his armies on the western front.

Then following that statement, one by one the high officials of both the War and Navy Departments have made pleas to our people to increase production, not only of ammunition but of all critical items needed for war purposes.

The War Production Board turns out month by month a report of present production and of needed production for the future. I hold in my hand a portion of the report put out by the War Production Board several days ago showing needed materials—critical items—at the present time. I want to give you the figures covering those items.

For instance, there is the item "critical aircraft," a very important item to our war effort. According to the War Production Board report, an increased production for January of 27 percent is needed in this one item.

There is "artillery ammunition," and an increase for January of production of 14 percent is needed.

There is heavy "field artillery" for January an increase of 5 percent over the December production is needed.

There are "mortars and mortar ammunition" great increases are needed.

There is "communications wire," which is vital for our communications on the front, an increase of 11 percent is needed.

"Bus and truck tires," an increase of 17 percent in January over the December production is needed.

"Cotton duck" in which an increase of 3 percent in January over December production is needed.

"Military dry cell batteries" of which an increase of 49 percent over the preceding month was needed.

If we go down the line and take up one item after another such as the item "Navy rockets," of which an increase of 92 percent in January over December production is needed, we find the War Production Board calculated a needed increase of production of many of them for every month from January, February, March, and straight on through the entire year 1945.

The same situation prevails with reference to "Navy high capacity ammunition." In this particular item, there is a scheduled increase in production vitally necessary for every single month during the year 1945. Likewise, "mortars and mortar ammunition" comes in for an increased production during every month in the current year 1945.

These things all arise at a critical time in our production schedule. They come up at the very time when the Army is calling for 900,000 additional men for the armed services. They come up at a time when the war plants of the country are calling for 700,000 additional men, plus 200,000 additional men who will be needed for our war plants to replace those taken out for the armed services.

Now there is presented to you this bill. It is presented to you who sat on this floor and voted for a declaration of war against Germany and Japan. I can recall sitting in this Chamber when we passed the resolution pledging the full resources of the Nation to the support of this war effort. At the time that resolution was passed this Congress meant exactly what the resolution said and that was everything.

When we face this crisis of production on the home front and the war crisis on the battle fronts, we need every support we can get to wind this war up shortly and effectively. Mr. Chairman, the bill presented to you today has for its intention the giving to those men the very best there is in the way of equipment to carry on this fight overseas. This measure has the purpose of keeping the muskets in the hands of those fighting men overseas. It has for its purpose the manufacture of ammunition to go into those weapons in order that they may carry on. It has for its purpose, Mr. Chairman, the giving to those men a fair chance to defend themselves and come back alive. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the bill will shorten the war, will save American lives, will bring victory more quickly to us and our allies, and it should be passed. It is a question of all-out wholehearted support of our fighting men wherever they may be, in Europe or in the Pacific. I want my vote cast for a bill that will give that support, wholehearted, all-out support.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the January report of the War Production Board be printed to show past production and the needed increases in certain critical items. The report follows:

THE OVER-ALL PICTURE

As to the over-all picture, total munitions productions and war construction for December, critical and noncritical, according to preliminary figures reached \$5,445,000,000. This was an increase of 1 percent over the \$5,404,000,000, of November but 2 percent behind the \$5,546,000,000 scheduled for the

month. This pattern of moderate gains over November but small deficits from the December schedule was followed by most of the major groups:

Total December production (critical and non-critical), preliminary		Percent deviation from gain over November Schedule	
		Percent deviation from gain over November Schedule	Percent deviation from gain over November Schedule
Aircraft	-----	+2	-2
Ships (including maintenance)	-----	-6	-4
Guns and fire control	-----	-1	0
Ammunition	-----	+3	-1
Combat and motor vehicles	-----	+7	-1
Communications and electronic equipment	-----	-1	-4
Other equipment and supplies	-----	+3	-2
Total munitions	-----	+1	-2
War construction	-----	-2	0
Total munitions and war construction	-----	+1	-2

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to inflict myself upon you again in this debate. There are a few things, however, sir, that we need to make clear. While I feel there is absolutely no necessity for any legislation on this subject I voted for the Barrett resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] as a substitute; I shall vote for the Voorhis bill as a substitute.

Let us really come now, in the words of the prophet, and reason together. First, I want to thank the ladies on the floor for their sweetness and you gentlemen for your kindness in not objecting to giving me 5 additional minutes; I appreciate that.

General Marshall and Admiral King or any other of our military authorities are not on trial. Those who oppose this bill have as high confidence and as great faith and as much respect, and I would even go further and say affection, for them as the staunchest advocates of this measure. That holds for Judge Patterson, too. But put a few stars on a fellow's shoulders or a little gold braid around his arm, and there are a few idolaters, there are a few who will bow down and worship Baal on this side and on that side; and the first point I want to make is that this issue is not at all political because we are split wide open on both sides of the aisle; there is no politics in it. I respect these admirals and generals, but they are human beings. Their judgment is not infallible—even on military matters. I am sorry but we have men over here on the Republican side who worship stars and love gold braid; and if Henry Stimson or George Marshall should take a pill they would move first.

Mr. Chairman, the first thing is, this is not political. Of course, politics were played last fall, but I will not even go into

that because I do not want to prejudice or weaken my case with some fellows over here who are tottering mugwumps. You know, a mugwump is one who has his mug on the wrong side of the fence and his wump on the other. You care more for your little seat in this House than you do for the welfare of this country and the safety of our boys. Oh, we have had a lot of emotional appeal, flag-waving, breast-feeding, turning red in the face, and the dropping of maps, all full of sentimentalism, sound and fury, wind and water.

Those of us who oppose this bill have flesh and blood in this war, on every continent and every sea. We are as anxious for those boys to come home as you fellows who would try to make it appear that anyone who opposes this vicious and indefensible measure is un-American and not for the boys at the front. That is tommyrot.

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

Mr. SHORT. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. HALLECK. Not so long ago we had a controversy about a soldier-vote bill. Some of us wanted the soldiers to have the whole ballot, a legal State ballot. It was said of us all over the country that we did not want the soldiers to vote. But what develops now? Stimson says that the men who wanted to vote did vote. Even in the States where the Federal ballot, the so-called bobtailed ballot, was legalized, they did not want it. It was said the soldiers would find out who was telling the truth and they will know the truth about this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Let us not bring politics into this. There are no politics in it. But the gentleman is 100 percent right—as he usually is.

Mr. Chairman, General Marshall, Admiral King, or any of the others are not on trial here. We love them and we respect them. Of course, we have got to because we have brothers and nephews in the service and we try to get along with them. But we do not care about that. Let them act in their own sphere. Generals and admirals should stay in their place. They have an applied science to prosecute this war. They are the military strategists. A lot of these parlor generals and pink-tea strategists that you see in Washington, and you see them at times, come up to your office and try to tell you how to win this war. What right have the military to tell business, labor, and industry, men who are qualified by lifelong experience, what to do? Industry and labor are both opposed to this bill.

What is it for? To cover up mistakes and miscalculations? Bickering and bungling on the home front? The only trouble between a general and a civilian is that the Army is never wrong. Was it ever wrong? I served and you served in it. Was it ever wrong? Never. They are infallible, impeccable, and Christ-like on this earth. I will not say where they will go afterward. We admit we are wrong at times. One must take orders in the Army. There is no humility.

This is not political, and the Army and Navy are not on trial.

Now, then, what is the other big thing? Mr. Chairman, I have never stood before

the House in the 16 years I have been here with an interruption which I did not welcome; I have never pleaded with the Members more earnestly than I am now.

Will this bill accomplish its objectives or will it fail?

I told you two or three days ago that if you take a drafted man and put him alongside a volunteer worker in a factory, you are going to weaken the morale of both. I deplore the fact that we have parlor and poolroom loafers and bowery bums. I know you cannot legislate patriotism, morality, or industry. I know that under our free system of enterprise, with all of its faults and weaknesses, with its strikes and stoppages and shortcomings, we have produced a miracle in this war.

History has proved and experience has shown that free labor is more effective, more efficient, and more productive than slave labor anywhere in all the world. That is the reason we have whipped Italy and are crushing Germany and Japan. We have done it on the home front as well as on the battle front. The men and the boys on the firing line, the miners who dig the leaded zinc down in my district, or the coal in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Illinois, and Kentucky or the copper out in Utah and Montana, are the ones who have hewn the block, whether it be in my district or whether in the far-off State of Washington. The miners, the farmers, the foresters, and the workers in our munitions industry are soldiers in this war.

We have too many men in one place; we have too few in another. We lulled them into a false sense of security last fall. All of us are to blame. I do not want to blame any particular individual. I think the Congress itself was to blame. The public was to blame because of the reports in the newspapers, and in the magazines and because of statements by our great military leaders who are not infallible, even when it comes to predicting when a war will end.

I do not want to embarrass them. I hesitate to do it. I curb myself today. I could quote you from our greatest military and naval leaders who thought this war was going to be over soon. They canceled contracts; they terminated contracts; they closed one factory after another all over this country and threw thousands of people out of employment.

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

Mr. BENDER. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. That is enough. There should not be any debate on this. Five minutes is too long, Mr. Chairman.

Here we are haggling. When we started in this war, defense and war plants sprang up like mushrooms all over the country. Farmers, bootblacks, soda jerkers, and people from every walk of life flocked to those centers and they were hired. If you could hit a nail and saw a board, you were paid a carpenter's wage. We had to do it. We were racing against time.

Yes; I have close, personal, intimate friends on the democratic side. That is the reason I am talking to them.

We had to hire these workers in war plants quickly. We had to get things going in a hurry. Time was of the essence. Do you know what they have done? Do you know what free labor has done in 3 years' time? Free labor, without a whip over its head, without somebody putting a harness and collar on it and gouging it and saying, "Get in there and work," has done the job. Under this bill, you would have to keep two good men watching one scoundrel who would produce nothing.

The coal miner today is producing 4 tons more of coal a day than he did 2 years ago. In England, under compulsion, he is producing only 1 ton. They sent their representatives over here, and they carried back an adverse report on their own system.

Take the rubber industry. We are producing 30 percent more rubber in all of our synthetic rubber plants per man per day than we produced 2 years ago. They have learned the know-how. Experience is a great teacher.

So much for coal and rubber. Let us take one other item, the aircraft industry. The workers in the aircraft plants today, because of improved methods of production, because of more efficient tools, because of the experience they have gained, are producing 83 percent more per man than they produced 2 years ago, and they have done it without slave labor, without a Nazi government.

Are we going to raise up a Hitler here to get rid of one abroad? Are we going to adopt a system against which our boys and girls are fighting and dying? Are we going to confess that democracy has failed and that we must adopt totalitarian methods in order to destroy dictatorship?

Mr. Chairman, over 3 years ago, on December 7, 1941, we started from scratch; we started from nothing, but we have supplied an Army and a Navy and a Marine Corps and a Coast Guard of 12,000,000 men; we have supplied Great Britain, and we have supplied Russia, yet here in this late day in the war we are asked to adopt Hitler's methods. I do not believe the soldiers at the front want us to do it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that after every storm there is a calm. I hope that while I undertake to discuss the pending amendment with you very briefly you will have calm consideration and consultation with your own good judgment.

I have been wondering, if I could have a manuscript of the discussion of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri on the radio a night or two ago, and line it up beside the speech that he made here this afternoon, how much similarity there would be.

Mr. SHORT. Thorough consistency, sir.

Mr. MAY. Out there he was for American industry, and then he wanted to regiment it and commandeer it, take the profits out of it, and mandatorily put it at the disposition of the Government, after it had shown its great performance. Here he lauds it to the sky again. I wonder just where he does stand. What does this measure present to us here?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true under the terms of the proposed Voorhis amendment that the Director of War Manpower, namely, Mr. Paul McNutt, would have the direction and control over every worker in America who is not engaged on a farm?

Mr. MAY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. THOMASON. Yet, we hear talk about bureaucracy.

Mr. MAY. I am going to discuss how much that means to the people of this country before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield to the gentleman just now; I am sorry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I was just going to comment on what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] said.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have time and cannot yield.

Mr. THOMASON. That is my understanding according to the answer the gentleman made to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment offered as a substitute is H. R. 1779 and was introduced in this House on the 25th day of January, 7 days after the hearings were closed on the bill H. R. 1119. At no time did either the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] or the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, ask that either of the two bills be taken up for consideration by the House Committee on Military Affairs. Yet, I wonder today why we do have legislative committees in the Congress. I wonder why they are required to go out and hold weeks and even months of hearings if we are to substitute a bill 15 pages long, without consideration by a congressional committee, for a bill that has been studied by such a committee and on which thoughtful deliberation has been had.

I want to call attention to the fact that this substitute does one thing which I am sure nobody in this House wants to vote for. In the first place it sets up in section 7 a "kangaroo court" in an executive department of the Government. It provides that the penalties of the War Powers Act shall be applicable.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is no "kangaroo court" involved there, but it does provide for the penalties, and that is the penalty section of the bill which I explained.

Mr. MAY. Then let us see if there is a kangaroo court. The language is as follows:

The Chairman shall by regulation—

That means the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission—

provide an opportunity for hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him by the War Manpower Commission under this act or under any regulation or order thereunder is unfair or unreasonable.

That vests in the War Manpower Commission Chairman the power to set up a tribunal to determine whether or not a man shall have imposed upon him the penalties of the Second War Powers Act. Those penalties are provided for in the act. The \$10,000-fine penalty is the same as is provided in what is called the May bill. But here there is provided a 1-year jail sentence whereas the May bill provides for 5 years. So that if a man violates any order or regulation adopted by Mr. McNutt, then he is subject to trial. It does not stop there. I call your attention to the fact that in line 22, page 8, it provides the determination made after such hearing shall be final.

Now where are the civil rights of a man? He will go to a district court and demand a trial when the penalties of the May bill become operative? We provide that he shall have a trial.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. This section is a section to give him a hearing before his case ever goes to trial. No one can be punished under this section. In the penalty section it says, "upon conviction."

Mr. MAY. Certainly you cannot impose a penalty until the party is convicted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. This section is a safeguard against the very thing the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. MAY. Why do you provide that it shall become final? How are you going to open it up in a judicial trial?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It means that the ruling of the War Manpower Commission as to whether or not a man shall have referrals to a new job or shall not, shall be final, after a hearing, if he asks for it.

Mr. MAY. It does not relate to referrals. It relates to everything that the man shall do.

I am sure the membership of this House is not anxious to vest in an administrative agency of the most powerful and dangerous bureaucracy that has ever been set up in any country, the right to say what a man's final rights shall be. In other words, he has done something for which he is brought to a hearing, whatever it may be. This says that hearing shall be final. The only thing left to a judicial tribunal will be the question of the penalty.

Now, there is another provision in this bill that makes the provisions of sections 1, a, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title 3 of the Second War Powers Act of 1942,

as amended, applicable under this act, except that the words "subsection a," wherever they occur in these provisions shall be replaced for the purpose of this act by the phrase "this act."

So that you will set up an executive agency downtown, a tribunal to establish the facts upon which the man shall be tried subsequently if he ever gets to a court. I think it would justify a proceeding by writ of habeas corpus to take a man from the jurisdiction of the War Manpower Commission, to give him a trial in the courts of justice. I do not think the House would act wisely, regardless of what you may think of the action of the House Military Affairs Committee, in adopting as a substitute a measure with all the ramifications, difficulties, and problems that are involved in a bill of 15 pages, without any consideration other than the brief debate on the floor of the House.

In addition to that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] aptly said the other day—and the membership of this House has confidence in him, not only in his patriotism and his wisdom, but in his judgment of legislation. He appeared before our committee and testified on the national service legislation more than a year ago. We have been considering this character of legislation for 2½ years. We have held hearings and hearings and hearings. They are printed and available to the Congress. One of the volumes contained 1,060 pages. The hearings on this particular bill contain several hundred pages. There are other hearings available. Yet, nobody proposing these substitutes ever asked a single time for a moment's time in connection with the hearings.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The provisions of the present bill provide that the Director of War Mobilization may assign to selective-service boards experts from such other agencies as they may need in an advisory capacity. All of the provisions of the Voorhis bill can be carried out by those agencies in an advisory capacity under the Director of War Mobilization for the benefit of the selective-service boards. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, and that provision is in the so-called May bill, H. R. 1752.

Furthermore, the bill provides that the local boards in the Selective Service System to whom is left the question of the determination of a man's availability or nonavailability for work or his assignment to any particular job shall be determined by those local boards. It provides that the Director of War Mobilization shall call upon the War Manpower Commission and such other agencies of Government as he may direct for assistance and aid. As stated by the gentleman from New York, there is no effort to dethrone the War Manpower Commission, but the House Committee on Military Affairs after months and months and even years of study—and I think I can say it is practically unanimous in its judgment—believes that the

administration of these laws should be left in the Selective Service System. I recall, but will not repeat here on the floor, many comments with respect to some of these executive agencies. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The War Manpower Commission has had a great deal of experience in the problem of employment. Has the Director of the War Manpower Commission been heard? The last expression I ever heard from him was that he was against compulsory-manpower-draft legislation. Why did not the Committee on Military Affairs inquire of him as to his present position in respect to the May bill?

Mr. MAY. I may say to my friend from Indiana that I believe he was overseas at the time the hearings were conducted, but we did have his representative, the Assistant Director, Judge Hay, before the committee. He testified on the matter, and his testimony appears in the printed hearings.

Mr. HALLECK. Just one further question: Has any effort been made to obtain the present judgment of the Director of the War Manpower Commission since his return to this country?

Mr. MAY. I made no such effort. I had no idea that he wanted to be heard further than sending the Assistant Director up here. The Assistant Director testified before the committee for some 3 hours.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I will say that Mr. McNutt testified before the committee at great length last spring on the very same subject, and at this time we had the benefit of the testimony of the Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. It is true that the Director of the War Manpower Commission was against this proposition originally.

Mr. MAY. He was first against it; later, I believe, he was for it; and still later he was against it again; and I do not know just where he stands.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In answer to what the gentleman from New York said about the possibility under the May bill of using other agencies in an advisory capacity, it seems to me that it is a very different matter from doing what my bill does, namely, to give powers of enforcement of ceilings. I believe these two things are quite different.

Mr. MAY. I quite agree with the gentleman that there is some difference in them.

I wish now to call attention to a matter which to me is very significant. You know, sometimes little things act as threads, as clues, as straws in the wind, that enable one to find out how things are going.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer for the consideration of the House a few reasons in addition to those given by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs why the Voorhis substitute for the bill before us should be defeated.

For some time now, Mr. Chairman, representatives of labor and management have requested that there be a joint meeting of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and other interested Government agencies with the War Manpower Commission, before compulsory legislation of any type were passed. The gentleman responsible for the utilization of war manpower on the home front is Mr. McNutt. I believe it safe to say that Mr. McNutt has never held any such hearings as these requested by labor and management.

These same representatives of labor and management have testified before our committee on numerous occasions during the past 2 years that no compulsory legislation was needed, because manpower had been improperly utilized under the voluntary system. They testified again and again that the true facts about manpower had never been given either to our committee or to the country by the War Manpower Commission. In short, labor and management for the past 2 years have been laying the failure of the manpower problem not at the door of the Congress for failing to pass legislation but right in the lap of an ineffectual War Manpower Commission.

It is exceedingly difficult for me to understand, in view of their charges, how labor and management could possibly welcome the continuation of the very system of which they have so long been complaining. It is very difficult for me to believe that labor and management are going to be pleased to give into the hands of the very man and the very agency which they have charged with such dire failures, the tremendous statutory powers that the Voorhis amendment bestows upon them.

It seems to me that the friends of labor and management should very carefully consider these far-reaching and drastic powers imbedded in the Voorhis substitute to our bill. They should look very thoughtfully at the consequences of such powers.

I urge you and ask my colleagues to examine the workings of the Allentown, Pa., plan. It is an example of what would happen if we were to pass this Voorhis substitute. I ask you to consider the result of the indiscriminate regimentation suggested by this substitute before you accept it in preference to the provisions for an orderly distribution of labor, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] called it, contained in the bill before us now.

If we pass the Voorhis amendment what we shall be doing here is to give a vote of full confidence to the War Manpower Commission. This would be an extraordinary action indeed when one remembers that not only the record of our committee hearings but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself is full of indict-

ments of labor, management, and of the general public of the way the War Manpower Commission has handled the manpower problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentlewoman be extended 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, this Voorhis substitute would give statutory recognition to Mr. McNutt's commission. Under this substitute he would have the power to close arbitrarily any business, large or small, when he, in his discretion, chose to close them. The only defense to this analysis of one power of the substitute bill is to say that the War Manpower Commission will be honest, fair, and wise at all times. The honesty and the fairness of Mr. McNutt cannot be challenged, but the consistent wisdom of the War Manpower Commission is certainly open to plenty of argument. This substitute bill would also mean that employees who were thrown out of their jobs by the imposition of a War Manpower Commission ceiling on the number of workers that could be employed in their factory or business would subsequently be forced to work where the War Manpower Commission told them they would have to work—or they would starve.

We have long talked about work-or-fight legislation in this House. And I believe we do have work-or-fight legislation now. We have talked about work-or-serve legislation, which was the type of legislation I introduced a year and a half ago in this House, then known as the IV-F bill. Today we have before us legislation which we may call and is called work-or-jail legislation. But this Voorhis legislation might best be called a work where you are told or starve in the street bill.

Therefore, it seems to me that before we pass this Voorhis bill everyone who is a friend of just ordinary people as well as those who are friends of the labor groups, and the employer groups and the industrial groups, should look well before they leap. There is no doubt that in our long delay in bringing out the committee bill before the House, and in our debates here upon it, we have shown our natural distaste for any type of compulsory legislation. But in our dislike, and our unhappiness in having to pass any form of compulsory legislation, do not let us strain at the gnat of this committee bill and suddenly turn around and swallow the Voorhis substitute camel.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have an agreement here as to the limitation of time.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. May I say that the committee has been allocated time and each Member has asked for additional time, and that there are some of us here who would also like some time.

Mr. MAY. I am not trying to rush it. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Let us go along for a time and see how things work out.

Mr. MAY. We have been here for some time now.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. And some of us have not had the opportunity to speak. We have waited 3 or 4 hours to talk now.

Mr. MAY. We will not get through today if we do that.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Suppose we do not get through today?

Mr. MAY. We will be here tomorrow then.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Then we will be here tomorrow. What is the difference?

Mr. MAY. I hope we can be reasonable. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 35 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW and Mr. LEMKE objected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 1 hour.

Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LEMKE, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. LECOMPTE objected.

Mr. MAY. Apparently there will be objection to anything I ask.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am one of many Members of this House who has great respect for the ability and sincerity of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. I think, however, it is most unfortunate that at this late stage in the discussion of this important and critical measure a substitute 15 pages long is offered, that was introduced in the House only 5 days ago and has had no specific consideration before the committee to which you have delegated the duty of looking into such legislation. I do not share the views of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and neither do I think his ridicule and sarcasm regarding our great military leaders was deserved. I have the greatest faith in them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Briefly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say I agree with what the gentleman has just said. I should like, however, to point out that my bill was introduced 1 day after the committee bill came into the House, that I introduced it as soon as I knew what the committee bill was going to be, and that I have spoken about it and had it printed in the Record in full twice.

Mr. THOMASON. I repeat that I never question the sincerity of the gentleman from California, because I have a lot of admiration for him, but at the same time we must face facts as they are. Your committee in charge of this character of legislation had daily hearings except Sundays for 3 weeks, and we heard everybody who wanted to be heard. We heard the military leaders and we heard the leaders of labor and industry. Not only that, but the Director of War Manpower was overseas and he sent his very able assistant, the late Judge Charles M.

Hay, there, and he testified before the committee.

After mature deliberation, I repeat, and I said this on the floor of the House a couple of days ago, we brought here what in my judgment is a safe and sound bill that will accomplish the desired results. We must meet immediately the situation that General Marshall and Admiral King have told us about. And how does the committee propose to administer it? We proposed that the local draft boards should be the ones who would select the men in their communities who would be subject to some kind of duty, and put them into essential war work.

I undertake to say that there are not 10 men in the House—in fact, I doubt if there is a single one except the author of the bill—who have carefully considered the import and the far reaching effects of this substitute. Let us be frank about it. I do not share the feeling that some have expressed against the Director of War Manpower. I think that, everything considered, Mr. McNutt has probably done a good job. I am one of his many admirers. I am sure that the U. S. E. S. has done a good job. But this bill gives to the Director of War Manpower, regardless of his name or politics, absolute control over every worker in America except those that are on the farms.

If you read the lines on page 8 between lines 20 and 23, you will find that the Director of War Manpower has absolute and final determination of what shall be done about every worker in America except those on the farm and those, I believe, in the employ of State and local governments.

You could not even employ a man to mow your lawn except with the approval of the Director of War Manpower. If you follow through the provisions of section 2 amending the act of June 28, 1940, you will find that you also give to Secretary Morgenthau control over all of the money and profits of the United States.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about the power being vested in the local boards. Today, in spite of the Tydings amendment, under the instructions of General Hershey and regardless of the law, in violation of the law, our local boards are sending the farm boys into the service. Why should we give him any more power?

Mr. THOMASON. That sounds like an isolated case.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They are not isolated cases.

Mr. THOMASON. I know that the Tydings farm amendment is fully protected and preserved by the May bill. In fact, it is strengthened.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman about his impression of section 4 on page 9. Insofar as no provision of this act shall be applicable to the employment of any individual in agriculture, that excludes all agriculture?

Mr. THOMASON. That is right.

Mr. O'NEAL. Under (3) it says "the hiring of any of their employees in any political subdivision or municipal government." Does that mean that any young man who might be in the street cleaning department will not be subject to it?

Mr. THOMASON. Absolutely.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is just one more. Under item 4 it says: "Anybody employed in the legislative or judicial branch." Does that mean any man who might be working on the Hill or who is a bailiff in the police court or in the district court would not be subject to any of this?

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman is absolutely right. Now then, let us face the issue. If you are against this bill in the form it is, and I am referring to the May bill, let us be frank and say so and vote against it. But I just do not see how, especially in view of the talk we hear about bureaucracy and dictatorship, I do not see how you can go along now and give the Director of War Manpower, no matter what his name is or what his politics may be, absolute control over nearly every worker in America. Let us leave this power and authority with local boards instead of centralizing all power in some bureau in Washington. I plead with you to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I see by the Washington Post that the Senate is figuring on a bill which is along this line. Has the House any license to feel that if it passes the bill with the safeguards now in it the House conferees will stand up?

Mr. THOMASON. I am not able to speak for the House conferees. There are no conferees now for the bill has not yet passed this House and has not even been considered by the Senate. I think it safe to say the conferees will carry out the expressed will of this body.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of seeing if we cannot by unanimous consent agree on a time limit.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I discussed the situation with our leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I know we want to be as lib-

eral as possible so as to take care of everybody who wants to speak on this amendment. It seems to me we might agree on closing debate on this amendment at 4 o'clock, and I make that suggestion to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the last three speakers consumed at least 30 minutes in opposition to the Voorhis amendment. Some of us have waited here a long time. I think we are entitled to express ourselves the same as anybody else. I do not think we ought to limit the time at present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if we agree on 4 o'clock, I think that would give sufficient time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there was something said that we might not be here tomorrow. So far as I am concerned, if I can keep the House here tomorrow we are going to stay. So there is no use cutting off debate for that reason.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1½ hours.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1½ hours.

The question was taken; and the motion was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I just want to point out first that a committee consisting of the heads of the chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the major farm organizations, meets regularly with the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. That is in partial answer to the gentleman from Connecticut. In the second place, my amendment, much to my surprise, is being attacked by members of the committee because it is too severe. Frankly, I expected the opposite. I expected them to attack my amendment because it was not strong enough in its mandatory provisions. Instead of that we are told it gives too much power. The power it gives is exactly the same power that is now being exercised under Executive order by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. This gives it statutory standing. That is all. It gives him the same powers that are being exercised in consultation with the heads of management and labor. Furthermore, the position of management has been made very clear that this is the kind of legislation they want, and I am confident labor will feel vastly better about my substitute than about the May bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to supplement the statement of the

gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] by presenting testimony from the president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, Mr. W. T. Holliday. He is a member of the management and labor advisory committee for region 5, including Ohio, Michigan, and Kentucky. I quote him:

I would like to say in passing that I think the War Manpower Commission has done a perfectly magnificent job. It has worked quietly but most effectively under its limited powers. It has been a very democratic organization in that in every region and in every war-production area representatives of management and labor have been enlisted as advisory committees, to whom all problems were submitted, and by whom all appeals from rulings of the United States Employment Service have been reviewed. The harmony between the representatives of management and of labor on these committees has been a splendid thing. It has been very seldom that we have not been unanimous in our views, and so far as general policy is concerned in region 5 advisory committee, there has been no divergence of opinion.

