

a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

134. By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial of Oklahoma State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4, memorializing Congress and the Veterans' Administration of the Federal Government to establish within the State of Oklahoma (1) additional hospital facilities for veterans and (2) additional facilities for the Veterans' Administration for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

135. Also, memorial of the Oklahoma State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Veterans' Administration of the United States to establish within Oklahoma a colony-type hospital for nervous cases and pledging co-operation of the State in securing land or site therefor; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

136. Also, memorial of Oklahoma State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3, memorializing Congress and the Federal Communications Commission to take such steps as may be necessary to enable and insure all practical use of radio in the operation of trains in the interest of public safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

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

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

O Lord, Master of all, at noonday and in the morning we praise Thee, we thank Thee, we glorify Thee. Thou who hast folded back the dark mantle of night to clothe us in the golden glory of this day, drive, we beseech Thee, from our hearts all gloomy thought, all hurtful ideas, make us glad with the brightness of hope, and lead our willful and wondering minds up to the pavilion of Thy presence. Thou who art the giver of all wisdom, enlighten our understanding with knowledge of the right, purge our hearts from the sins of pride and prejudice which doth so easily beset us, that no deceit may mislead us, no temptation corrupt us.

In these days of great tribulations, and yet of great expectations, give us ears to hear the sounds of Thy chariot wheels, give us eyes to thrill at the reddening dawn which lights with deathless hope even a weary world in flames. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Monday, March 5, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

FELICITATIONS FROM THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication or address from the Secretary of the

Government of Costa Rica, and directs the clerk to read it.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

REMARKS ADDRESSED TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE BY MR. FERNANDO SOTO HARRISON, SECRETARY OF GOVERNMENT AND PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, it is indeed a privilege which I shall long remember to be accorded this opportunity of attending a session of this honorable Senate and of addressing these few words to you.

In the name of President Teodoro Picado of Costa Rica, I present to you most cordial greetings and expressions of sincere friendship and respect. Our people have a profound admiration for your country, and your great men have been a source of inspiration to the builders of our democracy.

During this terrible war we have fought together, each according to his abilities, because we have a common destiny. In the construction of the peace, our statesmen are also working shoulder to shoulder with yours, as in Chapultepec.

The good-neighbor policy has been converted into the policy of the good brother. We Costa Ricans have felt that at the Crimea Conference we were represented because President Roosevelt in promoting the interests of the United States was also promoting those of the sister republics of the hemisphere.

This time the errors of Vienna and Versailles will not be repeated. The final act of war will not be confused with the structure of the peace. We have been preparing the international constitution upon which the peace will rest. May this constitution be as robust as the Constitution of the United States, so that it may live through a long future of work blest with peace.

WASHINGTON, March 6, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication from Mr. Fernando Soto Harrison will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MOSES, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I feel a sense of very deep personal loss in the passing of Senator MOSES, of North Dakota. He was a personal friend of mine for many years, and during the time we were both serving as chief executives of our respective States we had many things in common and worked together on problems confronting us, and I had an opportunity to become very closely acquainted with Senator MOSES.

I know of no man in public life who is finer in any of the aspects of true manhood than was JOHN MOSES. He was gentle, he was loyal, he was able in his service to his State. I feel that not only has the State of North Dakota lost one of its most outstanding citizens but the Senate has lost a man who in the course of time would have cut a large figure in our deliberations. I express very deep grief and regret at the passing of my personal friend.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM M. CALDER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it becomes my sad duty to announce to my colleagues of the Senate the death of former Senator William M. Calder, of New York. I ask that the item in Who's Who in America dealing with Senator Calder

be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

William M. Calder, ex-Senator, born in Brooklyn, N. Y., May 3, 1869. Educated in the public schools of New York; got his LL. D. at George Washington University in 1920, and at Syracuse University in 1921, Fordham University and Gonzales College in 1922.

Building commissioner of Brooklyn, 1902-3. Was a Member of the Fifty-ninth to Sixty-third Congresses, 1905-15, Sixth New York District. Delegate to Republican National Convention nine times, to 1940. Member of the United States Senate from 1917-23.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Mon Wallgren as a Member of the Senate from the State of Washington.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, established by House Concurrent Resolution 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, the following Senators: The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. John Moses, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

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. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

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

H. R. 433. An act to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives;

H. R. 534. An act to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases; and for other purposes;

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 1439. An act to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries;

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finders' Act;

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2125. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code; and

H. R. 2284. An act to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 25)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1945, in the amount of \$1,855,000 for the Post Office Department (with an accompany-

ing paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY, AND INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT POLICY

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, the first monthly report of the Attorney General on the disposition of surplus Government-owned property, and also the first of a series of reports on transportation, the report in question dealing with international air-transport policy, with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 123 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

RELIEF OF THE CHIEF DISBURSING OFFICER, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement,

PENSIONS COMMITTEE

name of person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February, in compliance with the terms of

Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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 agencies 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 (with accompanying papers); 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.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report for the month of February 1945 from the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

MARCH 1, 1945.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle.....	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md.....	Veterans' Administration.....	\$5,000

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Whereas agitation for the passage of Federal legislation approving the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project has been revived in the Federal Congress; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of Pennsylvania is vitally concerned in the effect that the completion of said project would have upon its citizens; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relies substantially for its economic stability and future prosperity on the preservation of its essential mining, manufacturing, and transportation industries; and

"Whereas the production of bituminous and anthracite coal, the manufacture of steel products, and the transportation of freight by steam railroads constitute important segments of the industrial life and well-being of the Commonwealth and its citizens; and

"Whereas the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity as contemplated by the St. Lawrence project would displace in excess of 5,000,000 tons of bituminous coal annually; and

"Whereas the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway would open existing markets for bituminous and anthracite coal mined in the Commonwealth to ruinous competition from foreign coal mined by cheap labor

and transported to Great Lakes ports of the United States and Canada in tramp foreign-flag vessels at ballast rates; and

"Whereas the importation of steel and other manufactured products similarly produced at low cost in foreign countries and sold in competition with Pennsylvania manufactured goods would injuriously affect manufacturing industry and employment in the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the diversion of freight tonnage to the proposed waterways from steam railroads serving the Commonwealth and the loss of traffic due to the diminution of coal tonnage would seriously and adversely affect the railroad industry; and

"Whereas as a result of the foregoing, thousands of citizens of Pennsylvania engaged in the mining and production of coal, the making and fabrication of steel and other products, and the transporting of freight would be deprived of their means of earning a livelihood at their chosen occupations; and

"Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence project would have an injurious effect upon the economy of the country, with incidental benefit, if any, being confined to relatively few small areas and certain manufacturers; and

"Whereas a large part of the enormous cost of this unwise and uneconomical project would fall upon the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed

St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce

"Whereas it has long been recognized that the absence of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes has been a definite deterrent to Michigan's tourist and resort business; and

"Whereas the United States War Department has spent a large amount of money and time making a survey of the Michigan shore line, as a result of which a rivers and harbors bill is now pending in Congress which includes proposed construction of 15 small boat harbors on Lake Superior and Lake Huron; and

"Whereas two groups of harbors on Lake Superior have been proposed, a primary group to be constructed at Black River, Big Bay, Little Lake, and White Fish Point, and a secondary group consisting of harbors at Grand Traverse Bay, Lac La Belle, Eagle Harbor, and Isle Royale; and on Lake Huron harbors are recommended for Port Sanilac, Port Austin, Au Sable, Harrisville, Hammond

JAMES M. TUNNELL, Chairman.

Bay, and Point Lookout; and a harbor is also proposed on Beaver Island in Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas the congressional proposal as presented is that part of the cost should be borne by the Federal Government and part by the State government, but, in view of the fact that the Federal Government in the past has absorbed the entire cost on such harbors on the Atlantic seaboard, the Atlantic seaboard policy should be written in the congressional proposal on the theory that such harbors are considered an integral part of interstate commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress is urgently requested to enact legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce, the cost to be borne by the Federal Government, in view of the policy of the Federal Government with respect to bearing the cost of similar harbors on the Atlantic seaboard; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 30, 1945.

Adopted by the senate February 9, 1945.
A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 12

"Concurrent resolution requesting that the United States take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

"Whereas the Nazi persecution and wholesale slaughter of Jews in Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have vastly aggravated the tragedy of the Jewish problem thereof; and

"Whereas at the end of the present war large numbers of European Jews will find themselves in desperate need for a new home where they can rebuild their lives in dignity and security; and

"Whereas after World War No. 1, Great Britain, in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 had accepted at the instance of the Allied and Associated Powers the mandate for Palestine and had undertaken to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, an undertaking subsequently approved by 52 nations, including the United States; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922; and

"Whereas the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their national conventions of 1944 adopted platforms in favor of the reestablishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the President of the United States on October 15, 1944, expressed his approval of this aim which he stated to be in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the 'four freedoms': Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we the people of the State of Michigan express our profound sympathy with the millions of innocent victims of the enemy's ruthless extermination policy, and that we demand just punishment of all those who perpetrated these horrible crimes against humanity; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States use its good offices with Great Britain to the end

that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization, so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Adopted by the house February 7, 1945.

Adopted by the senate February 14, 1945.

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial to the Fish and Wildlife Service, Chicago, Ill., petitioning said Fish and Wildlife Service for a more applicable season on migratory waterfowl in the State of Montana.

"Whereas the season on migratory waterfowl in Montana has been unsatisfactory for many years; and

"Whereas the State of Montana is not suited geographically for one migratory-waterfowl zone; and

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of migratory waterfowl winter in Montana annually; and

"Whereas the Montana Wildlife Federation unanimously favors this resolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-ninth Legislative Session in the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully petition the Fish and Wildlife Service that the season on migratory waterfowl open on or about September 25 each year and remain open for 90 consecutive days, or the State of Montana be divided into two zones, separating the eastern part of the State from the remainder, and that the eastern section be put in the northern zone and the remainder in the intermediate zone, and that the hours of shooting be extended to include one-half an hour after sundown; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to mail copies of this resolution to the Fish and Wildlife Service, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.; the Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER, Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Senators from Montana; the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative in Congress; the Honorable President of the United States Senate and the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the Congress of the United States, United States Senators B. K. WHEELER, JAMES E. MURRAY, Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, all of Washington, D. C., opposing the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority, so far proposed or any similar delegation of governmental power and requesting that the Missouri Basin development and operation of such development be carried on by the United States Army Engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation under such plans of unified or joint representation as may be decided by Congress

"Whereas there has been and is proposed legislation in the Congress of the United States which would create a so-called Missouri Valley Authority covering the waters of the Missouri Basin; and

"Whereas the waters of such Missouri Basin originate in and adjacent to the State of Montana, and such waters are of vital importance and necessary to the stabilization of the agricultural and livestock industries of this State, and to the welfare and prosperity of the inhabitants thereof; and

"Whereas such Missouri River Basin waters are of great value to the welfare and prosperity of the people of Montana because such waters should be used for the production of cheap and plentiful hydroelectric power for use in rural electrification projects and industry to the end that Montana may enjoy the benefits of such power by increasing agricultural and industrial production, thereby furnishing employment and providing homes and business enterprise for our returning soldiers; and

"Whereas the fact of the importance of such waters to the people of the State of Montana, and to the welfare and prosperity of said State has long been recognized with the consequences that studies relating to the proper utilization of soil and water resources have been made by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and by the United States Army Engineers, and such plans have been coordinated in detail following such studies, which plans would result in great benefit to the people of the State of Montana from the standpoint of the use of such waters for the purposes of agriculture and great benefit would result to the inhabitants of States within the basin by reason of flood control and navigation which would follow such proposed development; and

"Whereas said Army Engineers and said Bureau of Reclamation are departments of long standing in the United States Government and have demonstrated their complete competence to undertake and carry forward the programs which have been outlined by them; and

"Whereas the inhabitants of the State of Montana have long since acquired property rights and interests in the waters of said Missouri Basin by reason of the ownership of water rights which are appurtenant to the land and without which such land to which such water rights are appurtenant would be rendered of little or no value; and

"Whereas the program of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the Army Engineers is compatible with such recognized water rights and with the normal processes of government; and

"Whereas the authority and bureau to be created by said proposed Missouri Valley Authority are inconsistent and incompatible with said rights of ownership and with the regularly constituted forms of government under which we operate; and

"Whereas there is a growing tendency in the Federal Government of the United States to encroach upon the rights originally reserved to the respective States, and to impose centralized government regulations and authorities in place of local government as contemplated under the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Montana, and to usurp the powers, privileges, and rights of the various States of the United States, including the State of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-ninth Legislative Session of the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we are opposed to the passage by the Congress of the United States of said Missouri Valley Authority legislation so far proposed or any similar delegation of governmental power, and that we favor the development of said Missouri Basin through such coordinated plans as have been developed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers; and that not only should the planning and construction of such projects be entrusted to the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in their respective fields according to their agreed plans, but the management, operation, and control

of all the projects of such unified and integrated plans should also remain in the same agencies working as joint operators or managers under such plans of unified or joint representation as may be directed by Congress, and that in any plans, means should be provided for the appropriate participation of State and local interests; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, to the Congress of the United States, to United States Senators B. K. WHEELER and JAMES E. MURRAY, to Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, all of Washington, D. C."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution requesting of the Congress of the United States that the problem of final political status be submitted to a vote of the people of Puerto Rico

"Whereas it is the feeling of the people of Puerto Rico that the problem of their definitive political status should be settled at the latest when the present war ends, or before that time if that were compatible with or favorable to the best development of the war effort against the totalitarian powers;

"Whereas the people of Puerto Rico have expressed themselves as opposed to any system of government in which sovereignty over their own life does not derive democratically from the governed, and therefore they desire the prompt termination of the colonial regime in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas it is the desire of the people of Puerto Rico, based on the Atlantic Charter and on the right of self-determination, to be enabled to decide, in a fraternal spirit with the people, the Congress, and the Government of the United States, on the political status that they may prefer for themselves; and

"Whereas the people of Puerto Rico should have the opportunity of deciding on their definitive political status within the clearest knowledge of the mutual economic relationships and mutual moral obligations that would exist under any form of status that they may approve with their votes in a plebiscite or referendum completely apart from the general elections: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico (the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico concurring),

"First. To petition respectfully, as by the present, from the Congress of the United States, the enactment of a law instrumenting the alternative forms of definitive political status for Puerto Rico that Congress may be disposed to grant upon approval of any of them by the people of Puerto Rico, in such manner that our people may have clear knowledge of the mutual economic relationships and the recognition of mutual moral obligations that would exist under each of the alternative forms that Congress may present to them.

"Second. That a similar petition be made to the President of the United States, requesting his support for such a measure before Congress.

"Third. That the referendum be carried out in such a manner that the people of Puerto Rico may express either their approval of any of the alternatives that may be submitted to them, or their disapproval of all of them of the latter should be their judgment.

"Fourth. That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, as President of the Senate, to the chairman of the Committees on Insular Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Governor of Puerto Rico, and to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington."

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial urging efforts in behalf of national and international agreements guaranteeing freedom of access to and transportation of news

"To the Congress and the Secretary of State of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: "Freedom of speech and of the press, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, is essential to the proper functioning of democracy, for only when men are free to report the facts of happenings of public import, and to communicate and publish them, can the people have knowledge by which the majority can exercise its will.

"Freedom of speech and press is the strongest guaranty of peace in the world, for normal men become killers only under the influence of mass emotion, and the most powerful implement of dictators and rulers who seek to drive their peoples to war is control and distortion of the flow of news. Such control, whether it be direct or indirect, gravely imperils the prospect of peace and human progress, for national prejudices, once aroused, are easily inflamed. People who are made slaves to such passions like to have them confirmed in what they hear and read.

"It is a basic democratic principle that the truth will prevail if it is not stifled at the source or before it can be reported to the public. If men are free to get the news of happenings of public import at the source, to transmit it and publish it, truthful men will ever be present to report the truth, and distorted and dishonest reports, spread for ulterior purposes, will be discredited. Thus will war-making schemes of dictators or dictatorial groups be frustrated.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urges:

"1. That the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States, and all representatives of the United States and official organizations having to do with foreign affairs and with any future peace settlements of this war, endeavor to have incorporated in national and international agreements proper provisions for freedom to report and publish news, and to seek the agreement of all nations that there shall be:

"1a. Freedom of access to news at its source on equal terms to all properly accredited reporters and correspondents, both native and foreign.

"1b. Freedom of transmission of news on equal terms to all at reasonable rates and with reasonable promptness.

"1c. Freedom of publication of both domestic and foreign news subject only to fair laws against libel and unjustified damage.

"Adopted by the senate February 6, 1945.

"Adopted by the house February 17, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor February 20, 1945."

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Veterans' Administration of the Federal Government to establish within the State of Oklahoma (1) additional hospital facilities for veterans, and (2) additional facilities for the Veterans' Administration for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected

"Whereas the hospital facilities in Oklahoma for veterans are wholly inadequate to care for the number of Oklahoma veterans who will need hospitalization, and

"Whereas the facilities for the Veterans' Administration in Oklahoma for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected, are likewise inadequate, and

"Whereas our Nation must not fail to provide for these veterans, their widows, and orphans: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America and the Veterans' Administration of the United States, be and they are hereby memorialized and requested:

"(a) To establish additional hospital facilities for veterans within the State of Oklahoma, the location thereof to be at some place centrally located within the State.

"(b) To establish additional facilities within the State of Oklahoma for the Veterans' Administration for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress and to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of February 1945."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Veterans' Administration of the United States to establish within Oklahoma a colony-type hospital for nervous cases and pledging cooperation of State in securing land or site therefor

"Whereas after the hardships of war many of the veterans returning to Oklahoma will suffer from nervous diseases, and

"Whereas it is believed that the colony-type hospital would be best for the treatment of these cases: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America and the Veterans' Administration of the United States be and they are hereby memorialized and requested to establish within the State of Oklahoma a colony-type hospital for nervous cases, and the cooperation of the State of Oklahoma is hereby pledged in the securing of land or site for said hospital.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, and to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of February 1945."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission to take such steps as may be necessary to enable and insure all practical use of radio in the operation of trains in the interest of public safety

"Whereas within the past few years there have been far-reaching developments in the science of electronics so that it has become a matter of common knowledge that the use of this technical development will diminish the possibility of train wrecks and will otherwise be of great benefit to the public; and

"Whereas this is a proper subject for the consideration of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas this matter has already had the consideration of the Federal Communications Commission in particular reference to the allocation of radio frequencies to the

railroad industry for this purpose, and it has conducted extensive research in that connection and has made proposed allocations of radio frequencies to the railroad industry for this purpose; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission in its report dated January 15, 1945, has stated that: 'It is hoped, in the light of the evidence adduced at the railroad radio hearing regarding the improved safety and efficiency factors attendant upon the use of radio in railroad operations, that the railroad industry will make the fullest possible use of the frequencies proposed to be allocated as soon as materials are available': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"1. That the State of Oklahoma is seriously interested and concerned in the problem of public safety and in the use by the railroad industry of radio technique as a safety measure; and

"2. Be it further resolved that the Federal Communications Commission be commended for its interest and efforts in this connection and that the railroad industry be commended for its splendid efforts being made in experiments looking to a solution of this highly technical problem; and

"3. Be it further resolved that it is the sense of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma that this matter should be pursued diligently by the Congress of the United States, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the end that as soon as possible this equipment be installed wherever practicable throughout the railroad industry; and

"4. Be it further resolved that the secretary of the State senate be and is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to all of the Members of the congressional delegation, both in the Senate and in the House, from the State of Oklahoma, and to the Secretary and each member of the Federal Communications Commission, and to the Secretary and each member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"Adopted by the senate the 1st day of February 1945."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

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

"Senate resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to extend the wild game season for a period of 90 days

"Whereas due to the large increase of wild waterfowl as reported by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas this increase would seem to justify the taking of a reasonable number of wild waterfowl for food and sport; and

"Whereas the number of persons who are in a position to shoot wild waterfowl has been very much reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service be and it is hereby requested to extend the open season for killing wild waterfowl for a period of 90 days; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of

the Interior, the chairmen of the United States Senate and House Committees on Wildlife and Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Maryland.

"Read and adopted February 20, 1945."

LIMITATION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON COUNTY (MD.) TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. RADCLIFFE presented a resolution adopted by the Washington County (Md.) Taxpayers' Association, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our country is engaged in a desperate, life-and-death struggle in which civilians, acting both individually and collectively through their Government, are expected to make sacrifices befitting the sacrifices made by the men and women in the armed services in a joint effort to safeguard our freedom and our democracy; and

Whereas our enormous public debt, resulting partly from military necessities and partly from long-continued deficit spending, threatens now to equal the entire wealth of the Nation and thereby to jeopardize the Government's solvency; and

Whereas there exists in the Federal Government, first, a tendency to appease large group interests by the use of Federal funds, much to the detriment of our national economy and unity and, secondly, a kindred tendency to appropriate funds to local communities and States for other than Federal needs, thus engendering a shameful, wasteful scramble for supposed benefactions from a supposed benefactor who, as in the case of Maryland, returns to her people only \$1 for every \$1.71 taken from them for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Representatives in Congress to adopt a policy of limiting Federal expenditures strictly to Federal Government needs and purposes and to make no unnecessary expenditures of any kind that would further mortgage the future of ourselves, of our children, or of the men and women in military service.

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA—POST-WAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT AND STATUS OF NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriate reference a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia relating to the post-war Military Establishment and the status of the National Guard.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia memorializing the Congress of the United States on the post-war Military Establishment and the status of the National Guard

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now confronted with the task of enacting future legislation which has as its purpose post-war military organization; and

Whereas the military policy and the character, composition, and size of the Military Establishment of the United States is a matter of vital importance to the people of Georgia, the several States and Territories of the Union, as well as to those of the Nation; and

Whereas the decisions to be arrived at by the Congress in this matter will be predicated upon the powers granted to the Congress

under the "militia clauses" as well as the "Army clauses" of the Constitution, and will directly affect the military establishments of the several States and the relationship of these State forces to the Army of the United States; and

Whereas the legislation to be enacted in this matter by the Congress will apply to a post-war America and when America is at peace: Now be it, therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress in considering military organization is respectfully urged to retain the basic principles and policies as promulgated by the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and in cogent acts, especially the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 relating to the status of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation; that the three civilian components of the Army of the United States, the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, be preserved and expanded in the post-war military organization; be it further

Resolved, That we advocate, in the event that a system of universal military training be included in the post-war plan for the Military Establishment, that such training be integrated with the civilian components of the Army, and specifically the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and be it further

Resolved, That in the discussion of the post-war military policy and the form of the Military Establishment the fullest opportunity consistent with existing conditions be accorded the officers and men of all components of the Army who are or who have been serving with the armed forces in time of war to express their views on this most important matter, to the end that this Nation will adopt a sound military policy consistent with our traditions and which will afford the utmost security to the Nation.

Approved this 2d day of February 1945.

ELLIS ARNELL,
Governor.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Legislature of South Dakota, which has recently adjourned its biennial session, adopted three concurrent resolutions, covering three matters. The first was the coordination of the National Guard with the national military forces. The next was a resolution in regard to the Federal gasoline tax. The third was on the subject of the disposal of surplus war material.

I ask that these resolutions be printed in the body of the RECORD, under the rule, and referred to the appropriate committees. I should like to say that I heartily concur in the policies which have been adopted and approved by the legislature of my State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be received, printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America on the post-war military policy and Military Establishment and of the National Guard

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the experience of the United States in the two World Wars, and more particularly World War No. 2, demonstrates that

It is desirable that our Nation should adopt a definite military policy so patterned that it will meet the post-war needs of the country; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to the Federal Government, and to the several States and Territories of the United States, as to what that policy shall be, and as to what the character, size, and composition of the Military Establishment; and

Whereas the decisions of the Congress which will be reached in this matter will directly affect the Military Establishment of the Nation and of the several States and Territories, and the relationship between those forces; and

Whereas the Congress now has before it plans and suggestions as to what the post-war policy and the future Military Establishments shall be; and it is believed that the basic principles of the military policy proposed by Gen. George Washington to the Continental Congress, and more recently approved by our present military authorities, then were and still are basically sound and should be given serious consideration by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (and concurred in by Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota):

That the Congress respectfully is urged to preserve in the post-war military policy the basic principles of the policy laid down by Gen. George Washington, the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, insofar as they relate to the civilian components of the Army of the United States, and more particularly the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and

That we fully endorse and subscribe to the position taken by the Secretary of War relative to the place which the National Guard should have as announced by him on November 23, 1944, in which he stated:

"It would be the mission of this reserve component (the National Guard), in the event of a national emergency, to furnish units fit for service anywhere in the world. * * *

"This conception of the mission of the National Guard of the United States would interfere in no way with the traditional mission of the National Guard of the States and Territories to provide sufficient organizations in each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, so trained and equipped as to enable them to function efficiently at existing strength in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety, under competent orders of the State authorities.

"National Guard units have played a vital role in the mobilization of our present Army and they have made a brilliant record on every fighting front. We are counting on them as a bulwark of our future national security."

That we do endorse and fully approve the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, as set forth in War Department Circular No. 347, August 25, 1944, to the effect that the post-war Military Establishment should consist of a professional army in peace, large enough to meet the normal requirements of the Nation, to be reinforced in time of emergency by units drawn from the civilian components of the Army of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That in the event a system of universal military training is included in the post-war plan for a Military Establishment, we favor that such training should be integrated with the civilian components of the Military Establishment, and more particularly with the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and

That the personnel of all components of the Army, both officers and enlisted per-

sonnel, be given full opportunity to express their views relative to the post-war military policy of the United States, and the form of the Military Establishment which should be provided, to the end that the Congress adopt a sound military policy consistent with the traditions and experiences of our Nation, and which will afford the greatest security of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. CHAN GURNEY, Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, and Hon. FRANCIS CASE, all in Washington, D. C.

The Vice President laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

To the Committee on Finance:

House Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a sales tax on gasoline averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1944 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of \$1,875,000, which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to a 10 percent retail sales tax on such product which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

Whereas the Federal lubricating oil tax is 6 cents per gallon, and is likewise an enormous retail sales tax upon a product necessary to the production of food for the country, and is an unfair and unreasonable imposition upon such necessity; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type which is a necessity to persons engaged in agricultural and producing pursuits; and

Whereas such gasoline tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should not increase such Federal gasoline tax or Federal lubricating oil tax or consider any increase in such taxes, and should discontinue the same at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon their expiration, and should thus leave the field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various States' highway systems; be it further

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby, urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing any suggested increase in the Federal gasoline or Federal

lubricating oil tax, or the reenactment or continuance of said taxes; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to be by them presented to the proper committees in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

House Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense, and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives, first session, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, H. R. 538, by Mr. POAGE, which is in the following language:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to requisition any materials, equipment, or supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil and water conservation work and operations in furtherance of the act approved April 27, 1935, entitled 'An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes.' Upon receipt of such requisition from the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any such property, the head of the Government agency having control of such property shall transfer such property to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement.

"Sec. 2. Material, equipment, and supplies requisitioned by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1 shall be distributed through the Soil Conservation Service, by grant or loan, to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized under State laws with powers to promote and carry out soil and water conservation operations and related public purposes. Such distribution shall be made in accordance with such standards, conditions, rules, and regulations as to use and disposition as may be recommended by the Soil Conservation Service and may be established for such purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Whereas South Dakota is extremely interested in such legislation and deems it wise and expedient that Congress enact such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring), That Congress be respectfully urged to enact H. R. 538, first session, Seventy-ninth Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. CHAN GURNEY, Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, Hon. FRANCIS CASE, all in Washington, D. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR, ETC.—LETTER AND PETITION FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a letter from the Reverend Peter W. Goering, of the Methodist Church at Linn, Kans., approving the closing down of horse racing, the midnight curfew for night clubs, and suggesting that the Government complete the job of limiting nonessential activities by curtailing the sale, production, and transportation of liquor.

I think his suggestion is a good one. Present shortages of manpower, foodstuffs, war materials, transportation, and many other things, it seems to me, justify the cutting out of these nonessentials for the duration of the war—and if there is anything which is nonessential, as I see it, it is the liquor business and its attendant rackets. I ask also that a petition reinforcing the points made in the Reverend Mr. Goering's letter be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as part of my remarks and properly referred.

There being no objection, the letter and the petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINN, KANS., February 26, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
House of Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Enclosed is a petition signed by a number of citizens of Linn, which is a progressive little town in Washington County. The names include the foremost of her citizens. We realize that the liquor situation is such that our national leaders should curtail its sale, production, and transportation.

We are, therefore, asking you if you would please forward it to War Mobilization Director Byrnes. We are glad for his recent announcement of the midnight curfew. We are greatly in favor of the restriction placed on nonessential enterprises, such as baseball. We are also pleased to note in the Topeka Daily Capital your efforts at attempting to do something about this very thing which the enclosed petition seeks to accomplish.

Gratefully yours,

REV. PETER W. GOERING,
Methodist Church.

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 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 bought 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 racing and other nonessentials to the war effort.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—THE SO-CALLED AUSTIN AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD three telegrams from the heads of labor organizations in Kansas, and a letter from the joint conference board of local unions of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders in the District of Columbia, protesting against the so-called Austin amendment included in pending manpower-control legislation.

The telegrams are from H. S. Scott, president of the Salina (Kans.) Allied Printing Trades Council; Roy J. Rankin, secretary-treasurer of the Allied Plumbing Trades Council of Topeka, Kans.; and J. V. Wolf, president of Topeka Typographical Union No. 121.

It seems to me that authority for the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to exercise the powers granted under the War Powers Act, including repeal of all laws and parts of laws in conflict with such orders as he may see fit to issue, is entirely too broad to be granted. I send the telegrams and the letter to the desk for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letter were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., February 28, 1945.

SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Topeka Allied Plumbing Trades Council at special meeting voted unanimously to strongly protest enslavement of American labor by adoption Austin amendment or language comparable thereto, which is now pending as part of House Resolution 1752, reported Friday by divided vote of Senate Military Affairs Committee, and request you vote against Austin amendment for compulsory service of labor as provided for which is neither necessary nor helpful, and will, we believe, actually impede war effort.

ROY J. RANKIN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Allied Plumbing Trades Council.

SALINA, KANS., February 26, 1945.

SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose passage of the Austin amendment or related bill. We do not believe it beneficial to war effort and we think it decidedly unfair to labor.

THE SALINA ALLIED PRINTING
TRADES COUNCIL,
H. D. SCOTT, President.

TOPEKA, KANS., February 27, 1945.

SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Topeka Typographical Union, No. 121, through its executive officers asked that you vote against the Austin amendment or any compulsory service of labor which is now pending as part of House Resolution 1752.

J. V. WOLF, President.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOOKBINDERS,

Washington, D. C., February 27, 1945.
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Bookbinders' local unions Nos. 4, 42, and 69, representing approximately 2,500 American families express opposition to the Austin amendment to H. R. 1752.

This amendment is viewed by organized labor as no more than a serious construction of the present manpower situation. By such language we mean the attitude that most certainly will be created by the passage of the Austin amendment is that organized labor would react to the sting of defeat.

Reports from over the Nation show many conflicting statements that leave the impression there is both a surplus of labor and a manpower shortage at the same time.

We feel that a vote against the Austin amendment is imperative as we feel that the manpower situation does not require such drastic measures.

Yours truly,

SEABORN D. JONES,
Chairman, Joint Conference Board.

NOTE.—Dear Senator, this is most certainly the attitude of Local Union No. 4.

OTIS CHAPPELL,
President, Local No. 4.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 645. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of March 3, 1893 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 84); and

S. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inspect naval establishments in the Western Hemisphere; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 79. Resolution to investigate the treatment by the Japanese of prisoners and civilians in the Philippines; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 674. A bill to fix the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

(Mr. GUFFEY also introduced Senate bill 675, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 676. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court

of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 677. A bill to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John A. Schaefer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 679. A bill to amend the act of April 18, 1940, relating to the furnishing of markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 680, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 681. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself I introduce a bill to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to facilitate voting by members of the armed forces and certain others who are away from their places of residence, and ask that the bill be referred to the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] (for himself and Mr. LUCAS) will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LUCAS):

S. 682. A bill to amend Public Law, 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to facilitate voting by members of the armed forces and certain others absent from the place of their residence; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 683. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Earl W. Nepple; and for the relief of Marie Nepple; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Ida M. Raney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO (by request):

S. 685. A bill to amend section 26 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 686. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes M. Segall; and

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 689. A bill for the relief of Harry M. Frazee; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 690. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in

ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. MOORE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 42, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a suitable memorial to those who served in the armed forces in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, to be known as World Wars Memorial Temple; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 433. An act to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 534. An act to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River; and

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finders' Act; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 1439. An act to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; and

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 2125. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

H. R. 2284. An act to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (a) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to any matters relating to the production, transportation, distribution, exportation, utilization, and consumption of food and allied products produced within or imported into the United States and its Territories and possessions, and of all products, commodities, and factors involved therein, including farm prices and shortages of farm labor, machinery, fertilizer, and feed or other commodities necessary to crop and livestock production; and (b) to make inquiries into any policies and practices of the Government which appear to imperil the production and distribution of adequate supplies of food for our armed forces, our civilian population, or our allies. The

committee or subcommittee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of its investigations, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 555 TO COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit a resolution on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 93), as follows:

Resolved, That when the Committee on Commerce shall have concluded its consideration of the bill (S. 555) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, and shall have reported thereon to the Senate, such bill shall thereupon be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be printed and lie on the table, and I especially invite the attention of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY—REFERENCE OF HOUSE BILL 37

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit another resolution, and request that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 94), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 37) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be printed, and, in view of the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], that it lie on the table until a future date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether this matter has been taken up with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and has received his approval.

Mr. McCARRAN. It has not. Therefore, I ask that the resolution lie over until the Senator from Montana is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be received and lie on the table.

POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on post-war military policy delivered by Senator HICKENLOOPER before the thirty-sixth annual Governors' Conference, at Hershey, Pa., May 31, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF—ARTICLE BY WALTER P. ARMSTRONG

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lincoln as Commander in Chief," written by Walter P. Armstrong, of Memphis, Tenn., and published in the Saturday Review of February 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRETON WOODS MONETARY PROPOSALS

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum entitled "The Bretton Woods Monetary Proposals," issued by the National League of Women Voters, which appears in the Appendix.]

VALUE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TO THE CITY OF BUFFALO

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Seaway Would Be of Great Aid to Frontier, Says C. I. O. Leader," from the Buffalo Evening News of February 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NIGHT—POEM BY PVT. (1ST CL.) ALBERT T. YOUNG

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert T. Young, Seventh Army, Thirty-sixth Infantry Division, entitled "Night," which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWTH OF BUREAUCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM MILES CITY (MONT.) DAILY STAR

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Cancerous Growth of Bureaucracy," written by W. S. Flinn, general manager of the Miles City Daily Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment pro-

posed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] as a substitute for the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, as amended.

Mr. HILL. 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	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Billbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnson, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Taylor
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Tobey
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wagner
Fulbright	Moore	Walsh
George	Morse	Wherry
Gerry	Murdock	White
Green	Murray	Wiley
Guffey	Myers	Willis
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is attending the funeral of the junior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses, and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, during last week there were printed in the RECORD as well as in the Appendix of the RECORD many quotations from the extended hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate in connection with the pending manpower legislation. On January 16, 1945, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, and Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Naval

Operations, wrote a joint letter to the President of the United States. The following day, January 17, the President wrote a letter to Representative ANDREW J. MAY, Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee. On February 11 the President of the United States sent a memorandum to our majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], which the Senator from Kentucky brought to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs just before the committee favorably reported the bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me so important to have printed in the RECORD the joint letter from General Marshall and Admiral King to the President of the United States, and the letter from the President to Representative MAY, as well as the memorandum from the President to the Senator from Kentucky, that I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the body of the RECORD, in the hope that the pending legislation, so sorely needed for our armed forces, may be passed promptly.

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

JANUARY 16, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the agents directly responsible to you for the conduct of military operations, we feel that it is our duty to report to you the urgent necessity for immediate action to improve the situation relative to the acute need for young and vigorous replacements for the Army and Navy and to provide the necessary manpower to increase the production of critical items of munitions, accelerate ship construction, and effect the rapid repair of damaged vessels.

Personnel losses sustained by the Army in the past 2 months have, by reason of the severity of the weather and the fighting on the European front, taxed the replacement system to the breaking point. The Army must provide 600,000 replacements for overseas theaters before June 30, and, together with the Navy, will require a total of 900,000 inductions by June 30. Losses or wastage in equipment due to the German offensive and winter fighting conditions must be made good, and there must also be provided the equipment for 8 French divisions and for the accumulation of reserves in equipment which do not exist at the present time. It is estimated that 700,000 industrial workers must be added to the force producing Army and Navy munitions and to supporting industries in the next 6 months if our urgent needs are to be met.

The increased intensity of the operations in the Pacific, particularly the operations of the fleet in support of the Philippine operations, has resulted in extensive damage to naval vessels, many of which will require major repairs. Due to the over-all shortage of shipworkers, this increased repair load is already being reflected in a slow-down in the construction of new ships which have been counted on for future operations. New devices and weapons in production and ready for production require additional facilities and civilian labor. The fast tempo and increased damage has introduced demands for additional naval personnel in the way of replacements. Items of particular moment are replacements for casualties and war-fatigued men, particularly pilots and crews for aircraft. The Navy also requires a considerable number of additional Medical Corps personnel.