I direct this to your attention in reply to the attacks that have been made on Mr. McNutt, obviously to prejudice some of the people who, whether for good reason or otherwise, have some feeling about Mr. McNutt. His name has been injected into this debate in order to influence the votes of some of the Members to whom the name "McNutt" is an anathema. It is most unfortunate that this has been injected into the debate as it has no place here. The testimony of the president of Standard Oil—Ohio—is ample evidence of the efficiency and quality of the service rendered by this Commission.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. May, referred to kangaroo courts. The country is full of them. You have them in O. P. A. and every other division. If you are legislating against kangaroo courts, then remember that you voted for them on many, many previous occasions.

I believe the committee is attempting to use a great big monkey wrench on a small nut when the size of the instrument needed is the Voorhis amendment; that is an amendment that would fit the nut. It is perfectly amazing to me that you would harass 15,700,000 men in this country in order to get the 148,000 men in those areas where a reshuffling would do the job.

I believe the Voorhis amendment will do exactly what is necessary at this time.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on the amendment.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for the last couple of days for an opportunity to discuss this bill with the Members of the House. Far be it from me to do anything, to vote for any measure, or to speak any word that would impede the conduct of the war. I hope what I do here will be a contribution rather than an impediment. I do not, however, want to be in the position to place the problems of my district before the national interest to the extent that I would selfishly vote to con-

sider the home problems as paramount to the first aim of America, that is, to win the war and to win the peace that will follow.

I am sure that the necessary steps will be taken in order to remove the objectionable conditions which exist at home so that we might in turn contribute our share at home to the war effort.

My predecessor in Congress wore out shoe after shoe after shoe going around this town from department to department to department trying to get them to do something to put the people of northeastern Pennsylvania to work, but without avail. Then this House and the Senate unanimously named a commission to go up to northeastern Pennsylvania to study the problem of the area. The committee came back and reported and after reporting made recommendations that something be done by the departments in order that the people might be given work, but again without avail. Right here in my hand is a map showing 8,000 vacant houses in northeastern Pennsylvania, 30,000 people gone out of the area, and today 5,000 are walking the streets without jobs, yet we hear the threat "work or jail." I say yes, somebody ought to go to jail—those responsible for the maldistribution of these factories throughout the country. They are the ones who ought to go to jail. Listen to this allocation of war work. On January 16, \$3,500,000 more to Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; \$18,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; \$10,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; \$7,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; \$1,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; \$500,000 to Akron, Ohio—Government plants; yet when we go to them they say we cannot have a plant in northeastern Pennsylvania.

I am asked by this bill to say to my people who are begging for work, who have 41,000 boys in the armed services, who have casualties second to none in the country, who want to help the war—I am asked to say to them by this bill that some draft board outside of the area, under section 4 (b), may say to my 5,000 men with the other thousands, "Go to Akron, Ohio," or elsewhere. I am not against this bill in the sense that I want people to stay on the jobs they are now doing. I want the turn-over to stop; I want the war completed and won at the earliest possible date; but for God's sake, I say to these men in Washington, look to northeastern Pennsylvania and give us a chance to help win the war.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition on the amendment.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to say some of the things I did not have time to say when I spoke

on this bill the other day. I have been very much concerned about the talk of shortage of ammunition, particularly in the battle for the bulge and on the western front. I have a 20-year-old boy in that battle. I know how his mother felt when the story came over the radio that they were allocating one shell per gun per hour. I think I know how the mothers of the millions of boys across the seas feel when they hear stories of that kind. I say there was no permanent shortage of ammunition in the battle for the bulge. There might have been an area shortage. The German Army put against us the finest panzer and infantry divisions they could muster, under the finest leader they had, Marshal Von Rundstedt. They hit us at the weakest spot where we had neither men nor ammunition nor guns and they drove us back into France. It took time to get ammunition, guns, and men into that area, but we got them there. When we did, Patton, Bradley, and Montgomery drove Von Rundstedt and his finest panzer and infantry divisions back into Germany. We licked them thoroughly and completely. The War Department tells us that we inflicted 4 casualties on their army to 1 received by our Army. There were 100,000 German casualties and we had one-fourth that number. How did we do that if there was a shortage of ammunition on that front? How did we drive the German Army back into Germany? With broomsticks? You do not lick that kind of an army by firing 1 shell per gun per hour.

We produced in this country during the years 1942 and 1943 and the first 4 months of 1944—in 28 months—over 6,000,000,000 pounds of powder and explosives of every type and kind. We produced nearly 1,600,000 during the first 4 months of 1944. We did this with free labor, with men and women who drove as far as 40 and 50 miles a day in all kinds of weather to their jobs, worked their shift and drove 40 to 50 miles back home again. That is what free patriotic labor did. We did not do it by chaining men to machines with a work-or-go-to-jail law.

In 1942 we produced 2,100,000 tons of artillery shells and 28,125,000 bag-loaded propelling charges. In 1943 we produced over 4,000,000 tons of shells and over 26,865,772 propelling charges. You will note that while we produced less propelling charges, the weight of the shells was almost double.

This meant heavier shells. During the first 4 months of 1944 we produced 1,509,431 tons of shells and over 16,000,000 bag-loaded propelling charges. We produced, during the first 4 months of 1944, shells at the rate of four and a half million tons per year, and bag-loaded propelling charges at the rate of 49,000,000 per year. We did this with 2 of the 4 bag-loading plants closed down.

What did the War Department do with all this ammunition if they are short now? And yet fear is driven into the heart of every mother in the country by telling them there was a shortage of ammunition on the fighting front. Can it be that this type of propaganda is being used to create sentiment for the May bill? All this production was by

free labor, by men and women who were appealed to by patriotic motives, by men and women who drove miles to and from their work.

In 1943 when I visited the Willow Run plant I drove 35 miles out of Detroit, all the way to Brighton before I could find a room. I found men and women driving as far as 40 miles over icy roads to this plant in subzero weather—25 to 30 degrees below zero—to do a day's work, and then drive back again after work. Then you talk about loyalty of workers.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing that concerns me very much.

You will recall that a few months ago Mr. Morgenthau issued a statement that we were going to make Germany an agricultural nation. He told the German people what they were fighting for at a time when they did not know what they were fighting for. He put the finest piece of propaganda into the mouth of Goebbels that you could put into the hands of an enemy propagandist. They used it, and from then on the German Army began to fight, as the newspapers reported it, with a frenzied fury. That statement cost thousands of American lives. Then the Allies began to divide Germany before we had won the war. Our State Department has approved a plan of helping to move the Polish population into German territory. That meant the German people would have to move out of their homes. If the German people needed any further reason for fighting, we gave it to them. They have redoubled their efforts and fought with renewed fury.

We broadcast stories that we are short of ammunition. They are using that propaganda. Are we going to let Hitler, Goebbels, and Himmler tell their people now that the American worker is not behind this war? Are you going to pass the May bill and tell our enemies that we have to put men in jail or threaten them with jail in order to get them to work in war plants? If we pass the May bill it will place another piece of propaganda into the hands of Hitler, Himmler, and Goebbels; propaganda that could cost thousands of casualties. When you do you will be broadcasting the greatest lie that has ever been broadcast in the history of this country. You will be questioning the patriotism of the finest group of workers that any nation ever had.

The May bill ought to be defeated by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I previously made on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion, based on more than 25 years' experience in dealing with employer-employee relations, that the May bill will not accomplish the results here sought. Neither do I believe it will accomplish the requests made by our chiefs of staff, General Marshall and Admiral King.

I make this statement, as I said, because of my experience in dealing with labor problems at the grass roots; personally listening to the grievances of labor, both real and imaginary, and the complaints of employers, both real and imaginary. It has been my life's work to attempt to iron out these differences.

Let me say at this point that not once in 25 years has there been a stoppage of work on the part of any men whom I have represented, either in negotiations of contracts or the settlement of disputes.

I am satisfied and I am sure every one of you will agree with me, that General Marshall and Admiral King are little concerned about the number of men employed in war industries. They are interested, and vitally so, in only one question as far as civilian life is concerned—they want production of tanks, guns, ships, planes, and all of the implements of war which will protect the lives of our boys and speed the day when they may return to their own fireside. You want the same thing; the people of my district and the people of this Nation are demanding the same thing. I too want to speed the day when my son will return, and my three sons-in-law, fathers of my grandchildren, will return. But my conscience will not permit me to support the May bill. I could take the easy way and hide behind the skirts of someone else and say, "Well, they asked for it; it is not my responsibility."

I say it is my responsibility. I do not want to send to our boys who are enduring the tortures of hell that we may continue to live a free democratic life in a land of plenty a crumb when the whole loaf is available for the taking.

The proponents of the May bill have stressed getting the poolroom bum into war industries; they have stressed getting the entertainers and the white-collar workers into war industries. General Marshall and Admiral King said, we want production now. An efficient production worker is not made over night. It takes months, and years in some cases, to properly train this type of worker and by the very nature of the past occupation of the persons mentioned, and their physical stamina, it would be difficult for them to rapidly take their place in the scheme of things in production work. Production managers and foremen will testify that nothing slows down production more all along the line than throwing in a group of untrained workers.

The May bill does not hit at the heart of the problem—immediate increase in production. It merely channels into industry more workers, and we all know from official investigations by Congress that in many cases production is slowed down because there are already too many employees getting in each other's way.

The Voorhis bill, which I can and will support, drives straight to the mark. It does first things first. It determines the requirements and supply of labor and permits a governmental agency, the War Manpower Commission, which is already trained in this work, to distribute the supply of skilled and trained workers where most needed. It restricts the number of employees in less essential in-

dustries. It has control over employers as well as employees. The May bill is silent on these vital questions.

The Voorhis bill puts responsibility on both the worker and management. The May bill puts all of the responsibility on the worker, and the penalty for non-compliance is a jail sentence or a fine. So I am sure no one will claim it is a work or fight bill. It is merely an ultimatum—get into a factory, whether you are able to accomplish anything or not, or go to jail.

Management does not want the May bill. They know that persons in their factory, shop, or mill are of little or no value to them unless they are there by choice. Labor does not want the bill, because they are proud of their record as freemen in helping management achieve a record of production that was thought fantastic a few short years ago and which by far out-strips the production record of any country that has had forced labor.

There is no surer way to bring about lack of cooperation and inefficiency than not having uniform rules and regulations and conditions of employment in an establishment. The May bill makes fish of some and fowl of others. It freezes to the job all male workers between 18 and 45, but permits the workers from 45 to 65 to leave at will. And Congress agreed that the age of employability runs to 65 when it passed the Social Security Act.

The May bill gives additional benefits, rights, and privileges to the workers who will be channeled into war industries over those who, voluntarily, have previously engaged in the production of war materials. Such persons on being ordered into employment are in the same status as if inducted into the armed forces, and have all of the rights and privileges of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The May bill would change the relationship between all male employees from 18 to 45 now engaged in war industries, with their foreman, superintendent, and management. They will, rightly or wrongly, feel that every reprimand, suggestion, and many of the assignments to particular jobs, are given simply because of the changed conditions and because of the governmental order that they remain on the job. In other words, they will feel that they are being taken advantage of, getting the worst of it, simply because their status in the establishment is different than male workers over 45, and all female employees.

It is my opinion that compulsion will tend to reduce rather than increase production. If we know human nature at all, we know that compulsion will result in a feeling of anger and resentment, and who is there that will say that a person in that frame of mind will be as efficient as the person in a normal state of mind? These resentful workers will be thrown in contact with many others who have been forced into the job and some who are there by choice and who are contented because they are not under compulsion. Under a condition of this kind, there can be no other result than bickering and quarreling and a total lack of

cooperation among the workers in the establishment. There is no other condition that will slow down production as much as this lack of cooperation and quarreling among workers.

Now just a word about those who are forced to leave one job and take another. It is my opinion that in most cases the income of the individual will be reduced. It is the natural thing for an individual to want to earn as much as possible, so it can be rightfully assumed that if there were better paying jobs available which the individual was capable of filling, he would have long ago made the change. This opinion was borne out by reports of the United States Employment Service in my own district when they listed the number of jobs available and the wage range. By far the greatest percentage of jobs available were in the low-wage brackets.

I have before me at this time a statement issued by Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, regional director of the War Manpower Commission for the New York City area, in which is listed the company name, the number of employees desired, and the wage rates. The jobs and wage rates are as follows:

	Per hour
6 male power-press operators.....	\$0.75
1 spark tester, male.....	.92
2 rubber-mill men.....	.92
1 machine operator, male.....	.85-.95
1 lead-press operator, male.....	1.00-1.10
1 weigh-up man.....	.78
4 unskilled male workers.....	.70-.90
10 male spot welders.....	.75-.85
7 male power-press operators.....	.70-.80
3 male packers.....	.70-.80
2 molding die sinkers.....	1.45
4 tool and diemakers.....	1.45
5 tool and die makers:	
First class.....	1.20-1.40
Second class.....	.90-1.20
10 male machinists:	
First class.....	1.05-1.30
Second class.....	.80-1.05
3 male sheet-metal workers.....	.75-.85
1 male guard.....	.75
123 unskilled female workers.....	.55
47 unskilled male workers.....	.68
5 male machinists.....	1.00
5 male millwright helpers.....	.68
2 male grinders.....	.90-1.48
1 male oiler.....	.89-1.07
1 pipe-fitter helper.....	.80
5 male janitors.....	.68
1 male packer.....	.68
1 male experimental machinist.....	1.00-1.34
235 female trainees.....	.60
38 male laborers.....	.65-.70
10 male packers.....	.66-.94
8 male mounting-machine operators.....	.65-1.03
8 male spooling-machine operators.....	.65

This indicates very clearly that with the exception of very highly skilled workers, the positions open are below the going rate for employees.

The May bill would make it necessary for the local draft boards—and when I say this I am mindful of the fact that the members of the local draft boards are friends, neighbors, and members of the same community as the persons they are dealing with—to order or suggest, under penalty of a jail sentence for non-compliance, that a man change his position and reduce his income. It is an established fact that people adopt a standard of living commensurate with their income, so it will mean the worker

and his family will be compelled to adjust their standard of living downward, a condition which is most resentful to all of us. The resentment will be multiplied many times when the condition takes place because of an order by a person of equal standing in the community and who in many instances is not covered by the law himself. So the resentment will not be confined to the place of employment but will spread among neighbors, relatives, and friends, and will disrupt home life and community life at a time when we need a united people, all working toward the one goal.

You might say our people are too patriotic to take the positions I have enumerated, but I think I need only call your attention to the griping and complaining that practically all of our citizens, including ourselves, have done at times over rationing and other restrictions which have been necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. And, mind you, we gripe even though we know this rationing and these regulations apply to everyone alike, which is not so in the case of the May bill.

I have read the transcript of the hearings of the committee, I have listened to debate for 3 days, and I am compelled to say that the advocates of this measure have appealed more to our emotions than to our mind. They have urged passage of this bill primarily because it will supposedly lift the morale of our men on the fighting fronts and will put fear into the hearts of our enemies, but I say let us not make a gesture and pass a law that will in all likelihood do harm rather than good. Let us keep faith with our men on the fighting fronts. Let us pass the Voorhis bill which will, in my opinion, actually speed the placing of every weapon, every device, every bit of material they can possibly use, in the hands of our gallant servicemen. Let us pass a bill that will not only lift the morale of our fighting men, but will give them the things they need to fight with, a law that will not only put fear in the hearts of our enemies, but one that will destroy and conquer them, and bring about the day when we can once again live in a world of peace where families will be reunited and there will be an end to this period of death and destruction.

I am perfectly willing to answer to my constituents for my vote against the May bill and my answer will be that employer organizations opposed and labor organizations opposed on the grounds that it would do more harm than good. The National Association of Manufacturers has publicly made the following statement:

It is our sincere and honest conviction that this legislation, as now drafted, will breed discord and confusion, will be inadequate as a solution to the manpower problem, and may seriously interfere with war productions.

In spite of shortages in a few specific items, industry is still performing a miracle of production. (See release of W. P. B., January 22, 1945, exhibit B.) Approximately 80 percent of war production is on or ahead of schedule. It would be a national tragedy to adopt any program which would endanger this present scale of output. Yet the bill, H. R. 1752, could do precisely that.

Surely these two groups, labor and employers, understand production problems far better than lawmakers or militarists.

The defeat of the May bill will not preclude Congress from passing a law such as the Voorhis bill, which the above-named groups both agree will in fact put such controls and regulations on management and labor as to bring about the maximum production in the shortest possible time.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I shall pay my further respects to the May bill. I shall rename it "May's delight." It is the kind of legislation that the distinguished and battling chairman enjoys. He is a seasoned battler along this line. He holds no punches and delivers them smilingly. Yet there is something strange about the situation in which we find our distinguished chairman. We find him not only in a battle with organized labor, but we find him on the side of Browder and affiliates. He got himself all tangled up with the Daily Worker.

Politics may make strange bedfellows, but war makes stranger ones still. In the name of war things have been and are being done to an unsuspecting public that one would not dare dream of in peacetime. In the name of war we find the modern triumvirate going into the same bed in Poland, Finland, and the Balkan states—nations for whose territorial integrity we entered the war.

The triumvirate that claimed that we were fighting for the "four freedoms"—for the now defunct Atlantic Charter—is sound asleep in the same bed while freedom shrieks not only in Poland, Finland, and the Balkan states, but in our own Nation. It is a strange world—a changing world—in which freemen are losing their freedom, and we are no exception unless we arouse ourselves and refuse to follow those who would lead us into darkness.

This bill, if passed, will cause confusion. It will not only be "May's delight" but "Browder's delight" also. It will create the dissatisfaction that Browder desires. If you can regiment labor—draft the civilian population to work for private corporations—then you can regiment and draft material, and Browder's desired dictatorship will become an accomplished fact.

This bill will not only create confusion but hardships. It will not increase production but decrease it. It will create hatred. What Member of this body will want to face the wrath of a man with a large family, who is today employed as a mechanic and his wages fixed by the War Stabilization Board at \$50 a week, and who tomorrow is transferred to another locality where he will receive but \$26 a week? You will not only have taken him unconstitutionally and placed him in involuntary servitude—in a corporation for profit—but you will have cut his wages in two. You had better think twice before you do that.

Again, I am opposed to this bill because if it is passed you will increase the obligations of our Government by billions for many years after the war is over. Then these men who are being drafted and put under the control of the Government will demand the same benefits given to those in the armed forces. You cannot justify this legislation. Organized labor will furnish you a million men if you want them. There is no shortage of labor, but there is a shortage of intelligence—a bungling and a blundering by those in charge of our war efforts.

I know that there is not a Member on this floor that has not a son, a daughter, or some relative in the armed forces. I know that we are proud of them, that we admire their courage, their ability, their ingenuity, and their accomplishments on the field of battle. We gladly bask in their reflected glory, but I challenge the right of any Member to stand on this floor and use their names in a vain attempt to justify this unconstitutional slave bill.

These sons and daughters of this Nation are giving their lives, their limbs, their health, and their all to crush the brute force of dictatorship. They are proving to Hitler and the dictators everywhere that a democracy can win a war. They are proving once and for all to all the world that only a free people can win because they have something to fight for.

I feel that not a single supporter of this bill can justify and square his conscience except on the grounds of political expediency. You may ease your political conscience temporarily, but the ghost will return and haunt you. You will receive the just condemnation not only from our sons when they return but from a more calm and enlightened public opinion.

You will not be permitted to crucify American labor upon the altar of falsehood and slander—upon the blunders and mistakes of others. Labor has furnished its full quota of fighting men and its full quota in the field of production. They have performed a miracle. They have supplied half the world with arms and munitions and war implements, and kept our own Army going in spite of official shortcomings.

Oh, I have heard the remark that the wise thing to do is to vote for this bill, because the Senate will kill it. My answer is that we have no right to hide behind the skirts of the Senate. This House has done that on several occasions. It did it on the so-called Gestapo bill. The responsibility is ours. It is here and now.

I repeat, this bill is opposed by every labor organization but the Browder affiliates. It is opposed by industry, by the American Chamber of Commerce. It is opposed by every lover of true liberty and is opposed by the heart, the soul, and the conscience of America.

Whenever the day comes that love for our country and patriotism fall so low that this kind of bill is necessary, then the Republic that you and I have cherished and loved, the Republic that the world has looked to as a model of justice, will be dead. Then we will have surrendered all that is sacred and good to the human race.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I had more time, I should like to pay my respects to the May bill, particularly its infamous proposal to put conscript labor at work for private profit. I am opposed to forcing any man to work for the private profit of another. But I choose to take the limited time at my disposal to speak on the basis of my personal experience concerning the major features of the Voorhis substitute amendment.

For the past 3 years I have been assistant to the vice chairman for labor production of the War Production Board. In the course of that work I did considerable liaison with the War Manpower Commission, particularly in developing the west coast manpower program, with special emphasis upon shipbuilding and aircraft. During that time I have seen the labor-management committees of the War Manpower Commission function very efficiently and function in such a manner that the voluntary consent of labor and management alike to the controls which the War Manpower Commission have developed has been obtained.

I regret that an effort has been made to have this House believe that present War Manpower Commission regulations are the result of bureaucratic meddling and bungling. Far from it. Every important War Manpower Commission regulation, those to which the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] now proposes to give statutory approval, have been developed with the full consent of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, the C. I. O., the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the leading farm organizations of this country. All important W. M. C. regulations, before promulgation, have been submitted to the National Labor Management Committee of the War Manpower Commission, which includes outstanding citizens such as Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O.; James Patton, president of the Farmers' Union, and others. They have given their consent to the rules and regulations which are now incorporated in the Voorhis bill. After the regulations have received the full consent of the top leadership of those organizations they have been perfected at local and State levels to meet any peculiar local conditions through consultation with the appropriate officials of these same organizations.

Many times various minor changes have been made to meet local conditions. One of my objections to the May bill is that it does not establish machinery to deal with local situations. It attempts to deal with the manpower situation purely as a national problem. But the real problems are in some given area. That is the crux of the manpower problem; these situations must be dealt with by local people if they are to be solved.

Just as the gentleman from Ohio has in his possession a resolution from the area labor-management committee of War Manpower Commission in his dis-

trict, so I have one from the Wisconsin-Illinois-Indiana area, which I desire to read into the RECORD along with the names of the members of the committee:

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has endeavored to perform the enormous task of mobilizing and allocating the labor force of this country for war; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has effectively performed the task of training the labor force of this country to meet the needs of war production; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has effectively performed the task of increasing the utilization of war workers by extending the minimum workweek and bringing about better personnel practices; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission is taking the steps necessary to meet current manpower problems; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has accomplished all this by means of a voluntary program with full cooperation of labor and management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Management-Labor Committee of the War Manpower Commission for the Sixth Region, composed of: Mr. L. H. Hill, vice president in charge of industrial relations, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; Mr. J. L. Palmer, first vice president, Marshall Field & Co.; Mr. Lester N. Selig, president, General American Transportation Corporation; Mr. J. T. Gillick, chief operating officer, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad; Mr. H. S. Vance, chairman, Studebaker Corporation board; Mr. Joseph Germano, district director, district No. 31, United Steel Workers of America, C. I. O.; Mr. George A. Haberman, president, Wisconsin Federation of Labor; Mr. Paul Russo, international representative and assistant director, region 4, United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; Mr. Reuben G. Soderstrom, president, Illinois State Federation of Labor; Mr. Thomas S. Roe, secretary-treasurer, Illinois State legislative committee, Order of Railway Conductors, hereby declares its opposition to any type of legislation providing for compulsory service by civilian workers; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the committee forward copies of this resolution to every Senator and Representative in the United States Congress representing the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, and to the President of the United States.

You will note their opposition to compulsory legislation.

If you will read carefully the letter on the May bill that came from President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, you will note he endorsed the work which the War Manpower Commission has done and urged that if controls have to be exerted, they be in civilian hands.

All of you have read numerous articles and listened to many speeches telling us that the future of America depends upon effective cooperation between Government, management, and labor. During my campaign for Congress I said over and over again that I believed if Government were to function efficiently, if the war were to be won in the quickest possible time, if we were to have prosperity in the post-war world, the duly designated leaders of our functional economic groups should participate in administering legislation affecting the vital interests of labor, management, and agriculture.

The War Manpower Commission has established such machinery and has obtained excellent cooperation. The May bill provides only for consultation at the

national level. I am for the Voorhis amendment because it does provide for constant contact with our basic economic groups at all levels, and we know that those groups are for the basic policies contained in the substitute before us.

Why not continue this successful teamwork and give it the statutory power it needs? I believe in building on the basis of successful experience in the American tradition of freedom and co-operation. That is why I shall vote for the Voorhis substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIE-MILLER] has expired.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield. That is one reason I asked for the additional 5 minutes, in order to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to thank the gentleman very much.

I have found considerable discussion on the floor about a provision in my bill which appears on page 6, line 7 through line 10. This provision has to do with the right of the worker to refuse referral to a job. It says that under certain circumstances a worker can refuse referral. That is, he can ask for referral to a different war-production job. One of the grounds on which he can do that is "any case in which his acceptance of a job offered would, over objections presented in good faith by the worker, require him to join or resign from or refrain from joining a labor organization."

Now, what does it mean? It means this, that if I go to the War Manpower Commission office and I am a member of the A. F. of L., and they try to refer me to a shop where I would have to join the C. I. O., I can refuse that referral and ask for another referral where I do not have to change my union affiliation. Or it means that if I do not belong to any labor organization I can ask for a different referral, if the referral is to a closed shop that I do not want to join. Or if I happen to belong to a labor organization and they refer me to a shop where I could not join that one, I can ask to be referred to one where I could join. It does not say, as other amendments have said, that it shall be within the power of the War Manpower Commission or any other Government agency to say to a man, "You must work in a certain place," and then say to him afterward, although there is a contract between employers and workers, "You do not have to abide by that." It does not say that. It does say the other.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is one fact in connection with this substitute, H. R. 1799, which I had intended to bring out for the benefit of the committee and those members who are vitally concerned with the personal rights of labor.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you listened intently to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. In the course of his remarks the gentleman pointed out how certain statements made by members of this administration, no doubt unwitting of the consequence thereof, have been used as food for propaganda to stimulate the Axis Powers in their fight against us. Everyone knows that propaganda is one of the most important weapons of war. Everyone knows that newspaper items that come out of the United States and little statements made by executives in the United States have vital effect upon the people of this country.

In my own area, which is a very important one in war production, certain statements, no doubt made unwittingly last summer and in the early fall, led literally thousands of people to go home.

Why? Because they were given the idea that the war was almost over, that we were about to engage in peacetime production, and that if they were smart they would hurry home and get a peacetime job. As a matter of fact, the war plants in my area in advertising for their help, used the slogan, "A wartime job that will carry through to peacetime." So literally thousands of them went to their homes in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, and perhaps as far as Illinois and Ohio. What is it going to take to get them back into the plants either in my area or your area? It is going to take leadership, Mr. Chairman, and telling the truth to these people, the unvarnished truth, that their services are still vitally needed by their country. Then they will go back without any trouble.

But if you pass this May bill, what are you going to do? You are going to advertise to the Axis Nations the best propaganda we can find to persuade the dictatorships that slave labor is right. What is the best propaganda to fight them with? The best propaganda I can find is to let the dictatorship nations know that dictatorship and slave labor can get the hell licked out of them by democracy and free labor.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield very briefly.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy the gentleman has pointed out the necessity for telling the American people the truth. A lot of unnecessary censorship I believe is responsible for our present condition.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am quite sure of it. I talked to a great many of the workers myself. They were all anxious for that peacetime job if peace was soon to be a reality.