Due to ever-increasing demands for the support of the large forces, Army and Navy, deployed overseas and for the minimum relief of liberated areas, the availability of shipping

also presents problems calling for early solution. The building, repair, and manning of ships of the merchant marine require to be taken fully into account in the over-all military situation.

You are intimately familiar, Mr. President, with the great importance of regaining the offensive on the western front and pressing it, together with operations against the Japanese, with constantly increasing intensity in the months to come. To this end, therefore, we feel that the United States should make every conceivable effort to enable the armed forces to carry out your instructions.

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

E. J. KING,
Chief of Naval Operations.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 17, 1945.

HON. ANDREW J. MAY,
*Chairman, House Military Affairs Committee,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAY: In my recent message on the state of the Union, I pointed out the urgent need of a national service law, and recommended that, pending action by the Congress on the broader aspects of national service, the Congress immediately enact legislation which will be effective in using the 4,000,000 men now classified in IV-F in whatever capacity is best for the war effort.

The urgent need of this legislation has not lessened but has increased since the sending of my message.

It is true that there has been a trend toward increased placement of manpower in the last 2 weeks, but there is danger that this trend, which was unquestionably due to the belief that Congress contemplated prompt action, will be reversed by reports now current in the press that congressional action is likely to be delayed.

I am familiar with the provisions of H. R. 1119, on which hearings are now being held before your committee. While this bill is not a complete national service law, it will go far to secure the effective employment in the war effort of all registrants under the selective-service law between the ages of 18 and 45.

While there may be some differences of opinion on the details of the bill, prompt action now is much more important in the war effort than the perfecting of detail.

As the United Nations enter upon a truly total offense against their enemies, it is vital that that total offense should not slacken because of any less than total utilization of our manpower on the home front.

I hope that you will impress upon the members of your committee, and that your committee will impress upon the Congress how important it is that action be taken without delay on H. R. 1119, so that news may go to our fighting men that they can go all out with confidence that they cannot exhaust the supplies we are sending them and that information may come to our enemies that there will be no slackening of our total offense until they lay down their arms.

I enclose copy of a letter signed by General Marshall and Admiral King which I have just received.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 11, 1945.

Memorandum for Senator BARKLEY from the President:

I hope that legislation embracing the principle of the May bill can be speedily enacted. It will assure the armed services

they can rely on the flow of necessary supplies and greatly contribute to the success of our arms.

F. D. R.

CONTINUATION OF PAY OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES FOR 12 MONTHS AFTER DISCHARGE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, next in importance to the winning of the war, which we now seem to be well on the way of doing, is the matter of the relocation into jobs of the millions of men who will return from the fighting fronts.

That will be a large and necessary part of the winning of the peace.

We know that our social and economic order will be determined largely in accordance with the way in which this situation is met.

Vague promises have been made that men will be given the opportunity to return to the positions from which they were taken when called into the armed service.

Yet we know that by reason of the many changes which have taken place and will continue to take place in business and industry, such jobs will not always be immediately available.

Further, there will be many who will not wish to return to the same work.

Again, there will be the vast number of younger men who went from school and college directly into the service.

Let us assume that it will take at least a year for business and industry as a whole to change and to make over machinery from war to peace production, even if we start now, as is being contemplated.

It will not take less time for the Federal Government, for States and municipalities actually to get started on programs of public works which only in a few cases are now in the blueprint state. That such programs will be necessary as a supplement to all that private enterprise can do would seem to be a foregone conclusion.

By such programs I do not mean another W. P. A. or anything that would savor of that, but rather work that will be done under regular contract procedure, for which men will be paid the going rate of wage for such work.

Any Government works program should be considered as secondary in importance to that of getting men back into suitable jobs in private industry.

We boast in this country, and we have reason to do so, of our great industrial plants, our far-flung transportation systems, our great mercantile establishments, our sound and tremendous financial institutions, our farms and our mines and our great natural resources but they are not our most valuable possession.

Our most valuable possession is the manpower of this country—the millions of men and women who constitute the physical and the nervous system of our body politic.

And among them none are more valuable than the brave and heroic men and women, keen of mind, sound of body, and inspired by love of our great democratic ideals, who have served and are serving this Nation in the greatest crisis in our history.

We owe it to them, but even more we owe it to our country and to our future destiny, to see to it that when they leave the armed services their reconversion into civilian life, their transition from the pursuits of war to the pursuits of peace, shall be in an atmosphere of sympathy, of practical helpfulness, of consideration and mutual aid.

We know how difficult a period that period of transition will be for sons and daughters, brothers and sisters now serving their country.

We know that even now, while they so bravely and unselfishly devote themselves to the single task of winning this war, they too are concerned as to what the post-war period holds in store for them when they take off their uniforms and return to civilian life.

For millions of them there is great and disturbing uncertainty and anxiety as to their future.

At least 2,000,000 of our boys and girls have never had jobs in civilian life.

Millions of others have come from farms, mercantile establishments, and financial institutions, and from employment in which there was no organized labor group.

I have heard it estimated that of the 11,000,000 men and women in our armed services, less than 2,500,000 belong to labor unions.

As I have said, while we have by legislation done what we possibly could to assure their return to their pre-war jobs, we must recognize that as a practical matter the accomplishment of our aim will be impossible.

It is imperative, therefore, that we strive to the utmost to do everything possible to preserve the self-respect and to assure the welfare of these heroic servicemen and servicewomen.

To that end I propose that the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will permit the continuation of pay of members of the armed forces up to 12 months—in monthly installments—following the date of their honorable discharge from service.

Such legislation will contain the provision that the period of payment shall in no case exceed the period of active military service performed during the 6 months following.

In the event that any serviceman or servicewoman takes advantage of the provisions of the existing servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—which is a serviceman's unemployment compensation act—the sum so received shall be deducted from payments due under this proposed act.

The proposed act will in no way affect the existing law as to mustering-out allowances, nor will it affect the G. I. bill of rights, particularly with respect to educational aid for discharged servicemen.

Since all things must have a name, I should like to designate this proposed act as the "Veterans' Readjustment Pay Act of 1945."

I know that there will be many who will view with alarm the expenditure involved. On that score, I can only say that during 1944 we spent \$86,000,000,000

to wage war so as to preserve our Nation and to assure our future. When the war comes to an end and this \$86,000,000,000 expenditure is reduced to perhaps one-tenth of that sum, is it too much to spend another \$4,000,000,000 a year to assure those who have been willing to give their all against want and the depression of body and of mind that may naturally come as they reenter civilian life?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator any estimate as to what the total cost would be?

Mr. GUFFEY. I will answer that question in a moment.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me ask the Senator another question. As I understand, the only deduction to be made from the sum to be paid to the returning soldiers would be the unemployment compensation which they receive.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. If a man received no unemployment compensation, what he would receive would be in the nature of a bonus, would it not?

Mr. GUFFEY. I call it deferred pay. I do not like the word "bonus."

Mr. OVERTON. There is not much distinction, except in the name.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is discussing a matter in which I am very much interested, and in which I believe all other Senators are interested. Is there any provision in the Senator's bill as to what the soldier shall do with the funds thus given to him? Must he invest them?

Mr. GUFFEY. There is no provision at all.

Mr. OVERTON. Could he do as he pleased with them?

Mr. GUFFEY. He could do as he pleased with them.

Mr. OVERTON. Could he spend the money as soon as he received it?

Mr. GUFFEY. He would receive it in 12 monthly payments. The total amount cannot exceed \$15,000,000,000. I do not think it will run that high.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the limitation.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is the limitation, because that is the total pay of all men in the service for 1 year.

Mr. OVERTON. Could it not possibly exceed \$15,000,000,000?

Mr. GUFFEY. No; it could not exceed \$15,000,000,000.

Mr. OVERTON. That would depend on how long the war lasts.

Mr. GUFFEY. I agree with the Senator; but the maximum amount that could be paid, on the present basis, is calculated upon what we paid last year to the men in the armed services, and it would not exceed \$15,000,000,000. That is 5 percent on the \$300,000,000,000 which I anticipate we will owe by the time the war is over. To me that is a very small

contribution to those who have fought and won the war.

Mr. OVERTON. What percentage would it be?

Mr. GUFFEY. Five percent on \$300,000,000,000.

Mr. OVERTON. What total payments to returning servicemen are contemplated by the bill?

Mr. GUFFEY. Four billion dollars the first year; and they could not possibly exceed \$15,000,000,000 in all.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for the information.

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

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Does the Senator contemplate covering all the military and naval forces, including commissioned officers?

Mr. GUFFEY. Every officer and every enlisted man who is honorably discharged.

Mr. MEAD. Every officer and every private?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. That would include all noncommissioned officers.

Mr. GUFFEY. Absolutely; but no allowances are made.

Mr. OVERTON. A general would receive a general's pay.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is all.

Mr. MEAD. Provided he left the service and was honorably discharged.

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. If he remained in the service he would not come under the provisions of the Senator's bill; is that correct?

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, these men and women merit this treatment from a country which they have saved from the suffering, agony, and wanton destruction which the Old World countries have experienced; deserve it from those of us, who, by their giving, have been able to go on living normally in entire comfort and security, while they endured the dangers and the sufferings of war.

We are being told that we are at least 6 months nearer the end of the war than was expected a year or more ago. If that be true, then the Government is being saved a vast amount of money, to say nothing of human lives. Can we not well afford to spend some of those money savings in this manner?

Secondly, it would be treating all alike and would remove the whole group from any necessary temporary charity, either private or public, no matter how well intentioned that might be, for this payment would go to them as a right for services rendered.

Its practical effect will be to make unemployment compensation unnecessary, the administration of which is difficult and costly, and which is bound to be uneven and cumbersome.

Third. It will be a simple matter of administration, by and through the War and Navy Departments, requiring no new commissions or bureaus, no army of investigators and welfare workers to carry on their endless inquiries and investigations to determine the social and eco-

nomic need of Tom Smith, as compared with Jim Brown, and as to whether this or that relative could be counted upon to help through the adjustment period.

It would give opportunity to men and women to make their own readjustments as to occupation, as, undoubtedly, the large majority would prefer to do rather than to be under constant supervision of this or that Government agency.

They did not need before the war, they will not need after the war, an army of welfare workers and rehabilitators to rehabilitate and orient them into civilian life and pursuits.

To those who say to me, as one United States Senator has said, "You will never get men back to work even if jobs are available, so long as they are kept on such a pay roll," my only answer is:

"You are thinking only of the few. You have no faith in the great army of common men who are fighting and dying that you may live."

Fourth. With this part of the task undertaken by the Federal Government, the States and municipalities would have more funds available for the public-works programs now being thought of and, in some cases, already planned.

I have discussed this proposed legislation with Mr. William H. Matthews, an experienced welfare worker, who is now located in New York, and whom I have known and worked with for the better part of 40 years. In writing to me endorsing this proposal, Mr. Matthews said:

I am not writing as one ignorant of relief procedures, either private or public.

I have known from first-hand observation the bitterness, the humiliation, and hopelessness, the loss of self-respect that is engendered in men's hearts when they are required to resort to bread lines, to hours of waiting on relief benches, or even to the better made work-relief programs, such as were carried on under private auspices in 1920 and 1921, and again in 1930 and 1932 and which later blossomed into the W. P. A.

Commendable as may have been the motives of those who supported and directed such attempts to ameliorate the sufferings of unemployed men and women, they offer nothing which should suggest their repetition in the difficult years directly ahead of us.

Mr. President, we are a mighty country. Government, industrial management, and labor have, over the past 3 years, performed a miracle. They have accomplished what seemed impossible.

Now this other seemingly impossible task, the early post-war period, awaits them, calling on their strength, intelligence, and integrity to make certain that there will be as little confusion and distress as possible during the period of reconversion.

What could be of greater aid during this trying period than a year's pay to every man and woman in the armed services?

Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce the bill for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed and put on every Member's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 675) to provide for continuing the pay of

members of the armed forces for 12 months following the date of discharge from the service, introduced by Mr. GUFFEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

VIGILANCE IN TREATY MAKING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, some time back, a fellow Senator, commenting on a debate here, remarked that the "human mind is a queer contraption."

Fortunately, in America, we realize that with different backgrounds and mental perspectives, people can see things differently and still be honest. I know of no better example of that than what we are now witnessing and have been witnessing in the Senate during the last week.

The other day, that distinguished statesman from North Carolina, Senator BAILEY, made a great talk, championing the May-Bailey bill. As one listened to the logic and eloquence of his expression, his subtle humor, and his classic references, one was prone to ask, "Can there be another side?"

Then we heard the scholarly dissertation of the esteemed junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] taking the position that the committee substitute was the appropriate measure, and outlining 14 points or reasons to substantiate this position.

After that we had proposed to us the substitute to the committee bill. This proposal was offered by my genial and versatile friend, the eminent Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. He advanced cogent arguments on why his bill was the answer to the situation. I understand there are many Senators who are going to support his position.

Several days later, the amiable junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] made the steel rafters ring in his plea against all three of these measures, asking that the Senate vote them down one at a time.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee has spent some 3 weeks considering this subject, and at last reported out the substitute to the May-Bailey bill by a vote of 13 to 4. I am not a member of the committee, nor have I had sufficient time to attend its sessions as an interested party in order to hear at first hand its important deliberations. I have been very busy with work in other committees.

This whole situation is all too common. Our time is so taken up with matters before our own committees that we cannot devote entirely adequate attention to the vast amount of important and controversial legislation.

Let me give another example of how the human mind, even after years have elapsed, can interpret history differently:

In Collier's of March 10, 1945, an article by our genial friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is prefaced by the statement, "26 years ago a little group of willful men prevented our entering the League of Nations."

In the Sunday Washington Star of March 4, 1945, there is an article by Judge Irvine L. Lenroot, a former United States Senator from Wisconsin, in which he says: "The truth is that President Wilson himself was the cause of our

failure to become a member of the League of Nations." Judge Lenroot, it should be remembered, was present in the Senate and participated actively in the League of Nations debates. Every Senator may read his article with profit. Mr. President, I had expected to request unanimous consent to have the article by Judge Lenroot printed in the RECORD, following my remarks. However, I find that it has already been printed in the Appendix of the RECORD of March 5, so I will not make that request.

Out of this bit of philosophy on the diverse workings of the human mind there comes this thought, Mr. President:

In the months ahead the Senate will have submitted to it a number of treaties relating to world affairs. Hearings will be held by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, and perhaps other committees. These treaties are of such significance and importance that it seems to me that, for the time being, many minor hearings of other committees might well be condensed, dispensed with, or postponed. Thus, the Senate could practically en masse attend the relatively more important hearings. Virtually all of its members could get first-hand information rather than have to rely on hearsay as to the testimony which was given.

Moreover, it seems to me that the Senate might even resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole and hear the testimony on such important matters as the Bretton Woods agreements and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals after the latter have been revamped at San Francisco. Let us attend to first things first.

Parenthetic to the suggestion above, let me say that everyone here appreciates the indispensability of the committee system and the faithfulness with which committee members formally and informally report their findings. I do, however, call to your attention the fact that every Senator will regard it as his sacred obligation to make the fullest analysis at the closest hand of the forthcoming treaties.

Each of us wants to be positively sure that everything to which we affix our signature on the dotted line will protect America, American rights, American principles, and American interests and territory. We do not want to sell America short in any way.

Twice within a generation our great country has given of its lifeblood and treasure. In this war America has already suffered many times the human casualties and many times the financial cost of World War No. 1.

We have every right to expect that our partners, the other members of the United Nations, in these great adventures will bear in mind what we have done for them, particularly when we offer our humble but legitimate claims.

We ourselves must bear in mind our contribution to our allies; for example, in building and improving numerous bases in the Atlantic and Pacific, and in capturing, at fearful cost, island strongholds in the Pacific.

If we need these bases for future air travel or shipping of a commercial or military nature, neither Britain nor any other nation should hesitate to give us

the necessary rights. After the First World War we did not need those bases because air transportation was not sufficiently developed. But we need many of them now for our commercial lines, and for our own protection in the world of tomorrow.

We proceed into this wider international field—world conditions have made it imperative that we do—with the hope and the prayer on our lips that we may prove adequate to find the way to world peace and prosperity. We do so with humbleness of spirit, but with firmness of conviction that those who deal for us must have sharp wits, and far vision, and must not forget American requirements and needs.

ENCOURAGEMENT AND PROTECTION OF SMALL OIL REFINERIES—STIMULATION OF OIL PRODUCTION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the General Leasing Act, which governs the disposition of land in the public domain, carries a provision with respect to the disposition of royalties derived from the leasing of oil lands that the Secretary of the Interior may receive such royalties in cash or in kind. In other words, the Secretary may call upon the producer to deliver the oil as oil to the Government for such disposition as the Government may desire to make of it.

In the past the control of the disposition of royalties has been exercised by the Department of the Interior through the sale of the oil to the highest bidder. The result of such practice has been that for the greater part the larger oil companies, particularly the so-called integrated companies, that is, the companies which have producing units, refining units, and marketing units, have succeeded in buying the Government oil. In many instances the oil so purchased amounted to tremendous quantities. As a consequence, small refiners, that is to say the refiners who do not own and operate their own producing leases, have found on occasion that it was very difficult to obtain the necessary oil with which to operate. The general philosophy of the Leasing Act, when it was originally adopted by the Congress back in 1920, was that wherever possible the Government should sustain the efforts of the small producer, the small-business man in the oil business, in carrying on his operations.

It has occurred to me, Mr. President, that the objective to which I have referred could be attained by an amendment of the terms of the General Leasing Act whereby a preference would be granted to the refiner who is without an independent or a known source of crude oil to purchase at the market price Government royalty oil for processing and use in that particular refinery.

I have, therefore, drafted a bill which I now introduce and ask to have referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. I also ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 680) to encourage and protect small oil refineries by extending preference to such refineries and disposing of royalty oil under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act, was read twice by its

title, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 36 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 451, U. S. Code, 1940 ed., title 30, sec. 192), is amended by adding before the first proviso in the second paragraph thereof the following: "Provided, That inasmuch as the public interest will be served by the sale of royalty oil to smaller refineries not having their own source of supply for oil, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant preference to such refineries in the sale of oil under the provisions of this section, for processing or use in such refineries and not for resale, and in so doing may sell to such refineries at private sale at not less than the market price any royalty oil accruing or reserved to the United States under leases issued pursuant to this act, as amended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may add, Mr. President, that in December 1942, with the active and able assistance of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], there was passed by this body and sent to the President a bill which I introduced for the purpose of holding out an incentive to stimulate search for oil upon the public domain by granting a flat royalty of 12½ percent to lessees who discovered oil during the period of the war. The flat royalty of 12½ percent was granted in lieu of the sliding scale which the Department of the Interior had adopted, running from 12½ percent to 32 percent, and was provided to extend over a period of 10 years. The thought back of the bill was that it would result in promoting the discovery of oil upon the public domain at a time when the Government very greatly needed new sources of oil supply.