On yesterday I attempted to show that the argument of the President and the military leaders of our country that they needed this bill to win the war was completely offset by the argument of labor and management which are charged with the actual production for war that the bill would in fact hinder war production and said at that time that the argument put up by the gentleman from Texas, the beloved Speaker of this House, and the gentleman from Illinois, the only good argument that could be found for the bill, was the effect its defeat might

have on the morale of our soldiers if they received the information in the wrong way. Let me say that if you want to save lives, if you want to help our boys win, let us continue to prove to the dictatorship nations that democracy and free labor can just lick the hell out of them any old time, now or in the future. Going into totalitarianism here will only tend to give force to their belief that dictatorship is right and democracy wrong.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a correction be made. In printing the bill, page 12, line 16, a technical mistake was made. I ask unanimous consent that parentheses be placed around the figures "3," "4," "6" and "7," in line 17. The reference would be incorrect if this were not done. I ask unanimous consent that parentheses be placed around them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. The Chair did not know the gentleman was a member of the committee or the Chair would have recognized the gentleman earlier.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I find myself today in the difficult position of being a new member on the Committee on Military Affairs and in being opposed to the National Service Act as now outlined. I believe I owe a deep responsibility to my President, to the military leaders of this Nation, to my colleagues on the committee, and to the chairman of my committee. But I owe a deeper responsibility to my own conscience and to the millions of workers in America who have voluntarily created the greatest production miracle the world has ever known. I owe to them the confidence which they have won. I owe to them the protection which they deserve and which this bill takes away. I cannot put under compulsion the fathers, mothers, sisters, and brothers of our fighting forces. I cannot put the chains of slave labor on the relatives of those members of the armed forces who are fighting the nations who have already enslaved their people. I cannot put the chains of slave labor on those discharged veterans who have returned to what they believe is a free country. I cannot compete in oratory with the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me. I cannot compete with them in appealing to you on a sentimental or emotional basis. I can only in my feeble way call upon you to reason on this subject and to believe me when I say that before the Members of this body and before the God I worship I am sincere in my beliefs.

If the May bill, so-called, contained the comprehensive provisions of the program advanced by the American Legion after World War No. 1, namely, total conscription of money, machines, and men, it would at least have the virtue of consistency. But it does not. If it contained the six provisions which our President asked for a year ago, it would be a national service act. But it does not. It is discriminatory, partial national service. In my opinion, the May bill approaches the problem piecemeal and imposes discriminatory regulations upon a portion of the population, leaving altogether free from any sort of control a great portion of the population now working in the defense plants, and I speak of the womanpower, I also speak of all those over the age of 45.

I will support the Voorhis amendment because it is more comprehensive in its scope, it covers the complete manpower situation and not just a portion of it, and it does not impose the severe penalties which will make it a felony to break some of the regulations which might be imposed. It is a reasonable extension of the present voluntary production system.

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

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

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true there are many men between 45 and 50 years of age, for instance, who are more able to do hard work in these war industries than many of the men in the age group from 18 to 45?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has spoken correctly.

Mr. SHORT. So it is class legislation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is partial legislation directed toward one class of our working population. It conscripts labor not for the sole benefit of the Nation but also for the private war profits of the owners of industry. It does not conscript nonessential or unused factories or compel management to perform contracts in those factories. It does not compel management to accept workers now discriminated against for various reasons, including race. It does not protect labor from transfer from a wage of \$1 an hour in one industry to a wage of 40 cents an hour in another industry. Therefore, that in itself is wrong. It ignores the 3 years of experience of the cooperation production committees, of the Manpower Commission, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], who has had 3 years experience himself on those committees, outlined to you a moment ago, and I wish he had had more time to speak to you from his practical experience on the problems of management and labor coordination. It substitutes the selective-service boards as referral boards and classification agencies of individuals, and I submit to you that they are not capable of performing that function. Their function is built up along different lines of deciding whether a man is qualified for military service under regulations which have been given them, and it duplicates the work now being done by the U. S. E. S., which has to do properly with the referral and classification of workers. It

makes no provision for transfer of a worker from an obnoxious employer, or an employer who becomes tyrannical or imposes working conditions or wages even, speaking of a separate industry, such as a 40-cent wage, instead of \$1 an hour. I think that it imposes an impossible administrative burden on the selective-service boards because it will immediately throw into consideration at least ten and one-half million new individuals to be classified, indexed, and handled. Many of these individuals are already classified in the records of the United States Employment Services. Thus we see confusion and duplication of referrals and classification of skills. For 3 years now the U. S. E. S. in cooperation with local and area manpower committees have been developing methods of referrals and procedures of classifying workers. Now we are preparing to ignore and nullify a system that has by trial and error proven to be successful.

I submit that when you talk about the different volunteer boards in your own district and the type of men that are on them, who have had no previous experience in management-labor relations and in the classification of industrial workers, it is an impossible burden to ask these already overburdened men and women to perform this additional, tremendous burden.

We have been asked to pass this bill because of the recommendations of the heads of the military forces of our country. I have voted and acceded to every request of the military forces in military matters where they are supposed to be experts; they now ask me to do a thing, the purported purpose of which they say is to increase production. No one can speak to me about my lack of concern. I have members of my own family fighting in the armed forces, and when I cast my vote on this bill it will be in a way that will give those members of my family and your family additional guns, tanks, and ammunition. I submit to you that the heads of the military forces are not capable of passing on this problem. This is not a military problem. I submit to you that the heads of the military forces of our country have not been 100 percent right in their own field, although I respect them highly. During the years of 1943 and 1942 we had repeated predictions on the part of our military leaders that the war would soon be over. I include in my remarks the following quotations from our military leaders and the names of those who made them.

MILITARY AUTHORITIES' PREDICTIONS ON END OF WAR

Admiral William F. Halsey on January 1, 1943:

Nineteen hundred and forty-three will see * * * complete, absolute defeat for the Axis.

Gen. H. H. Arnold in February 1943:

I have an appointment in Berlin a year from today.

Lieut. Gen. Mark W. Clark in November 1943:

It is my hope and belief that before November 1944 the battle for Europe will have terminated in a smashing victory.

General Eisenhower in December 1943:
The Allies will win the European war in 1944.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in August 1944:

Victory over the Germans is not far off.

Gen. George C. Marshall in December 7, 1944:

Before this statement is published, hostilities might have terminated in the European theater.

I place these quotations in the RECORD not to discredit the military leaders, but to prove to the Members of this House that our military leaders have not been infallible in their judgment regarding military matters. Why then should we regard their recommendations in a field foreign to their training? That is, the field of industrial production.

I would not accept the judgment of Philip Murray, William Green, or any other labor leader on a military problem. I would not accept the judgment of Frederick Crawford, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers, on a military problem. But, gentlemen and ladies of the House, I would accept the combined judgment of these men in matters of production. Here is their advice:

ATTITUDE OF LEADERS RESPONSIBLE FOR PRODUCTION

N. A. M.—One hundred and fifty State and local industrial associations:

If national manpower legislation could provide the answer, industry itself would be the first to call for the enactment of a national service law. But the very nature of the manpower problem today is proof positive that national legislation—a blanket law—would not and could not solve the crisis.

Labor—William Green, American Federation of Labor:

The manpower problem can be dealt with in a constructive way and solved—not through resort to compulsion and force—but instead, through the better utilization of available manpower. There is no shortage of manpower. It is a question of the proper utilization of available manpower.

Mr. Murray, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

We are today abreast of or ahead of most war production schedules. Where we are not it is due to step-ups in a few lines of war products, or to errors in scheduling by procurement agencies. We must correct and overcome these situations by joint cooperation between labor, industry, and the war agencies.

And I want to comment at this time on a few suggestions as to how we can improve existing production schedules without resorting to the slave-labor philosophy contained in H. R. 1752.

First. All procurement contracts of the Army, Navy, Maritime, and Treasury should be placed by a central procurement agency, avoiding the confusion, competitive bidding, and overlapping purchases now existing due to the separate procurement agencies named.

Second. Proper allocation of contracts with regard to available facilities and manpower, regardless of size of plant.

This would utilize the tremendous facilities of small plants throughout our Nation, who have, to a great extent, been ignored in favor of the 7½-percent portion of industry in the big-business category.

Third. Authorize the United States Employment Service to register all workers now engaged in nonessential industries between the ages of 18 and 60, classify their skills, and offer them essential work. Give them the protection of their present pension and seniority rights. Pay their transportation expenses to the area where they are needed and provide them housing facilities when they are located. Protect their earning power against hardship, reduction, and protect their contractual obligations.

Continue to have faith in the American way of free enterprise, free labor, and the civil rights of the Constitution which prohibits involuntary servitude. Continue to give American free labor the chance to produce the guns, tanks, ammunition, food, and planes to destroy the principal exponents of slave labor, the Axis Nations. In our anxiety let us beware of losing the freedom of our people at home, while our boys are dying to preserve it on the far-flung battlefields of the world.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky if it does not come out of my time.

Mr. MAY. I am perfectly willing it not come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. JENNINGS. All right.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time will that give those who have not spoken?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have not had an opportunity to speak on this bill, and I want 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 40 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time will that give us who desire to be heard?

Mr. MAY. The 40 minutes will be apportioned among those wishing to speak.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Ten minutes has already been granted by unanimous consent to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 40 minutes, not including the time allotted to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. IZAC, Mr. VURSELL, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. HOFFMAN objected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I will revise that request and ask unanimous consent that the time be limited to 1 hour, including the time of the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration by this House is the most far-reaching and drastic measure affecting the persons, the liberties, and the lives of the civilian population of this country ever pressed for passage in any Congress of this Nation. If enacted into law by our votes, the life, the liberty, and the person of every man and boy in this Nation between the ages of 18 and 45 years will absolutely be in the hands of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. He can freeze them in their jobs. He can say to those engaged in industry and on the farm and in every other line of human activity, "Leave your home, leave the place of your residence, leave your present job, and go to the job that I designate for you."

Let us consider this all-inclusive language of the bill. Men may be forced to work in what is designated as war production or in support of what is vaguely designated as in the interest of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is the gentleman referring to the bill, H. R. 1752, or to the Voorhis amendment?

Mr. JENNINGS. I am talking about the bill, H. R. 1752.

I cannot support this measure because in my opinion it is violative of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of this country, which reads as follows:

SECTION 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The first section of amendment XIII is self-executing, that is to say, it does not require any congressional act to make it effective, because by its terms it is inhibitory. It is not within the power of Congress to sanction or to create or to set up machinery that results in slavery or involuntary servitude except that the man upon whom it is imposed shall have first been indicted and tried before a jury of his peers and convicted of a crime, part of the penalty of which is hard labor.

Now, let us just talk about the facts of life for a little bit. What have we done in this war effort? We have shifted from a basis of peacetime production to a basis of wartime production, and what we have done through free labor, through the cooperation of ownership, management, and labor, has been and is the envy and the marvel of the world.

I represent a district which is one of the largest in population in this country, almost 500,000 men and women and children. It is a cross-section of America. We are engaged in every form of productive activity, in agriculture, in mining, in manufacturing. Forty-five thousand of our boys have been builded into a living organization of offense and defense, and they are fighting all over the world.

I have seen the labor of my district at work. I have seen them go into the mines in the morning and come out at nightfall, grimy with the dust of the mines. I have seen them on the farm work from sun-up until dark. I have seen them in the great aluminum plant at Alcoa in my district, 13,000 in number, make aluminum for our war plants, 50 times as fast as Hitler can make it. I have seen them in other plants making all of the intricate and effective implements of warfare. These people in my district, in common with the men and women who work in your district, look upon this bill as a bill sanctioning and imposing on them slave labor.

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

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

Mr. SHORT. Thousands of men in that Alcoa plant were forced to go out of work because of Army cut-backs, because of a surplus supply.

Mr. JENNINGS. Whatever shortage of munitions may exist, and I doubt whether it does exist, is due to the bungling and mistakes and misjudgment of those above them. It is not labor's fault.

I will introduce to you a witness whose veracity, I take it, few who are supporting this bill would question. I am going to read the words of this witness which he delivered in a public address when he sought the highest office within the gift of this people. After recapitulating what we had done for our allies, the British, Russians, the French, and all who are fighting on our side, he used these words:

All of these operations have to be planned far in advance, and that does not mean merely drawing arrows on maps. It has meant planning in terms of precisely how many men will be needed, how many ships, warships, cargo ships, landing craft, how many bombers and how many fighter planes and equipment, and what types of equipment down to the last cartridge.

None other than the President of the United States said that a little more than 90 days ago.

This bill is harsh in its terms and anyone violating its requirements may be indicted in the United States district court and if found guilty of a willful violation may be punished by imprisonment of not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The power of Congress to raise and support armies and to declare war or to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, in my opinion, has no application to the proposed measure. There is a vast difference between the power of the Congress to provide for the national defense by a compulsory Selective Service System

and this attempt to draft men and boys and to compel them to enter the employ of a private individual or a private corporation engaged in private enterprise.

I have carefully examined all of the authorities cited by the report of the Committee on Military Affairs in the effort of the committee to afford legal justification for the enactment of this measure. None of the cases support the proposition; none of the opinions justify the enactment of this measure because no Federal district court, no United States Circuit Court of Appeals nor the Supreme Court of the United States in any opinion has ever held that the Government has the power to compel a citizen to submit to "slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." No Federal court in this land since the adoption of the thirteenth amendment in 1865 has ever upheld a law such as it is proposed to enact by this bill. This is true because Congress has never heretofore enacted such a law.

This Nation fought and won the Spanish-American War, it fought and won the First World War, without resorting to any such measure.

We have fought this war, the greatest in which we have ever been involved, for the past 3 years, have raised an armed force of 12,000,000 men and women, have clothed, fed, and equipped them without resorting to slave labor.

Whoever drafted the report in support of the pending bill was so hard put for an authority to support it that he cited the case in which the Supreme Court of the United States held that this Government has the power to require a Jap to observe a curfew regulation requiring him to be in his own home after a certain hour at night—*Hirabayashi v. U. S.* (320 U. S. 81), at page 93. And in an effort to bolster the position of the supporters of this measure, the case of *Heflin* against *Sanford*, reported in *One Hundred and Forty-second Federal Reports*, second edition, page 799, is cited, in which the Court held:

Where by law able-bodied male persons between 25 and 45 years were required to labor on the highways of the county for 6 days each year, failure being punishment as a crime and such a person was convicted and on habeas corpus contended there was violation of the thirteenth amendment—

It was held that such service, like compulsory service in the Army, on juries, and the like, was no violation of the amendment—meaning the thirteenth amendment.

It is thus seen that the only kind of service that the Government may compel the citizen to render is a public service. There has never heretofore been an attempt made to compel the citizens to work in private industry for a private employer engaged in private enterprise for a profit to the employer.

I have also carefully examined all of the cases cited on page 6 of the report of the committee. These are cases in which persons claiming to be conscientious objectors were classified as such by their draft boards and who, when called for induction into the civilian public

service camps where they were required to perform labor at a small compensation per month, failed to report and were indicted, tried, and convicted, and sentenced to prison, and on appeal their convictions were affirmed. Some of the cases arose on an effort of these conscientious objectors to be discharged from such camps by resorting to the writ of habeas corpus. The courts uniformly held in all these cases that the classifying of these persons as conscientious objectors and their relief from service in the armed forces by the terms of the Selective Service Act is an act of grace on the part of the Congress and the Government and that they cannot be heard to complain if, instead of being inducted into the armed forces, they are inducted into a camp where labor useful to the public is performed. They are not required to work in private industry for a private employer who realizes a profit out of their labor.

Congress in an effort to enforce the thirteenth amendment by appropriate legislation has passed statutes known as the Peonage Statutes. These statutes denounce as a crime the holding of a citizen in peonage—that is, compelling him to perform involuntary labor in discharge of a civil debt or obligation. In certain States an effort was made to circumvent the Federal laws against peonage by resorting to this expedient: A person desiring to obtain the labor of a prisoner confined in a jail or work house on some minor offense would enter into a contract with the prisoner under the terms of which the person desiring to obtain the labor of the prisoner would assume the payment of the prisoner's fine and costs and the prisoner would contract with such person to work for him until the amount of his fine and costs had been worked out at so much per month. The Federal courts have uniformly held that such a contract is involuntary servitude, is illegal, and in violation of the thirteenth amendment. Speaking of the purpose of these antipeonage statutes, the Supreme Court of the United States used this language:

The purpose of this section (referring to the section forbidding involuntary servitude) was to strike down all laws, regulations, and usages in States and Territories which attempted to maintain and enforce, directly or indirectly, voluntary or involuntary service or labor of any person as peons, in liquidation of any debt or obligation. (*United States v. Reynolds* (235 U. S. Sup. Ct. Repts., p. 133).)

It is seen, therefore, that insofar as any attempt has ever been made in this country, since the adoption of the thirteenth amendment, to impose upon any citizen of this land involuntary servitude or the obligation to perform labor for a private individual in private industry such illegal attempt has been stricken down by the courts, either in enforcement of the thirteenth amendment or the enforcement of the Federal statutes against peonage.

And it has been said in the course of the debate on this measure and in justification of many of the flagrant usurpations of power and illegal trespasses against the lives, liberties, and property

rights of the citizens of this country by this administration that such violations of the citizens' rights are sanctioned and justifiable because we are engaged in war and that an emergency exists. In the case *Ex parte Milligan* reported in *United States Supreme Court Reports* 71, page 2, it is held:

Neither the President, nor Congress, nor the judiciary can disturb any one of the safeguards of civil liberty incorporated in the Constitution except so far as the right is given to suspend in certain cases the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. Justice Davis, in delivering the opinion of the Court in the *Milligan* case and in stressing the supremacy of the supreme law of the land and the sanctity of the rights of the citizens guaranteed by the Constitution and the wisdom of our ancestors in providing these safeguards, used the following language:

Time has proven the discernment of our ancestors; for even these provisions, expressed in such plain English words, that it would seem the ingenuity of man could not evade them, are now, after the lapse of more than 70 years, sought to be avoided. Those great and good men foresaw that troublous times would arise, when rulers and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper; and that the principles of constitutional liberty would be in peril, unless established by irrepealable law. The history of the world had taught them that what was done in the past might be attempted in the future. The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence; as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority.

This act is the culmination of a determined effort to strip the citizens of this country of the protection afforded them both by the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution and the fifth amendment, which provides:

No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

The creeping paralysis of arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of the citizen has found expression and sanction in the words of the President, who in his annual message to Congress, January 3, 1936, used these words:

In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

Any instrument of public power capable of providing shackles for the liberties of the people is a menace to the rights of our people regardless of who exercises such power.

Again the President said in his address in Madison Square Garden on Saturday, October 31, 1936:

I should like to have it said of my first administration that in it the forces of selfishness and of lust for power met their match. I should like to have it said of my second administration that in it these forces met their master.

It is significant that the far-reaching and unprecedented powers sought by this administration under this bill were not mentioned until after the November 1944 election. This bill is but another step in the march toward a communistic form of government in the United States. It may well prove the last and final step on the road that carries the people of this country into what every Communist in the country is driving toward, a communistic state. It is significant that this measure is supported by the Communists of the country. This measure, in my opinion, will cripple and reduce rather than strengthen and increase production. Its enforcement will require the time and labor of thousands of men who might otherwise be employed in war industry. It will create confusion and resentment in the minds of millions of loyal men, women, boys, and girls who are now engaged in an all-out effort to produce the implements of warfare. It is another illustration of the insatiable greed of this administration for power and more power. It has never surrendered any power that has been delegated to it, and it has never failed to abuse and go beyond the limits of the powers granted to it. Last year as a notable example of its disregard of the rights of the citizen, we witnessed an administrative agency of the Government through the employment of the armed forces carry Sewell Avery, a man 70 years of age, out of his office in Montgomery Ward's place of business in Chicago. I hold no brief for Sewell Avery. He seems to be able to take care of himself. But the feet of those, who, with armed might at the point of a gun, carried him from his place of business, now stand at the door and on the threshold of every workingman between the ages of 18 and 45 in the land. They resent it; their employers resent it; their sons and daughters in the armed forces resent it. This act applies to our veterans, and its heavy hand may deprive them of their liberty and force them into slave labor. The people of this country were not born with saddles on their backs to be ridden, or driven, by anyone desiring to place shackles on their limbs or to be their master. This measure is uncalled for. It is opposed by ownership, management, and labor. And I am unalterably opposed to its enactment and shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, it is with keen reluctance that I find myself opposed to the request of our Commander in Chief and his military staff. Only once in the past 4 years have I voted against any major legislation that they requested. There has been much partisan debate on this May bill but there

is only one issue before the House, and that is: Will the proposed legislation—the May bill—provide the necessary manpower requirements of the Army and the civilian labor needs, and, second, will the enactment of this bill increase production of vital implements of war. That is all. The only way I can gage this whole situation is by the facts which I intend to submit to the Committee for its consideration.

We must first read and bear in mind the report of Senator MEAD's committee, formerly the Truman committee. We know there have been no greater administration followers than Senator MEAD and Senator KILGORE, and certainly their report would not be biased. Yet after spending 2 days in the Norfolk Navy Yard with over 38,000 employees, the Navy maintains there is a manpower shortage of 4,000 men. The Mead committee, in its report, said they found men making "knickknacks" and employees falling over each other upon the decks of warships. Yet, the Navy says there is a manpower shortage at Norfolk.

I want to make a few remarks about the district which I represent, the largest heavy steel industrial district in America. I will show you actual statistics in a moment where we produced more steel in my district alone last year than was made by the entire Nipponese Government. We came within 50,000 tons of the entire production of Germany. Here is what the Director of the War Manpower Commission for Western Pennsylvania says in a letter to me dated January 31, which I received at noon today:

Shortage of manpower in the Pittsburgh Area IX of the War Manpower Commission (Allegheny, Beaver, parts of Westmoreland and Washington Counties) does not warrant passage of work or fight legislation in my opinion. Congressional action to put teeth in present W. M. C. manpower control program would be the answer here.

How can I justify my action to the boys overseas and to my constituents by voting for the May bill? Here are the production records of the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania—which speak for themselves—of our cooperation with the rest of the Nation to outproduce the world in shells, planes, tanks, and guns:

The world record for pig-iron production was broken by the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Edgar Thomson plant, Braddock, Pa.

The world's production records were broken by blast-furnace crew twice within 1 month in Rankin, Pa., when 42,131 net tons of steel were produced during the month of March of last year by 31 men, all of whom received personal citation by Robert Patterson, Under Secretary of War.

Pittsburgh Steel Foundry Corporation of Glassport, Pa., shattered an all-time production record for 1944, producing 100 percent for war and not 1 pound of goods for civilian orders.

United States Steel Corporation, world's largest industrial empire, with large facilities in my district in Homestead, Duquesne, Clairton, Mifflin, and Braddock, revealed an all-time production peak in turning out over 40,000,000 tons of steel.

A new world's record for iron production was set last month, and also during 1944, by the National Tube Co.'s blast furnaces, setting an iron record in the United States.

The Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation broke many steel-production records during 1944, establishing new highs for the months of March and April. A new high record in the production of plates for ships was also made in May.

The National Tube Co.'s Christy Park works, McKeesport, Pa., set a world's record in shell production. A work crew during a 24-hour period produced 7,014 forgings without a rejection.

The Homestead Steel Works of the United States Steel is far ahead of schedule in producing 30-inch armor plate for giant battleships.

In view of this unbelievable record of production by free labor, how can I conscientiously vote for a conscription of labor?

There are other more competent authorities who share my belief and I want to quote them:

Maj. Gen. Levin H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, said in a Pittsburgh address last year:

You are producing the world's finest weapons, from rifles to tanks and Flying Fortresses that are rolling off the production lines, in such quantities as to confound the enemy. My hat is off to all you steel makers.

Donald Nelson, former W. P. B. chief, lauded production miracle in America, greatest in the world, and said we have now reached the victory peak of production and it is now only a question of proper allocation and procurement.

How do the boys overseas feel about this legislation? I interviewed 17 families in my area with two or more boys in service, in each of which families at least one son has made the supreme sacrifice, and every family except one opposed the May bill, for conscription of labor.

PARENTS OPPOSE

Our distinguished colleague, Congressman A. B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, with five sons in the service, is opposed to the May bill.

I want to read an excerpt from the letter of a father in my district—with four sons in the service, one of whom has been permanently disabled—about labor conscription, and I quote:

I wish to register my opposition to any such measure because it is my firm conviction that it is both un-American and will work irretrievable harm to democratic institutions.

I have four sons in the service, or rather I did have, one is already permanently crippled, so I have every possible reason, personal as well as patriotic, to desire the earliest possible ending of the war. I know they would strenuously oppose a national service act as the very antithesis of what we have been told they are fighting for.

MEAD COMMITTEE SAYS "NO"

With the evidence I have to verify the findings of the Mead committee, that is, hoarding of manpower in my own district, and with the record of production I have submitted, I urge this House to grant the power and authority to the War Manpower Commission, in coopera-

tion with labor and management, to go into each plant and check the manpower situation, and maladjustments will be rectified. There is now clear-cut evidence of malutilization of labor that will not be alleviated by a national service law. The voluntary system has worked wonders to date; let us continue it in the future and help speed the day of victory and aid in bringing our boys home as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have been told by the proponents of the May conscription bill, H. R. 1752, that the Army and the Navy will need 900,000 additional men by June 30, 1945, and that there will be needed an additional 700,000 men and women in essential war industries.

The President and the Selective Service have all the laws and powers and authority necessary to secure the 900,000 additional men and more. General Hershey the other day said that under the powers of Congress, he can place every male between the ages of 18 and 45—numbering 18,000,000 men—in the armed services regardless of their circumstances or conditions except—the administration had inserted in the Selective Service or Draft Act a provision giving almost unlimited power to the heads of various Federal departments and agencies to determine whether or not officials and workers in these departments and agencies may be exempted from the armed forces. This provision should never have been put into the draft law to give Government officials and workers a preferential status. Investigations made by various committees—some of them of the House and Senate—disclosed that more than 300,000 young men, a large majority of whom are single, and all are in good health and subject to the draft, and who are performing for the most part clerical work for the Government, are exempted and kept out of the armed services.

I have many times denounced, and I am today denouncing, this partiality and favoritism to this group of Federal officers. They are not performing essential war services that are comparable to the young men who have been taken from the farms, mines, shops, plants, mills, railroads, and industries and of the country.

It is a notorious fact that the Federal Government is the greatest hoarder of manpower in the Nation. Recent records disclose that there are now 3,009,000 Federal officeholders. There was an increase of over 300,000 in the year 1944. Hardly anyone attempts to deny that there are at least a million more persons on the Federal pay rolls than are needed. The May conscription bill will not reach nor correct this partiality and favoritism existing in favor of employees of the Federal Government.

Why does not the Military Affairs Committee of the House bring out a bill amending the draft law, so as to make these 300,000 able-bodied young men subject to the draft? This would reduce the alleged requirements of the Army and

Navy to 600,000. If the same rate of volunteering for the Navy of young men under 18 carries through to June 30, 1945, it will bring to the armed service an additional 150,000. There will be another 420,000 young men who will become of age before June 30, 1945 and who will meet the physical and mental requirements.

These 4 items would bring into the armed services 1,170,000. There are 18,000,000 boys and men now between the ages of 18 and 45 who are not in the armed services. The Selective Service has the power to dip into the 18,000,000 and get whatever number the armed forces may call for to take care of the 900,000 which it is said will be required for the armed service by June 30, 1945.

However, some are insisting that an additional 200,000 men and boys should be taken from the farms. Who does not realize the great importance of the production of food, feed, and fiber? We must have these to win the war; these must come from the products of the farm.

According to their numbers, more men have been taken from the farms than from industry or any other activity. There can be no serious question but that the 900,000 additional men in the service can be secured. The President and the Director of Selective Service have been granted all the power that they have sought or need to secure all the men necessary for the armed services. The American people and every Member of Congress will follow the recommendations of our generals and admirals in charge of our armed forces and in the direction of our war efforts. They must have all the men that in their opinion they need for the successful prosecution of the war. I certainly would not set my judgment against theirs as to the need for 900,000 additional men by June 30, 1945.