It is known to every person interested in the oil business, and to each one who has any knowledge of the oil business, that during the present war, as in the First World War, the petroleum sources of the United States were drawn upon in a substantial manner to carry on the war. That was true in the First World War, and it is even more true in the present World War. Our reserves have been the principal sources of the petroleum supply with which the present great global struggle is being fought. It indicates why it is of importance that the search for oil in the United States be stimulated.

Since the act to which I have referred, of December 24, 1942, was signed by the President, 29 new discoveries of oil have been made on the public domain in the Rocky Mountain region and in California. Of those new discoveries 14 were made in Wyoming, 8 in California, 5 in New Mexico, and 1 each in Colorado and Montana. Of course, a very lively search was made for oil, and during the war more wells have been drilled on private land than on public land. A substantial increase has been made in the production of oil in Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana since the enactment of the act of December 24, 1942, and according to the information available to the Geological Survey there is every reason to believe that many important new tests will be made during 1945 throughout the Rocky Mountain area. Many wells will be drilled to a depth in excess of 10,000 feet. In Montana the production of oil

increased from 497,503 barrels in 1943 to 658,430 barrels in 1944. Production fell off slightly in New Mexico in 1944; but there was a substantial increase in both Colorado and Wyoming. In Colorado the total production in 1944 was 2,187,474 barrels, as compared with 1,571,546 barrels in 1943, and the reserve of oil in Colorado was estimated on January 1, 1945, by the Oil and Gas Journal as amounting to 57,920,000 barrels, as compared with 30,779,000 barrels the year before.

In Wyoming the crude-oil production from public lands increased from 19,586,250 barrels in 1943 to 20,693,483 barrels in 1944. There has been a substantial draft upon the oil resources of the State of Wyoming, but, in spite of that, the reserves are estimated at this moment to be about 600,000,000 barrels of oil.

Reports of the United States Geological Survey show that there has been a tremendous increase in the number of new wells drilled in the Rocky Mountain area since the passage of the act of December 24, 1942. Wyoming, New Mexico, and Montana saw the greatest amount of activity, and there was a substantial increase in Colorado. In Wyoming 316 wells were drilled on public lands, Indian land, and private land in 1944, as compared with 179 in 1942. New Mexico showed an increase from 345 in 1943 to 536 in 1944. Montana jumped from 265 to 497, and Colorado from 55 to 94.

Mr. President, when the bill which I have just introduced was in preparation I requested Assistant Secretary Chapman, of the Interior Department, to have a memorandum prepared from the records of the United States Geological Survey on oil development in this general region. That statement has been prepared and has been handed to me, and I ask unanimous consent that it and the attached tables may appear at this point in the *RECORD* as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the memorandum and tables will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The memorandum and tables are as follows:

Reference is made to a verbal request by Mr. Doty for information on new oil production developed on public land since January 1, 1943. The information contained in the Geological Survey files has not been assembled exactly under that definition and estimated reserves by fields have not been received. They are normally computed as soon after the close of the calendar year as possible without interference with the routine supervisory activities.

In discussing with Mr. Doty the information that may be desired, it is believed that you are interested in the discoveries of new fields or deposits of oil under the act of December 24, 1942, sponsored by Senator O'MAHONEY. There is attached a tabulation of the new discoveries, by States, on which applications have been or are expected to be filed for the benefit of the so-called 12½ percent discovery act. Applications for discovery benefits are filed with the General Land Office; however, the tabulation is believed to represent all discoveries to date under the O'Mahoney Act that may be entitled to a favorable report by the Geological Survey. It is of interest to note that in several instances the lessees are not filing applications for discov-

ery benefits if a new discovery is made on a 5-percent royalty rate lease unless a field is unitized, consequently a few new discoveries may have been missed in assembling the information.

WYOMING

Valuable new discoveries of oil have been made in Wyoming since January 1, 1942, such as Golden Eagle (private land), Wagonhound, Little Buffalo Basin, Crooks Gap, Bailey Dome, Little Buck Creek, and Big Sand Draw, embracing public lands, and Steamboat Butte and Winkelman in the Wind River Indian Agency. Development of old fields, such as Oregon Basin, Elk Basin, Garland, Byron, Wertz, Lost Soldier, Pitchfork, Fourbear, Cole Creek, and East Lance Creek have added materially to new production and the ability of the fields to maintain a reasonable rate of production without damage to the productive zone.

Wyoming reserves remain well above 600,000,000 barrels (Oil and Gas Journal, estimate all lands 619,810,000 barrels January 1, 1945), even with withdrawals for the past 3 years exceeding 33,000,000 barrels per year. The sustained reserves are in part due to new discoveries, readjustment of acre content, and area and formation characteristics. Drilling has been particularly active in Wyoming for the past 3 years, as evidenced by the following:

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public land...	100	116	166
Wells drilled on Indian land...	17	11	21
Wells drilled on other land...	62	100	150
Total wells drilled.....	179	227	316

It is believed that the act of December 24, 1942, was an added incentive to drill on the public lands in Wyoming for new deposits of oil.

New pipe-line outlets, refinery requirements to meet the war demands, and subsidy payments for production and transportation have likewise aided in developing old and new areas alike thereby maintaining the sustained yearly production for the State.

The total production of crude oil from public lands in Wyoming for 1943 was 19,586,250 barrels and for 1944, 20,693,483 barrels.

COLORADO

Colorado has witnessed an increase in wildcat drilling for discovery of new fields but the number of new discoveries on public lands is very limited. The Wilson Creek unit, embracing only public lands, has been actively drilled to meet market demand and a deep prospecting test to Granite expected at approximately 10,000 feet is now drilling. Several exploratory wells were drilled in the State, including one in the White River unit on public land without obtaining commercial production.

Two interesting developments have been the reopening of producible wells and extension of the producing area by drilling in the North McCallum field and the renewed activity in the Rangely field. The major portion of the productive acreage in the North McCallum field is on public land. The real development in Colorado is in the Rangely field in western Colorado where an active drilling campaign is starting. This field, while developed in the shallow zones for years, has had deep production shut-in on public land in the Weber sand since 1932, due to lack of a satisfactory market. Late in 1943, the one well resumed production and additional drilling on public land commenced. Because of depth and unknown sand conditions, several hundred feet in thickness, drilling was slow in 1944, however, it is predicted that as many as 25 or more rotary

rigs will be operating in 1945 with one major operator alone having 12 rigs in operation. If structural conditions are as predicted, the Rangely field will be one of the primary sources of crude oil in the Rocky Mountain area. Pipe-line facilities now being constructed will permit transportation of the oil to rail or direct to refineries. The area is not controlled by public-land oil and gas leases.

Drilling in Colorado for the past 3 years does not compare in magnitude with the other major producing public-land States. The following tabulation shows the wells drilled and evidence of increased activity.

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public lands...	32	37	44
Wells drilled on other lands...	23	41	50
Total wells drilled.....	55	78	94

The total production of crude oil in Colorado from public lands in 1943 was 1,575,146 barrels and for 1944 the production increased to 2,187,474 barrels. Production and reserves in 1945 should show a substantial increase. The estimated oil reserve for all lands in Colorado, as of January 1, 1945, as published by the Oil and Gas Journal, is 57,920,000 barrels and on January 1, 1944, were 30,779,000 barrels.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico development on public lands has been active since January 1, 1943, and some new production has been discovered in deep horizons or by extensions to old producing areas. In many cases the new production has been developed by merely expanding old fields, more or less classified as semiwildcat territory. Stratigraphic conditions are not in evidence at the surface similar to most of the presently producing areas in Wyoming and Colorado. Development of proven or semiproven areas has added materially to sustaining producible reserves both on public and other lands. The following

tabulation furnishes evidence of increased drilling activity in New Mexico.

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public lands...	217	178	276
Wells drilled on other lands...	128	110	260
Total wells drilled.....	345	288	536

Production from public lands has decreased slightly from 11,267,253 barrels in 1943 to 11,115,832 barrels in 1944. The estimated oil reserves for all lands was 582,049,000 barrels January 1, 1944, and 541,926,000 barrels January 1, 1945.

MONTANA

Montana has had a large number of wildcat wells drilled on promising structural features, but the number of new discoveries of oil has been very disappointing for the past 2 years. A new discovery of undetermined value was made late in 1944 on public land in the Clarke's Fork field, in southern Montana. Additional drilling and testing will be necessary before estimating the reserve or importance of the field.

Drilling in the State, developing new sources of oil, has been largely in or adjacent to areas already defined as proven for production, although any drilling in the Kevin-Sunburst field or area is highly speculative as to the final results, and consequently nearly every well is a new source of production. Drilling on public lands is only a small percentage of the State total, as shown by the following tabulation:

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public lands...	44	47	82
Wells drilled on Indian lands...	40	65	69
Wells drilled on other lands...	181	261	346
Total wells drilled.....	265	373	497

Production from public lands increased from 497,503 barrels in 1943 to 658,430 barrels in 1944. Practically all of the increase came from the part of the Elk Basin field located in Montana. Estimated oil reserves for all lands published by the Oil and Gas Journal decreased from 103,317,000 barrels January 1, 1944, to 92,680,000 barrels January 1, 1945.

OTHER PUBLIC LAND STATES—CALIFORNIA, UTAH, OKLAHOMA, LOUISIANA

No important new production was developed on public land since January 1, 1943. Drilling and production on public land in any of these States is very limited compared to the State totals. Production from public lands in California for 1944 was 19,844,103 barrels and increased to 21,104,030 barrels in 1944.

GENERAL

New gas discoveries on public lands since January 1, 1943, have been included in the tabulation. The calendar year promises many interesting wildcats in the Rocky Mountain area with several projected to be drilled below 10,000 feet. Two important wildcats will be drilled on the Church Buttes and Pinedale structures in southwestern Wyoming, one deep well is proposed in the Worland area, Wyoming, and several deep wildcats will be drilled in Colorado and New Mexico. In practically all instances prospective areas are unutilized.

The Geological Survey reports new discoveries on individual leases issued under the amendment of August 21, 1935, to the Mineral Leasing Act for determination of rentals. Since January 1, 1943 reports have been made on 8 oil and 1 gas in California; 1 oil and 21 gas in Colorado; 5 oil in Montana; 20 oil and 1 gas in New Mexico; 19 oil and 3 gas in Wyoming; and 2 gas in Kansas. The total new discoveries reported are 53 oil and 8 gas on the so-called new form leases.

The Survey will endeavor to supplement this hurried report with additional facts if desired and will attempt to assemble information as directed either by fiscal or calendar years.

H. J. DUNCAN,
Chief, Conservation Branch.

New discoveries on public land leases for which applications have been filed or are expected for royalty benefits under the act of Dec. 24, 1942

Date of discovery	Field	Operator	Lease No.	Well No.	Location	Total depth	Initial production	Producing formation	New field or zone
WYOMING									
Feb. 6, 1943	South Oregon Basin...	Yale Petroleum Co....	Chey. 066528..	4.....	5-5 N-100 W.....	4,663	300 barrels per day.	Madison.....	New pool.
Nov. 5, 1943	Little Buffalo Basin...	Fred Goodstein.....	Chey. 052236..	1—Pedley.....	13-47 N-100 W.....	4,965	150 barrels per day.	Tensleep.....	Do.
May 9, 1944	do.....	Stanford Oil & Gas Co.	Chey. 045856..	3.....	1-47 N-100 W.....	4,965	168 barrels per day.	Embar.....	Do.
Oct. 8, 1943	Gebo Dome.....	Continental Oil Co....	Chey. 066982..	1—unit.....	23-44 N-95 W.....	4,845	413 barrels per day.	do.....	Do.
Nov. 3, 1943	do.....	do.....	Chey. 066982..	do.....	do.....	4,845	268 barrels per day.	Tensleep.....	New zone.
Mar. 3, 1944	Wagonhound Anticline.	Broderick & Gordon..	Chey. 065997..	1—unit—Christian-son.	6-44 N-98 W.....	4,700	504 barrels per day.	Embar.....	New pool.
June 8, 1944	Little Buck Creek.....	Continental Oil Co....	Chey. 064741..	1—Wright.....	25-36 N-64 W.....	4,100	546 barrels per day.	Dakota.....	Extension.
Aug. 12, 1944	Spindletop.....	Wyalta Oil Co.....	Chey. 037004(a)	1-D.....	32-30 N-81 W.....	2,445	250 barrels per day.	Tensleep.....	New pool.
Sept. 26, 1944	Half Moon.....	Husky Refining Co....	Chey. 063922..	1.....	23-51 N-102 W.....	7,381	200 barrels per day.	Embar.....	New field.
Oct. 7, 1944	Big Sand Draw.....	Sinclair-Wyoming Oil.	Chey. 044150..	1.....	14-32 N-95 W.....	7,381	17,000 M cubic feet.	do.....	New pool.
Nov. 20, 1944	Big Sand Draw.....	Sinclair-Wyoming Oil.	Chey. 044150..	1.....	14-32 N-95 W.....	7,381	804 barrels per day.	Tensleep.....	New zone.
Oct. 26, 1944	Crooks Gap.....	do.....	Chey. 033009..	1—unit.....	18-28 N-92 W.....	5,315	1,478 barrels per day.	Cloverly.....	New field.
Nov. 22, 1944	South Elk Basin.....	Continental Oil Co....	Chey. 067559..	1—tp.....	20-57 N-99 W.....	4,390	2,800 M cubic feet.	Second frontier.....	Do.
Dec. 19, 1944	Bailey Dome.....	Sinclair-Wyoming Oil.	Chey. 677671..	1.....	21-26 N-99 W.....	5,232	634 barrels per day.	Sundance.....	Do.
COLORADO									
June 26, 1943	Douglas Creek.....	Superior Oil Co.....	Denver 034909.	1—Hellman.....	5-3 S-101 W.....	8,564	5,865 M cubic feet.	Dakota and Lakota.	
CALIFORNIA									
Dec. 27, 1943	Poso Creek area.....	D. G. Vedder.....	Sac. 019288..	1.....	18-27 S-28 E.....	2,470	5,300 M cubic feet.	Vedder.....	Do.
Feb. 3, 1944	do.....	do.....	Sac. 019288..	3.....	do.....	2,462	148 barrels per day.	Vedder (Miocene).	
Apr. 27, 1944	Aliso Canyon.....	Standard Oil Co.....	LA-055641..	1—Frew.....	29-3 N-16 W.....	9,291	86 barrels per day.	Frew (Eocene).	New zone.
Oct. 26, 1944	Round Mountain area.	E. A. Bender Drilling Co.	Sac. 034892..	14-1.....	14-28 S-28 E.....	2,660	150 barrels per day.	Vedder (Miocene).	New pool.
Oct. 15, 1944	Oak Canyon.....	Western Gulf Oil Co..	LA-042151 cons.	Wickham-1A.	31-5 N-17 W.....	7,017	127 barrels per day.	Weaver sand.....	New zone.
Nov. 2, 1944	do.....	do.....	LA-042151 cons.	do.....	do.....	7,017	323 barrels per day.	Maxwell sand (Miocene).	Do.
Mar. 17, 1944	Aliso Canyon.....	Barnsdall Oil Co.....	LA-052994..	1—Roosa.....	29-3 N-16 W.....	6,627	63 barrels per day.	Roosa (Pliocene).	Do.

New discoveries on public land leases for which applications have been filed or are expected for royalty benefits under the act of Dec. 24, 1942—Continued

Date of discovery	Field	Operator	Lease No.	Well No.	Location	Total depth	Initial production	Producing formation	New field or zone
MONTANA									
Nov. 29, 1944	Clark Fork.....	Julius Peters.....	Billings 034208.	1.....	25-9 S-22 E.....	Feet 6,531	20 barrels per hour.	Second frontier....	New field.
NEW MEXICO									
May 12, 1944	Not named.....	The Texas Co.....	LC-029446.	1—Bashkin.....	22-10 S-33 E.....	3,586	142 barrels per day.	Seven Rivers.....	Do.
Nov. 7, 1944	Dublin Field.....	Humble Oil & Refining Co.	LC-062384.	1—Leonard.....	12-26 S-37 E.....	11,969	297 barrels per day.	Ellenberger.....	New pool.
May 20, 1943	South Maljamar.....	Maljamar Oil & Gas Co.	LC-029401.	2X—Chessman.....	22-18 S-32 E.....	4,840	75 barrels per day..	Grayberg.....	New field.
Dec. 20, 1944	Skaggs Field.....	Continental Oil Co.....	LC-031620 (b).	2—Skaggs.....	23-20 S-37 E.....	10,465	269 barrels per day. 150 M cubic feet.	Abo (Permian)....	New pool.
June 10, 1943	Feñton Pool.....	Schuster & Mersinger.	LC-033171.	1—Page.....	15-21 S-28 E.....	2,650	25 barrels per day..	Delaware (Permian).	New field.

LIQUIDATION OF PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to liquidate and dissolve Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government corporation, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which I think is the proper committee to consider it.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Chair with reference to the committee to which the joint resolution should go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it should go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it should be referred to the committee where it ought to go regardless of any request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution refers to powers under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.

Mr. MOORE. Of course, Mr. President, I cannot argue the matter of jurisdiction. Is it the holding of the Chair that the joint resolution should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair refers the joint resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MOORE. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that a similar resolution which I introduced at the last session was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. That might not have been the proper committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. What we are trying to do is to get away from the practice, which was announced here some years ago in an informal way, that a bill would be referred to any committee to which the Senator introducing it desired it to go, which abrogates all the rules of committee jurisdiction. So I think the joint resolution ought to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to liquidate and dissolve Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government corporation, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have just introduced a joint resolution to liquidate and dissolve Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government corporation. Petroleum Reserves Corporation was organized, pursuant to section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation Act, as amended, on the last day on which said powers might be exercised.

The act authorizes the organization of corporations confined to the production and transportation of critical and strategic materials for war. The asserted purposes for which this Corporation was organized was to build and operate the so-called Arabian oil pipe line.

The language of the corporate charter reflects a definite purpose to engage the United States in the petroleum business, both at home and abroad, as a permanent industrial program, contrary to the affirmative expressions of the statute under which the Corporation was created. In fact the act provides that no such corporation shall have succession after January 22, 1947. Because of the attempted perpetual purposes and character of this Corporation, its legal existence is seriously challenged.