WORK-OR-JAIL BILL

The country has been led to believe, through the press and over the radio, that we have before us a work-or-fight bill. Mr. MAX, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, did introduce such a bill (H. R. 1119), but he and his committee abandoned this bill providing for "work or fight," and he introduced a new bill (H. R. 1752), the work-or-jail bill. This work-or-jail bill is the bill that is before us for consideration and not the work-or-fight bill.

This bill gives to various agencies of the Government the power to conscript all men between the ages of 18 and 45, about 18,000,000 in all. The committee abandoned the work-or-fight bill because there was no basis for such a bill, as the President and the Selective Service had all the power necessary to induct into the armed forces any or all of the 18,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45 when the generals and admirals say they only need 900,000 by June 30, 1945.

We have already pointed out how easy it would be to secure these 900,000 men by June 30 next. Under the work-or-fight bill, if a man refused to work he could be put into the armed services. There is nothing in this bill that provides

for placing these 18,000,000 men in the armed services. It does provide, however, that these men may be conscripted for work, and required to work, and be sent to any part of the United States or elsewhere, to work on any job or task to which they may be assigned. If they fail to respond they are subject to a fine not to exceed \$10,000 or 5 years in the penitentiary, or both the fine and imprisonment. It can be seen at once why this is designated the work-or-jail bill.

Bear in mind these men will not work for the Government as soldiers, sailors, or marines work; but they must work for private companies or for individuals engaged in production, on farms, railroads, in mines, shops and mills and factories, for profit. Those in our armed services work for their Government and their Government is not engaged in activities for profit but for the defense and welfare of the Nation.

The question arises, Can private citizens under the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits involuntary servitude, be required to work for private concerns or for individuals who are carrying on a business for profit for themselves?

Under H. R. 1752 persons could be taken off their own farms and away from their businesses, or from their stores or shops, and thereby have their business destroyed. They could be required to go and work for some other individual and help him carry on his business for profit.

Under H. R. 1119, the work-or-fight bill, any citizen could be inducted into the armed forces, and, as such, his Government could require him to perform any service within his abilities but it is quite different being drafted for the Government in the defense and for the welfare of the country, and working for private concerns and individuals who are engaged in business for profit.

I cannot believe the Senate will place its stamp of approval on H. R. 1752.

WE MUST PROVIDE ALL MEN AND EQUIPMENT NECESSARY

The War and Navy Departments say they need additional munitions of war, and we are told by some that it would require 700,000 additional men and women by June 30, 1945, to provide the additional equipment. The War Manpower Commission, whose job it has been during the war to study the needs of the necessary manpower for our war-production facilities, says that less than 160,000 additional men will meet the requirements. I certainly shall not interpose my judgment against the generals and admirals as to the number of additional men required for the armed services, neither will I question what they say they need in the way of additional equipment and munitions. Our grand and heroic defenders should have all the help and all of the munitions, as well as an abundance of food and ample and suitable clothing, and a substantial surplus besides. Let us meet their requirements without stint, in order to win the war at the earliest moment possible.

Our generals and admirals have been trained from boyhood in the sciences of war. They have special experience and

knowledge about the needs and requirements for the battle fronts. They use what the home front provides. Our generals and admirals are not experienced or specialists in production. I have not received from my district one letter, telegram, or other communication from industry, management, agriculture, or labor in favor of the May bill, H. R. 1752, but have received literally hundreds of communications from industry, management, farmers, and labor in my district strongly protesting against it.

INDUSTRY, MANAGEMENT, LABOR, AND
AGRICULTURE

The proponents of this bill insist that the best way to procure this additional equipment is by force—the conscription of 18,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45. This policy is insisted upon by those who are not experienced or trained in production. Industry, management, agriculture, and labor insist that a policy of force will not increase but decrease production. It will hurt and not help. The real question to be determined by us is what is the best course to follow to secure increased production. Is it force or patriotic cooperation? Who is best able to advise us as to the better course, those without experience in production, or those of long training and wide experience in that field? We should not be carried away by emotion or sentiment. We should look at this matter realistically. We should call upon those who produce our war needs and find out the best way of meeting the requests of our generals and our admirals. Some of the proponents of this legislation, waving the flag and with great emotion, have insisted that we adopt H. R. 1752, without a single amendment, not even to the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." Our Speaker took the floor and insisted that there should be no amendments adopted. They attempted to tell us that General Marshall, Chief of Staff, and Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations, wanted this particular bill. I find no words or statement from them whereby they put their seal of approval on H. R. 1752. I doubt if they would undertake to tell the Congress, or those in charge of production, how they should organize the agencies of production. Some of those who have spoken with great emotion pointed out that we must adopt this particular bill and without amendments or hurt the morale of our men in the armed forces. Some of these proponents have no one in the armed services, while many of us, who look with misgivings on this bill, have sons, nephews, and brothers in the armed forces, and overseas. My only son, although married before Pearl Harbor, volunteered and has been in the service for nearly 3 years, and my nephews who were physically able and old enough to volunteer; and this son and these nephews are overseas. I am sure they would desire you and me to examine this whole matter with great care and do the very best thing possible for them and for our country.

I have tried to inform myself as to what is the best thing and I hope that I may have the courage to do what ap-

pears to me in good conscience to be in the interest of our people and our country, and when I do that it will be the answer to my son, my nephews, and the others when they return.

FREE LABOR OR CONSCRIPT LABOR

Judging from what our admirals and generals say that we need additional munitions and materials of war, and others have estimated that this might require the services of 700,000 additional men and women in industry and agriculture before June 30, 1945, although the Manpower Commission, that should know better than any of us, says that it will not require more than 160,000. The simple question is, Can we secure better results through the cooperation of industry, management, agriculture, and labor acting with the Manpower Commission set up by Congress, as provided in the substitute bill, H. R. 1803, offered by Mr. HARNES of Indiana, of the Military Affairs Committee, or the other substitute bill offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California, or will we secure better results by the conscription of enforced labor provided in H. R. 1752 before us? We look to our commanders and fighting men to use effectively the ships, guns, planes, shells, tanks, and other war materials that we have furnished them, and what a wonderful job and what a glorious record of courageous and patriotic achievement they have made! On the other hand, to whom must we look to provide the ships, planes, tanks, guns, shells, food, clothing, oil, gas, coal, and other munitions of war? Do we not have to look to and depend upon industry, management, labor, agriculture, and our Manpower Commission, cooperating together, to produce adequately and, yes, even more than our fighting forces say they require? There must be no shortage at any time or at any place.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers' Association, other business organizations, a great majority of the farmers of the Nation, the Railroad Brotherhoods, truck operators, the American Federation of Labor, the United Mine Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, for one time have united, and with one accord they declare that free labor and not conscript labor is the answer. Conscript labor will not increase but will decrease production. Enforced labor will hurt and not help in producing this necessary equipment and munitions. They are joined in this view by those conducting our Manpower Commission. They are vigorously opposing the May conscript bill, H. R. 1752, and almost as a unit are giving their support to the substitute bill, H. R. 1803. These groups are specialists in the field of production. Can we in good conscience ignore their protest?

American labor is not the only one protesting against this bill. A most vigorous protest comes from the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, industry, management, and agriculture.

The American Association of Manufacturers said in part in a very illuminating statement in opposition to this bill—

Management of American industries have been extremely reluctant to employ any form

of compulsory labor. This has been based on long experience in dealing with American workers, and because this experience has convinced management that compulsion does not produce as efficiently as free men. The record of production since Pearl Harbor justifies this belief.

President William Green says—

Our great production record was achieved in spite of manpower wastage in plants on cost-plus basis, and waste in Government controlled plants, navy yards, etc. These wastages can no longer be tolerated.

Mr. Green also states—

that conditions exist in navy yards and many other plants working on cost-plus basis as we know from our representatives, and especially is that confirmed by Senator MEAD's statement to the United States Senate. This bill (H. R. 1803) gives the authority necessary to correct this condition. Manpower is adequate to meet the demand under a free system and there is no need for compulsion.

Hon. Donald Nelson, the great industrialist and the greatest production man in the United States, stated in one of his written reports:

We call our secret weapon the initiative and intelligence and know-how of free American workers.

Hon. Joseph Keenan, W. P. B. Vice Chairman, stated:

Labor's morale, her sense of participation, have been so heightened that they broke all records.

Industry, management, labor, and agriculture have set about to build up a great cooperative program.

First. To give the legislative authority for War Manpower Commission. The War Manpower Commission today was created by Executive order. It is without legal status. It could only recommend.

Second. Establishment of employment ceilings.

Third. Use of controlled referrals to regulate hiring.

Fourth. Authorize compulsory release of employees in excess of the number permitted individual employers under manpower ceilings.

Fifth. Enforcement of such regulations, not against the workers but against the employers through court proceedings comparable to those used to enforce price ceilings under the Price Control Act.

Sixth. Reemphasize by management in plant practices to increase production and eliminate labor hoarding.

Seventh. Reemphasize by labor on increasing production with workers now available.

Eighth. Community publicity campaigns.

The Federal Government is the greatest hoarder of labor, according to the reports of investigating committees of the Senate. There is particularly in the cost-plus plants a great excess of labor, and this is true as to the ship yards and other Government-operated industries. You can see that the program here provides that there shall be established employment ceilings. In no plant are they permitted to hire more people than are reasonably necessary to carry on the work in that plant, and as H. R. 1803 and the Voorhis bill would correct these conditions and carry out these recommen-

dations but the May bill does not reach any of these conditions or situations, and this plan provides for punishment of employers who violate their ceiling number as we now punish persons who violate ceiling prices under the O. P. A. This program has the backing of the War Manpower Commission and many other Government officials who are interested in production. Let us not forget that all of these great agencies of production, including labor, assert most positively that the May bill will reduce and not increase production.

PARTIALITY AND FAVORITISM

Let us keep in mind that the May bill deals only with persons between the ages of 18 and 45. Under the present laws, the draft boards deal only with the induction of men into our armed forces. The May bill brings into the picture the conscription of labor. They will have much to do with sending people all over the country. I mean those who have not gone into war activities, except it freezes into their jobs the millions who are now employed in war-work activities. It was stated on the floor by one of the proponents of this measure that this would pick up the bums in poolrooms and other joints. If any of these bums or others are picked up and conscripted between the ages of 18 and 45, they will receive special treatment under the May bill.

First. They will be paid their transportation to their place of employment and return after their employment ceases.

Second. They will be granted all the rights and privileges provided under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. They will receive special consideration as to debts they owe, taxes, and holding leased property, and so forth, and at the end of the war they are guaranteed other employment as soldiers, sailors, and marines. How could there be a more flagrant case of partiality and favoritism? When they are assigned to work and go to a factory that has a closed shop they must join the union, or if they are opposed to joining the union, they will not have to work at that shop or factory. There is nothing in the May bill giving the employers the power to discharge any worthless, trifling person that may be picked up under this conscription bill. Let us bear in mind that there are tens of millions of patriotic, industrious workers that are already in these plants and other millions will go voluntarily when they know that their Government needs them, but they do not get the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. They have not been paid their transportation to their work and will not receive their transportation back home.

It does not take a wise man to see what effect this preferred treatment of draftees will have on the millions of other loyal, industrious, patriotic workers. These millions will, no doubt, insist that they receive like treatment, and if it is refused, what discord and dissension will it develop. We can see at a glance that the loyal, patriotic, industrious workers are penalized under this bill, while those who are forced into war work will be rewarded. How will our soldiers, sailors, and marines feel when

they learn that these drafted war workers will receive perhaps \$50 to \$100 per week or more and be put on the same footing as soldiers, sailors, and marines under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act who are in our armed services, offering their lives and giving their lives on a base pay to start with of \$50 per month and giving \$22 or more of that to needy dependents back home?

I have always placed our defenders first and I shall continue to do so. I could not in good conscience vote for any bill that discriminates against the millions who are already in war work and the millions or more who are more than 45 years of age and against our soldiers, sailors, and marines. We have been warned that if we voted against the monstrosity of a bill that has not been endorsed by General Marshall or Admiral King and has been denounced by industry, management, labor, and agriculture, that we will likely be defeated. My conscience tells me that we are right in opposing this bill, and I would not exchange what I believe to be right for any tenure of office I might receive in the future.

These proponents of the bill seem to forget that there are more than 50,000,000 people employed in this country in industry, agriculture, transportation, and other activities. We have approximately 12,000,000 men in our armed services. I am satisfied that 85 to 90 percent of these come from those engaged in industry, agriculture, transportation, and other activities. Let us repeat again that the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Manufacturers Association, those engaged in transportation, agriculture, management, and labor are opposed to the May conscription bill. Millions of boys have been taken from the farms and the mines, from the railroads, the shops, mills, factories, and the offices of this country. They in one capacity or another left industry, management, labor, and agriculture to go into our armed services. These boys are fighting against totalitarianism; they are fighting for liberty and freedom on the seven seas and the 5 continents of the world.

Must we in adopting this bill change the policy of this Government from its beginning? We had the institution of slavery in this country for a long time. The black man was compelled to work for private citizens who were engaged in profit-making activities. We fought a war to get away from that. Now we propose to adopt it for white men and black men alike who happen to be between the ages of 18 and 45. Those who know the problem of production say we can do a better job with free labor than with conscripted labor. We have amazed the world in our productive enterprises with free enterprise and free labor. Starting from scratch we have built the greatest Navy in all history. We have the best equipped, best clothed, and best fed Army in the world, and we have the best transportation system in the world. Our farmers with millions of their boys away in war have broken all production records in 1943, and still better in 1944. What a wonderful job

has been done on the railroads, the bus, and truck lines, the air lines, in the mines, factories, shops, mills, and on the farms. Yes; we provided for ourselves and furnished billions of dollars' worth of munitions and other war equipment, food, and other supplies to our allies and with that wonderful record of achievement and the experience that it has brought to us why should we now disrupt all of this management and cooperation and enter upon a new and untried program and one that is vigorously opposed by all those engaged in production. What a story this is to go to the totalitarian governments that Americans had to be threatened with jail before they would produce. They can point to the fact that a democracy is all right in peacetime but it cannot carry a nation through a war. Let us improve our program and profit by the experience we have gained, and I have no doubt as to the results.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say much in the time allotted me. I will oppose this bill if I am the only one left to oppose it. I do so on this ground: it is an honor and a duty for everyone to come to the defense of the Nation in time of war. That is why we have men and women in the armed services, ready to sacrifice their all. The Constitution requires that we provide for the national defense and therein lies the power to draft men in the way we now do. Can you show me any place in the Constitution where we say anything about taking a man from civil life and putting him in John Jones' factory so that John Jones can make some profit? You cannot show it to me because it is not there. We draft our men to safeguard our sovereignty, to protect the homeland, to bare their breasts to the enemy that all the people of our country may be protected—we draft them to fight for Uncle Sam.

The men and women in industry in this country have done a wonderful job. Now, you are going to spoil it all. You are going to say, "We have just been fooling with you people. You are no longer free. You are slaves. We are going to see if we cannot push your nose into the dirt and get more out of you." More what? More production? No; not more production, because the effect of this bill will be the opposite. You may get more profits for the fellows who have been fixing up the profit side of the ledger all these years. Let me read of an instance of what I mean, taken from this book of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Here is a little aircraft corporation. Just before Pearl Harbor, the executive vice president gave himself \$2,325 a year. Right after Pearl Harbor, he gave himself \$89,000 a year, plus high profits made by his company. So, now we want to take men and women out of the various walks of life of this country where perhaps they are only making a fair living and put them at an arbitrary wage some place where somebody can make a lot of profit out of their labor. Forced labor to make profits for the owner of

the plant or business. Is there any justice in that? If this bill ever becomes operative—and I predict it will not—God help our country. The Constitution does not provide for it; none of the laws of our land have ever provided for it, and I will not be a party to it now. We will gain something if we keep free labor going to the bat for the men at the front; and, furthermore, when those men come back from the front, under this bill you are going to do the same thing to them; you are going to say, "It is all right, buddy; you served pretty well over there, but we have got to get a little bit more work out of you to make a little more profit for John Jones' machine shop down the street."

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I want the RECORD to show that the gentleman from California now speaking [Mr. IZAC] is a great American patriot with a most enviable record of service in the Navy of his country.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, let us get away from all the window dressing in the bill and come down to the crux of it. It is this: Are we willing to draft men to do forced labor so other men and businesses can make profit out of this war? Are we willing to do this, at the same time refusing to draft capital and all the other national resources? I am not, and I now so declare myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am opposed to the May bill. I am supporting this Voorhis substitute which is pending before us. It does not provide plenary power to Paul McNutt to run the manpower of the country, as has been claimed, but limited powers, which are defined in the substitute, to carry out the manpower system now in effect.

The fundamental differences between the May bill and this substitute can be seen by comparing the two penalty provisions. The penalty clause of the substitute now before us reads as follows—and I urge you to follow it because the great difference between the Voorhis substitute and the May bill is that in the May bill the penalty of jail is for a man who refuses to take a job; in the Voorhis substitute you do not have that forced-labor provision among the penalties. Here is the way it reads:

Any person who in violation of the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder willfully hires, rehires, or solicits an individual or accepts employment or fails to comply with an employment ceiling or to release individuals or fails to submit information or permit inspections or investigations shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

It goes on to provide a penalty of not more than 1 year in jail or a fine up to \$10,000. Note that there is no criminal penalty to force a man to take a particular job. That is a great deal different from the May bill, which provides the same penalty for a man who refuses to take a job as for a man who refuses to take his place in the draft.

This May bill is described by its proponents as a national service bill for men

from 18 to 45. The heart of the proposal is that draft boards, who draft men to fight, who now have the power to force men to work or fight, are to be given the additional power to draft men to work who cannot fight.

They say, "If we draft men to fight and die for their country, we should also draft them to work for their country." This is a compelling emotional appeal, but will not stand the test of reason because this labor draft is different from our military draft.

Selective service was proposed as the democratic way to raise an army; it was so democratic and patriotic that volunteering for military service was frowned upon and was finally forbidden, for the average man. When it comes to military service, the patriotic citizen of a republic must not say where or how he wants to serve, but must wait for his government to tell him where he is needed. The same argument about democracy is used to justify this forced labor measure, but in the next breath the proponents say it will not be used very much. The whole emphasis in the bill, in this debate, is upon volunteering for war work, and the processes of the selective service are to be used only as a shameful last resort, as a threat of punishment to coerce the laborer into volunteering. There is nothing democratic about drafting a few laborers out of millions who are doing as they please. There is nothing democratic about giving these labor draftees travel pay, relief from civilian obligations, and rights to their former jobs, when none of the millions of patriotic volunteer workers receives these benefits.

There is another great difference between this bill and the military draft. When we draft a man for military service we, the Congress, determine his pay, and his working conditions; we take care of his dependents, his post-war opportunities. There is nothing like that in this bill. It sets up machinery for forcing an American citizen to work for a private employer, upon that employer's terms. That is forced labor, involuntary servitude, slavery. We surround it with none of the dignity or security which we give to the men drafted for military service. Instead of making induction into the labor draft the highest form of patriotic duty of a citizen, as we have attempted to do in our military draft, we make it an alternative form of punishment. By this bill we are saying to every man below 45, "If you do not volunteer for a war job you will be sent to jail, or to forced labor." With all due respect to my brethren who are approving this procedure, I think it is undemocratic and un-American.

Furthermore, it is highly inefficient as a means of securing war production. It is most significant that labor and management, who know the most about production, say that this bill will hinder, not help, war production. They know that unwilling workers are inefficient workers; that our country has out-produced the world by using free labor.

Here are some of the causes of the manpower shortage that the proponents admit are not touched by this bill:

Cut-backs caused a loss of over a million and a half workers to industry last fall; this bill will not prevent cut-backs.

Absenteeism causes a man-hour loss of 24 times the present manpower shortage; this bill will not prevent absenteeism.

Manpower shortages are often in the skilled groups of workers, and a transfer of skilled workers from one essential industry to another even more essential is the only way to meet such a shortage. This bill does not enforce such transfers.

Strikes have caused losses in production; this bill has nothing to do with strikes.

Not a single Member of this House, not a single administrative official, not a single military man, is claiming that this bill will solve our manpower problem or our production problem. All are placing primary reliance upon the patriotic, voluntary cooperation of labor and management and Government.

The main arguments for the May bill are: First, it will not be used much; second, it will make the men in service feel good. I oppose setting up a system that is so bad, so objectionable, that it will not be used. I do not think the soldier's morale will be improved by an ineffective bill. Loafing and striking and absenteeism and slow-downs and cut-backs are hurting our soldier's morale right now, and these are not touched by this bill.

Our Speaker has argued that regardless of the merits of this bill, we must pass it unchanged, now that it is on the floor, so that the headlines that the soldiers see will read well. That is proposing the kind of thing we hated in the last war—kidding the troops. The men in this war hate that, too.

The men who want this bill are the military men who direct military operations so well and who have bungled so badly on their decisions on the supplies they need produced. They have also bungled badly on their whole judgment of civilian morale. They are our servants, not our masters. We want to restrain, not increase, their power over us; we want to get rid of their domination, with gratitude but with relief, as much and as soon as possible.

Let the military experts do the fighting, and the production experts do the producing; let us pass laws the producers, labor and management, say they need, and not this half-baked measure that nobody needs and only the militarists want.

This Voorhis substitute gives the force of law to the system of voluntary cooperation between labor and management and Government which is working fairly well now. It puts no man in forced labor, but punishes the chiseler employer and the slacker worker who refuses to cooperate with this voluntary system of ceilings for employers, and availability certificates for employees. It is all that management and labor and the War Manpower Commission say they need to meet the military demands for production. It throws out the entire May bill, with its labor draft. This substitute is not perfect. Under any system we adopt there will be slickers and slackers who evade their full duty to

their country. Their only punishment may be the contempt of their neighbors and of the returning servicemen, but that punishment will last a long time, and come up in many ways. We should adopt this substitute, and then let the word go to our fighting men that Congress has done its part to speed up production, and has refused to adopt at home the system they are fighting to destroy abroad.

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

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, for several days I have been listening to the debate and reading articles both for and against the conscription of labor. I have tried to look at these problems from the position of a physician, which I know best. As a physician, it seems to me that the present legislation to force individuals between the ages of 18 and 45 into certain types of labor is not complete. Indications are that the House will pass the measure. This patient, lack of manpower and shortage of war materials, has been a sick one but only just recently. The patient is showing signs of recovering without this legislation.

It will be remembered that early last summer many predictions were being made by military leaders, including Churchill, Eisenhower, and men high in military rank in this country, that the war would be over in 1944. It was only natural that the laboring man would leave industry and seek something permanent for himself and his family.

This Congress was called back into session to enact some reconversion legislation. All might have been well had we not underestimated the strength of the enemy. The patient would not now be ill or need a prescription if the cut-backs had not been ordered by the military. Factories were closed. Ammunition lines were closed. Small arms plants were being reconverted. Great cut-backs occurred all along the line. This cannot be blamed upon the individual working in the war plants. It cannot be blamed upon this Congress. If there is anyone at fault, it must be the military experts who ordered the cut-backs.

I say that the patient is already recovering because evidence presented to this Congress shows that thousands of workers are now returning to the essential production of war needs. This rapid return of the workers who had left the war plants will continue without this legislation.

The prescription that Congress is writing is not complete. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] suggested an ingredient to this prescription which should have been accepted by this House if the prescription is at all necessary. Certainly, without this ingredient, the right to work and the right of the individual to either join a union or not join a union is fundamental. If we are to keep in this country a system whereby one segment of society, and in this case it is the selfish, greedy racketeer of labor, who says that you cannot work unless you join a union and pay for the right to

work and in some instances they were not even a member of the union, then American liberties and democratic government is in jeopardy. The check-off system and the maintenance of membership established in war plants should not be tolerated. The lack of this ingredient in the prescription that Congress is writing will certainly cause some trouble in the near future.

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] offered an important ingredient to the prescription. The House rejected this suggestion. He was offering some fundamental truths and ideas which would help make our body politic a much stronger and healthier individual.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] offered a substitute which, in my opinion, is the right prescription to make this giant of production, America, a strong, active producing organism which will meet all the requirements of the military in the American way. Some have stated that the substitute bill is a mouth without teeth. It is my firm belief that the teeth in the so-called May bill may well hinder and keep the patient from recovering.

I am just as certain as I am standing here today that if labor, management, industry, and agriculture would receive the proper appeal through an evangelistic selling, much like we sell our war bonds, that there is a great need for additional labor that these four giants of this country would arise and meet the emergency without the compulsion, the jail sentences, and the fines which are being inserted in the May bill.

There are other things that our Government and Congress should do and I enumerate them as follows: We should eliminate the waste of manpower existing in so many of our factories. The Mead committee put their finger upon one institution wasting manpower and there are many more doing the same thing. I have received a number of letters from individuals who quit war plants because they were not permitted to do a full day's work. Some of these patriotic men and women said there were four or five people for every full-time job.

A system prevalent in many factories of limited production should not be tolerated. The military released some 4,000 men from the Army who knew something about the making of rubber, truck tires, and so forth. Recently, one of these men told me that he could produce in 4 hours the work assigned to him for 8 hours. That condition should not be permitted. Men should be encouraged to produce all they can in the critical industries. No slow-down or feather-bedding of production in these critical areas should find a place in American industry during these critical wartimes.

The cost-plus contract has been one reason that industry has hoarded labor. It has been impossible for industry to know what demands might be made by the Government so it is only natural they would keep additional workers on hand.

The Government should lengthen the day of labor in the critical plants from 2, 4, or 6 hours if it need be in order to produce results. The average week of labor

in this country is less than 46 hours in all of our war plants. Labor in our allied nations averages from 60 to 70 hours. The soldier fighting our battles is kept constantly many hours in the trenches when it is necessary. The farmers of this country are averaging more than 70 hours a week producing the necessary food and fiber needed by the world. Is there any reason why the hours of labor could not be extended, particularly in the plants where known shortages of material now exist? This ingredient has not been added to the prescription being offered to the country.

There is no question but what there are many nonessential activities besides horse racing which are permitted to continue. Why are not some of these activities eliminated?

The evidence submitted to this House indicates that in some areas there are thousands unemployed and drawing unemployment compensation insurance. Would it not be reasonable to try and get a better distribution of workers before this legislation is enacted into law? Does any Member of this House feel that forcing more individuals into war plants when we have the cost plus, the limited production, and the improper distribution of workers in effect, will remedy or help cure the patient? It may well add to the difficulties of the Nation.

There are many Members who will vote for this work-or-jail bill. They do it not because they like the prescription but because some of our military leaders have said that it was necessary. In this connection, let me point out to the House that the generals in the war are not only conducting the activity in the war theaters, but are controlling the domestic economy as well. They have wanted this power for a long time. They control the War Production Board, the O. D. T., and other vital governmental agencies. I question the wisdom of this House permitting the generals to direct the domestic economy. It is their job to fight the war. They should leave the production job and all of its ramifications to the captains of labor and industry who know how the job should be done. If this Congress passes the May bill they are ignoring the experts and generals on the home front who know production and labor problems. If we continue to let the inexperienced generals guide domestic economy, we can only find further chaos and needless regimentation at home.

Yes; the Members of the House feel that some legislation should be passed. They are voting for the bill, knowing that the other body may well present a more rational prescription to the country. The conference committee may then be able to work out something which would be more effective than the one now under consideration.

It may well be that the progress on the eastern and western fronts will soon find this war in its final stages. It may soon be shown that labor, management, and industry has outrun the expectations of the country and supplied all the implements of war required by the generals. This legislation will then not be necessary.

There has been much emotional appeal in this Chamber and not enough light on the problem before us. We have heard that there was a shortage of ammunition which permitted the breakthrough on the bulge. A careful analysis does not indicate that this was a fact. Were we not surprised by the enemy? Did we not have fewer men and less equipment at this particular point? Was it not a matter of distribution of war equipment and ammunition? Did not our American soldiers, when this ammunition and equipment was properly distributed, push back the finest panzer divisions that Germany had to offer? Was it not done at a 4 to 1 loss to the Germans? Does anyone in this House think that this was done with broomsticks or clubs? This was accomplished with tanks, gun, armor piercing shells, and the courage of our soldiers. It was not from a lack of ammunition and fighting equipment.

I am fearful that the Members of the House have been unduly influenced by the military leaders. As a physician, I cannot concur and prescribe a prescription which does not cure the patient. Yes; which may even make that patient worse and leave unhealed the many sores created by the mistakes of the military and evils existing in our war plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, during an experience of more than two decades in public life I have learned that one of the safest guides for official action is the old maxim: "Be sure of your facts, then go ahead."

I have listened carefully to the debates on the pending bill, H. R. 1752. From these debates I have gleaned the following facts:

First. The President of the United States did not ask for the pending bill, nor has he specifically endorsed this measure.

Second. Neither General Marshall nor Admiral King has asked for the passage of the pending bill.

Third. Neither the War Production Board nor the War Manpower Commission has asked for the passage of the present bill. Instead, official spokesmen for the Manpower Commission have definitely stated that they did not believe that this bill would solve the problem of speeding up production of critical war matériel.

Fourth. The president of the American Federation of Labor, the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the president of the National Association of Manufacturers have repeatedly stated that they did not believe that the bill under consideration would speed up war production or give to our armed forces the additional munitions and other military supplies which they so urgently need to press the war to a successful conclusion.

Fifth. The pending bill will permit the use of conscript labor in privately owned industrial plants for private profit. Such use of conscript labor is repugnant to one of the fundamental concepts of the American way of life and is probably

a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Sixth. In urging Congress to adopt a National Service Act as the most efficient and democratic way of insuring full production for our war requirements, the President said:

In adopting such legislation, it is not necessary to discard the voluntary and cooperative processes which have prevailed up to this time. This cooperation has already produced great results. The contribution of our workers to the war effort has been beyond measure. We must build on the foundations that have already been laid and supplement the measures now in operation, in order to guarantee the production that may be necessary in the critical period that lies ahead.

The President, at the same time, called upon Congress to enact a National Service Act "for the total mobilization of all of our human resources for the prosecution of the war."

The pending bill does not mobilize all of our human resources for the prosecution of the war. It proposes only to conscript labor, and leaves capital free, in many instances, to reap a profit out of the products of this conscript labor.

Mr. Chairman, the men whose genius has accomplished the greatest job of war production in all of the history of the world are not in favor of this bill. They are the experts upon whose judgment Congress should depend in its efforts to increase the marvelous volume of war production which has already been attained. They believe that another approach to this problem would be more effective than the approach proposed by this bill, and they have had proposed substitutes for this measure which they advise us to enact into law immediately.

When the bill to conscript the young manpower of America for military service was passed by Congress in 1940, many of the Members of both Houses of Congress sought to allay the apprehensions of organized labor by repeated statements that one of the primary purposes of this measure for the national defense was to preserve free labor in America. They said, over and over again that Hitler and the other totalitarian dictators of Europe had imposed a slave economy upon their peoples, and that America was going to conscript its young men for military service in order to prevent the possibility of such an economy in this country. There were repeated assurances to labor that if the problem of national defense ever became so grave that it might seem necessary to extend conscription for other purposes than military service, the principle of conscription would be applied to labor and capital alike.

But now the proposal is to make this initial extension of conscription apply to labor alone. What has become of the old argument that labor and capital should be treated alike in any future extension of conscription? Why is it deemed necessary, at this time, to conscript labor alone, and leave capital the only free agent in our national economy?

Mr. Chairman, in common, I am sure, with every Member of Congress, I am willing and eager to vote for any measure

which will assure to the men of America's fighting forces at the earliest possible moment the matériel which they need to bring this war to a speedy and victorious conclusion. But, when I apply the maxim of my legislative experience, "Be sure of the facts, then go ahead," to the pending bill, it does not meet the test. Factual support for the enactment of this specific measure is entirely lacking.

I voted for the substitute measure submitted by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and I shall vote for the substitute proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. Both of these proposed substitutes have the endorsement and the factual support of the leading experts on war production in America. Upon their recommendations and advice I feel that the Congress can confidently rely.

Mr. Chairman, the principal argument I have heard in conversation with Members of this House in favor of the passage of this bill is that we owe it to our boys overseas to give them a psychological lift in their grave task of winning the war. But, Mr. Chairman, if this bill will not do the job of increasing war production, its passage will merely raise a false hope in the hearts of our fighting men. To such a false encouragement I cannot subscribe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said on both sides of this question concerning the effect it will have upon the citizenry that is engaged in the manufacture of war materials and the great demand that the military forces are making upon us to provide ways and means for increasing production. I am not going to take all of the time that has been allotted to me, as short as it is, because I want to give you some pungent facts that I think should have some effect on the vote on H. R. 1752. I am opposed to the bill.

I have here a bulletin issued by the Treasury Department stating that there is put on sale surplus commodities amounting to 161,407 Ford spring leaves that are no longer needed for the war effort.

Another item, 71,225 Chrysler automobile parts. It takes a lot of labor to make that many parts. They are no longer needed. Still we are being told that we need a bill to conscript labor, to produce the very things we are selling to the public for a song. You know how much the public pays for these things at auction.

Another item, 20,998 Diamond T replacement parts, including many accessories necessary in the manufacture and the assembly of automobiles.

Another item, 134,469 hats. That is in the cotton-fabric category.

Another item, 184,503 5-gallon cans. What are we going to put this conscripted labor to work at when, on the other hand, that is only a partial inventory of the tremendous amount of surplus commodities that are now being offered to the public?

Another item, 37,430 5-gallon cans with handles, all equipped and ready to use, but no longer needed for the war effort.

This is only a partial report, a weekly report, if you please, of the tremendous quantities of unnecessary war material that we have produced and are now selling to the public for nothing. Think of those things when you pass this bill which, as has been said here, and I agree, is undoubtedly unconstitutional, because you are putting the civilian population of this country into involuntary servitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks in connection with the Voorhis amendment to those Members of the House who have been or are defenders of labor. I do not address my remarks to those who though having voted for the Smith-Connally bill now seek to justify their opposition to the May bill by pretending a sudden interest in labor. Having voted for the Smith-Connally bill they do not fool anyone by their alleged interest in the rights of American labor.

Page 6 of the Voorhis bill provides an exemption from being required to accept the referral if one is referred to a shop where he is required to join a union. So you have right here in this Voorhis bill practically what we defeated yesterday in the Wadsworth amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have only 3 minutes. The gentleman has made his explanation.

Of course, the gentleman is going to say, "But if he refuses to work in that particular plant to which he is sent, the Commission may send him to another plant." But let us be realistic about this proposition. Unionization is by areas. John Jones is sent to A plant in that area. It is unionized. He comes back and says, "You cannot make me work there; that is unionized. They require me to join a union." So what plant are you going to send him to?

If in that particular area we find thorough unionization, and if the War Manpower Commission and the military authorities state that we need, say, 5,000 men in that area which is in critical need of manpower, what are you accomplishing by this language? You are accomplishing what the Wadsworth amendment would have accomplished. You are bringing about pressure on what? On the union contracts between labor and management, pressure on the closed shop and union contracts between labor and management. Therefore, by this language you are undermining the closed shop and the union shop. Even though the gentleman did not intend it as such, this language is definitely antilabor, and no pro-labor Member can vote for the Voorhis amendment with this language in it.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, consideration of this legislation is certainly making some strange bedfellows. I find that a large group on the right who have always opposed communism are joined

in their support of this bill by the Daily Worker and by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who just addressed the House. I am getting confused a little when I find myself aligned with the C. I. O., and if I did not do some independent thinking of my own I would not know what to do. There is no partisan alinement for there is but one issue. That is, how can we get the greatest production. We who oppose the bill are convinced that free labor will give us greater production than will administration regimented labor.

Here is the gentleman from New York who spoke yesterday from that great city of Brooklyn, who is a spokesman for labor. He said that the passage of this bill 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." The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] tells us that we should vote for a bill which in my opinion imposes a system similar to that of Hitler, destroys the freedom for which our men are fighting. If the generals and admirals will tell us what they want and if the administration will keep its fingers out, the workers and the industrial leaders will give us production.

In addition to the reason I gave the other day for opposing the bill, let me call your attention to this fact. I would not trust this administration to administer civilian business under any circumstances, and I will give you one reason why. This House gave it authority to draft young men. The Congress wrote into the law the Tydings amendment. Then the other day along came the President and said it was more essential that we should draft the young men from the farms than follow the selective-service law. When the head of the Government assumes to disregard a statute I am through granting it additional power. Throughout the country the local draft boards, acting under instructions from General Hershey and the State directors, are taking into the ranks young men off the farms who by the express provisions of the law are exempt from service. That is a strong statement but it is true.

When the President and the selective-service officials and the local boards—and I do not blame the local boards—acting under them will violate the laws passed by Congress and Shanghai farm boys who are exempt, I do not propose to vote for any bill to give them more power. Today I dropped into the hopper a bill which will probably get nowhere but which, if it became a law, would make it the duty of the officers in command when those boys reach the units, when there is proof offered that they have been taken contrary to law, to discharge them and send them home there to stay until they are drafted in a lawful manner. It is about time that the Army authorities and the administration conduct themselves in accordance with the laws which Congress passes. If the officers charged with administering the law can violate it without being called to ac-

count, then we no longer have government by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it had been my purpose not to say anything with reference to this amendment or the May bill, but for the 25 years or so that I have served in this House I have followed a certain procedure with reference to the Constitution and the laws made thereunder. I shall adhere to the philosophy of free labor, free enterprise, whether in war or in peace. There are certain fundamental principles which have made this country great and made it free. We have had many wars and many battles and we have won them. We have won them with free labor, and with free fighting men. I thought before you voted on this bill, if you are not emotional or hysterical under pressure, you might give heed to the words of calm wisdom uttered by one of the founders of the Federal Constitution. In describing the effect of a tyrannical government upon a citizen he said:

A person appears in view—pale, trembling, emaciated, faltering in his steps, not daring to look upwards, but, with marked anxiety, rolling his eager eyes on every side. Who is he? He is the slave of . . . a tyrannical government. He is afraid to act, to speak, or look. He knows that his actions and his words, however guarded, may be construed to be criminal; he knows that even his looks and countenance may be considered as the signs and evidences of treacherous thoughts and treasonable conspiracies; and he knows that the suspicion of his masters, upon any of these points, may be fatal; for he knows, that he is at the mercy of those who, upon the slightest suspicion, may seize or hang him—who may do whatever they please with him, and with all those who are dear to him. What effect must this man's situation produce upon his mind and temper? Can his views be great or exalted? No. Such views, instead of being encouraged, would give offence; and he is well aware what would follow. Can openness and candor beam from his soul? No. Such light would be hateful to his masters; it must be extinguished.

Now I ask you, for what are our boys fighting and dying and becoming maimed and blinded? Is it to set up any such system of totalitarian control or any such tyranny as you find in these bills? You know it is not. It has never entered their minds that they are fighting for any such set-up as this and it is not worthy of Congress to put any such totalitarian bill on the statute books of this country. The virus is too dangerous and too malignant to be introduced into our system of free government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the other evening I had the privilege of listening to the broadcast of a testimonial dinner in New York City. Mr. Kaiser was one of the main speakers at the dinner in honor of Mr. Henry Wallace. The following morning I received this letter from a friend of mine who is working in the Kaiser shipyards at Vancouver, Wash. The letter adds to the confusion not only of the Members of

the House of Representatives but also of labor. I want to read that letter to you:

VANCOUVER, WASH., January 24, 1945.
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: My husband and I have been out here for a couple years working in the Vancouver ship yards. He is still working as a rigger and I was a journeyman electrician. A few days ago they began laying off and when it came my turn I went along with the others. Well and good, if the work is slack and I can truthfully say it had been slack on the outfitting docks where I worked. But when I went down to the United States Employment Office to register for my unemployment insurance, the place had standing room only. Naturally, I thought they were there for the same thing, but when I finally had my turn the man at the desk said they were new hires. In fact, he stated that 1,500 were in from Texas that day and they had to hire them. You can imagine how I felt—after my training and \$53 initiation fee in order to work, and here they were hiring green help.

This is the question in my mind and everyone else right now, is Kaiser getting (shall we say) a rake-off on each new hire or is the union to blame? My union claims they can't do a thing for us, that it is out of their hands.

Every radio program says something about manpower shortage and stay on the job. What is the answer? It's too big for a mere worker, but didn't think it would hurt to let someone know who could probably investigate. The final question in my mind is, will these people be laid off too like I was, and hundreds like me? By the way, my craft was not the only one hit either, but I speak of what I know happened to me and what I found out is taking place here.

Sincerely yours,

A WORKER.

I have read the letter from my friend in the Kaiser shipyards, because it is typical of what has been found to exist in hundreds of large war plants now engaged in the production of war materials under a cost-plus contract system. It has a direct bearing on the legislation before us, in the May bill, which proposed to draft labor for war work at a time when many war plants have tens of thousands of men on the pay roll, who do nothing but draw their pay.

The investigations now being made by the Senate Mead committee, daily disclose that the large war plants operating under the cost-plus contracts, are continuing to hire workers far in excess of actual production needs. Of course, the manufacturer does not care about the expense, because the greater the pay roll, the greater will be the profits.

Furthermore, the Government itself is the greatest hoarder and waster of labor. Out of the 3,500,000 civilian employees on the Government pay roll today, at least 1,000,000 of them could easily be spared for military service or for war work. Instead of demanding the passage of this bill, the Executive Department should do some house cleaning as an example for industry.

Let me also add, that there is no need for this legislation, as the administration now has ample authority to deal with the labor problem to provide the necessary workers for the plants in which additional labor is needed. The Selective Training and Service Act, the Manpower law, and the regulations of the Army

and Navy, give adequate authority to the Executive Department to place all men from 18 to 45 in the armed forces or in essential war work. Why does the administration not do what it should do, instead of coming to Congress demanding the passage of the May bill, which is not satisfactory to anyone?

I am convinced that results will not be secured in production by the use of forced or drafted labor. A patriotic and free American worker will deliver the goods, as he has so splendidly done for more than 3 years of war. Industry says that forced labor will lower production. Organized labor makes the same statement. Both are against the bill to draft labor. They claim that this problem can be solved without the need for legislation which will draft every American worker. If we are to do more drafting, then let us draft everyone, including capital, industry and all persons.

Of course, every Member of this House, and every American want our fighting men to have an abundance of the best fighting equipment, material, and food. There is no difference of opinion on that score, which is evidenced by the record since our country began preparing for war in 1940. There is an honest difference of opinion as to the best method for getting results. I agree with industry and labor that the best results can be secured by voluntary and free labor. In my opinion, the administration bill proposes an un-American policy, which means nothing less than forced or slave labor, directing the imposition of jail sentences and heavy fines against those who are not willing to be moved about the country on the order of some Washington bureaucrat. The administration can now deal with such individuals, without the need for this legislation. They can be put into the Army, which has already been done in many instances. I cast my vote for H. R. 1803, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] which provided for a voluntary method to solve the labor problem. I regret that the House did not adopt this substitute proposal, as I am convinced that the labor-shortage problem in certain areas could have been solved by industry and labor in a voluntary manner.

The May bill will no doubt pass the House today. I hope that when the Senate takes it up for consideration, a voluntary plan will be perfected through cooperative arrangement between Government, industry, and labor, so that maximum production will be promptly secured of all vital war materials and equipment. When such a bill is returned to the House, I will give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall take but a minute. I would like to turn back the pages of history for 1 year. Right in this House when we were considering the soldier-vote bill a year ago General Marshall, the Army and the Navy, and others high in authority, and even a Presidential message, claimed that dire results would follow if we passed the long-ballot bill. The Congress, which has always laid down the great policies of this Nation throughout its existence, failed to be deterred by

propaganda, and we passed the long-ballot bill. Yesterday Secretary of War Stimson gave out a statement that the soldiers had preferred the long ballot to the extent of over 2,000,000 of them using it. Only about 100,000 or a little more used the short ballots. In other words, we were right 99½ percent. About one-half of 1 percent of the soldiers backed up the judgment of the Commander in Chief and those people on the floor of the House who thought we were going to lose the war unless we gave the soldiers an opportunity to vote the bob-tail ballot.

Now, we have about such a situation here today. There was a statement made yesterday that the Barrett bill was only a pious hope. The same thing was said last year when we were considering the soldier-vote legislation, that it was only a pious hope that the Governors of the various States would call their legislatures into session to implement their laws and put them in line with the pattern of national legislation that we were about to lay down. So I think the Congress has a precedent to take matters into its own hands and not be too greatly influenced by such a parade of witnesses. This Congress cannot increase production by the passage of the May bill. This Congress should not hazard the passage of such a bill, which may greatly slow down production rather than increase it. Referring again to the soldier-vote bill, I want to insert this editorial from the Evening Star:

THE SOLDIER BALLOTS

Secretary Stimson's report on the use of absentee ballots by service men and women, while expressing dissatisfaction with some complexities of the present law, indicates that the President was very wide of the mark when, a year ago, he told Congress that the soldier vote bill was a "fraud" on our fighting men and on the American people.

Severely criticizing the State ballots and the voting procedure set up in 1942, Mr. Roosevelt said it would be no less difficult for soldiers to vote under the 1944 law. Perhaps he was right, but the fact is that, difficult or not, about 2,800,000 service ballots were cast in the 1944 Presidential race. In 1942 the service vote was negligible, some estimates placing it at less than one-half of 1 percent of those eligible to vote.

Mr. Stimson said that he had no "authentic" figures for the total number of State absentee ballots and Federal ballots cast last year. It is interesting to note his assertion, however, that in 10 States which approved the Federal ballot and reported to the Army, 28,136, or 2.2 percent, of the eligible persons used the Federal ballot, while 446,974, or 34.6 percent, used the State absentee ballots.

That would indicate that the State ballots were not as objectionable to the troops as some of the pre-election partisans would have had the country believe. No doubt these partisans were convinced that the service vote would be preponderantly for the President (it was about 3 to 2 in his favor) and feared that any difficulty in voting might prejudice his election. Now that the campaign is over and the verdict in, their more extreme complaints against the voting law can be dismissed. Some valid criticisms remain, however, as indicated by Mr. Stimson, and appropriate steps should be taken to meet them before 1946, in the unhappy event that we should still be at war when the elections of that year are held.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I do not for a moment question the sincerity of purpose of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. However, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs in the House I respectfully urge that the House do not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

After careful consideration, the House Committee on Military Affairs rejected a proposed amendment which would have taken the authority out of the selective service local boards and would have permitted the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to place that authority in Governor McNutt, the U. S. E. S., or any Executive-order agency, or other agency of his choice. The committee was informed by proponents of that amendment that it was intended to delegate that authority to Mr. McNutt and the U. S. E. S., if that amendment were adopted. For that reason, the committee members rejected that proposed amendment. They wanted to be sure that the uncompensated members of the selective service local boards would be the ones to make the vital decisions that would be involved. They did not want to have anyone else or any other persons given that authority. According to the newspapers, that same amendment is being urged upon the Senate committee. I feel confident that when the Senate committee looks into the matter it will come to the same conclusions and will react the same way the House committee has reacted.

I respectfully urge you to give this question your best consideration. I do not see how we can possibly do anything but make a czar or dictator out of War Manpower Commissioner McNutt should the amendment offered by the gentleman from California carry.

Mr. McNutt has been War Manpower Commissioner for the past several years and yet at this very time we necessarily must pass some type of legislation, as the May bill, so that we can bring order out of chaos in the labor field of which he has charge. For years I have consistently voted against granting additional power to any bureaucrat and I am not going to start now. Over 6,000 draft boards in this country have, as a whole, done a splendid job and I feel they can and will conscientiously administer this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any way in which we could mess up our manpower situation worse than to give more authority to the Manpower Commission and Paul McNutt, the greatest failure in this administration; still it is proposed that we now turn over to him the recruiting of the labor for our war plants.

Personally I do not believe there would be a shortage of manpower if they were properly organized and if some of those who claim to represent labor would urge their people to full performance rather than try to create watching jobs. But I do believe it is necessary at this time

when we make a move that we put it in the hands of people who have been found somewhat trustworthy. Frankly, I would rather trust the local selective service draft boards than I would Paul McNutt considering the manpower picture we have had to look at for so long, the bungling and the damage they have done to the war effort.

I shall not vote for this amendment.

I shall, unless damaging amendments are offered, feel obliged to support the bill that has been offered by the committee, because I believe that if it is properly administered and those in charge of the local draft boards do their very best to be fair and square they can do it without damage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss for a very brief period the so-called Voorhis amendment.

From the very beginning of this discussion, which has now lasted for nearly 2½ years, I have been thoroughly convinced that if we were ever to employ the element of compulsion upon any citizen of the United States, be it for military or industrial service, we should leave the administration of it close to the people and keep it close to the people rather than centralize it in Washington or even, indeed, centralize it in bureaucratic headquarters in the several areas in the country. From the very beginning I have insisted that if we were to legislate on this subject at all we should and must take advantage of the Selective Service System with its 6,500 local draft boards composed of people who live in the community in which the potential soldier or worker lives, who know that man, know his family, how he lives, how he has lived for years, what his skills are. They have a complete record of them all. I have believed that any final decision that is made must be made by those men of the draft boards who are his neighbors and who know all about him. By contrast, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California removes that function of selection—and the element of selection must enter into these things—completely away from the local draft boards and entrusts it to a bureaucratic organization headed by an official in the city of Washington and proposes to clothe that organization, the War Manpower Commission, with power practically to govern the economy of the United States. It may go into any plant in the country and tell it what to do. It may tell the people discharged from those plants that they must in turn go to another bureaucratic organization—the Employment Service—and there be told where to work. If for some reason they do not go to work, what happens to them? Is there any appeal in the proposed amendment to a committee of the man's neighbors? None whatsoever. The appeal is to a kangaroo court established within the bureaucracy, and if that court decrees against this man, he is not permitted to be employed by anybody in the United States except on a farm. Literally that is what you are coming to if you adopt an amendment

of this sort. It is bureaucracy to the nth degree, and I make an appeal to the men on our side of the aisle, who time and time again in the last 12 years have begged and implored for a restriction upon the growth of bureaucracy in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues, with whom I have worked for 14 years, will not put me down either as an associate or supporter of Earl Browder. I was fighting Earl Browder and his beliefs before Pearl Harbor, and I have been fighting his beliefs since Pearl Harbor.

For the benefit of my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], who loves the farmers like I love them, I want to read a telegram which I received from one of his neighbors across in Minnesota. This telegram is addressed to me and reads as follows:

Please pass your bill at once. I am 72 years old and tired trying to run a 50-cow farm when a lot of men will neither work in essential industry or fight.

W. F. SCHILLING.

Mr. Chairman, that is the result of the work of the Manpower Commission, and when these gentlemen talk about the mess in the shipyards and in the plants up and down the Pacific coast and all around the eastern seaboard, I ask them, Who has had control of civilian labor for the last 3 years? The War Manpower Commission. It is the agency that has given you the mess that has been referred to so often in this debate. The Selective Service Bureau up to this time has had nothing to do with anything except military necessities, in manpower. Now, for the first time, we are allowing them to invade the field of private employment.

I wonder if the gentleman here who said that the American Legion had favored national-service legislation knows what they favor now? Here is a telegram I received yesterday:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 31, 1945.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,

New House Office Building:

Since the inception of the American Legion we recommended enactment of a Universal Service Act to conscript all resources of this Nation in time of war. More recently we urged enactment of the Austin-Wadsworth bill as part of such universal service law. While pending May bill does not accomplish complete universal service or complete national service, the American Legion urges passage by the House of such May bill. The leaders of our armed forces have informed the Nation that such a law is necessary to support our fighting men at the battle fronts. Therefore, we respectfully urge the enactment of H. R. 1752 without amendment.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative
Committee, the American Legion.

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

Mr. MAY. Not just now. I have only 5 minutes. That telegram was from the legislative representative of the American Legion.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman would yield.

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I want it to be fully understood by the Members of the House that the American Legion has not had a national convention since this bill has been proposed. That telegram, in my estimation, is not the consensus of opinion of the veterans of the last war.

Mr. MAY. Maybe the gentleman does not know as much about that as the representative of the organization here in Washington, who is their legislative liaison officer.

If we have a mess in the industries of this country on the labor question, the War Manpower Commission that has had absolute domination of it for the last 3 years is responsible for it. If the Democrats on this side of the House—and I am calling you Democrats—and if the Republicans on this side of the House have gotten square away from the old centralized idea of Alexander Hamilton and have gotten around to a complete endorsement of local self-government much more so than we have, are you going to vote now, when you have the question presented clearly to you, to take it out of the hands of the local people in the local communities, in 6,500 of them in this country, and centralize it under the domination of one dictator in Washington in a Federal agency set up by statute? Let us preserve the principle of local self-government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. [Mr. Voorhis].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Voorhis of California) there were—ayes 71, noes 205.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEWART: On pages 4 and 5 strike out lines 22, 23, 24, and 25, on page 4, all after "scribe", and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 5, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "to such agencies as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may designate for such purposes, for referral to employment in the plants, facilities, and farms specified in the certification and to accept the work to which he is so referred within the specified time. It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith. Such order shall be subject to appeal in accordance with such regulations as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may prescribe. Registrants so referred shall be given a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to go into a lengthy discussion. This amendment is understood, I am sure, by every Member of Congress. I think under its present provisions the May bill creates a new agency and which will be too cumbersome. It would cost too many billions of dollars to create this new agency to handle the manpower situation and junk the agency that now has the control of manpower especially during these trying times.

This amendment was in substance placed in the May bill while in committee and was later stricken. I am sure you all agree that the War Manpower Commission is the only agency of the Government that has the machinery to put these people to work.

They speak of the local selective-service boards. The local selective-service boards have done an excellent job and should receive compensation if they are to replace high paid officials and not have to continue to give from twice to possibly many more times of their time they are now giving. I am sure they would do an honest job if the new agency would give traveling expenses to the 6,500 local selective-service boards of America to where they could investigate and make a study of the various war activities and plants throughout the country.

Of course the War Manpower Commission has made mistakes. We have all made them, and we are going to make many more mistakes before this war is over; we have made more than one mistake, the greatest of which was the failure of the adoption of the Wadsworth amendment.

I wish to call to your attention on a straight-out issue without a lot of conversation and a lot of talk, that the War Manpower Commission is far better prepared than the selective-service boards are at this time or will be a year from now after spending millions of dollars.

We have done our duty as we see it, we have supported the Wadsworth amendment and several other amendments to make this a better bill. We are unalterably opposed to the provision that leaves open the question of forcing an unorganized worker to join a union and shall support any and all amendments that proposes to cure this evil.

Under the circumstances that our leaders of the armed forces advise the passage of this bill will shorten the war, I shall support it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I have heard a lot of discussion here today, some of it very difficult to understand in view of the sources from which it has come on both sides of the aisle. I do not say that with any intention of assailing anyone, but this legislation has certainly caused some strange bedfellows. It is not partisan. There is a division on both sides of the aisle.

I think the Committee on Military Affairs has labored long and earnestly to follow the recommendations of the President. I have supported labor on every vote since I have been in this House. When the President of the United States says to me that this is a recommendation of his that is necessary for the war program, I find it difficult not to accept his recommendation. I want to vote for some kind of legislation that will give him what he says is necessary for the winning of the war.

The May bill is still the legislation we are considering because all substitute amendments have so far been defeated. I think, though, that it can be improved. I do not think the local selective-service boards are equipped well enough to handle the work and the terrific task which would be imposed upon them by this legislation. I know that in the big industrial districts they just will not be able to function, they will break down,

and chaos may result if we do not place the administration of this program in the hands of an agency which has been set up and established for it.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma and the others which he will offer to follow it will improve the May bill. It will take the administration of it from the hands of those who are not equipped to carry out the provisions of the bill and put it in the hands of an agency which has the personnel and the machinery that is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will give thoughtful and earnest consideration to the proposal of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. May].

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, quite often in legal practice we find cases before the court in which counsel speak quite a bit about the law and very little about the facts. When they have a good case they talk about the facts. I would like to ask the chairman and members of the committee two or three questions to get some facts and clear up some doubts in my mind. First, how many additional Federal employees will this bill call into employment?

Mr. MAY. I would say that if it calls any in there will be very few for the reason we provide in the bill that it shall be administered by the Selective Service Bureau which already has an organization of 6,500 local boards and a headquarters here in Washington. In addition to that the bill provides they shall call upon the War Manpower Commission and on the War Mobilization Director for advice and information relative to any individual employed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That brings up the next question. Where will the advisers for the 6,500 local boards come from? Are they available now?