After a penetrating investigation by a special committee of the Congress and after wide and vigorous opposition to the proposed activities by the petroleum industry and by the various industry trade associations and condemnation of the objectives of the Corporation by the Petroleum Industry War Council, the active personnel of the Corporation resigned their positions, and as of today I am informed that the Corporation exists in name only, with the possible exception of one employee. It is my further understanding that although the Corporation originally secured a commitment for the loan of \$30,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it has used less than \$100,000 of its credit.

Other than the Secretary of the Interior, who still holds to the ambition of becoming petroleum czar in the new order of American bureaucracy, I know of no one who now defends the existence of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. It is one of the many Government corporations which certainly can and should be dissolved by the Congress.

Mr. President, while the joint resolution I have introduced today is directed only at the dissolution of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, I feel it is appropriate to discuss some of the aspects of Government corporations in general. The time has come when the Congress must either accept the totalitarianism of the corporate state, which can only be supported by a permanent system of planned economy, or support the de-

mocracy of a free and competitive system of private enterprise.

These Government corporations are divided into three general classifications: First, 40 corporations directly owned by the Government and supervised by governmental agencies; second, 4 wholly owned Government corporations independently operated under direct statutory authority; and, third, 11 corporations in which the Government has a proprietary interest, or a contractual relation. In addition, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures lists 13 Federal Government agencies engaged in the fields of credit, banking, and other business enterprises.

The dimensions and scope of the activities of these corporations and agencies are of infinite proportions. In practically every case they have trespassed far beyond the outer boundary of the most liberal interpretation of the congressional powers intended for them. I dare the assertion that there is not a single Member of the Congress or a single committee of the Congress that has a complete grasp of the manifold machinations of this group of economic giants.

A glaring example of the almost limitless activities of these Government corporations was exposed in an address by the able Representative from Wisconsin, Mr. FRANK KEEFE, appearing in the Record of February 20, concerning the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Representative KEEFE's remarks should arouse us to the dangers inherent in these uncontrolled corporations.

The recent testimony of the learned Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] before the Commerce Committee of the Senate in support of his bill to divorce various lending agencies from the Commerce Department is a startling and chilling revelation of the long distance which American democracy has moved toward economic totalitarianism. In some countries it is called communism, in others national socialism, and in still others fascism. Its name is immaterial. Whatever name may be applied to the system, it all adds up to a controlled economy by governmental edict administered by an unresponsive bureaucracy. In each case the individual is made subservient to the state, and the lives of the people affected are regulated for the benefit of the government, instead of having a government regulated for the advantage of its people.

Those who would harness our democracy with a planned economy are no longer deceptive. They firmly believe that government can blueprint our economy without totalitarianism. The planners believe that in times of business recessions and periods of unemployment government should come to the rescue with government financed projects, made work, and other artificial stimulants. Conversely, they believe, in times of prosperity, labor shortages, and inflationary trends, that government support should be withdrawn, and tax burdens increased, and thus a brake applied to the wheels of business.

For more than a decade we have experienced this philosophy of government and have witnessed its failure, but the effectiveness of the plan to accomplish the objectives claimed for it is not the question. The question is, What does it do to democracy, what does it do to our freedom, what does it do to our constitutional guaranties? No plan or scheme that arbitrarily directs the national economy, however good the result may be, can function without a master mind in the driver's seat. Someone, somewhere, must be supreme, and that means dictatorship and totalitarianism. I do not believe that America is ready to sacrifice individualism for a planned economy at the expense of freedom.

It has long been recognized by the Congress and the people at large that the operation of this great corporate division of Government was completely out of hand, but few attempts have been made to do anything about it. Under our present inadequate controls and supervision, the Congress has been helpless even to find out what these corporations are doing, and, consequently, has not indicated its approval or disapproval of their actions. I seriously doubt that the full significance of these corporate activities is appreciated by our people. Without any effective control by the Congress, Government through these corporate instrumentalities is engaged in practically every industrial field known to the economic life of the United States.

Too many Americans have permitted themselves to be fitted with rose-colored glasses. We have become saturated with talk of new social schemes, bold social engineering, security from the cradle to the grave, and other catch phrases. Although couched in the language of democracy and constitutional government, the fact that our democracy is being throttled through bureaucratic control of business and administrative regulations cannot be disguised. All roads to destruction have been paved with good intentions and pretty promises. The tempting bait now held out to us is subsidies, price supports, ceilings, minimum and maximum prices, Government guaranties, and other equally attractive sugar-coated pills. Government is now subsidizing the petroleum industry at the rate of \$250,000,000 a year, sugar at the rate of eighteen million, and coal at the rate of twenty-five million.

The report of the Secretary of Commerce to the President and Congress, dated January 15, discloses total subsidy disbursements by Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary corpora-

tions under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, have amounted to \$1,400,000,000. It should be remembered that these disbursements are exclusive of agricultural subsidies and money spent to support prices by the various corporations and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Only recently the Senate passed a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation a billion and a half dollars, to a total of four and a half billion dollars. The House bill proposes to expand Commodity Credit Corporation credit to five billion.

German labor, agriculture, and business took the same bait. Hitler bribed his way to power with the same kind of counterfeit promises, but, once having gained dictatorial prerogatives, Hitler had no hesitancy in letting the people know that the structure of his compulsory state had not been built for the benefit of the individual.

Does labor realize that it is being liquidated by these corporations? Is it possible that the farmer does not now realize that he is living in a state of badly diluted freedom? Does the merchant know that his business is literally being dried up? Does the banker understand that he is being definitely driven from the field of finance? From January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1945, 162 banks in 11 Midwestern States were voluntarily liquidated.

Labor cannot survive without an employer, and employers cannot survive the competition of Government corporations that operate with capital directly drawn out of their business. These Government corporations pay no income or other business taxes. Their boards of directors are responsible to no stockholders. A deficit merely means another sale of bonds to the Federal Treasury and a corresponding increase in the tax rate on private business. The margin between private income and tax payments is constantly growing thinner. Already some branches of industry are operating on 20-cent dollars, and still we hear the proponents of a "planned economy" with all profundity loudly proclaim the necessity of "holding the line" against inflation.

Eighteen of these corporations and lending agencies are engaged in the field of credit and banking. Twelve are in the field of commodities and supplies; four in the field of insurance; six in transportation. Four are engaged in construction; four in economic and social rehabilitation. One is in the power business. Some are in the wholesale and retail business; others in manufacturing and the operation of distilleries, breweries, hotels, and mines; and one in public utility.

Nine of these corporations are organized under and are subject to the laws of the State of Delaware. Two were created under and subject to the laws of the State of Maryland; one under the provisions of the laws of Tennessee; two under and pursuant to the laws of New York; one under the laws of New Jersey; three under and pursuant to the laws of the District of Columbia; one under the laws of the State of Washington; and one pursuant to the Colonial Council for the

Municipalities of St. Thomas and St. John of the Virgin Islands. Why these corporations were not organized under the Federal law with Federal charters is not clear.

While the regular departments of Government must secure annual appropriations from Congress, these corporations have been able almost entirely to evade the financial controls of the Congress. Three procedures make this possible.

First. Many of them have invested the capital provided for them by the Congress in interest-paying Government bonds, for the purpose of creating an annual operating income to the corporation, and thus the necessity of returning to Congress for an appropriation to cover administrative expenses is avoided.

For example, the January 1943 bulletin of the Treasury Department showed that as of November 30, 1942, the banks for cooperatives owned \$33,800,000 of Government securities and \$61,000,000 of other interest-bearing investments. The Federal home-loan banks, as of the same date, showed an investment of over \$105,000,000 in United States securities.

Second. Most of these corporations have authority to issue their secured or unsecured obligations and by this method are able to borrow directly from the Treasury or from more prosperous corporate kinsfolk. If the authority is not directly granted by the Congress, the organizers of the particular corporation assume the authority by merely writing the power into the corporate charter. In the case of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, the charter expressly provides that the Corporation shall have unlimited power to borrow money and to issue its secured or unsecured obligations in aid thereof. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures lists the total authorized limit of this power at \$33,000,000,000, and shows that as of March 31 of last year over \$12,000,000,000 was outstanding in Government corporation bonds. We wonder what the attitude of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission might be toward a private set-up of stair-step holding companies and related operating corporations paralleling the financial activities of these holding companies and relating operating corporations of the Government.

Third. Many of these corporations are actually engaged in enterprise for profit. Since they do not have the responsibility of taxes and other burdens peculiar to private corporations, they have been able to show profits sufficient to sustain their administrative and operating expenses and, thus again, are evading the financial controls of Congress.

The December Bulletin of the Treasury indicates that this group of Government corporations and credit agencies, as of September 30, 1944, had combined assets of \$55,154,700,070, including \$6,998,300,000 of outstanding loans. As of June 30, 1944, the 14,553 banks of the United States had total outstanding loans of nearly \$25,500,000,000. Thus, Government corporations through the use of money taken from American industry and the individual taxpayer is

conducting 22 percent of the banking and credit business of the country.

Among the assets of these corporations is listed \$2,165,000,000 in interest-bearing obligations of the Federal Treasury. Witness the spectacle of the Treasury paying interest out of the taxpayers' pockets to Government corporations on Federal securities purchased with capital originally furnished these corporations by the Treasury itself.

Has the provision of the Constitution that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law" been thrown overboard?

It is entirely appropriate, of course, to point out that the Treasury's investment in these Government corporations and credit agencies has been substantially augmented by the war. It is true that 16 of these corporations and agencies have been brought into being exclusively as instrumentalities of the war, but I think it highly important to call attention to the significant fact that 50 of these peacetime Government-owned corporations and credit agencies as of the end of the first half of the fiscal year 1941 already showed gross assets of nearly \$32,000,000,000, as compared with the \$55,000,000,000, shown by the Treasury's statement of September 30, 1944. These peacetime assets included over \$8,000,000,000 of outstanding loans, as compared with less than 7 billions of loans outstanding on September 30, 1944.

Although some of these corporations and agencies have been brought into existence for war purposes, the dollar investment in the Government corporations for war purposes has been small in comparison to the over-all war cost. From June 30, 1942, to September 30, 1944, total gross assets of all Government corporations increased approximately \$23,000,000,000. During the same period, war appropriations totaled approximately \$235,000,000,000. From these figures, it will at once be apparent that although our war activities are substantially reflected in the size and operations of these Government corporations, they are, to a very large extent, actually peacetime organizations.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the governmental lending agencies which have been created because of the war will continue to operate after the war is over; has provision been made within organizations of these agencies whereby the lending agencies will be terminated after the war?

Mr. MOORE. I think the law provides that they must be terminated after the war.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma care to make an observation as to whether he feels that these lending agencies have made loans that now become so much a part of our economic system that such agencies cannot be terminated? I refer, for example, to the milk subsidy we pay which now totals over a half a billion dollars. Do not our milk producers now rely on this payment for their milk production?

How can they be returned to the retail price system without the payment of a subsidy?

Mr. MOORE. I most certainly think that unless there is a change of sentiment and a more intensive study made of the situation with reference to what I consider the building of the corporate state, there will be very little likelihood of discontinuance of these corporations. I hope, however, the subject will be studied and considered, and I have abundant hope that something will be done before it is too late.

Mr. President, another method by which this fourth division of Government evades the constitutional prohibition that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, except in consequence of appropriations made by law, is illustrated by the fact that between 1938 and March 31, 1943, the Secretary of the Treasury canceled over \$2,784,000,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation peacetime obligations, including among other items \$1,782,000,000 for relief, \$260,000,000 advanced to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Land Bank Commissioner for crop loans and loans to farmers, and \$33,000,000 in interest.

Not a single penny of this money was appropriated by the Congress. Disbursements were made under authority delegated to the various agencies by the Congress. The Secretary of the Treasury canceled these obligations under an act of the Congress authorizing cancellation of notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and all sums due and unpaid in connection with such notes in an amount equal to the outstanding funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation theretofore or disbursed under certain provisions of law.

The Congress thus finds itself in the ludicrous position of having authorized the Treasury to open its doors to certain agencies and then later directing the cancellation of all past as well as all future obligations created under the authorization.

The December Bulletin of the Treasury further discloses that it had invested in these agencies approximately \$37,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money as of September 30, 1944. Eleven billion dollars of this is represented by loans from the Treasury to the corporations and agencies. A check of the over-all operations of these corporations and agencies to September 30, 1944, shows that 35 of them had a total deficit of fifteen and one-half billion dollars. Eighteen of them had accumulated a surplus totaling \$684,000,000, or a net deficit for the American taxpayers of \$14,745,000,000.

The fact that the over-all operations of this governmental venture into the field of competitive enterprise have resulted in a deficit which could well be the last straw that breaks the back of the already overburdened war-weary taxpayer, although bad enough, in itself is not the vice. The vice lies in the fact that the Congress has permitted power-hungry and ambitious bureaucrats who live in the starlit world of theories to engage this Government in the field of competitive enterprise, in violation of the supreme law of the land. It is as iniquitous

in principle for these Government corporations and lending agencies to engage in business at a profit as it is to show a deficit. Our Government was not organized as a business institution. It was not designed as a profit-making organization. Who wants to see Government operate for profit, except the bureaucrats who dictate the operations?

The Congress cannot escape the responsibility for having permitted the creation of this gigantic and complicated governmental business machine, to which, over the last decade, so many gears, cogs, wheels, and wheels within wheels have been added, that those who oil the machine have no comprehensive idea of its operations. This great business machine is manned and operated by thousands of engineers, assistant engineers, directors, managers, trustees, and administrators, all engaged in issuing commands, orders, and directives for different purposes and different objectives.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was originally organized for a 2-year period with limited powers to extend financial aid to designated industrial enterprises affected with a public interest, and only after it was shown that financial aid could not be obtained from private sources, but has now grown into a permanent organization much larger than the largest of our private industrial corporations. Its manifold activities are so varied and far reaching that neither the Congress nor the people have any conception of its far-flung operations. It operates through subsidiaries and subsidiaries of subsidiaries. It controls, through the medium of finance, hundreds of businesses and Government agencies and, although the Congress may suspend some of these operations at one point, they immediately pop out in a different form through the activities of another agency.

The distinguished Senators from Virginia and Nebraska have introduced the Byrd-Butler bill—S. 469—designed to place Government corporations and lending agencies under the same congressional controls as other Government departments. As I understand the proposed legislation, it would require such corporations to submit their operations to the Bureau of the Budget. Their proposed expenditures would be included in an annual appropriation bill for the consideration of the Congress. In addition, these corporations and agencies would be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office in the same manner as other departments of Government, and the General Accounting Office would be required to report to the Congress on their operations.

The proposal is, of course, a wholesome and necessary step in the effort of Congress to regain its constitutional authority. The mandate of the Constitution that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of Appropriations made by law; and a regular Statement and Account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time," cannot in any other manner be safeguarded.

As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], while Secretary of the Treasury, once commented:

Nothing promotes so rapidly an atmosphere of laxity as a removal of the legislative restraints long and zealously imposed by the Congress with respect to appropriations from the public funds or a weakening of the established requirement that public moneys shall be deposited in the Public Treasury and withdrawn only in consequence of legislative authorization.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is an excellent example of the necessity for congressional control of these Government corporations. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is one of the few corporations required to secure an annual appropriation for its administrative expenses and submit a report to the Congress. It was discovered by Congress that this Corporation had received \$51,795,000 in premiums and had paid out \$32,945,000 in losses and indemnities. In addition to this operating deficit, it had piled up administrative expenses of \$31,963,000. As a result, the Congress abolished the program and a new program has been substituted. But without the controls to which this Corporation was required to submit, how long would such past operation have continued?

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I have been impressed with the Senator's comments as to the burden which this system of financing is placing on the present generation. Is it not true that it also places a burden on future generations, and will create a handicap to our future recovery, unless something is done to stop it?

Mr. MOORE. I most certainly think so; and I thank the Senator for making the suggestion.

Mr. President, I shall support the Byrd-Butler bill because I am hoping that it will be the beginning of the end of government in business. I appreciate the necessity of bringing these corporations and agencies under congressional control in order that the Congress may have some understanding of their operations and formulate a program that will eventually free the people and private business enterprise of this country from the devastating effects of these ever-growing Government monopolies and Government activities in restraint of free and competitive trade. The Byrd-Butler bill is a necessary first step but, in my opinion, it is not the answer. The answer can lie only in withdrawing government from business. We cannot hold to democracy with one hand and engage in the practices of a totalitarian corporate state with the other. The two are unalterably incompatible. There is not room enough in this country for the exercise of both philosophies of government.

A PLAN FOR PEACE

Mr. BUSHFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the American form of government has functioned well for a century and a half. So successful has it been that it is the model upon which most of the nations of the earth have at one time or another attempted to form their governments.

Its three equal parts, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, have so nearly balanced each other that our citizens have found little fault with its operation, and occasional attempts at sabotage have always failed.

For generations the eyes of every people on the earth have been turned toward America. For the poor and less-favored peoples, America has been a mecca toward which their hopes have turned. While our physical and material growth have been phenomenal, they have been possible only because of the things for which America stands, namely, opportunity, freedom, and prosperity.

For thousands of years we humans have been striving for more liberty and less government. Sometimes we gained. Sometimes we lost ground, but the final result has always been a gain. If we slipped back in one decade, we pushed forward to a new high in the succeeding one. Because of the opportunities afforded under our form of government we have been able to forge ahead more rapidly and more soundly than the people of any other nation.

Until a century and a half ago the human race had never learned to produce enough food to meet its needs. The founding of the American Republic brought a new day to mankind. We learned how to produce food and so release part of our people to other work. Long centuries before America, history records an unbroken succession of famines and pestilence, and the world was always hungry. We began making machines to do the work of man. And so, by the expanding cycle of intellectual development, we have delved more and more into the discovery of processes and

methods whereby the standard of living for all people could be and has been raised.

The problem before us today is a grave one. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said on January 10:

There are critical moments in the life of every nation which call for the straightest, plainest, and most courageous thinking of which we are capable. We confront such a moment now.

This is a critical moment in human history as well as in American history. It behooves us, therefore, to examine the problems that confront us with the best intelligence of which we are capable, with the calmness and resolution which will bring us to the right solution, and with a determination not to be swayed by caprice, hatred, or emotion. There are many who have some particular axe to grind. Many idealists urge that this is an opportunity to remake the world. Many, with sincere motives, are swept off their feet in the belief that they have discovered the final and only answer to our problem. It is our duty in the Congress to study all those proposals, sift out the wheat from the chaff, and steel ourselves from emotionalism.

Hysteria has no place in this picture. We have solved every problem with which we have been faced, and we will solve this one. Freedom is not going to disappear from the earth. The American constitutional form of government will not be destroyed. Desperate though the times may seem, the sturdy, well-founded judgments of our people will prevail. We will succeed, because our decisions represent the combined wisdom of many men rather than the conclusions of one man.

We are in war today—a terrible war. Nothing that we do will ever justify its cost. It is our duty to make sure that war will not come again, but our decision must represent the combined wisdom of a free people.

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

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should prefer to wait until I have finished my speech and then I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, lest there be misunderstanding or misinterpretation of my position, let me make it crystal clear.

For years, by speech and written word, I have favored the creation of an association of nations which would abolish war. It can be done and must be done, but it must be done without destroying America.

The Government under which we have lived and prospered has proved the soundness of my thesis. The American people have advanced further than has any other nation. We are not now going to discard the things that have made that progress possible.

America has no monopoly of brains. Every nation in the world has produced men of intellectual attainments equal to those of our own. We do not possess a monopoly of natural resources. A gen-

erous Providence has distributed those resources all over the earth. We do not claim or possess a monopoly of inventive genius or of scientific skill. Every civilized nation has produced men of attainment equal to ours.

We have no monopoly of religious beliefs. In our Republic all religions are recognized. Church and state have never been combined. Freedom of religion as well as freedom of speech are freedoms which American civilization demand. What, then, is the secret of our success?

Individual freedom is the answer. Freedom for each man to develop his talents in his own way without interference or oppression has been our policy. It must continue to be. Government is not for the benefit of government but for the benefit of the people; and when the day comes that the government is master instead of servant, then will come the decay and final destruction of the things we call America.

The latest plan for peace is Dumbarton Oaks. It will presently be before us as a treaty. Is it a peoples' plan? Or will it destroy America? I wish to speak of that proposal, in the hope that what I say will bring discussion which may help us all.

Last September, in a debate on Dumbarton Oaks upon this floor, I said:

Under that plan the President will have the power to declare war without the knowledge, the consent, or the approval of Congress.

In section B of the official Dumbarton Oaks agreement, later released to the public, and particularly in subsection (6) thereof, we find these words:

In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the organization, there should be held immediately available by the members of the organization national airforce contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action should be determined by the Security Council.

Thus, Mr. President, we do not decide even the size of our contribution. The Security Council, composed of Britain, Russia, China, ourselves, and seven other members selected from the small nations, will determine when, where, and how our soldiers shall fight.

On October 9 an Associated Press representative, John H. Hightower, published the following statement:

It was said on high authority that the means by which the United States would furnish its share of forces remained to be decided, but the administrative branch is expected to press for blanket authorization to obviate the necessity of asking for congressional authority each time forces were to be used.

This statement has now been verified in a statement printed in the Christian Science Monitor, February 21:

The specific authority to be delegated to the American representative on the United Nations Security Council, determining the extent to which he will be able to commit the United States to prompt armed action against any future aggression, will be fixed by a separate statute, which the administration intends to submit to Congress as a supplement to the Dumbarton Oaks Charter.

The essentials in President Roosevelt's plans on this point can now be stated authoritatively:

The White House favors investing the American delegate with broad authority to enable the Security Council to act promptly and effectively in face of either a threat or an actual breach of the peace.

The administration proposes to establish this authority for the American member on the council by a specific act of Congress to be passed by both Houses, since it will be an act of domestic legislation, not a treaty commitment.

It is generally known in Washington that that is the position taken by the President and that when this treaty is finally presented to the Senate for action a demand will be made that such authority be granted to him, either in the treaty or by statute, which will require only a majority vote of Congress, thus making it easier to secure passage than if a treaty vote were required. Granting this power to the delegate of the United States is the same as granting it to the President, because the delegate will be the appointee of the President and subject to him at all times.

If this power is granted to the President or to the American delegate, it will be a delegation of power to an individual to act instead of Congress. Can this be done? Definitely, I assert that it cannot. Raymond Moley said on December 4:

In clothing the American representative with power to act, Congress is delegating one of its greatest prerogatives.

Alexander Wilson, noted author, writing in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, has this to say:

Will the American people willingly leave it to the security council to send troops into battle on the authority and initiative of the security council?

Will the one member representing the United States on the security council be empowered to decide on his sole judgment for the 130,000,000 Americans whether the armed strength of this country should be used to suppress aggression anywhere in the world and thus plunge us into another war?

Will Congress by constitutional amendment abdicate its exclusive right to declare war to a solitary representative?

What does the Constitution say about this power?

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution provides:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

Section 8 of article I provides that Congress shall have power—

To declare war * * *;
To raise and support armies * * *;
To provide and maintain a navy;
To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.
To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

No one will seriously dispute the statement that Congress alone has power to declare war. Attempting to delegate such power is in direct violation of our Constitution.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at present; no. Mr. President, it may be contended that giving the President or his delegate

authority to consent to the use of the armed forces of the United States to preserve the peace is not a declaration of war. Such a statement is pure bunk. The sending of armies or navies or air forces against a foreign country is war.

Dr. Wright, in his book *Control of American Foreign Relations*, says:

The President cannot declare war.

On page 289, we find this statement:

Acts of war, such as those committed by Germany from 1915 to 1917, would not justify Presidential recognition of war.

On page 290, we find this statement:

Where acts of violence or reprisal alone are in question, Congress is the only authority that can put the country in a state of war.

Where no war exists in fact, Congress is the only authority in the United States that can declare one, and Congress cannot delegate this power.

In a Senate debate of 25 years ago Senator Stone of Missouri spoke these significant words:

The Constitution vests the war-making power alone in the Congress. It is a power that Congress is not at liberty to delegate.

Thomas Jefferson, in his message to the Congress in 1801, said:

I communicate to Congress all material information on this subject, that in the exercise of the important function, confided by the Constitution to the legislature exclusively, their judgment may form itself on a knowledge and consideration of every circumstance of weight. (P. 169, U. S. President, Speeches and Message, Congressional Library, J 81, A 25.)

Mr. President, the Dumbarton Oaks plan is simply a new league of nations, which three, or at the most four great powers will completely dominate and control. There will be peace by force. That force will be administered by three or four men. They will have full power to investigate every instance, whenever in their opinion there is a threat to peace, and they will be the sole judges of how and when to act. The life of such an agreement will depend upon how long those three men can get along together. Fifty or more nations will be ruled by three men. Do we want that kind of world government? Would any of the three great nations consent to a police force that could control it? We know they will not.

The Tablet, influential Catholic weekly, in its editorial commenting on President Roosevelt's estimate of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, said:

Granting whatever good points the Dumbarton Oaks proposals may be credited with, it must be conceded that even as machinery the entire program, as it stands, here and now, is useless.

What faith, Mr. President, can we, the American people, have in the reliability, the promise of the individual leaders of three great powers or their governments, when Japan and Germany are concerned?

Let me refer to the record. I quote from George E. Sokolsky, gifted writer in the New York Sun:

Let us take a leaf out of the past. In 1917, before this country entered World War No. 1, precisely on February 16, 1917, the British Government addressed a note to the Japanese

Government which contained the following paragraph:

"His Majesty's Government accedes with pleasure to the request of the Japanese Government for an assurance that they will support Japan's claims in regard to the disposal of Germany's rights in Shantung and possessions in islands north of the equator on the occasion of the peace conference, it being understood that the Japanese Government will, in the eventual peace settlement, treat in the same spirit Great Britain's claims to German islands south of the equator."

This is the formula of the secret treaty by which China, soon to be an ally in the war, was to be robbed of essential territory. The Japanese agreed to support the claims which the British would put forward at the peace conference. The French and Russians concurred in this proposal, each stipulating schemes of their own and the Italians said that they had no objection regarding the matter.

William Hard in the December 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest, speaking of continued Japanese aggression, said:

Two treaties forbade that aggression. One was the League of Nations Treaty, which the United States had not signed. The other was the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922, which the United States had vigorously signed; and so had China, Japan, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, France, and Britain. It pledged all signatories to respect "territorial and administrative integrity" and "sovereignty" of China.

In 1937 the League met at Geneva to stop Japan under the League of Nations Covenant Treaty. It arrived at nothing that could be called action. Japan went on.

In that same year 1937, the United States went to a Nine-Power Treaty Conference at Brussels to stop Japan. The conference opened. It adjourned. It arrived at nothing that could be called action. Japan went on.

I really seriously inquire: How can anybody believe that what the United States failed to do at Brussels it would have been willing and able to do at Geneva?

So complete was the failure at Brussels that 2 years later Britain went right over from the side of China to the side of Japan and signed an agreement with Japan declaring that "the Japanese forces in China have special requirements for the purpose of safeguarding their own security; and His Britannic Majesty's Government have no intention of countenancing any act prejudicial to the attainment of that object."

I quote Mr. Hard further:

In 1882 we signed a treaty with Korea whereby we undertook to take diplomatic steps if any third country should deal "oppressively" with Korea. In 1905 Japan dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by conquering it; and in 1910 it further dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by annexing it. Did we take any diplomatic steps against Japan? Absolutely none. On the contrary, we were the very first government to recognize the Japanese conquest of Korea by withdrawing our diplomatic legation from Korean soil and by thus proclaiming to the world that Korea, our "ally," had ceased to exist as an independent country.

Still quoting Mr. Hard:

In 1846 we signed a treaty with Colombia whereby we undertook to "guarantee" the "sovereignty" of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama. This commitment was in full force and vigor in 1903. In that year there was an artificially concocted revolution on the Isthmus. Did we then help Colombia to restore its sovereignty over the Isthmus? We did the reverse. We used our armed forces to prevent Colombia from itself restoring its sovereignty over the Isthmus? For doing so we ultimately paid Colombia an apologetic

indemnity of \$25,000,000. We acknowledged that in changed circumstances we had violated a commitment given in circumstances long gone by.

It is also interesting to note President Roosevelt's former attitude in connection with our entrance into a league of nations. On December 28, 1933, he said of the League of Nations:

We are not members and we do not contemplate membership.

On January 3, 1934, he said:

I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in the political arrangements in Europe.

On October 2, 1935, he said:

Despite what happens to continents overseas, the United States of America shall and must remain untangled and free.

On August 4, 1933, he said:

Both sides agree that this Nation should agree at all times to avoid entangling alliances or involvements with other nations.

Lord Winstor, speaking in the House of Lords on October 11, 1944, said:

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal is an organization for keeping small boys in order by prefects, who would themselves be exempt from the rules they would have to administer.

Will Dumbarton Oaks succeed? History answers for us.

For more than a thousand years there have been almost continuous wars in the Balkans and in the small states bordering Russia on the west. An attempt to intermingle racial groups and religious groups has never succeeded. Peace treaties, conferences, and various commissions have been set up for the purpose of bringing peace to the Balkans. None have succeeded. None of them ever will succeed as long as those mixed issues of religion and nationality continue to exist.

C. A. McCartney, in Hungary and Her Successors, Oxford University Press of 1937, says:

Practically all these minorities are discontented with their position, and must always remain so.

Stoyan Pribichevich, in World Without End, says:

The Balkanite has survived all who oppressed him. Hordes of aggressors have vanished into nothing, empires have fallen to dust, but the tiny Slav nations tenaciously cling to the soil they occupied more than a thousand years ago.

Two world wars have come out of those small states along the western border of Russia. Millions of human beings have been slaughtered in the search for racial equality among divergent peoples.

Do the Big Three intend to declare perpetual war against these small nations? Do they propose to permanently locate American troops within the boundaries of those nations for the so-called purpose of preserving the peace?

To those who say that the President must have power to use force without approval by Congress I cannot agree. There are many on this floor who cannot agree to such delegation of power no matter by what verbal legerdemain it may be presented. We will not assent to

any treaty or law that has for its purpose the destruction or emasculation of the Constitution or of Congress. The President has authority under the Constitution for defense in case of attack and for the suppression of bandits, but sending the Army into a foreign country in an attack upon the people of that country is war.

Whether the invasion is made by the big bad wolf or the kindly, humanitarian Big Three, it is still war.

It is said that the President must be given the power to declare war without referring it back to Congress. The only argument which has been made from any source in support of this demand is that of time.

In no international trouble in which we have engaged has there been any question of time. President Roosevelt called Hitler an aggressor and demanded that he be quarantined 5 years before the beginning of the European war. When the President asked Congress for war it acted in less than 2 hours.

He called Japan an aggressor in 1934. When he asked Congress on December 8, 1941, for war, Congress acted in 33 minutes. Aggressors do not arise overnight. They require months and often years to commit the overt act.

Can Senators point to any necessity for speedier action than we have taken in these two last wars?

The decision for war is the most serious and terrible step that a nation can take. It should never be made by one man. In a republic like ours, it should be made by the constitutional processes provided only after open debate and without secrecy.

Can anyone suggest that attacking Germany would not mean war? If we send a fleet of our warplanes over Berlin or Frankfurt or Hamburg indiscriminately destroying property and human beings, is there anyone so naive as to suggest that that does not mean war?

If we were ordered, in the enforcement of our alleged police control, to destroy German factories or to seize German soil, does any Senator suggest that such action would not mean war?

I am not willing to leave it to one man's decision to bring the United States into such a crisis. Policing a foreign nation means war against that nation and against its people, and no polished words will cover that ugly fact.

Civilization practically disappeared during the Dark Ages. It may disappear again. Our own civilization could be destroyed by a continuation of wars such as this one. One man may and can again reverse the march of civilization for a century or more. We cannot afford to place the future of mankind, to place civilization itself in the hands of one man or a small group of men.

Some there are who assure us that all we need is a token police force, and merely to wave the policeman's club or blow his whistle to insure immediate obedience. That is wishful thinking. If a large nation starts a war in this day and age it means total war. War is not divisible. We cannot measure it with a yardstick and say we will go this far and no farther. The nation attacked and the

attacking nation will put every resource and every strength and every man they have in the struggle, to win. You cannot say to your opponent that you will black only one eye and no more. The fight must go on until one is down and out. No, wars are not conducted that way. One side must win. There must be a victor. Whenever this proposed United Nations police force crosses the boundary of a foreign country it asks for war. Dare we permit one man to make the decision?

If the security council proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks agreement decides to disarm any nation, how is the order to be enforced? How many men will it take? How many guns? How many ships? How many airplanes? There is no limit to such a proposal. In dealing with nations we are not dealing with drunks. Do we, holding most of the facilities in the world, consent that Russia and Britain disarm us or perhaps order us to attack some friendly nation?

A military alliance with Great Britain and Russia now will bring only disappointment and loss of friends. Only once in our entire history has the United States been a party to a military alliance. That was with France over a hundred years ago and it was completely unsatisfactory. France kept her agreement. We did not. Are we now to enter a military alliance with Great Britain and Russia to rule the world?

Instead of alliances, let us endeavor to build an association of nations along the lines of the Pan American Union. All nations, big and little, should be in it with equal rights for all.

But Russia has unofficially stated that it expects to take certain foreign territory. The Yalta Conference apparently has agreed to that. Is there anyone so simple as to believe that Russia, with the largest army in the world, is not going to take what it wants; and when it does so, who is going to say no to it? Will Great Britain and the United States immediately declare war upon Russia? Will several million American boys be sent to Europe to engage in that war, which is none of our concern?

We want nothing out of this war, except peace and security. We have no desire for a single acre of land. We have no wish to impose our will either politically or governmentally upon any other people in the world.

We must learn to work together as neighbors, peacefully. Without the milk of human kindness and Christian forbearance there is little hope of permanent peace. "Speak softly and carry a big stick and we will go far."

Under the American form of government, no Congress has power to bind any succeeding Congress. We in America have seen public opinion shift from one side to another on public questions. We know not today what the Eightieth or Eighty-first Congress may do. Our acts, whatever they be, must be governed by that knowledge.

The League of Nations under President Wilson created the machinery for peace. It has functioned for nearly a quarter of a century. It is still in force. To say

that it failed because the United States was not in it, is not supported by the facts.

Russia recognized the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1920. Within a year they were admitted to the League of Nations. The following year the United States recognized their independence.

The League of Nations is still in existence. All its commitments are still binding upon all its members. Britain, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, South America, and France are members.

Article 10 of the League binds its members to preserve the independence and sovereignty of the Baltic States. President Roosevelt has committed us to the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live. Now Russia says she is going to annex the Baltic States.

The League of Nations failed not because of what we did not do, but because of what Great Britain and France refused to do when the time for action came. It failed because they refused to carry out their bond in Manchuria, in China, in Germany, and in Ethiopia.

The Connally resolution expressed our foreign policy definitely and forcibly when we declared the position of the United States. Its provisions control today. Let me quote you what it says:

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Winston Churchill made the oft-quoted remark, now famous throughout the world:

I am not the King's first minister to liquidate the British Empire.

Personally, I am not a member of the United States Senate to liquidate the American Republic, and I do not propose to give away our property or our liberty through some altruistic dream that we must solve all the problems of mankind. Let us make the best agreement we can. Let us take every step forward that is possible, but let us be realistic while we are doing so.

Secretary Hull went to Moscow and returned with an agreement which he pronounced an important step in our program toward a post-war world. He declared:

There will no longer be need for spheres of influence, or alliances, or balances of power.

Today, upon the morning after Yalta, we are presented with spheres of influence covering central Europe. Germany is to be divided in three or more parts. Poland is betrayed and the Balkans are under the sphere of Russian influence.

By what pattern of reasoning or justice can the Big Three choose the form of government under which other nations live just because those nations are small and cannot resist?

We either mean what we say or we do not. There has been too much double talk in world diplomacy. The American people are entitled to know exactly the destiny planned for the 54 small nations of the world. We have no fear of serious war from them. Only the Big Three will ever start a major war.

Our talk of free elections by free people for all countries has just been made, by the Yalta Conference, a living lie.

America has once more been outraded by men smarter and more able than those we sent to the mill to bring home our grist.

As David Lawrence said under date of February 16:

The same high-sounding phrases have been given to the world again this week as were issued at Moscow and Tehran Conferences in November and December of 1943. The same promises of military coordination and the desire to work together in peace as well as war were promulgated then. The same European advisory commission was pointed to in 1943, as a pious body to examine questions arising day by day out of the liberated countries, and joint action was pledged. But that pledge was broken by Britain through her single-handed action in Greece and in Italy, and by Russia in her encouragement of and setting up of the Lublin government in Poland.

In the decision to destroy Germany's economic life and make it impossible for her for many years to come to live as a peaceful partner in the European family, the Crimean Conference has condemned Germany to a life of underground gangsterism and outlawry.

On February 12, 1945, President Roosevelt in his message to the Congress said:

The cornerstone for international political cooperation is the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for a permanent United Nations.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal, if it means anything at all, means freedom and liberty from oppression for all peoples. But the Crimean agreement issued under the same date abandons the small nations to their fate.

There is much wishful thinking in this country to the effect that it is our duty to police the world, that our resources dug out of the soil and out of the factory by the hard-working laboring men and women of this country, are to be distributed like Christmas gifts to anyone who asks for them.