Mr. MAY. They have their advisers in the set-up. But they are also to call upon the local U. S. E. S. or any other agency of government for any additional information which they do not have.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We now have this picture of these local draft boards who have done a magnificent job, and I saw what they did as an appeal agent for nearly 3 years. These men have worked tirelessly day and night, week in and week out, without pay. Many of them have already died from overwork on the draft boards and many of them by their exertions have had their lives shortened. In most of these offices they have a chief clerk and two or three stenographers. Will there be more persons needed in each one of those offices to give these local boards more help to do this job which is an added burden upon the three-man board—the extent of which cannot be foretold?

Mr. MAY. I am of the opinion they will not need any further clerical as-

sistance or any other kind of additional personnel, but if they do the gentleman of course knows that the Congress should give them whatever they have to have in order to carry out the war program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Then another problem arises. In many of these counties—and these are practical problems which you are going to have to face—there may be five boards in one county. That county will have within it men who are working in a war plant in an adjoining county. What is the machinery of getting the information that you want these boards to have to determine when the call will be made, how it is going to be gathered and made available, what men will be affected, and how are the orders to be imposed upon those men to be drafted?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. One of the provisions of this bill provides that the War Manpower Commission and other governmental bureaus may appoint to each selective service board experts in an advisory capacity to assist them with its problems.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is exactly what I am asking about. Do you have these 6,275 experts to appoint to these boards? And secondly, will they be mere advisers or will they tell the boards what to do?

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

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

Mr. SHORT. We have a shortage of manpower and we are going to get some more men to travel to each local board to tell them what to do.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is one of the doubts I had in my mind; that is what I was trying to clear up.

Mr. Chairman, other questions arise to which lack of time prevents full answer.

For instance, what type of manpower is needed, in what plants, in what localities?

Will this measure prevent draining labor to one area from another where it is also needed?

Will this legislation bring about production or will it produce more confusion in the field of labor and production?

And last, but by no means least, Is this legislation constitutional? Does it not border upon the very totalitarian control that we are fighting against on many foreign fronts?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEWART) there were—ayes 33, noes 175.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEELAN: Strike out section 1 and insert the following as a substitute for the bill:

"That section 2 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every citizen of the United States, and of every other person residing in the United States, who, on

the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 45, to present himself or herself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder."

"SEC. 2. Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"The President may, in his discretion, whenever, in his opinion, the successful prosecution of the war so requires, take possession on behalf of the United States, of any or—

"(1) All manufacturing and production facilities in the United States;

"(2) All transportation and communication facilities in the United States;

"(3) All facilities in the United States for the wholesale or retail distribution of articles or commodities;

"(4) All banks and other financial institutions and facilities in the United States;

"(5) All mines and other natural resources in the United States;

"(6) All farms in the United States engaged in the production of agricultural commodities for market;

"(7) All other facilities in the United States used in, or in connection with, any trade or business; and use and operate such properties, through such agencies of the Government as he may designate, in the interests of the war effort and in the interests of the civilian economy during the present war. In designating the Government agencies to operate such properties, the President shall, so far as practicable, designate as the agency to operate any particular class of property, that agency whose responsibilities are most closely connected with properties of such class (as, for example, the Department of the Treasury with financial institutions, the Department of Agriculture with farms, the Department of the Interior with mines and certain natural resources, etc.). The compensation to be paid for the use of property of which possession is taken by the United States under this paragraph shall be fair and just."

"Sec. 3. Section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(n) (1) Every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not a member of the land or naval forces on active duty and is not exempted or deferred from training and service therein by section 5 (c) (1) or (d) shall be liable to perform work in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort whether or not such registrant is also liable for training and service in the land or naval forces. For the purposes of this subsection, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him, shall from time to time by regulations designate, and certify to the Director of Selective Service, the plants and facilities, and the activities therein, in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, and the farms and agricultural occupations and endeavors essential to the war effort. In making such designations, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may make classifications on the basis of geographical areas, types of activities, types of occupations within activities, and types of plants, facilities, and farms, and also on the basis of the relative importance of each.

"(2) A registrant liable to perform such work who is now or hereafter employed by an employer, or now or hereafter self-employed, in an activity or agricultural occupation or endeavor which is so certified shall have a duty not to voluntarily discontinue such em-

ployment unless the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him (subject to appeal in such manner as such Director shall by regulations prescribe), has determined that it is in the best interest of the war effort that he or she leave such employment, or unless such registrant has been requested to volunteer for, or has been ordered to, other employment pursuant to paragraph (4).

"(3) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall from time to time (after consultation with the appropriate representatives of management, labor, agriculture, and Government) certify or cause to be certified to the Director of Selective Service the extent to which, in the various areas, the plants, facilities, and farms described in paragraph (1) are unable, through the operation of paragraph (2) and by voluntary recruiting by management, labor, agriculture, and Government, to meet their manpower requirements in the activities, occupations, and endeavors so described.

"(4) Upon receiving such a certification for a particular area, the Director of Selective Service—

"(A) shall designate the categories (by age and other status) of registrants who are liable to perform work under paragraph (1) from which registrants capable of performing the work involved shall be called before calls are made from other categories of such registrants. In designating such categories the Director shall first designate categories which include registrants who are, by reason of their age and other status, the type of registrants he deems can transfer to such work with the least disruption to the war war effort and the civilian economy and to themselves in comparison with registrants in other categories, and may exclude, or by regulations provide for the exclusion, from any category so designated, of those types of veterans (discharged or released from active duty in the land or naval forces under conditions not dishonorable) whose exclusion from such category the Director deems fair and equitable;

"(B) shall direct the local boards in such area, and also local boards outside the area to the extent that he may deem necessary, to request their registrants within the categories so designated to report, within a time fixed by the Director of Selective Service, to such agencies as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may designate, for referral to employment in the activities, occupations, and endeavors covered by the certification;

"(C) if the requirements of the certification have not been met under subparagraph (B) within the time fixed, shall direct the local boards in such area, and also local boards outside the area to the extent that he may deem necessary, to order (subject to regulations prescribed by him) registrants within the categories so designated and capable of performing the work involved (in numbers sufficient to meet the requirements of the certification) to report, within such time as the Director of Selective Service may prescribe, to such agencies as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may designate, for referral by such agencies to employment in the activities, occupations, and endeavors specified in the certification and to enter upon the employment to which so referred when accepted therefor. Such orders shall be subject to appeal in such manner as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe. It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith.

"(5) It shall be the duty of an employer to whom a registrant is referred under paragraph (4) (B) or (C) to accept such registrant for employment.

"(6) Nothing in this subsection shall affect the powers under other provisions of

this act with respect to the classification and selection of persons for, or the induction, or deferment from induction, of persons into the land or naval forces; or preclude the Selective Service System from classifying and selecting for induction any registrant who violates a duty imposed upon him by this subsection or preclude the land or naval forces from inducting such a registrant."

"Sec. 4. (a) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (C) thereof a new sentence reading as follows: 'If such position is in an activity, occupation, or endeavor not designated by the appropriate Government agency as being in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, and if—

"(i) such person, within 90 days after being relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization (whether before, on, or after the date upon which this sentence takes effect), becomes employed in an activity which is so designated; and

"(ii) such person continues to be employed in an activity which is so designated until (a) section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (disregarding any period not exceeding 15 days between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment), or (b) he has secured a determination by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him (subject to appeal in such manner as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, whichever is the earlier;

the period beginning with the date upon which he first becomes employed in an activity, occupation, or endeavor which is so designated and ending with the date on which section 5 (i) ceases to be operative, or with the date of such determination, whichever is the earlier, shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made."

"(b) Section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(j) Any registrant—

"(1) who becomes employed as a result of a request or order under section 5 (n) (4); and

"(2) with respect to whom it has been determined under section 5 (n) (if such subsection is still operative) that it is no longer necessary for him or her to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort;

shall be entitled, in respect of the position left by him or her in order to become so employed, to the benefits of subsections (b), (c), (e), and (g) of this section to the same extent as if he or she had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which the determination provided for in paragraph (2) is made (or on the day on which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, if he or she is still in any such employment on such day and no such determination has been made), and had been given the certificate referred to in subsection (a)."

"Sec. 5. Section 10 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof two new subsections reading as follows:

"(f) A person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment under section 5 (n) (4)

shall receive the same travel, and subsistence during such travel, which he or she would receive if the request (in the case of a volunteer) or order (in other cases) constituted an order to report for induction at the place of such employment; and on or after the date of a determination under section 5 (n) (2) that it is no longer necessary for him or her to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or on or after the date upon which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (if he or she is employed in such an activity on such date), or on or after the date of this or her being involuntarily separated from such employment, he or she shall receive similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he or she was first allowed travel under this subsection (or, at his or her election, to his or her home if that is not farther distant), if application is made therefor within 30 days after such date.

"(g) A person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment under section 5 (n) (4), shall be paid with respect to such employment compensation at a rate which will result in such person's receiving for each workweek of such employment at least as much as he or she was receiving for any workweek (designated by him or her) of his or her last previous employment which was not an employment entered upon pursuant to a request or order under section 5 (n) (4), and in addition (if the employment for which he or she volunteered, or to which he or she was ordered, does not permit him or her to live at his or her home) shall be furnished with living quarters, or be paid in lieu thereof such reasonable allowance for living quarters as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe."

"Sec. 6. Section 11 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: 'No individual shall be subject to the penalties of this section for having violated any duty imposed by section 5 (a), except for willful violations thereof, and—

"(a) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (2), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he or she made application for a determination described in section 5 (n) (2), and (2) that the denial of such application was not based on a fair consideration of his or her application; and it shall also be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to establish a determination by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him (which shall be subject to appeal in such manner as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe) that he or she had a justifiable reason for not complying with such duty;

"(b) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (4), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he or she made timely application for revocation or modification of the order under section 5 (n) (4), and (2) that the denial of the revocation or modification requested was not based on a fair consideration of his or her application."

"Sec. 7. Section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting '5 (n),' after '3 (d),' and by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: 'The provisions of section 5 (n) shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose.' As used in this section the term 'date of the termination of

hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is the earlier.

"Sec. 8. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 107 a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 108. The benefits of this act shall extend to a person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment pursuant to section 5 (n) (4) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if—

"(a) the application for such employment constituted an order to report for induction into the land or naval forces;

"(b) such employment constituted military service;

"(c) entering upon such employment constituted induction into the land or naval forces; and

"(d) the period beginning with the date of entering upon such employment and ending with either (1) the date on which such section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, or (2) the date of a determination under such section 5 (n) that it is no longer necessary for him or her to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or (3) the date on which he or she violates a duty imposed by paragraph (2) of such section 5 (n), whichever of such dates occurs first, constituted the period of military service.

For the purposes of this section the period during which the relief and benefits provided in section 106 are to be in effect shall in no event extend beyond 30 days from the date of making application for employment."

Mr. MAY. I desire to make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAY. I do not care to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Connecticut on the point of order.

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for our consideration a bill which is termed a limited conscription or national-service bill. Statements have been made on the floor that this is a total war and that we must face it with total measures. However, we have under consideration an act which will only conscript labor. I propose in a permissive sense, to permit, if and when the President of the United States in his discretion says that it requires such action, to take over and operate for the common good, any facility of the United States. If that is not germane to the bill under discussion, then I do not know what national-service legislation is.

Mr. Chairman, evidently acting upon the advice and suggestion of the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, the President of the United States has called our attention to a condition existing in our civilian productive effort of war materials which has resulted in what has been subsequently termed "spot shortages" and "spot surpluses" of manpower.

To correct this condition, the President has recommended and the Military Affairs Committee has favorably reported out a bill which would compel employment on the part of all eligible registrants between the ages of 18 and 45 in an industry essential to the war effort.

On January 11, 1944, more than 1 year ago, the President also, at the suggestion of the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, suggested a similar law, but at that time he tied his request in with a mandate that the Congress enact a realistic tax law, the continuation of the Renegotiation Act, a cost-of-food law, and the continuation of the stabilization statute of 1942. All of the President's wishes in these respects were not adhered to, and for that reason no national-service legislation was enacted at that time.

While it is contended that the Federal Government now has the power to draft capital and property, you all know this is a very moot question. As a matter of fact, several cases on this subject are now pending in the courts. While I am willing to subscribe to the advice and counsel of our military leaders as far as our military requirements are concerned, I do not agree that they are the best judges as to how these requirements may be met insofar as our civilian population is concerned. I suggest, therefore, that we not approach this problem on a piecemeal basis but on a plane which would make the sacrifices necessary for the winning of this war somewhere near equal. That is what the amendment I have offered hopes to accomplish. The enactment into law of this amendment would grant permissive powers to the President in those instances where he felt the successful prosecution of the war would require it to take over any property or resource of the Nation and cause such property or resource to be operated for the common good, just compensation being paid therefor.

The amendment would also provide, as does the present bill, for selection of registrants by the Selective Service but assignments to essential plants by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Director. It also contains provisions for reimbursement for expenses of living quarters for those people who are ordered or who volunteer and are accepted, to perform work in a place which would make it impossible for them to live at home, and a provision that employers must accept employees under the same conditions and subject to the same penalties as employees who are ordered to perform work would be subject to if they failed to comply.

I think the amendment, which I have offered, is a fairer, more just approach to this difficult problem, and it will preclude the necessity for any other compulsory measures in this fast-changing war picture, the Directors of which say they are unable to prophesy, with any degree of accuracy as to what their needs will be for any great length of time in advance.

We also have pending before the Congress a bill which would, if passed, give our Selective Service boards the power

to draft nurses. Here again we are singling out one segment of our population and imposing a restriction upon them, not shared by others. This proposed amendment, as you will note, provides for the registration of both men and women between the ages of 18 and 45, so that if, when and where their services become necessary to the war effort, they may be so assigned.

While I still am unconvinced that there is a need for this type of legislation at this time, if we must have it, let us make our sacrifices equal; that is the American way.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment prevails.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEELAN] offers to the pending bill a rather voluminous amendment, comprehensive in its nature. The amendment undertakes to confer upon the President the power to conscript all manufacturing and production facilities in the United States, all transportation and communication facilities in the United States, all facilities in the United States for the wholesale or retail distribution of articles or commodities, all banks and other financial institutions and facilities in the United States, and so forth and so forth.

It is much broader, much more comprehensive and far beyond the scope of the bill presently before the committee, H. R. 1752, which is very definite, specific, and restrictive in its nature.

The Chair does not believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is germane to the bill and sustains the point of order.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House while I make a brief statement with respect to my views on the pending bill.

I frankly state that I do not like the bill. In our industrial-labor relations, I am against coercion and force. I have always believed that industry should be free. I still do. I have always believed in free labor. I still do. Our traditional policy of keeping labor and industry free has worked. It has worked so well that our production record during the war is nothing short of miraculous.

With respect to labor I have no delusions as to the coercive features in the bill. When you freeze a man to his job under penalty that if he leaves the job he will be fined or imprisoned, you are using coercion. When you say to a man who is not working, "get a job"—when you say to a man who is working, "I am not satisfied with the kind of work you are doing, and if you do not change jobs and secure one in an industry that I consider to be essential to the war effort, pay a fine or go to jail," you are using coercion.

Coercion is not the American way, nor is it, in my opinion, the way to increase the production of those things essential

to our war effort. It would be much better, it seems to me, for management, labor, and agriculture to get together and work our labor problems out in the traditional American way. Had this been unsuccessfully tried, I would be among the first to advocate coercion or force or any other means thought necessary to bring forth the men needed to produce the implements of war and the food and fiber necessary to supply our fighting men.

What am I going to do? I am going to do what I think every other Representative should do with a clear conscience—I am going to vote for the pending bill. And I have reasons that satisfy me in laying aside my own views and voting for the pending bill.

In the first place, our Commander in Chief and the heads of the Army and Navy, as shown by the committee hearings, are demanding the passage of this bill. This being true, what else is there left for me to do? Prior to Pearl Harbor, and since, I have backed up by my vote every war effort, and to this policy I shall unswervingly adhere. I have confidence in the men in charge of our war effort. That confidence is justified by the results that they have accomplished so far. While, as I have frankly stated, I have misgivings as to the effectiveness of the bill under consideration, those in charge of the war effort, and in whom I have confidence, have asked for it, and I shall comply with their wishes by voting to give them the legislation for which they have asked. These men know a great deal more about the war effort than I. They have, so far, directed it in such a way as to produce results, and results are what I am looking for. I am willing, until we get through with the war, to surrender any preconceived ideas I may have as to manpower and production, to the opinion, judgment, and wishes of those in authority. In war we have to place men in authority to direct. There is no other way to successfully prosecute a war. Having placed them in authority to direct, my duty, as I see it, is to follow and carry out, as far as I can, their directives. The old kitchen philosophy, "Too many cooks spoil the broth," is a pretty good philosophy to follow in time of war.

Another reason: It has gone forth that those directing our war effort want the legislation we are now considering. Our fighting men know this, and are expecting us here on the home front to back up our war leaders just as they are backing them up on the battle front. If it goes forth that we have turned our war leaders down, what effect will it have upon our fighting men? It will, I am afraid, to say the least, lower their morale. Our fighting men are not going to take time to debate and quibble over coercion, force, and this, that, and the other. If this bill is defeated, they are going to assume that there is something wrong, radically wrong, here on the home front; that Congress is not backing up the war effort in the way it should; and that, in all probability, because there is a fight going on between Congress and the war leadership, their chances of bringing the

war to a speedy conclusion will be lessened. We cannot let this happen.

Then, too, our failure to back up our war leaders will be used by the Nazi propagandist in an effective way, in such a way, I am afraid, that will strengthen the morale of the German people. And we cannot let this happen.

The agitation of this legislation has already had a wholesome effect. I am in hopes that the effects of the passage of the bill will be such that none of its harsh provisions will ever have to be put into effect.

In closing, let me express the hope that before this legislation reaches the Senate that those in charge of our war effort will give further thought to our manpower situation. If they do, I believe they will advocate, in principle, the provisions of what is known as the Voorhis amendment which, I am persuaded, is the correct approach to the manpower problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (C) thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "If such position is in an activity, occupation, or endeavor not designated by the appropriate Government agency as being in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, and if—

"(i) such person, within 90 days after being relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization (whether before, on, or after the date upon which this sentence takes effect), becomes employed in an activity which is so designated; and

"(ii) such person continues to be employed in an activity which is so designated until (a) section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (disregarding any period not exceeding 15 days between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment), or (b) he has secured a determination by his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, whichever is the earlier; the period beginning with the date upon which he first becomes employed in an activity, occupation, or endeavor which is so designated and ending with the date on which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, or with the date of such determination by his selective-service local board, whichever is the earlier, shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made."

(b) Section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(j) Any registrant—

"(1) who becomes employed as a result of a request or order under section 5 (n) (4); and

"(2) with respect to whom it has been determined under section 5 (n) (if such subsection is still operative) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort;

shall be entitled, in respect of the position left by him in order to become so employed, to the benefits of subsections (b), (c), (e),

and (g) of this section to the same extent as if he had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which the determination provided for in paragraph (2) is made (or on the day on which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, if he is still in any such employment on such day and no such determination has been made), and had been given the certificate referred to in subsection (a)."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been assured by business managers, including a manager in one of the Nation's greatest war industries, that we are 100-percent right in opposing this bill because of its disruptive consequences. It would be wrong to rely upon General Knudsen as an expert witness for this kind of question—though he too advised against labor regimentation in order to solve the foundry problem. General Knudsen is, perhaps, the country's best expert at looking at a machine and telling how a man can work it more efficiently. But management is not the field in which he is expert.

I am assured that we are right in believing that this bill would have a disruptive and unpredictably dangerous effect upon war production. As soon as it becomes law, men in little businesses all over the Nation—though they may be more necessary to the economy than any Government planner apprehends in advance—will start to tumble out of present jobs. Men in oil stations, banks, grocery stores, truckers, taxi drivers, and so forth, not knowing whether or not they will be drafted and punished a few months later, will begin scurrying about trying to beat the next fellow getting into some job likely to continue to be considered jobs for which deferment would be granted—for example, into the already overmanned Government or, perhaps, into the domestic branch of Red Cross, already overmanned. I am told, with former W. P. A. and N. Y. A. officials. As Under Secretary Patterson originally testified, it is not so much a manpower shortage as maldistribution. I am assured that the manpower shortage exists only in sporadic and isolated instances which may or may not be eliminated by this bill. This bill would be more likely to aggravate than solve the problem. Because the little trucker or oil-station keeper or what not will not have the information to know how much the economy and war production depends upon his saying where he is. Nor will his local draft board know.

I will not follow blindly General Marshall's endorsement of this legislation, because I know how blindly General Marshall has to follow the Commander in Chief in order to remain Chief of Staff. You ought to remember, for example, that it was only indignant public opinion that kept him Chief of Staff after he asserted himself at Quebec.

Perhaps even if he knows the economic dangers inherent in this bill General Marshall believes that it cannot matter now in view of the war situation in Europe. I suppose that there is no use emphasizing what the war situation really is. Beginning last March and all last summer, when workers were virtually in-

vited to leave war jobs by the optimistic propaganda, some of us who are truthful persons tried to warn that we were reliably informed that the optimism was unjustified. That we were reliably informed by military men that there would be fierce Nazi resistance to the United States armies in western Europe, costing us an estimated 500,000 casualties or more. And also, that the Russians, instead of synchronizing their attack as agreed, would probably go looting in the Balkans and end up in a deal with the Germans, since their peace terms which, for many months, they have broadcasted six times daily, leave the German Army virtually intact. The public preferred to believe the optimistic propaganda which hooted us down and later, after the Nazi offensive, cried "Surprise! Surprise!" Now that the Russians seem to be almost in Berlin this bill seems to be chiefly for psychological effect.

But, we ought to know by this time that New Deal "psychologistics" are often downright moronic—the Morgenthau plan announcement, for instance, and the unconditional surrender policy, which the Russians save hundreds of thousands of lives by not using. Probably the psychological effect the new dealers most want to create by means of this bill is to show the soldiers that although the administration has been drastically criticized for not getting tough with labor, they are really willing to clap down on labor—this, of course, being a time when they can assure the labor leaders privately that the war in Europe seems likely to be over before laboring men have time to begin resenting this slave-labor law.

But the fortunes of war are so reversible that you and I dare not feel certain that this bill will not be used. The possibilities for abuse of power under this bill are well nigh inexhaustible. It is the last long step toward giving the same slave-labor power over our citizens that the Russian Government has over its citizens, or the Nazi government has over Germans.

The damaging effects of this bill will begin to be felt as soon as it seems at all likely to become law. The competition to be sure to get a job which will remain essential as long as the new law lasts will start immediately. Not only minors in college, but also men in all kinds of little and big businesses all over the United States, will endeavor to find berths where they know they will be safe. A criminal sentence stares them in the face unless they get such jobs and a man will be trying to get such a job before the next fellow does. Many will leave the jobs in which they are now engaged, liquidating their little businesses if necessary. The general exodus is going to cause chaotic disruption the extent of which cannot be estimated in advance.

It would be easy to vote for this bill and avoid criticism. But it seems that you cannot do a good job of trying to preserve our Republic and also avoid criticism. As Emerson said, "For non-formity the world whips with its displeasures."

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

Mr. Chairman, stripped to its essentials, the bill before us, H. R. 1752, involves only one question—will it increase or will it decrease needed war production?

If it will increase such production it should be enacted. If it will decrease production, its enactment will be a cruel deception to G. I. Joe.

Whose answer to the question should we accept—those whose experience and knowledge and expertness lie in fields other than production, or those who know production through producing?

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations join in stating that this bill will decrease production. They are experts. Theirs is the advice which should be followed on this question.

H. R. 1752 should be defeated.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the decision as to how to vote on this bill is most difficult for me. In talking with many Members on both sides I find it is proving difficult for many of them, too. A good case and unimpeachably valid reasons can be presented for the bill and also against it.

I doubt that the legislation is actually necessary to accomplish the desired end, namely, greater production in certain categories where shortages unquestionably exist. I suspect it represents in part an attempt to imply that the primary blame for these shortages is on the shoulders of labor and management—that is, the civilian citizens of this country—when as a matter of plain fact the real origin of most of the shortages is elsewhere, miscalculations by some military leaders, unwise allotment of contracts to areas already overburdened, sudden stepping-up of demands for new models, underutilization of the manpower already at work in war plants, and so on.

Yesterday I received a letter saying:

If you vote for the bill to draft war workers you should also at the same time try to provide something for them to do, as most of them in the plants are already standing around without enough to keep them busy. Go through a plant sometime when they haven't got a special day arranged for you ahead of time, and you'll see what I mean.

Two days previously a constituent wrote complaining that he has been working on the swing shift in a certain war plant in my State and has not had 2 hours of real work to do a single night in the last 3 months.

Most of all the difficulty in getting adequate manpower is due to confusion in the public mind regarding what the real needs and the real prospects are. There have been so many conflicting reports every week from equally official Government agencies, both military and civilian, that the average citizen is almost forced to give up in disgust, or at least hopelessness.

There is reason to doubt that enactment of this bill as it is will show results until the acuteness of the need for it is already past. I hoped we would adopt the Barrett substitute as an essentially sounder measure and actually more practical in getting results. I fear the May bill may increase rather than decrease confusion in our whole manpower problem, may lower rather than raise morale on the home front, may disturb rather than quiet the widespread uneasy misgivings regarding the steady concentration in Government of more and more power over the lives of American citizens. That is, I fear the bill will not do much good and may do real harm on the home front.

And yet we are constantly told on highest authority that it is necessary to pass it for the sake of the effect on the men in the armed services. I doubt that it will do much good to the morale of our soldiers. But if to reject it, now that it has been brought before us, might conceivably do some harm on the war front, then I feel under solemn obligation to resolve any possible doubt on that issue in favor of the war front. I must, therefore, vote for the bill with misgivings.

One aspect of the matter has not, to my knowledge, been frankly mentioned but ought to be. At the end of the European war there will inevitably be a let-down here at home. If a better job is not done in explaining to the people of the country the full implications of the war in the Pacific than has been done hitherto, then there may be a real need for the bill in order to compel people to stay at work until the war against Japan is fully completed. It may be some of our military and civilian leaders have this in mind in their using the emergency on the western front to urge its enactment now. If so, then I express once more, as I have many times in the past, my regret that so many of our leaders still fail to understand the American people, still imagine we have to be hoodwinked, or cajoled, or tricked, into doing what is right and necessary for the defense of this land. When will they realize that this is our country too? That we also belong to the team? That whenever they will start laying the cards frankly on the table before us in full, frank confidence and candor, they will get response from us, voluntarily and eagerly given, that will far surpass anything the Nation has ever done. The way for them to get fullest support to ultimate victory is not by seeking to manage our thinking and emotions by manipulation of news and propaganda in the best Hollywood advertising manner. It is by their beginning really to believe in the democracy they so frequently talk about, by beginning to trust the American people to make the right decisions if given the plain truth.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(f) A person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment under section 5 (n) (4) shall receive the same travel, and subsistence during such travel, which he would receive if the request (in the case of a volunteer) or

the order (in other cases) constituted an order to report for induction at the place of such employment; and on or after the date of a determination under section 5 (n) (2) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or on or after the date upon which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (if he is employed in such an activity on such date), 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."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BIEMILLER: On page 8 strike out lines 17, 18, 19, and 20 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "ment under section 5 (n) (4) shall receive transportation, including transportation of dependents and household effects to the location of such employment, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, provided that the cost of such transportation shall not exceed \$300 for any one worker, his dependents and household effects, and shall not exceed the amount allowable for civilian employees of the several departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government under the standardized Government travel regulations; and on or after the date."

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, as the bill now reads, transportation allowances are given only to the man who volunteers or is ordered to another place of residence. I am proposing in this amendment that when a man volunteers or is ordered to go to another place of employment he shall also be given allowances for his family and his household effects, not to exceed \$300 for any one such trip.

I think we recognize that if the law is going to function there will be men with families who will be required to move from one place to another. It seems to me that the least we can do in those situations is to permit the family to be moved along with the worker. In other democratic countries that have legislation of this nature this is a usual provision in such laws. Most of them, in fact, go a good deal further. I am not, at this time, proposing anything beyond permitting families to be kept intact, and that wives and children and their necessary household effects can be moved along with the worker.