Any way in which we approach this proposal for a new league we find three, and only three, great nations dominating it. China was formerly referred to as one of the Big Four. China never has been and probably never will be a great nation. The inclusion of her name in the Security Council was fantastic.

Three nations—Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin—will, under this proposal of Dumbarton Oaks, absolutely run the world.

This proposed league is just as impossible as one formed for the United States of our States, with New York and Pennsylvania controlling it. Were New York and Pennsylvania to adopt such a course they would have the bitter enmity and hatred of every other State in the Union. This new league will have the enmity and hatred of every small nation in the world.

I repeat, we want an association of nations, but let us have an association of equality, of sincere honest-to-goodness participation by every nation, each having one vote, regardless of its size, regardless of its constituent parts.

When the time comes, let us gather around the peace table and with our cards in front of us, see if it is not possible for civilized men to agree upon a workable plan by which we can live together in peace. But on one thing I am certain. We must make our allies accept democracy in principle by whatever name we call it. Unless we approach the peace table with that conviction in our hearts, there will be no permanent peace.

The principles upon which the American Nation has grown great and strong are those prescribed in the Constitution, and upon which we have developed our civilization. We hold the cards. We are the most powerful Nation in the world. Every country in this war looks to us for aid and assistance, and has received it. We must not overplay our hand by overpromising what we will do. The man who is a 60-day borrower from the bank is more polite to his banker and more amenable to reason than the one who has a 10-year loan.

For a thousand years Russian rulers have dreamed of and schemed for a warm-water outlet to the sea. Peter the Great built St. Petersburg on the Baltic Sea to have an ocean outlet, but the Baltic is frozen most of the year. Today is Russia's opportunity. Does anyone doubt that she will make the most of it? If she does, who is going to stop her? Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, even the Balkans, or Turkey, cannot prevent her. Is it our job to do so? You and I know that it is not, and we are not going to do so. Thus ends the keystone of Dumbarton Oaks, and we gain the hatred of every small nation to which we break our promise for self-determination.

Other problems that confront us, and which should be proposed for discussion, are our future policy for lend-lease, for U. N. R. R. A., and for the fantastic plans of the President's Food Conference.

What, it may be asked, will we agree to? What are we willing to ask other nations to subscribe to? Briefly, they are:

No coercion by any nation upon another.

Self-determination by all people.

Conflicts of nationalities within separate countries shall be settled by majority vote of the people of that country.

Any limitation of armaments must be voluntary, except with respect to Germany and Japan.

There must be free access to the sea and air at the expense of each country demanding it.

No invasion of another country or crossing its boundaries with armed forces except to suppress the Axis from rearming.

There shall be no destruction of Germany as a country, except to prevent preparation for military activity.

There shall be no changing of boundaries except by mutual agreement.

There shall be a complete return of all loot taken by the Axis countries or payment for it.

There shall be a return of all people, held under bondage or force, to their own homes.

There shall be immediate restoration of legislative bodies of the various countries and free elections without coercion.

There shall be an armistice and peace immediately, whenever this war ends.

There must be a complete surrender of all arms and war material by the Axis at once.

If we enter the agreement proposed by Dumbarton Oaks, will England, Holland, and Russia insist that the management of their conquered colonies is a domestic question, and cannot be brought before the league? What about the people of those conquered countries? Have they no right to be heard? Have they no appeal to the league for protection?

As Alexander Wilson, noted author, said:

Perhaps it is almost axiomatic to say that it is not the small nations that need a world peace organization to keep them from starting world wars, for it was the big powers which fell out with each other and have been directly responsible for the world wars.

Woodrow Wilson, in an address to the Senate, January 22, 1917, stated:

And there is a deeper thing involved than even equality of right among organized nations. No peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand people about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.

In my opinion, the only plan which will insure peace is the total disarmament of all the nations of the world, but it is a foregone conclusion that the big nations of the earth would not at present agree to such a proposal.

The future of this world agreement to preserve peace will depend upon the personalities who control the three or four big nations, and we must not forget that personalities change. Each of the three important leaders of the Big Three today is past 60. Inevitably, death will remove all of them within a comparatively short time. Who, then will follow in their steps? Who then will be the rulers? Will their differing personalities combine in complete agreement, as those of the present leaders have done?

Walter Lippmann, famous author and columnist, said recently:

There is no way of committing any nation in 1945, least of all this one, to wage a theoretical war in say 1955 against an unknown power under unforeseeable conditions. If and when a threat of war arises in 1955, the man who will then be Presi-

dent, the Congress then in session, and the people then in active life will decide our action.

Most of the proposals and discussion heretofore have related to and dealt with the military angle. But in this picture there is a larger, broader question than any military arrangement. What about the economic settlements for the European populations? People must have food. Is it not a major portion of our job to see that the opportunity be granted to the people of crushed Europe to have sufficient food and an opportunity to work out their own destinies? Men will surrender their liberty, and have done so, in order to secure food and a chance to work. They may do so again unless they are helped over the first rough spots.

There are, to me, two paramount questions to be determined at the peace table.

First. We must insist with all the power we have that a peace be made upon democratic principles—a peoples' peace.

Second. We must secure the material welfare of the people who are bankrupt and crushed by war. I do not mean to say that the financial burden rests upon us alone. It should be shared equally by our allies. All peoples are looking to America for leadership, for succor. Unless we provide ways and means by which those people may be given an opportunity to work out their own destinies, to have food, to have an opportunity to prosper in their own way, we shall have failed in the leadership which we have assumed, and we shall have anarchy and, probably, chaos.

When the sun goes down for the last time upon this bloody, ghastly war in which supposedly civilized men have sought to destroy their fellow men, when guns have ceased to roar, and the exhausted world turns wearily to bind its wounds, let us hope and pray that the gleaming sunrise of a better day will lead us hopefully, prayerfully, to a peace table at which all people join in a solemn determination to work out the plans that will forever banish war from the earth.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] as a substitute for the committee amendment as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Capehart	Green
Balley	Capper	Guffey
Ball	Candler	Gurney
Bankhead	Chavez	Hart
Barkley	Cordon	Hatch
Bilbo	Donnell	Hawkes
Brewster	Downey	Hayden
Briggs	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Buck	Ferguson	Hill
Burton	Fulbright	Hoyer
Bushfield	George	Johnson, Calif.
Butler	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.

Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Taft
Kilgore	Myers	Taylor
La Follette	O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
McFarland	Overton	Tobey
McKellar	Pepper	Tunnell
McMahon	Radcliffe	Tydings
Magnuson	Reed	Vandenberg
Maybank	Revercomb	Wagner
Mead	Robertson	Walsh
Millikin	Russell	Wherry
Mitchell	Saltonstall	White
Moore	Shipstead	Wiley
Morse	Smith	Willis
Murdoch	Stewart	Wilson

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope we can now get down to serious consideration of the measure under debate and can begin to vote on some of the amendments. We have now been debating the pending bill for more than a week, and the only thing we have done is to vote on the Tydings amendment, although one other amendment was voted on and rejected. I regret to say that there seems to be more confusion in the minds of Members of the Senate over the different provisions of the bill now under consideration than there has been regarding any legislation of which I have any recollection. We have the House bill; we have the committee amendment; we have the Revercomb substitute. Up to now, no one has drawn a very clear distinction between any of them, as to what they mean or where one impinges upon the others. Certainly we could clarify the situation at least by beginning to vote on some of the amendments and substitutes, and I hope that now we can start on that process.

Amendments to the text of the committee amendment are, of course, in order to perfect it before voting on the substitute. I hope that we may limit our discussion now. I have thought of undertaking to bring about a limitation of debate. I do not wish to do that; of course, I could only do it by unanimous consent. But I hope that we can get down to consideration of the merits of amendments so that we may conclude the discussion and consideration of the pending legislation.

If this bill must be written in conference, then it is our duty to get it to conference as soon as possible so that the conferees may begin to write it there, if it must be written there. If we can pass here an acceptable bill, we should begin to try to do that.

I hope that Members of the Senate will restrain themselves from now on in the delivery of addresses which are not connected with the subject matter before the Senate.

I understand that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has an amendment which he desires to offer. It would be in order before the Senate voted on the Revercomb substitute. I hope that any Senator who wishes to offer an amendment to the text of the committee substitute will offer it so that the Senate may vote upon it. If any Senator wishes to offer an amendment in the nature of a perfecting amendment—if the committee substitute can be made perfect, or more nearly perfect than it is—let us vote on it so that we

may have a clear understanding of the committee substitute in order that we may vote on something which we understand. Up to now we have not been able to do that. I hope that in a good-natured way I may urge the Senate to refrain from presenting extraneous matters until we have disposed of the pending legislation. Let us get action upon it. Let us vote on something. If we are not to pass any form of legislation let us let the country know that we will not do so, and then it will not expect anything from us.

I do not make these remarks in capricious criticism of any Senator, but I think we will all agree that we have spent a great deal of time "messaging around" on the subject without getting down to any concrete proposal with regard to what we intend to do.

Mr. WHITE rose.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I listened to the Senator from Kentucky I could not repress a desire to express my complete concurrence in what he was saying. I believe that everything which the Senator said in the nature of suggestion or criticism is wholly justified by the lack of progress which the Senate has made on the pending bill.

I understand that a number of amendments to the committee substitute are now lying on the desk. I suppose they should be disposed of before the Senate votes on the Revercomb substitute. I think it would be very helpful if Senators who have sent amendments to the desk would speedily make up their minds whether they wish to press them for consideration by the Senate so that we may dispose of all amendments to the committee substitute at the earliest possible time consistent with a respectful consideration of them. If we succeed in getting them out of the way I assume that the Revercomb amendment will then be disposed of with reasonable speed.

Mr. President, again I say that I concur in the statement the Senator from Kentucky has made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine. I believe the country has a right to expect something from the Senate in the way of concentrated consideration of the important subject now pending. I could go on indefinitely and expatiate on the sacrifices which our men are making in snow, sleet, and mud in their efforts to cross rivers where bridges are being blown up. We could all talk about such things, but it is not necessary to emphasize what is going on anywhere else except in the United States Senate. I hope that we may reach a speedy conclusion to do what we will do with the pending legislation so that we may terminate consideration of it sooner or later, at least before the war is over, or before the San Francisco Conference takes place and a treaty is sent to the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as Senators know, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent, attending the funeral of his colleague, the late Senator Moses. I have received a telegram from him asking me to call up in

his behalf two amendments which he has offered to the bill and have them voted on. I will do that at this time if the Senator from Kentucky wants something for the Senate to vote on.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will give my full cooperation in calling up those amendments and having them voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have them before me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that if we could start the process of voting we could make some progress.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate now has an opportunity to vote twice.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer a short amendment to the Revercomb substitute. I trust that it will be satisfactory to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. On page 6, beginning in line 12, I move to strike out the words "other than a place of entertainment and amusement."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the language referred to by the able Senator from California was discussed with me a few days ago. At that time I believe I indicated that if there were objection to the language I should not oppose striking it from the amendment, and I now do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the right to modify his amendment, and the modification will be made.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have heretofore submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 17, in section 7, it is proposed to strike out "(5)", so as to make section 7 read as follows:

Sec. 7. Paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this act, the word "President," wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, my amendment relates to section 7 of the amendment reported by the committee to the pending bill, House bill 1752. Section 7 of the bill as originally reported from the Committee on Military Affairs reads as follows:

Paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940—

And so forth. My amendment would eliminate the reference to paragraph (5). The paragraphs referred to in the bill are from the Second War Powers Act. I invite the attention of the Senate to paragraph (5) of the Second War Powers Act, reading as follows:

(5) Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required by, any provision of this subsection (a) or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, whether heretofore or hereafter issued, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor,

and shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. President, the bill as reported by the committee referred to the paragraph which I have read only as "(5)". It is known as the penalty clause of the bill. My amendment is for the purpose of eliminating the penalty provision. I do not believe the Congress or the people of the country favor putting a man in the penitentiary as provided in the committee substitute. I therefore hope that the chairman of the committee will agree to the elimination of the reference to paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the reference to paragraph (5) was put into the bill after it was referred to the committee and after the committee had considered the bill. The original O'Mahoney-Kilgore bill did not contain a reference to paragraph (5). The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is in keeping with the wish of the authors of the substitute to strike out reference to the paragraph. But it should be remembered that paragraph (5) was deemed by the committee to be necessary because otherwise there would be no penalty whatsoever.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understood that another amendment to the section was adopted the other day whereby a lesser penalty was provided. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The penalty adopted the other day has to do with the Tydings amendment and covers only the agricultural worker who has been deferred because of an agricultural occupation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then it does not refer to section 7.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; it does not refer to that section.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it had not been for placing in the bill the so-called Tydings amendment, I do not believe that the committee would ever have put into this bill the reference to paragraph (5). As I recall, it was offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and was only adopted by a vote of 7 to 5. That is the reason for the opposition of some of us to that section, as well as the farm-penalty section. I think that if the Tydings amendment had not been inserted in the bill this provision would not have been put in, and it ought not to be in.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It becomes my duty to explain why the amendment was put in, and the reason the Senator from Vermont had for putting it in and to attempt to make it plain to the Senate exactly what will be the effect if they vote to strike out paragraph (5).

The last statement which the Senator from South Dakota made that someone

might be put in the penitentiary as the result of breaking a regulation issued by the War Manpower Commission and enforced by the War Mobilization Board is hardly correct. I realize that it is loose language, but there is no penalty except the penalty for a misdemeanor in paragraph (5) and then the penalty applies only when there has been a willful act to try to avoid the action of the War Manpower Commission.

Because paragraph (5) starts out with the words "Any person," it might therefore be assumed that by the use of the broad term "any person" all persons might come under this penalty as a result of the way in which the paragraph reads; but the penalty will fall only upon the willful employer who refuses to abide by an order of the War Manpower Commission. So, the penalty is not so broad and so stringent as might be assumed. The penalty would be controlled by the regulations the War Manpower Commission would have to draw up and enforce, and those regulations would be made within the limits of the act itself. So, the penalty will fall, according to the theory of the sponsor of the amendment, upon the employer only and would not reach the employee.

I emphasize that because there is another amendment pending to be considered later on which would extend the penalty to any individual, and an employee might thus be caught if that amendment were adopted. But this amendment would merely relieve the employer of the penalty.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee as to whether, in his opinion, the provisions of paragraph (5), which on their face are directed to a willful violation by an employer, might not also reach the employer's employee who by virtue of remaining on a job or taking a job in violation of the regulation thereby aided and abetted his employer and ordinarily would be deemed an accomplice and subject to the same penalty as his principal.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. He would not be subject to it, according to the opinion of the sponsor of the amendment and according to the opinion as set forth in the report of the committee. Of course, these provisions are highly speculative. I wondered, as the Senator from Oregon wonders, whether the penalty would not extend beyond the employer. I was told that the penalty would not so extend, and I am now attempting to support the position of the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Utah, then, as is the Senator from Oregon, is somewhat in doubt about it. I confess I am.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sure that anyone who entered into a conspiracy would be held under some other law, because there is a general con-

spiracy statute, of course. So, a willful violator might, through other circumstances and other laws, be held, and he should be punished if he is contributing to the breaking of the law of the land. But, so far as the penalty in the amendment is concerned, it extends only to the employer.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the case of willful violation it is manifest that the case could be taken to the United States district court, and would then be subject to appeal to the court of appeals and finally to the Supreme Court of the United States. Am I correct about that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should think that an employer could carry his case up in the ordinary way. I imagine it would be governed by statute in the ordinary way.

Mr. MAYBANK. The thought has been expressed that perhaps bureaus or Government agencies might have the final determination under the section, but it is my understanding—and I trust the Senator will correct me if I am in error—that the understandings we had were that the final determination would be in the hands of the courts of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is as I understand it. I know no administrative tribunal at all that is set up to carry on such functions.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, then, any willful violation of the law would be carried before the district judges, subject to appeal to the circuit judges, and then subject to appeal to the United States Supreme Court, and those judges have all been confirmed by the United States Senate, and constitute the judiciary of America.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield again?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon and then I will yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Utah suggests that if this provision should be deleted from the bill there would be no other penalty provision in it, and I am in entire accord so far as any criminal penalty is concerned. But if it were deleted there would remain the provisions of section 8 which would prohibit the deduction as an expense from income-tax returns of wages paid in violation of the act or prevent the inclusion of wages so paid in any cost-plus contract. Those provisions would still apply and be in the nature of civilian compulsion. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They would apply only to the employer.

Mr. CORDON. Definitely so, and they would continue to apply even

though paragraph (5) were deleted, and would be a compulsion on the employer.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I do not know of any bureau that may be called upon to enforce this proposed statute that could put a man in jail or levy a fine. As the Senator from South Carolina has well suggested, a case is usually carried into the district court, with all the rights of appeal, just as in any other criminal case. There would also be the right of trial by jury, would there not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume so.

Mr. HILL. Certainly a defendant would have the right of trial by jury and all rights of appeal he has today under any other criminal statute.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for bringing out the additional point to which he referred, because I have seen it indicated in articles and in letters I have received that bureaucracy in Washington or somewhere else will be clamped down, whereas, as I understand it, as it was understood in the committee, and as the legislative counsel told us in the committee, the penalty is imposed only for willful violation of the law in a case tried in the district court, by jurors from the district of the man who violates the law, subject to appeal to the circuit court, and subject to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true; and the prosecuting official would be the ordinary prosecuting official.

Mr. MAYBANK. The United States district attorney.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am sure that the violators of the law would be greatly consoled by and grateful for being given the right to trial by jury.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. While we are speaking of penalties, the most severe penalty under the provision being discussed can apply only where there is a willful violation, and the measure used the word "willful." The provision is that such a person found guilty under this provision shall be found guilty of only a misdemeanor, and be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than a year, or both. We should bear in mind that under the Selective Service Act any selectee who is guilty of a violation of any of the provisions of the act is subject to prosecution for a felony, with the possibility of a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for 5 years. Furthermore, under section 9 of the Selective Service Act, which gives to the President, the head of the War Department, or the head of the Navy Department the right "to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry" for war production, if such an order be given by the President through the War Department or the Navy Department and any individual, firm, company, as-

sociation, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, fails to comply with the order, such action is also made a felony, subject to punishment by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding \$50,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, it is deemed by the committee that the bill would be stronger with the penalty provision which has been explained. I trust the Senate will vote down the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, and stand by the committee amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the amendment as offered. Some question has been raised because it was thought that the penalty provided later in the bill as reported by the committee was unconstitutional, under the provision of the Constitution that any bill intended for the raising of revenue must originate in the House of Representatives.