I think the adoption of this amendment would bring more volunteers under the act than you would get otherwise. I think it would be a matter of simple justice to any worker who is required to move by order.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that this legislation is before the House. In the first

place, no testimony has been presented showing there is a shortage of manpower. Secondly, industry has been and still is capable of furnishing any and all material that can be transported to our fighting fronts. I say I think it is unfortunate that we are considering this legislation because it does not start to reach the real problem of production in this country. The Military Affairs Committee well knows that there are some problems of production that are basic. What we need is a better utilization of the manpower available.

As one Member of Congress I regret very much that we have failed as a legislative body to assume our full responsibility to the boys at the front and to our people at home. One constructive thing that Congress could do, and should have done years ago, was to amend the Wages and Hours Act and the National Labor Relations Act. We enacted legislation for the 40-hour week to spread labor. It seems almost unbelievable that we should fight a war with a 40-hour week. It just does not make sense.

The National Labor Relations Act should be amended so that labor would be equally responsible with industry when it comes to showing the responsibility for production of war material. Under existing law an employer cannot discharge an employee without the approval of a Government agency. The employer cannot even discuss labor conditions or wages with his employees without violating the law. This reaches heights of absurdity, especially in the smaller communities where the employer and employees live across the street from each other, where their children attend the same schools, and where they have the same community interests.

I know of my own knowledge of a case where a labor leader from Chicago went into a small rural community and began organizing a unit in an industry employing less than 40 people. He was not very successful because the men were satisfied with the hours, the wages, and the working conditions. Finally he conceived the idea that he would ask some of the men if the employer or boss had discussed their wages and working conditions with them. One or two men frankly stated they had discussed wages and the hours of work. The labor leader immediately filed a suit through the National Labor Relations Board and this small concern has been through two courts because of a violation of this act.

It was my privilege to visit personally 2 years ago with one of the large employers of labor in the Nation. As a matter of fact, he was using 40,000 employees in one plant. At the time I was there they were having labor trouble, and I made inquiries concerning it. The housing was not good, the transportation was most difficult, and I thought I could readily see why some of the men and women would be dissatisfied with working in that plant. In visiting with the owner and manager he advised me that if he could fire three people tomorrow morning the labor troubles in that plant would be solved, but he could not fire them. It seems almost unbelievable that we would have legislation of that type on our statutes during a war.

During this debate we have heard much discussion about the War Manpower Commission. They have had a difficult job, but they are also responsible for much of the confusion and wastage of manpower.

Wichita, Kans., is one of the large airplane producing centers of the Nation. When the aircraft factories of that city were asked to step up production on B-29's they were assured by the War Department and War Manpower Commission that they would be given every consideration in securing the thousands of additional help needed. What did they do? They started running large newspaper advertisements in Wichita, which was already a critical area. As usual, it developed that the manager of the aircraft plant had much more knowledge of securing production than either the War Department or War Manpower Commission. After many conferences and much delay the War Department and War Manpower Commission consented to the use of two 10-hour shifts per day instead of the regular three 8-hour shifts. What happened? The production requirements were met and exceeded in a very short time. They did it by using less employees instead of more.

This administration has so bungled the manpower problem that now it becomes necessary for Congress to enact draft or work legislation. I do not think it is necessary to enact the legislation in order to secure production. I am rather fearful, however, that it is necessary to vote this bill in order that our boys on the battle fronts will not misunderstand the Members of Congress. We voted to induct them into the military service and certainly that required more courage than to vote to put a man into essential industry where they will receive the highest wages in our Nation's history and have the privilege of working under the best of working conditions.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER, of Kansas: Add a new section 4 on page 9, after line 9:

"SEC. 4. (a) Before any proposed regulation or order to be prescribed under this act by any governmental agency exercising powers granted herein or authority conferred hereunder, other than intraagency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or inter-agency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, shall issue, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

"(b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, for study to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be effective upon approval by the committee on

Military Affairs of either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either, or, unless previously disapproved, may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(c) For the purposes of this act the committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Members are just a bit impatient; but if they will forget the psychology of the situation, they will realize that after all it is actually only 4 o'clock and it is yet early in the day. Incidentally, if this matter of the 5 o'clock hour irks any of you, why, you can give us some assistance in returning God's time to the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I was greatly interested in the remarks of the chairman a few moments ago, and on another occasion today when he made some statements about the powerful bureaucracies in this country and the fear of one dictator here in Washington. That is one of the reasons why this amendment is proposed. A similar one was offered to the Surplus War Supplies bill, a bill which we were told we should vote for because Mr. Will Clayton was to administer it. But Mr. Clayton is not administering it. We are told Mr. Byrnes will administer this bill. Maybe he will and maybe he will not. The practice provided for by this amendment is not difficult to carry out. It merely says that when any one of these agencies, whether it is the War Manpower Commission or whether it is the Selective Service or whether it is the Director of War Mobilization, when they propose to issue a rule, order, or edict they must send a copy of it to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. Then it would be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and that committee, or a subcommittee, which knows every word and paragraph of and semicolon in this bill, and which knows the intent and purpose of it, can scan that rule, order, or edict and see for themselves whether the regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of power is proposed. If such a provision had been inserted in many of the laws which we have passed heretofore we would not now be in a position of condemning many of the bureaucratic agencies for some of their questionable rules because Congress would have kept control over its legislative child, would have seen that it obeyed the will, the intent, and the purpose of Congress.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I gladly yield to the chairman.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, any regulation made by either the Selective Service Bureau, or the War Manpower Commission, or anybody else would have to come to the Congress and be considered by the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs of the two bodies before it could become effective?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; any rule they might propose that comes as the result of this May bill.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think that that might so delay the induction of people in this country quite a bit and may delay the furnishing of manpower to the armed forces?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; it could be done almost immediately. If that rule or order is in conformity with the intent, spirit, and purpose of this law, it would take any committee or subcommittee very little time to decide it. In this bill you are dealing not merely with property, you are dealing with men's lives, hence supreme care must be exercised.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. To carry out the gentleman's idea it seems to me it would be necessary for the Committee on Military Affairs to report a bill in every instance.

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; they would not report a bill at all. This amendment gives your committee the power of veto over any regulation which is not in conformity with this law, and the report is made to the agency itself. How convenient it would have been if such a provision had been in the law when General Hershey sent out this memorandum or order telling the draft boards, in effect, to ignore the Tydings amendment. That would have had to come to the committee first, and the committee would have said, "That is not in conformity with the spirit, intent, or purpose of the bill as we passed it."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that General Hershey issued no such order.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Well, that was the effect of the order, and was so understood by the local boards.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "No individual shall be subject to the penalties of this section for having violated any duty imposed by section 5 (n), except for willful violations thereof, and—

"(a) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (2), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he made application to his selective-service local board for a determination described in section 5 (n) (2), and (2) that the denial of such application was not based on a fair consideration of his application; and it shall also be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to establish a determination by such local board (which shall be subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) that he had a justifiable reason for not complying with such duty;

"(b) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (4), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to

show (1) that he made timely application for revocation or modification of the order under section 5 (n) (4), and (2) that the denial of the revocation or modification requested was not based on a fair consideration of his application."

SEC. 5. Section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting "5 (n)," after "3 (d)," and by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "The provisions of section 5 (n) shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose. As used in this section the term 'date of the termination of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is the earlier."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

We are almost at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill. Some of us have earnestly tried to amend the bill into such form as would assure production but also be in accordance with American principles. Substitutes, the Barrett bill, my bill, and all amendments have been defeated. Our efforts have failed. We have the May bill before us.

I have already expressed some of my convictions about the legislation. At the moment I want to repeat some of them. Free American workers have performed a production miracle in this war. The strength that comes from freedom is and always will remain superior to any other system. I feel impelled to say once again, as I have before, that I think this type of legislation violates a fundamental principle upon which our country is founded. It would not do so if it were drafted in such fashion as to require work for our Nation but to avoid compelling the labor of one man to be exerted for the private profit of another.

Had my amendment to take all profit out of war contracts been adopted, we would have an altogether different choice before us, one where it would be possible for a Member to cast a vote for something that would be right. As it is, from my view, I will be doing a wrong act whether I vote for the bill or against it. In my opinion, a bill of this character should never have come before the House. For as I believe I have made clear in the debate there are available in my opinion other and much better methods.

I must say in fairness, however, that I think if the committee was going to bring in any bill of this particular character at all, it has surrounded this bill with about as good safeguards as could have been provided. I refer particularly to the provision that voluntary recruitment shall be tried first and, if successful, no compulsion will be used, and to the provision that every worker shall have a reasonable choice of employers.

I do not believe that even at this hour we have the answer to things that confuse our people, as to why for example, this legislation should come before us at this time when there are substantial lay-offs taking place; as to why it is necessary for us to be asked to put this most

extraordinary and unprecedented power upon the people in fact of the fact that, after all, the basic mistake was not theirs but was made last summer when they were told on highest authority that they should prepare for an early end of the war in Europe and when such substantial cut-backs were made in war production.

To my mind the arguments that have been made against this bill have been better, on the whole, than the arguments that have been made for it, except for one. That argument is not that the President asked for the bill or that outstanding military leaders whose field, after all, is not industrial production, asked for it. That one argument, I remember best as having come from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]. Mr. LYLE made his maiden speech in the House a couple of days ago. He said nothing so very different perhaps from what other Members had said, but he said it as one who only very recently was on the battle front himself. He asked us to remember that several million young men around the world will be listening for the result of this vote. And as we are deeply concerned about injustice and inequity in this bill or elsewhere, the paramount consideration as long as the war lasts must be these young men who are carrying the load, facing exhaustion and death. For they who had least of all to do with the making of this war are that young generation which through history has been drafted to go out to fight and die that other people may be free.

As we close this debate the war they are fighting in the snow and sleet is in a critical stage. We are at a place where any action that could be—and we know it would be, however unfairly—termed an evidence of unwillingness to back them up would be a blow to their spirits which we must not deal them. We must not do anything that might be interpreted as a return to the disastrous over-optimism and lack of understanding of the tremendous task of our fighting forces which pervaded the nation last summer. And so my vote will be cast for the bill.

Just one message is going out after the House votes. American soldiers are not going to know about the Harness substitute or my substitute or any of the amendments that have been offered. They will only know that the House either did or did not adopt a measure that was brought before us—even though, as I believe, mistakenly—for the alleged purpose of trying to increase war production and increase their supplies. The only news that will go out will be whether the House voted "yea" or "nay." I cannot vote "no" for the simple but compelling reason that, were the House to defeat the bill, I am convinced the news would be carried to the men and boys at the front in such a manner as to make them feel we had let them down. Right now, especially, that would mean discouragement and bewilderment to them. I am by no means sure that the passage of the bill will actually get any additional equipment to our men. I hope it will. But I am sure its defeat would rob them of spirit.

And as one who believes a new progressive movement in the people's interest must be built, I look into the future, too. I even look ahead to the possibility that Congress might get down to business and take the profit out of the war, that it might make a sincere effort to adjust the basic wrong in this legislation. And for a very important reason I want my vote to be understood as the vote of a Member who has stood the best he knew how for the rights of the common people of this Nation. I want them to get credit for my vote. Yes; I want American workers to get credit for my vote, no matter how they may feel against me for casting my vote as I do. For, should this bill be defeated by the votes of people like myself, who are known as supporters and friends of men and women who labor in factories and on farms, a certain group in this country would find in that fact grist for their mill. The group I speak of are those who are at present working so cleverly and so relentlessly to try to drive a wedge of misunderstanding and bitterness between the men in uniform and the workers on the home front, workers who have so far met every production demand which they have understood. This bill cannot and will not be passed without the votes of Members who are known as progressives, as friends of the common people and the people who work. These votes can defeat the purposes of those who seek to use deception to divide soldier and workers and farmer and thus to keep monopolistic privilege in places of power. For by our votes we will be saying for the people of America, "We are ready to lay down even a sacred right, even to do it while no corresponding sacrifice of wealth and property is required, if by our action we can help in any way at all our men at the fighting fronts."

Let every one of us who votes for this bill resolve that at the earliest possible moment consistent with the war situation we will strike it from the statute books. And it now becomes even more than before our solemn duty to prepare against any possibility of a day coming when there will be mass unemployment in this land. Some of us will be back in the well of the House and we will call on Members of the House to join with us in seeing to it that policies are followed which can be effective in maintaining for all people whom this bill affects, as well as for all the men in the armed forces, their basic rights of American citizenship.

This is no hour to talk about the end of the war. America is grimly determined tonight. Her teeth are clenched; her fists doubled. This mighty Nation is going through with this war as fast and as hard as human endurance can do it. And we will not again leave in spirit the sides of the men that fight. My substitute amendment would have been a vastly better way than the May bill to implement that determination, for by it we could have taken the froth of luxury and self-indulgence from our economy while the war lasts and we could have ended labor hoarding. But the House turned it down for reasons I still cannot

understand. The Senate, I predict, will act otherwise.

But I cannot close without this: A day will come when it is all over, and then the men and women who took even this bill and still outproduced the whole world, used even this measure to increase their production more and more—as they will do—will find their recompense; for then, if there is breath in my body and the bodies of others here, we will strip inordinate power from places where it does not belong—in government, in monopoly, anywhere—and build a nation in which human beings will come first, as America through the years has promised. We will build a nation in which the wrongs of war will be requited, in which we shall do justice, first, to our soldiers, sailors, and marines, and, second, to those on the home front, who, though they knew someone had blundered, went ahead, as they will, and did their duty by their sons and brothers overseas to the limit of their ability.

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: On page 10, line 15, strike out all of line 15 and insert "February 1, 1946" and strike out all of lines 18 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to fix a definite date to which this bill will apply. Under the proposed law, it is to apply until the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war. In other words, even though the war with Germany may come to an end and the need for this legislation is no longer with us, yet this particular bill will continue in force until after the Japanese war is over. We have been told by high authority that the Japanese war may last for a period of 4 or more years. It is quite possible that after the war with Germany is over and we can concentrate on the Pacific war the need for this bill and the regimentation of 53,000,000 workers will not be necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There is also a provision in here that Congress may terminate this act at any time that it may want to.

Mr. CLASON. This bill in fact surrenders control of the situations covered by its provisions until the end of the Japanese war, the period for which this bill shall run. I would like to see the Congress control the period by a definite limitation and not by resolution. If we do, I feel certain it will be much easier for many on the Republican side to vote in favor of the bill. To leave power in the hands of people in Washington in the departments to carry on under the terms of this bill indefinitely appears to me to be a faulty part of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman's amendment strike out of the bill the

provision which gives the Congress the right to pass a concurrent resolution terminating it at any time?

Mr. CLASON. No; it does not.

Mr. MAY. I understand it does.

Mr. CLASON. No. It strikes out line 15 and all of lines 18 to 23, inclusive, and leaves in lines 16 and 17, so that the Congress would have the right to pass a concurrent resolution at any time before February 1, 1946, if it saw fit; otherwise the law would run until February 1, 1946. By that time we should know how it will work. Otherwise this whole matter may come up on May 15, 1945, and we will have all this to go over again before we really have a chance to work out the terms of the bill, if it passes.

Mr. Chairman, I offered an anti-discrimination amendment yesterday. The Speaker said he thought it would cost 50 to 75 votes if it were included. I am interested in a newspaper article which I show you that reads that CLASON's sponsorship of the anti-discrimination amendment might corral enough Republican votes for the bill to assure its passage through the House. Whatever way you look at an amendment its effect looks different to some one else.

I was also interested in what the majority leader said. In effect he stated he was against my amendment because he wanted to vote for the bill and he was afraid if he voted for the amendment it would perhaps prevent passage of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is not quoting me correctly. I opposed his amendment because it was unnecessary. I stated that there was a commission under Executive order already in existence and that the amendment had no place in the bill and was unnecessary.

Mr. CLASON. At any rate, as near as I can get it—and I perhaps misinterpreted the gentleman's remarks—it was to the effect that being in the bill, it would hurt the bill so far as those who perhaps wanted to support it were concerned.

Another speaker who followed said that he was opposed to it and later indicated that he intended to vote against the bill. At some later date, whether on May 15, 1945, or February 1, 1946, or whenever the F. E. P. C. bill does come out of the Labor Committee, has a rule, and reaches the floor, this issue is going to be voted on again. I appreciate the fact that since that amendment was defeated yesterday, many Members on the Democratic side have come to me and said that they were in favor of such legislation and intended to support it in the future.

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 85, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will not keep you 5 minutes, so just give me a minute or two of your attention.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as resenting very much the intemperate remarks made by certain speakers here today with regard to General Marshall, a man who has earned not only the respect but also the affection of every real American. History will pass on his conduct of this war, and when that history is written General Marshall's magnificent leadership will no doubt form one of its brightest pages.

I know that in the heat of legislative battle many intemperate remarks and speeches are made, but at least we should confine such speeches to the bill before the House.

General Marshall should have our prayers, not unfair, vicious criticism of things we know little about. There are parts of this bill that I do not like but I intend to follow the leadership of the Commander in Chief and the heads of our armed forces who are responsible for the conduct of the war. The sons of America are fighting all over the world. My first responsibility is to them. I shall discharge this obligation as I see it. Vote for this bill and pray that it will help to bring about an earlier termination of this tragic war.

I yield to no person in my devotion to the working men and women of my country but I believe I have as much of an obligation to the workers on the battlefields of Europe and Asia as I have to those at home.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently for 4 days to find one logical reason to support this bill. I am impressed with the contention that we must have a bill because of the psychological effect its approval here will have on the fighting fronts throughout the world. We are not fooling or deceiving or duping the G. I. Joes. That was attempted with the bob-tail ballot. What are we doing today? Millions of letters have gone overseas to our sons and daughters, and they know about the confusion on the home front and the maladministration.

Just a few minutes ago the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs referred to a telegram which he received from the American Legion urging support of this bill because it allegedly approximates universal service. Back in June of 1941 there was an opportunity presented to this House to prevent the hoarding and the wasting of manpower in war industries, to take the profit out of war; yes, to prevent profiteering. I urge every Member to examine roll call No. 65 on June 9, 1941, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to outlaw cost-plus contracts. This was lost 175 to 179, and I particularly urge the 9 Democratic Members of the House Committee on Military Affairs who were members of that committee at that time to examine that roll call. You as well as all of us then had an opportunity to show good faith in complying with the

requests of the American Legion to adopt universal service. Examine that roll call and you will find out how you failed to keep faith with the veterans of the first war and to take the profit out of this war. You approved the vicious cost-plus contract system which is largely responsible for the hoarding and misuse of manpower in war industries. You encouraged the conditions which have made possible overstaffing and criminal abuses in the large war industries.

We have heard recently about the investigations and revelations made by the Mead committee in some of the plants operated by the Government. Were those revelations conducive to improving the morale of our soldiers?

I have here reports from the United States Civil Service Commission showing the status of civilian employment in the Federal Government. On December 31, 1943, the total number of civilians on the Federal pay roll was 3,007,000. On December 31, 1944, the total was 3,309,000, or an increase during 1944 of 302,000. So during the last calendar year, when the Nation faced a critical manpower situation—when our farms were being denuded of farm labor and the small businesses of this country were deprived of essential labor—what did benevolent old Uncle Sam do. Why, he added 300,000 civilian employees during the last year.

Can you fool G. I. Joe and make him think there is some psychology in this bill? No. He knows about the bungling and the failure to utilize manpower fully on the home front, while he is making sacrifices and giving everything in the service of his country.

I should like to read a paragraph from a letter I received this week from a responsible constituent at Pocatello:

We have heard a lot recently about a manpower shortage. I am wondering if the Army has been informed of that fact. The 1st of November things began to slow up out at the Army base west of Pocatello. By the 1st of December signs were definite that the base would be closed. A number of the civilian employees at the base have tried since that time when they first learned of the closing of the base to get a release to go to work somewhere else. To date none have been released. I was informed last night by one of the men that in the last 6 weeks he had done nothing but play poker because there just is nothing to do. From my conversation with other men out there I find that is generally the case. The thing I would like answered is why such things need occur—if we are really short of manpower.

I call these facts to your attention because I, like every Member of this House and every American citizen, want maximum production in order to win the war. Passing ill-advised legislation merely because it may have a psychological effect in improving the morale of our armed forces is not advisable in this critical hour.

I am eager to do everything possible to insure an early decisive military victory and make possible the united support of both labor and industry in the production of essential war supplies and equipment. However, I am informed by the War Production Board that military pro-

duction during 1944 was 12 percent above 1943. Representatives of industry and labor—those who are responsible for production—are vigorously opposed to any compulsory labor-draft legislation at this time. Certainly there is room for improvement, but this can be accomplished under existing laws, and by telling the people the truth, instead of misrepresenting the facts and indulging in ill-advised optimism over the early ending of the war—as was done last summer.

I am not in accord with the contention of many proponents of the May bill that it will have a psychological effect in improving the morale of those in the service. They need ammunition, not meaningless and worthless gestures. Therefore, I shall vote against this measure because I sincerely believe that it would retard not accelerate production.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 107 a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 108. The benefits of this act shall extend to a person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment pursuant to section 5 (n) (4) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if—

"(a) the application for such employment constituted an order to report for induction into the land or naval forces;

"(b) such employment constituted military service;

"(c) entering upon such employment constituted induction into the land or naval forces; and

"(d) the period beginning with the date of entering upon such employment and ending with either (1) the date on which such section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, or (2) the date of a determination under such section 5 (n) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or (3) the date on which he violates a duty imposed on him by paragraph (2) of such section 5 (n), whichever of such dates occurs first, constituted the period of military service.

For the purposes of this section, the period which the relief and benefits provided in section 106 are to be in effect shall in no event extend beyond 30 days from the date of making application for employment."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 10, line 24, strike out all of section 6.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if I thought the passage of this bill would shorten this terrible war by 1 day or by 1 hour, or would save the life or prevent the injury of one man, of course I would support it wholeheartedly just as any other Member of this body would do if he were convinced it would do that very thing. I am convinced it will have the opposite effect.

The amendment I am submitting strikes from the bill all of section 6. This section gives the individuals forced into these jobs all of the benefits and rights allowed in the Soldiers' and Sail-

ors' Relief Act. Read the section for yourself. It says "Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act" is amended to include this group.

The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has told us a number of times this measure is intended to gather up a lot of pool-hall loafers and bums, and so forth, and make them work in industry. Of course they ought to work. Everyone ought to work at tasks that are worth while. After he forces these men into industry, and has agreed to pay transportation clear across the country and back in some cases, and pays industrial wages, it is agreed the particular group included in this legislation, shall have the rights and benefits that are allowed to members of the armed forces under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. That act was designed for them and for them, only. I want to add right here the great majority of the men included under this legislation are not bums or pool-hall loafers.

There has been considerable talk about what the boys in the armed forces would think about our action on this legislation today. What, I ask you, are they going to think when they discover you have included this provision in this legislation? Then, I ask you also, what is the man who has been working faithfully on his job, many miles from home, going to think when this new man comes in to work alongside, whether he be the pool-hall loafer or not? How will he feel when the new recruit who gets the same pay says, "I had my way paid to this job. Not only that, but I was awarded the rights and benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act."

These benefits are not for the man who stayed on the job and who has been there all the time. The proponents of this measure are blowing hot and cold on this legislation. You regiment the men classified in the IV-F category. Men who did not refuse to go into the armed forces, but were turned down by the armed forces because they could not qualify. You regiment them and put them in the job selected for them, or go to jail. Then you turn right around and excuse yourselves for seeming to be harsh, and tell them after all you want to give them benefits not accorded other workers who have stuck to their jobs. "Consistency, thou are a jewel."

Now, someone is going to say this is not as important as it seems. I say to you it is important. The inequity, the principle of it is not right and you know it. If you want to extend these privileges, including transportation expenses, to all workers in war plants, that is different, but to do it for a particular group in order to sort of pacify them, just does not make sense and you know it.

I know the hour is late, and I realize the leadership of the House on the majority side has insisted and has told those on his side that all amendments must be voted down. Members of the committee, you know this amendment is right. I trust you will support it.

Mr. Chairman, one thing more, I was disappointed to hear Members say on the floor this afternoon they did not like this legislation, the May bill, or its implications, but might be misunderstood if

they did not support it. Misunderstood by whom? I ask. A vote on this measure is too important and far-reaching to apply but one test. The question is whether it is right and for the best interests of the people of America.

I would like to add that proponents of this legislation say the fact that this legislation is even being considered has caused increased employment. I will tell you what has caused increased employment. Industry and labor have been told we were mistaken in thinking there was a huge supply of certain kinds of munitions on hand, but the facts are there is likely to be a scarcity because of reverses on the European front. Tell industry, labor, and agriculture, and the people of this country the gravity of the situation. Tell them the facts. The American people can take it if they know they are getting the facts. Cut out a lot of unnecessary activities in which thousands and thousands of men and women are engaged, and you will get everything you need and want.

So I may not be charged with failure to offer suggestions on this very important matter, I call attention I submitted a bill to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that would, in my opinion, have solved the problem. The committee did not see fit to even consider it.

Our military leaders did not ask for the May bill. General Marshall did not even testify after being invited to do so. These leaders did say they will need more men and more of certain munitions. I do not believe the May bill is the best way to do it, not at this late hour.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I expect to vote for the bill. Regardless of the position of the gentleman from Kansas on the bill, however, I am certainly for his amendment. I think the House should know what his amendment proposes and understand it clearly. The section which he proposes to strike out is that which would amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act by extending its benefits to the people who will be drawn for industrial or farm work under this bill and—I quote from the bill—to the same extent as if the application for such employment constituted an order to report for induction into the land or naval forces, or that such employment constituted military services.

Thus the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act would be amended to give to these people inducted for labor the same exemptions, the same protection against eviction for nonpayment of rent, the same relief from payment on installment contracts, the same relief from taxes and numerous other benefits that Congress has set up for the soldier or sailor away from home, unable to make his payments, unable to answer summons, and unable to make out tax returns. The gentleman from Kansas does not believe we should put these new industrial inductees on the same basis and neither do I.

Mr. Chairman, the most thrilling story that has come out of the war, in my

opinion, is a story in the papers today of the rescue of the 513 men in the Philippines. Because it is pertinent at this point, I want to read you just a few paragraphs from that story:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S HEADQUARTERS,
Luzon, January 31.

In a daring raid 25 miles behind the Japanese lines, 400 picked men of the Sixth Ranger Battalion and Filipino guerrillas last night rescued 513 veterans of Bataan, Corregidor, and Singapore from an enemy prison camp. * * * 486 Americans, 23 Britons, 3 Netherlands, and 1 Norwegian—all that remained. Hundreds of others had been sent to work in Japan. Other hundreds had died.

All but two of the men were brought out alive. * * * The enfeebled hearts of the two men flickered out when they were in sight of American lines.

Nearly 100 were so weak from malnutrition, disease, and 3-year-old wounds that they could not walk when they were cut loose from Japanese bondage.

Now, then, are you going to give the new industrial inductees the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act set up for those hero prisoners? Let me read further:

The commando raid, ordered on short notice when intelligence reports disclosed the whereabouts of the camp, was such a success that General MacArthur decorated every man in the force.

The lean and ragged captives received the homage of thousands of American soldiers * * * who formed an impromptu honor guard, flanking the military highway down which the rescue party passed.

It was the last of many marches for the rescued men—marches which began with the brutal "death march" of Bataan.

The freed men showed their happiness despite their sores and ulcers, wasted bodies, and ragged clothes.

Some looked helplessly up from litters. Others were proudly erect. There were old men with gray hair and dazed, sunken eyes. Some were surprisingly young and almost at their normal weight. Others were limp from beri-beri.

Their shirts were tattered. Shorts were patched and repatched. Several officers still proudly wore their emblems of rank. There were battered campaign hats, overseas caps, and one pre-war type helmet.

Their sentiment was expressed by Capt. James B. Prippe, Los Angeles, former provost marshal on Corregidor. He said:

"The thrill of seeing those green-clad Rangers storm into the prison camp last night will never quite leave me."

My but I would like to have been there, to have shared in that thrill; but I would not like to tell those men who have been away from home, suffering those tortures, that Congress was proposing to give equal civil-relief benefits to the new draftees for war jobs at wartime pay.

But if section 6 stays in the bill it is proposed to do just that. These new inductees who will be paid workers' wages, who will be working in the United States, will get the same benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act as those men who were rescued on Bataan, the same rights and benefits as the men who rescued them have been promised. Such benefits ought not to be offered to the men inducted for labor at regular wages. The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas should prevail.

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

I want to call to the attention of the House some facts. The argument has been made that by this section we are giving certain benefits to these people. The inference to be drawn from that is that the benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act are positive benefits, or that they are benefits that are guaranteed; that we are giving them something; that they are absolute. As a matter of fact, that is not true. What the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act does is this: It provides that when a man goes into the service—and under this section we say the man who goes into work under the provisions of this bill—whose ability to discharge his obligation is adversely affected by the change, then he is protected. Then he is entitled to the benefits under that act.

There is one other thing that I want to call attention to and that is this, that they are not absolute. They are given within the discretion of the court. The judge must be convinced that the man's ability to discharge those obligations has been adversely affected by his change in status. Unless he is so convinced there is no obligation on him whatsoever to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act to that person.

Someone has said we ought not give it to these men who are going to work under the terms of this bill, whereas it is not given to those who are voluntarily at work already. I simply want to call attention to this fact that even though that may sound good, you must remember that the person who is at work voluntarily has had plenty of time to adjust his personal affairs. Therefore, perhaps the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act would not be worth anything to him anyhow, because his ability to handle his obligations has not been adversely affected, whereas we are going to snatch up the men covered by this bill hurriedly and give them a change of status that may affect adversely their ability to discharge their obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I will say there is merit in the point of view of the gentleman from Alabama. But the Military Affairs Committee has proved the fact that military policy, as a feature, was removed from this bill. While there may be some reason, the fundamental provisions of this act, which the amendment seeks to remove, are unfair to every man in the armed services and are unfair to every man working in a plant who has been there before. I substantially agree with the gentleman from Kansas and hope his amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 125 and noes 155.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. REES of Kansas to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 139, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: Page 12, line 3, add a new section, reading as follows: "It is the intent of the Congress in the administration of this act that the penalties provided herein cannot be imposed by administrative or Executive directive, or order, or otherwise, against any inductee who shall choose to select a labor union of his choice for membership, or who shall refuse to enroll or place his membership in any labor organization or union, as a condition precedent to his employment."

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, when the Congress voted a formal declaration of war against various of the Axis Powers, we pledged to back that declaration with all the resources which our country possessed, including all of our manpower if necessary. We have mobilized and sent into every land and clime American boys to fight and die, and we have promised to back them on the home front with everything we have.

None of us, at least those of us who profess to believe in a republican form of government, like regimentation, excessive Government control of manpower, or anything else connected with our economy. We realize, however, that when the country is at war, great and extraordinary powers must be given to the executive branch of the Government. These extraordinary war powers which, of necessity, must be taken away from the people and given to the executive branch of the Government when our country is at war, are always a threat to our system of Government.

Fortunately, however, heretofore in our country, the executive branch of the Government has been anxious to surrender these extraordinary powers and return them to the people immediately that the war was over and the emergency no longer existed. We hope, and we must see to it, that the same policy will be pursued when this war is ended and peace shall come again.

This bill that we are now considering, H. R. 1752, which has been referred to throughout the country as a work-or-fight bill, is, as I view it, a limited national service act. By that I mean to say it is a national service act for all men up to and including the age of 45. Only the extreme exigencies of a global war, such as we are now engaged in, would warrant even consideration of the bill by the Congress.

The only question for determination by the Congress in respect to this particular bill, as I see it, is: Will the legislation augment the present machinery that has heretofore been set up by the Congress for the prosecution of the war and assist those who are responsible for carrying out all phases of the war effort to do it more efficiently, bring the war to a successful conclusion more quickly, and, above all, reduce materially our casualties?

If the proposed legislation will accomplish, or even aid in the accomplish-

ment of these objectives, then of course no one should, or would, oppose this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly find no fault, or shall I criticize, those who may hold opposite views in respect to this legislation. I have read every word and line of the hearings conducted by our Committee on Military Affairs. The evidence is as conflicting and the expert opinions as varied as the number of witnesses testifying as to the accomplishments of this bill, when it becomes the law.

After reading all of the testimony and the reports accompanying this bill, and after listening to arguments that have been made by the various members of the committee, I am persuaded that the proponents have made out their case by at least a fair preponderance of the evidence or, as the lawyers would say, by the greater weight of the testimony.

This being true, I shall vote for the bill and if I err, I shall err on what I believe to be the side of the 12,000,000 young men and women whom we have sent to fight and die on and over every sea, and on and over every land, where war is being waged.

Now, let us look at the record, let us see who says that we need this law. Who are the witnesses, and what are their qualifications concerning the matters about which they testify?

First we have the Honorable Robert P. Patterson; he is the Under Secretary of War. He says the bill is necessary. Then we have Mr. Ralph A. Bard, the Under Secretary of the Navy. He says, and I quote, "the Navy Department strongly recommends favorable consideration of this bill." Another witness, Mr. J. A. Krug, Director of the War Production Board, who testified, and I quote, "The War Production Board endorses the bill without qualification."

Another is Judge Charles M. Hay, Chairman and Executive Director of the War Manpower Commission; also Col. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., Deputy Administrator of Selective Service, and Lt. Comdr. William S. Knudsen. We all know who he is.

Then we have Col. Lewis Sanders, consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in everyday life an industrial engineer, and who has been chief of the Reemployment Division of Selective Service from the time it was organized until January 1944. Also Marvin Jones, who for 20 years was a Member of this House, now a Federal judge, who holds the temporary position of National War Food Administrator, and as such, responsible for the necessary food and fiber for our armies and our civilian population as well. He says we need this legislation.

Also Mr. Ogg, in charge of the Washington office of the American Farm Bureau. All of these many men testify that in their opinion the legislation is necessary and will aid and assist in the promotion of the war effort.

Opposing the legislation, we find Mr. Albert Hamilton, of Vienna, Va., appearing on behalf of the Socialist Party; Mr. Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Phillip Murray, president of the

Congress of Industrial Organizations; Rev. Donald Herrington, who appeared in behalf of the Workers' Defense League; also John J. Mankowski, a member of the executive board of District 6, Mine, Mill, and Smelters' Union; Leo Jandreau, a vice president of the United Electrical and Radio Machine Workers of America, an affiliate of the C. I. O.; Irving Abramson, president of the New Jersey State Industrial Union Council of the C. I. O.; Percy Llewellyn, a member of the executive board of the United Automobile Workers; Frederick C. Crawford, president of Thompson Products, Inc., and chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers; Martin H. Miller, national representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

All of these men oppose this bill and give as their reasons, among others, that the legislation is not necessary. They are apprehensive that the bill will have the effect of curtailing production rather than increasing production of the necessary tools and implements of war. They refer to the bill as a slave labor bill.

These, in the main, constitute the witnesses both for and against the bill, and the reasons given by those for as well as those opposing the legislation. It is, of course, generally known that General Hershey, of Selective Service; Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff; Admiral King, and General Arnold, as well as War Mobilization Director Byrnes, have requested legislation of this character and favor the enactment of the proposed bill.

Now for a brief discussion of the amendment I have offered. We have heard a lot of talk here during the past 4 days about free labor. We have heard it charged here on the floor of the House that those who vote for this bill are opposed to free labor. This statement has been made by several gentlemen whom the P. A. C. take credit for bringing here in the recent election. And others like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who in construing legislative intent take the position that anyone who offers in good faith clarifying amendments are either labor haters or labor baiters. They relegate to themselves all wisdom as to legislative intent.

Now what does this amendment that I have offered do? It does this and no more: It tells those who shall hereafter administer this act, if and when it becomes law, that they cannot say to a man who belongs to a particular labor union that he must join some other union before he can work, and in the event he refuses to join some union other than the one of his choice, he is exempt from the penalties of this bill.

In other words, they cannot fine him or put him in jail for refusing to join a labor union not of his choice and he is likewise exempt from paying a fine or going to jail if he refuses to join any union. It has been said by members of the committee that this bill will not compel any man who does not want to to join a labor union. If that is true, what possible harm could come from an amendment that specifically says so?

The facts are that, after the Wadsworth amendment was defeated yesterday, many of the commentators in the

country construed the defeat of the Wadsworth amendment otherwise, and it was repeatedly stated over the radio last night and this morning, after the Wadsworth amendment was defeated, that the Congress had refused to exempt those who are to be drafted to work pursuant to this legislation from joining labor unions or to select a union of his own choice.

We know that during the past few years strikes have been called and production of vital war materials stopped because of jurisdictional disputes between various labor organizations, and I want this legislation to be crystal clear that a man who belongs to the C. I. O. cannot be fined or put in jail because he refuses to become a member of the A. F. of L., or vice versa, and that he cannot be fined or put in jail because he refuses to become a member of either of these organizations.

This amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to stop these proceedings for even a moment because I know everybody wants to get through and go home. We have done a good job here so far. I hope we are not going to spoil it now. This is just another effort to make this bill unpalatable to the people who are having a struggle anyway in going along with it. It is a slap in the face of labor, that is what it amounts to. It is a slap in the face of labor. The bill does not require any man to join a union, as was said here yesterday, and when he answers the call under this bill and presents himself for employment he has complied with the act and no penalty attaches to him. He can refuse to join a union. If he does so he cannot be penalized. He has complied with this act.

The legislative counsel has personally assured me that that is the law as it is written in this bill. Why make it harder for men on both sides of the aisle who are friendly with labor and who want to vote for this bill to go along? I hope we will vote this down as we did the Wadsworth amendment yesterday and as we have done others. Let us pass this bill and give the armed services the support the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff and the Admiral of the Fleet say they need. They know. Let us give it to them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just observed with a great deal of care what our majority whip told us about this bill not forcing any man to join a union, but if you will just flip her around, it does not protect him against having to join a union to work for his Government, and be subjected to the penalties of the bill. That is the answer to the speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. The amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma to make men their own free agents against having to join a union against his own will, should by all means be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIZLEY) there were—ayes 64, noes 185.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: At the end of section 6, page 12, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 7. No registrant requested or ordered to accept employment under the provisions of this act shall be required to join any religious, political, fraternal, or labor organization in order to comply with said order or request."

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska on the ground that the amendment is not germane and on the ground that the identical question has already been voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The Chair will state that the substance of the amendment is along the line of other amendments which have been considered by the Committee. The Chair holds the amendment is in order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment if adopted would guarantee to the individual freedom of choice in joining or not joining a union if he volunteered or was ordered to accept employment under the provisions of this act. I have a profound respect for those patriotic unselfish individuals who are serving on our local draft boards. I received a telegram which I believe represents the sentiment of a great many of those boards which says: "This board is reticent in classifying men into I-A when the alternative is a war plant job requiring union membership. Congress should eliminate such requirement for full support of the war effort." If in order to increase production, shorten the war, and lessen the number of casualties it is necessary to require that our citizens serve in war jobs, the men of America will gladly respond, but we have no right to compel them to join any organization in order to perform the work that they are ordered to do. If the law remains that these individuals sent into war jobs must join a union you will have done the unions a great injustice. You will have aroused public sentiment against them. You will have done nothing to protect the workman. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed 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 Service and Training Act of 1940, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 107, reported the same back to the House without amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHORT. Emphatically, sir.

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

The Clerk read as follows: Mr. SHORT moves to recommit H. R. 1752 to the Committee on Military Affairs for further study.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 230, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—183

Adams	Gillie	Neely
Allen, Ill.	Graham	O'Brien, Mich.
Andersen,	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
H. Carl	Green	O'Konski
Andersen,	Griffiths	Outland
August H.	Gross	Patterson
Angell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Phillips
Arnold	Hagen	Phillips
Auchincloss	Hall	Pittenger
Bailey	Edwin Arthur Ploesser	
Barrett, Wyo.	Halleck	Powell
Beall	Harless, Ariz.	Price, Ill.
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Rabaut
Bennett, Mo.	Havenner	Ramey
Biemiller	Healy	Rankin
Bishop	Hedrick	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Boren	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Rich
Brehm	Hooven	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Robertson,
Brumbaugh	Holfield	N. Dak.
Buck	Holmes, Mass.	Robison, Ky.
Buffett	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Bunker	Hook	Rodgers, Pa.
Butler	Horan	Sadowski
Byrnes, Wis.	Howell	Savage
Campbell	Hull	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Izac	Schwabe, Okla.
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Scrivner
Celler	Jennings	Shafer
Chenoweth	Jensen	Sharp
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Sheridan
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Short
Clason	Jones	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	Judd	Smith, Maine
Cole, Mo.	Kee	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Kelley, Pa.	Springer
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Starkey
Cunningham	Kinzer	Stefan
Curtis	Kirwan	Stevenson
Dondero	Knutson	Stockman
Doyle	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Dworshak	Lane	Talbot
Ellis	Larcade	Talle
Ellsworth	Lemke	Taylor
Elsaesser	Lesinski	Tibbott
Elston	Lewis	Traynor
Engel, Mich.	Ludlow	Vorys, Ohio
Feighan	McConnell	Vursell
Fellows	McCowan	Wasielewski
Fenton	McGlinchey	Welch
Flood	McGregor	Weiss
Fuller	McKenzie	Welch
Gardner	Madden	Wilson
Gavin	Mason	Wolcott
Gearhart	Miller, Neb.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	Morgan	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillespie	Murphy	
Gillette	Murray, Wis.	

NAYS—230

Abernethy	Forand	Mundt
Allen, La.	Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Norton
Anderson,	Gathings	O'Brien, Ill.
N. Mex.	Geelan	O'Neal
Andrews, Ala.	Gibson	O'Toole
Andrews, N. Y.	Gifford	Pace
Arends	Goodwin	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Peterson, Fla.
Barden	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Pfeifer
Barry	Granger	Pickett
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Poage
Beckworth	Gwynne, Iowa	Price, Fla.
Bell	Hale	Priest
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall	Quinn, N. Y.
Bland	Leonard W.	Rabin
Bloom	Hancock	Rains
Bonner	Hand	Ramspeck
Boykin	Hare	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Harris	Rayfield
Brooks	Hart	Resa
Brown, Ga.	Hartley	Richards
Bryson	Hays	Riley
Buckley	Hebert	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Robertson, Va.
Burch	Hendricks	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Herter	Roe, Md.
Byrne, N. Y.	Heseltun	Roe, N. Y.
Camp	Hobbs	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoch	Rogers, Mass.
Carlson	Hope	Rooney
Carnahan	Huber	Rowan
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jarman	Ryder
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Sasscer
Chelf	Johnson,	Sheppard
Clark	Luther A.	Sikes
Clements	Johnson,	Slaughter
Cochran	Lyndon B.	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Snyder
Colmer	Kean	Somers, N. Y.
Combs	Keogh	Sparkman
Cooley	Kerr	Spence
Cooper	Kilburn	Stewart
Courtney	Kilday	Stigler
Cox	King	Sullivan
Cravens	Kopplemann	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	Kunkel	Sundstrom
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Taber
Daughton, Va.	Lea	Tarver
Davis	LeCompte	Thom
De Lacy	LeFevre	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney,	Link	Thomas, Tex.
James J.	Luce	Thomason
Delaney,	Lyle	Tolan
John J.	Lynch	Torrens
Dickstein	McCormack	Towe
Dingell	McDonough	Trimble
Dirksen	McGehee	Vinson
Dolliver	McMillan, S. C.	Voorhis, Calif.
Domeneaux	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Doughton, N. C.	Mahon	Walter
Douglas, Calif.	Maloney	Weaver
Douglas, Ill.	Manasco	West
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Durham	Marcantonio	Whittington
Earthman	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Eberhart	Martin Mass.	Wigglesworth
Elliot	May	Winstead
Engle, Calif.	Morrow	Wolverton, N. J.
Ervin	Michener	Wood
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Woodhouse
Fernandez	Mills	Woodrum, Va.
Fisher	Monroney	Worley
Flannagan	Morrison	Zimmerman
Folger	Mott	

NOT VOTING—16

Cole, Kans.	LaFollette	Rogers, N. Y.
Dawson	Mansfield,	Sabath
Eaton	Mont.	Satterfield
Heidinger	Murdock	White
Kearney	Norrell	Winter
Kefauver	Powers	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Heidinger for, with Mr. Sabath against.

General pairs:

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Rogers of New York with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. White with Mr. LaFollette.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 167, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—246

Abernethy	Flannagan	Norton
Adams	Folger	O'Brien, Ill.
Allen, La.	Forand	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Fuller	O'Neal
Anderson,	Gamble	O'Toole
N. Mex.	Gathings	Pace
Andrews, Ala.	Geelan	Patman
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	Patrick
Angell	Gifford	Peterson, Fla.
Arends	Goodwin	Peterson, Ga.
Auchincloss	Gordon	Pfeifer
Baldwin, Md.	Gorski	Pickett
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gossett	Plumley
Barden	Granger	Poage
Barrett, Pa.	Grant, Ala.	Price, Fla.
Barry	Gregory	Priest
Bates, Ky.	Gwynne, Iowa	Quinn, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Hale	Rabin
Beckworth	Hall	Rains
Bell	Leonard W.	Ramspeck
Bennet, N. Y.	Hancock	Randolph
Bland	Hand	Rankin
Bloom	Hare	Rayfield
Bonner	Harris	Resa
Boren	Hart	Richards
Boykin	Hartley	Riley
Bradley, Pa.	Hays	Rivers
Brooks	Healy	Rizley
Brown, Ga.	Hebert	Robertson, Va.
Bryson	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Buckley	Hendricks	Roe, Md.
Bulwinkle	Herter	Roe, N. Y.
Burch	Heseltun	Rogers, Fla.
Burgin	Hobbs	Rogers, Mass.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hooven	Rooney
Byrnes, Wis.	Holmes, Wash.	Rowan
Camp	Hope	Russell
Cannon, Fla.	Huber	Ryder
Carlson	Jackson	Sasscer
Carnahan	Jarman	Sharp
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Calif.	Sheppard
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson,	Sikes
Chapman	Luther A.	Slaughter
Chelf	Johnson,	Smith, Va.
Clark	Lyndon B.	Snyder
Clason	Johnson, Okla.	Somers, N. Y.
Clements	Judd	Sparkman
Cochran	Kean	Spence
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Stefan
Colmer	Kerr	Stewart
Combs	Kilburn	Stigler
Cooley	Kilday	Stockman
Cooper	Kopplemann	Sullivan
Courtney	Kunkel	Sumners, Tex.
Cox	Lanham	Sundstrom
Cravens	Lea	Taber
Cunningham	LeCompte	Talle
Curtis	LeFevre	Tarver
D'Alesandro	Link	Taylor
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Thom
Davis	Lyle	Thomas, N. J.
De Lacy	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney,	McCormack	Thomason
James J.	McGehee	Tolan
Delaney,	McMillan, S. C.	Torrens
John J.	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Dickstein	Mahon	Trimble
Dingell	Maloney	Vinson
Dirksen	Manasco	Voorhis, Calif.
Dolliver	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Domeneaux	Marcantonio	Walter
Doughton, N. C.	Martin, Iowa	Weaver
Douglas, Calif.	Martin, Mass.	West
Douglas, Ill.	May	Whitten
Drewry	Morrow	Whittington
Durham	Michener	Wickersham
Earthman	Miller, Calif.	Wigglesworth
Eberhart	Mills	Winstead
Elliott	Monroney	Wolverton, N. J.
Engle, Calif.	Morrison	Wood
Ervin	Mott	Woodhouse
Fallon	Mundt	Woodrum, Va.
Fernandez	Murphy	Worley
Fisher	Murray, Tenn.	Zimmerman

NAYS—167

Allen, Ill.	Arnold	Bennett, Mo.
Andersen,	Bailey	Biemiller
H. Carl	Barrett, Wyo.	Bishop
Andersen,	Beall	Blackney
August H.	Bender	Bolton

Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	O'Brien, Mich.
Brehm	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Brown, Ohio	Harness, Ind.	Outland
Brumbaugh	Havener	Patterson
Buck	Hedrick	Philbin
Buffett	Henry	Phillips
Bunker	Hess	Pittenger
Butler	Hill	Ploesser
Campbell	Hinshaw	Powell
Canfield	Hoch	Price, Ill.
Cannon, Mo.	Hoffman	Rabaut
Celler	Holfield	Ramey
Chenoweth	Holmes, Mass.	Reece, Tenn.
Chipperfield	Hook	Reed, Ill.
Church	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Howell	Rees, Kans.
Coffee	Hull	Rich
Cole, Mo.	Izac	Robertson,
Corbett	Jenkins	N. Dak.
Crawford	Jennings	Robison, Ky.
Crosser	Jensen	Rockwell
Curley	Johnson, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Dondero	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Doyle	Jones	Savage
Dworshak	Jonkman	Schwabe, Mo.
Ellis	Kee	Schwabe, Okla.
Elisworth	Keefe	Scrivner
Elsaesser	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer
Elston	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Engel, Mich.	King	Short
Feighan	Kinzer	Simpson, Ill.
Fellows	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Fenton	Knutsen	Smith, Maine
Flood	Landis	Smith, Ohio
Gallagher	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Gardner	Larcade	Springer
Gavin	Lemke	Starkey
Gearhart	Lesinski	Stevenson
Gerlach	Lewis	Sumner, Ill.
Gillespie	Ludlow	Talbot
Gillette	McConnell	Tibbott
Gillie	McCowan	Traynor
Graham	McDonough	Vorys, Ohio
Granahan	McGlinchey	Vursel
Grant, Ind.	McGregor	Wasielewski
Green	McKenzie	Weichel
Griffiths	Madden	Weiss
Gross	Mason	Weich
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson
Hagen	Morgan	Wolcott
Hall	Murray, Wis.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Edwin Arthur Neely		Woodruff, Mich.

NOT VOTING—16

Cole, Kans.	LaFollette	Rogers, N. Y.
Dawson	Mansfield,	Sabath
Eaton	Mont.	Satterfield
Heidinger	Murdock	White
Kearney	Norrell	Winter
Kefauver	Powers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Heidinger against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rogers of New York with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. White with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. GRANAHAN changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing for tomorrow. I understand there are no special orders for tomorrow, and I intend to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I shall object to that request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, rather than let the gentleman have the privilege of objecting, I shall not submit the request. The purpose of my statement was to feel the gentleman out.

There is nothing on the program for Monday. On Tuesday the farm census bill will be considered. Following that the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill will be in order.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday next be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

WALLACE-FOR-PRESIDENT CLUB

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, a telegram sent at 4:25 from my home city of Hartford, Conn., was received by me late this afternoon. It reads as follows:

In view of Senate action in trying to push Henry A. Wallace out of the political picture we the undersigned have formed a Wallace-for-President Club and are planning to extend the organization of such clubs throughout the State and Nation.

Martin Hogan, William Zeman, Joseph V. Cronin, John Banks, Daniel Howard, Rev. Alfred M. Lambert, Irving Atwood, J. B. O'Brien, James C. Egan, William Conroy, Harry Cooper, Patrick Ward, Henry Mitchell, Dr. Allen F. Jackson, Harold Conroy, Ben Abrams, George David, and others.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today a chart of the War Production Board showing production.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from ex-Senator Robert L. Owen.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include some brief excerpts, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Courier-Journal of some days ago.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMPBELL] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects. On one extension I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost will exceed the usual amount by \$676, but I ask that it be printed nevertheless.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the Ladies Home Journal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include a statement by the National Manufacturers' Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on rural phase-inverters by Lee M. Moore.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EATON (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for an indefinite time.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, for an indefinite time, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 2, 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., Friday, February 2, 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:

156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement to the effect that no reservations pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858), were made during the calendar year of 1944; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

157. A letter from the secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting the annual report of the directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

158. A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

159. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting a report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

160. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the estimated number of pieces of matter mailed free of postage under the penalty privileges during the quarter ended September 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

161. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting tabulations submitted by the Commissioner of the General Land Office showing the withdrawals and restorations made under the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847; 16 U. S. C., sec. 471; 43 U. S. C., sec. 141 et seq.), for the period from January 1, 1944, through December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

162. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

163. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the government of the District of Columbia for year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

164. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a request for reintroduction of H. R. 7500, Seventy-seventh Congress, a bill to amend section 927 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, relating to insane criminals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

165. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, a report of a committee was delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 689. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; with amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1916) granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Chappelle, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 1920. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1921. A bill to discharge registrants unlawfully inducted into the armed service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1922. A bill to repeal section 3 of the act approved April 13, 1938, as amended, relating to hops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1923. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, so as to eliminate financial inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite to obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1924. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, relating to eligibility for annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1925. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1926. A bill to repeal the use tax on motor vehicles and boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 1927. A bill to provide for the payment of grave and grave-marker allowances for veterans' burials; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1928. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1929. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to authorize the termination under certain conditions of the payment of monthly family allowances to class A dependents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1930. A bill to provide for the making of loans to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the deduction of certain circulation expenditures, and expenditures in defense of or perfecting property rights or title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1932 (by request). A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1933 (by request). A bill to increase the compensation or pension for nurse or attendant for service-connected disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1934 (by request). A bill to establish effective dates of revisions of the schedule for rating disabilities, 1938, under Veterans' Regulation No. 3 (a), promulgated under the act of March 20, 1933, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1935 (by request). A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part 1, paragraph 1, to authorize service connection of certain disabilities on the basis of aggravation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1936 (by request). A bill to grant pension to World War No. 2 veterans and others entitled to war-service-connected rates under paragraph 1 of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended, at the same rates as granted World War No. 1 veterans for specified war-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1937 (by request). A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 10 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1938 (by request). A bill to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1939 (by request). A bill to increase the allowance for burial expenses of deceased veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1940. A bill to incorporate the United War Mothers of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1941. A bill to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1942. A bill to provide that all sums received by the United States from the liquidation of Government property be applied to the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1943. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1944 (by request). A bill to establish uniformity by increasing by 15 percent the special awards and allowances fixed by law for service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1945 (by request). A bill to recognize service in the land and naval forces performed on or after September 8, 1939, but prior to December 7, 1941, as service performed during the present war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1946. A bill relating to contracts between Members of Congress and agencies of the United States for housing facilities in and near the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1947. A bill to authorize an increase in the pay of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a document of the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and providing for additional copies for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to terminate the effectiveness of the act of January 20, 1942, which established daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Res. 118. Resolution providing additional compensation for two floor managers of telephones of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1948. A bill for the relief of Drapery Hardware Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1949. A bill for the compensation of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of Harry Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1951. A bill for the relief of George H. Hines, Jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Joseph Brunette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiel; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Oscar S. Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Annie M. Lannon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Frank Sable; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of L. A. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1959. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

44. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Jessie Lord, Grinnell, Iowa, and members of the First Friend's Church of Grinnell, Iowa, in opposition to compulsory peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

45. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors of the Alamo National Farm Loan Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to House bill 667 in its present form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

46. Also, petition of the American Water Works Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the upgrading of their industry in regulatory directives, to the position to which by reason of its vital functions, and in the public interest, public water supply service is entitled; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast given unto the chosen representatives of our beloved country the sacred and difficult task of serving their generation in these days of unparalleled tragedies, we pray that Thou wilt create within their souls a vivid sense of Thy presence and power.

Help us to have a clear understanding of the problems which confront the members of the human family. Give us wisdom that we may know how to counsel them in their perplexities. Make us strong and brave that we may be able to assuage their sorrows and anxieties. Fill us with sympathy and hope that we may bring courage to all who are in distress and despair.

Grant that our hearts may be leagued with Thine in an abiding comradeship. Make us sensitive and responsive to the guidance of Thy Spirit. May we seek to fulfill each appointed task in faith and in faithfulness. Hasten the day when the ideals of righteousness and peace which we recognize and cherish shall become the blessed realities in the life of humanity.

Hear us for the sake of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

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

S. 63. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs;

S. 72. An act for the relief of Antonio Ruiz;

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper;

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins,

formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 184. An act to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment-compensation agencies;

S. 213. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 216. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. An act to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 221. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them