When that penalty was drafted—a penalty which, together with the penalty sought to be stricken by the Senator from South Dakota, constitutes a double penalty—it was thought advisable to penalize employers in two ways. In the first place, an employer who was operating on, shall we say, the unit-price system, frequently found himself encumbered by an employer in the same area who was operating on a cost-plus-fixed-fee system, whose pay rolls were met out of the taxpayers' pockets, and the first employer was unable to compete for labor. Therefore, he felt he must have some protection if he were to be able to meet his production schedule. Consequently, we drafted a section, which was in the bill originally reported, which provided, first, that any employer of labor who persisted in hoarding labor by keeping labor over and above the fixed ceiling could not claim reimbursement from the United States Government for such labor if he were operating on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, when it was shown that he was so operating. Secondly, that producers of war material, under Government contract or otherwise, including the nonessential men, who failed to comply with price ceilings, could not claim in their income-tax returns as deductions wages wrongfully paid to workers employed in excess of the ceiling.

Question has been raised and has been brought to my attention as to the constitutionality of that provision in that it applies to income tax and also to the saving of money. We were impelled to the course which we followed by the employer who felt that there must be a rather drastic penalty to keep the employer who was, shall we say, employing on a Government pay roll, whose entire pay roll was met by the Government, from overemploying. That was to protect the man who was competing with him on a unit-cost basis. Secondly, in order to prevent people who were operating on a unit-cost basis, or who were engaged in nonessential industry, from employing unnecessary labor, we refused to give them income-tax credit, and, as I have said, the constitutionality of that was questioned.

I am certain that the constitutionality of that section was determined by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1897, in the case of *Twin City Bank v. Nebeker* (167 U. S. 196), in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Harlan on a very similar provision, under very similar circumstances. In that case in the National Banking Act which had been passed by the House the Senate inserted certain clauses very similar to the clause in the pending bill under discussion, by which certain charges to be covered into the Treasury were made against those who did not comply with the National Banking Act. In the opinion in that case Mr. Justice Harlan said:

The Journals of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States for the first session of the Thirty-eighth Congress were put in evidence by the plaintiff.

I may add, in passing, that this was purely a test case, instituted by the Twin City Bank against Nebeker, in which the total sum involved was only \$56. It was merely to test the constitutionality of such an amendment made by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Justice Harlan continued:

The bank claims that these Journals show that the National Bank Act originated as a bill in the House of Representatives; that when it passed the House it contained no provision for a tax upon the national banks, or upon any corporation, or upon any property, nor any provisions whatever for raising revenue; and that all the provisions that appear to authorize the Treasurer of the United States to collect any tax on the circulating notes of national banks originated in the Senate by way of amendment to the House bill.

To boil it down to the syllabus of the decision, we find this statement:

Section 41 of the National Banking Act imposing certain taxes upon the average amount of the notes in circulation of a banking association, now found in the Revised Statutes, is not a revenue bill within the meaning of the clause of the Constitution declaring that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives," but the Senate may propose or concur in amendments as on other bills.

Whether in determining such a question the courts may refer to the Journals of the two Houses of Congress for the purpose of ascertaining whether the act originated in the one House or the other is not decided.

In the decision on appeal, which reviewed the case, it was held that the tax provision was inserted by the Senate by way of a penalty to make sure that the law was enforced, that it was not intended particularly for revenue, but merely as a penalty imposed by the Senate on the banks of the United States. That is the reason for the later clause in this bill, and that is the reason why I am impelled to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, because I believe the subject matter is adequately taken care of by the penalties affecting income-tax returns and reimbursement for expenditures for wages imposed in excess of the ceiling and in violation of the act.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I simply wish to reply to the last statement made by

the Senator from West Virginia. I do so not in the sense of argument at all, but merely to point out one or two facts respecting the bill, for the reason that the committee provided both penalties referred to by the Senator. Before I do so I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia for bringing up the point of the constitutionality of the provision. We should remember the point which has been made, and in discussing the constitutionality of the provision remember the case of the Twin City Bank.

Mr. KILGORE. If any Senator wishes to check on the case I wish to say that the decision from which I read appears in One Hundred and Sixty-seventh United States Reports, page 196. It is the case of Twin City Bank against Nebeker.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to have the citation.

Mr. President, the provision contained in the bill is not new, and is not unique. Such a provision already appears in the Stabilization Act. Having made that statement, I may go one step further and point out that the provision has worked successfully in the Stabilization Act, has been successfully administered, and has brought about respect for that law.

Mr. President, the point I want to make in reply to the argument put forth by the Senator from West Virginia is that the Stabilization Act contains the same two penalties which are contained in the pending bill. The reason for inclusion of both penalties in the Stabilization Act is exactly the same reason as that which prevails for their inclusion in the pending measure. The penalty for infraction of the law which involves income taxes would not cover all the situations arising from the placing of ceilings and concerning employers generally. For instance, if an individual were operating a business from which there was no income, of course there could be no penalty. In the second place, in spite of what we are ordinarily told, all the employers of the United States do not have contracts with the Government of the United States, so it would be necessary to place a penalty also on the employers who do not have contracts with the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I trust that neither penalty will be stricken from the bill as it was reported by the committee, and I say again that I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] will be voted down.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I may say in reply to the Senator from Utah that I always have great deference for his views on such matters as this, but I may state frankly that the leaders of industry and labor who talked to me about the bill did not complain about it containing both penalties. Inasmuch as those representing industry, in conjunction with the labor group who furnish the manpower, had agreed upon the original provision I felt I should support the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], because I felt that the one penalty was sufficient. I do not desire to enter into a discussion with my good friend the Sen-

ator from Utah on this matter, but I did want to assure the Senate that the action taken by the Military Affairs Committee with respect to the one penalty I spoke of is entirely constitutional, and the penalty is perfectly enforceable in the courts of the United States.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to mention, in line with what the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], has brought out, that, in the opinion of some of us on the committee, the income-tax provision did not reach far enough into all categories. I also wish to suggest, and I trust the chairman of the committee will agree with me, that punishment provided with respect to income taxes is extremely delayed punishment. Income-tax returns are not made out until after the year in which the income is received, and it may perhaps be 2 or 3 years before the return has been thoroughly checked. Whereas if we add the other penalty contained in the bill for willful violation of the law, we make it possible for whomsoever may be placed in charge of administering the law to go into the courts and prevent such willful violation, so that what the bill is designed to accomplish may be accomplished, and that is, Mr. President, to have whatever is to be done, done as soon as possible for the assistance of our armed forces, because now is when our armed forces need materials of war, not when the time comes for preparing the income-tax returns for 1947 and 1948.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with all due deference to the Senator from South Carolina, I may call attention to the fact that the bill provides, by inference, for the utter shutting down, by way of injunction, if necessary, of any plant that violates the provision with respect to ceilings or does not properly conform.

I may also call to the Senator's mind that worry concerning the correctness of an income-tax return, even though it be prepared by an expert, is something which would deter certain persons from violating the law.

I may say further to the Senator from South Carolina that there is one thing in connection with the particular penalty referred to with which I am impressed. In their investigation numerous Members of the Senate have found that one of the greatest handicaps under which the war program has suffered is the hoarding of labor at the expense of the American taxpayer, by the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractor operating in competition with the contractor who is selling what he produces at a fixed unit price, and who cannot afford to hoard labor in his plant, because he, not the taxpayers of the United States, is paying the bill. I want that penalty provision to remain as a weapon to protect the perfectly patriotic and absolutely sincere contractor who is making the gadgets, the parts—I may say the subcontractor who makes the carburetors, who makes the springs, who makes the screws, and such things,

on a fixed-fee basis. I want the penalty provision to remain to protect him against labor recruiting encroachment by the man who can charge his employment bill up to the taxpayers of the United States for refund, not 3 years later, but within 30 days. I wish to give the contractor who is not operating on a cost-plus basis a little assistance from the Government in the battle which he has been so successfully waging all through this war.

Mr. President, I may say that 75 percent of the production of the United States is by such contractors by men who make items for the Government, and who themselves gamble the labor and material against the charges which they make. That is the type of contractor I am trying to help. I wish to make sure he is protected under this bill against the encroachments of—may I say with all due deference—the contractor whose manager or whose personnel chief is all too frequently a bit careless respecting the number of employees he keeps upon the pay roll, because contrary to common belief, he does not receive any additional percentage by holding such employees, but they do not cost him anything. By placing this provision in the bill we give the other contractor a little leeway, a little help in securing labor without encroachment being made upon him by the other type of contractor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I think my good and distinguished friend the Senator from West Virginia will admit that neither he nor I have any argument with respect to the hoarding of manpower.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have done the best we could to stop such practices. But in view of the fact that the Senator brought up this subject, I wish to say that it is my opinion that a law which would place an over-all board in charge, such a board as was provided for in the original bill the committee voted favorably upon by a vote of 7 to 2 more than a month ago, a board of which the Director of War Mobilization would be the head and which would channel the contracts, and have supervision over the Army and the Navy, and so forth, insofar as employment in navy yards and factories is concerned, is the answer to the question of hoarding manpower and the rivalry with respect to manpower, not in the armed forces themselves but in the agencies of government which represent the armed forces.

I think the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me on that point.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am compelled to disagree with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, because the bill which he so ably attempts to defend touches such a small percentage of the manpower of the United States engaged in the war effort as to be almost futile.

I also disagree with him, as numerous other Senators will, when I say that the armed forces themselves are not blameless in the hoarding of manpower, as has been plainly evidenced on numerous occasions.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator ought to understand that the Senator from South Carolina is for the May-Bailey bill, which was rejected in the committee by a vote of 12 to 6. He voted for it there.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to remind the Senate that on a certain Saturday 5 or 6 weeks ago, when a quorum of the committee was present, that bill was approved by a vote of 6 to 2. Later it was determined to have open hearings, and the Senator from Kentucky is eminently correct in saying that after the hearings were held, I was on the losing end, by a vote of 12 to 6. I have no regrets, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on the question of the hearings, Senators may remember the old political story about the cats whose eyes were opened. Possibly the hearings opened the eyes of the committee.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it is well for the Senate to know that while those in the Senate who favor the May bill have been temporarily defeated, they are still wide awake, and hope that if the Senate does pass a bill ultimately we may have the same bill back here again. That is the reason why I have fought so hard during the past couple of weeks to defeat all these bills. If we do defeat all of them we will not get back the May bill, which was rejected by a vote of 12 to 6, after hearings were held.

So far as I am advised, no substantial testimony was given by anyone which indicated the need of this sort of bill at the present time. I wish to refresh the recollection of my friend from West Virginia with respect to the reason for inserting the penalty provided in section 5 of the Second War Powers Act. It was inserted upon motion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], after the committee had adopted the so-called farm penalty. The farm penalty provides that if a man on the farm is called for induction and is declared to be IV-F, he must go back to the farm immediately. If he leaves the farm he is subject to a \$10,000 fine and 5 years in jail. But if he has reason to believe that he will be declared IV-F, and he knows that a call from the draft board is imminent, he may leave the farm and go downtown to wait for the call. Then if he is called from the courthouse steps, or from Main Street, and is declared IV-F, he is free to go anywhere and no penalty attaches to him at all.

I wish to refresh the recollection of Senators who were present. After the so-called farm penalty was adopted, some of us thought that if we were to have a penalty bill we might as well put in penalties against everyone. If my recollection is correct, the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont was agreed to in the committee by a vote of 7 to 5. I helped to have it adopted, because after we adopted the penalty of a \$10,000 fine

or 5 years in jail for the farm boys, it seemed to me that if we were to vote for that kind of bill we ought to penalize everyone.

I repeat, this is a terrible bill. It ought to be sent back to the committee. If I were not a member of the committee I would repudiate the action of the committee in reporting such a bill as this to the Senate. But if Senators wish to go ahead with it and suffer through it, they have a right to do so. I will suffer along with them, but I will not vote for it.

The Senator from West Virginia may recall that the amendment in question was put in after the adoption of the farm penalty amendment. Neither of them should have been put in the bill; and this is the first opportunity I have had to vote to take one of them out. I shall vote to eliminate the penalty provision, and if it remains in the bill, I shall vote against the bill. I think probably I shall vote against the bill anyway.

I ask the Senator from West Virginia if the statement which I have made is in accord with his recollection?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Kentucky for his statement. I was not present on all the occasions to which he refers. I was present after the insertion had been made.

Let me also invite attention to the fact that the agricultural amendment was inserted in the bill at the instance of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. Since the insertion of this amendment, the Senator from Maryland, who was the proponent of the amendment, has seen fit to propose, with the agreement of the Senate, to strike therefrom the penalty clause, and to propose certain other amendments in the bill, because the Senator from Maryland felt that his own amendment was too drastic. As the Senator from Kentucky has so ably stated, the committee, after noting the penalty of 5 years in the penitentiary and a \$10,000 fine, decided that the other penalty might as well follow along, because it was a lesser penalty.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield the floor, if the Senator wishes to obtain the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask this privilege merely to continue the discussion of the point which has been under discussion between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky.

The memory of the Senator from Kentucky is quite correct. The so-called Austin amendment, putting the penalty under the Second War Powers Act in the committee bill, was the result of the adoption of the Tydings amendment. I voted against the Tydings amendment, and I also voted against the Austin amendment.

We are now in this position: The provision of the Tydings amendment which gave such concern to the Senator from Kentucky has been eliminated, and there is no penalty on the farm boy who leaves the farm; but we now have the penalty under the Second War Powers Act. That provision was adopted not because a majority of the committee wanted it, but because some members of the committee

who were against any penalty voted for the Austin amendment because the other penalty was in the bill.

The consequence is that if our friends who are against any penalty had voted against the Austin amendment it would not now be a part of the committee bill, and we should have had a committee measure sufficiently good to have attracted the support of the Senator from Kentucky, whose name was attached to the bill just before the penalties were added.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his absolutely correct statement of the situation. I voted against reporting the bill because I disagreed with the majority of the committee on those two amendments, and those two amendments only.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am delighted that this amendment has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota, because it illustrates the confusion which exists on the floor of the Senate with respect to penalties.

I joined with my colleague and other members of the Military Affairs Committee in voting against placing this particular reference in the bill.

As I say, this discussion shows better than anything else the confusion which exists in the committee report with respect to penalties.

With due modesty, I invite my colleague's attention to section 10 of the substitute which I have proposed, which does away with all reference to the provisions under discussion, and spells out distinctly what the penalty shall be, and where it shall be placed.

This is the provision, and the only provision, with respect to penalties on the placing of ceilings. Section 10 is on page 10 of the substitute. It reads as follows:

Any employer who violates any regulation or any order made pursuant thereto as provided in section 6 of this act—

Section 6 provides for the placing of an employment ceiling—

shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurred, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or by a fine not to exceed \$10,000, or both.

Mr. President, I wish to say that there is no other reference to punishment with respect to the fixing of ceilings in the substitute measure. There is no confusion in the substitute about it. There is no doubt where the penalty lies, nor is there any doubt as to what the penalty will be. I call the attention of my colleagues to this section, in support of the substitute, which will shortly be voted on, and as another reason which I offer to them in all sincerity for support of the substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to section 7, on page 19 of the committee substitute.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to understand whether the vote is to be on the Revercomb amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to section 7, on page 19 of the committee substitute.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, I shall wait.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state once more, for the information of Senators, that the pending vote is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to section 7, on page 19 of the committee substitute.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote, if present and voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a special pair on this question with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I am informed that if the junior Senator from Indiana were present he would vote "yea," and that the senior Senator from Vermont, if present, would vote "nay." The senior Senator from Vermont is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

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

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending

the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Briggs	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Capper	Kilgore	Taft
Chandler	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Ferguson	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Moore	Wherry
Hart	Morse	Willis
Hawkes	Murdock	Wilson
Hayden	Murray	

NAYS—35

Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hill	Saltonstall
Barkley	McKellar	Smith
Brewster	McMahon	Stewart
Burton	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Eastland	Mitchell	Tydings
Fulbright	Myers	Vandenberg
George	O'Daniel	White
Green	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Capehart	McClellan
Austin	Connally	Scruggam
Bilbo	Ellender	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Glass	Wheeler
Brooks	Langer	
Byrd	Lucas	

So Mr. BUSHFIELD's amendment to section 7 of the committee substitute was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think I should say that with the adoption of the Bushfield amendment, and with the Tydings amendment to the committee substitute, making a change in regard to penalties, the bill, with the exception of the Tydings amendment, is now practically in the form submitted to the Senate committee by the sponsors of the committee substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I shall ask to have read. It is an amendment to what has been designated as the Revercomb substitute. It would amend the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia for himself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] by striking out the words "in a lawful occupation" on page 3, in line 3, of the Revercomb substitute and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in an activity, profession, occupation, or industry essential to the war effort."

Before sending the amendment forward I will read the sentence beginning in line 1, on page 3, as it would then appear:

Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in an activity, profession, occupation, or industry essential to the war effort as determined by the selective-service local board, shall forthwith be ordered by said local board to report on a designated date, fixed by said local board, for induction into the land or naval forces.

Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate. I am in complete sympathy with what was said by the leaders on both sides of the Chamber. We have delayed the pending measure long enough. We should proceed to complete it one way or the other.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I correctly understood the Senator's amendment, its effect would be to substitute language which would indicate that if the registrant were not performing substantial work in a capacity essential to the war effort, rather than engaging in some vague "lawful occupation" as now provided in the language which the Senator seeks to strike out, he would forthwith be ordered by the local board to report, and so forth.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the point. I thank the Senator.

As the Revercomb amendment now stands, it would be possible to find some men engaged in gambling, or in the white-slave traffic, highway robbery, or burglary, and compel them to do certain things. That is about all that could be done. But that would not meet the situation. It would not begin to meet it. It has a little virtue, in that it does invoke the compulsory principle. But if we invoke the compulsory principle we should invoke it with a view to accomplishing the objectives of the legislation, and meeting the demands of the authorities who have called upon us to help them produce materials essential to the war effort, and provide the necessary forces in the Army and in the Navy.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should not rise at this time except for the statement made by the able Senator from North Carolina that the amendment in its present form would reach only those engaged in some illegal occupation. Perhaps there would be a few of them. They were thought of when the substitute was drafted; but the substitute was designed to reach the men who were not working, that is the loafers, and not those who were engaged in illegal occupations.

Mr. BAILEY. If we include the loafers as well as violators of the Mann Act we will meet the situation. But I never before heard that a loafer was engaged in an unlawful occupation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The language of the bill does not contain the term "unlawful occupation."

Mr. BAILEY. If unlawful occupation means substantially to engage in loafing, I fear that it might not be included. But we either must take the matter seriously, or not take it seriously. I think the amendment which I am about to offer frames the existing issue with respect to the Revercomb substitute, and I think it frames it very well. The issue is not in doubt here. There are those among us who believe in the compulsory principle. We intend to invoke it. That principle was invoked with respect to more than 10,000,000 American young men. Now is not the time to abandon

it. If the principle was fair with respect to them, it is fair with respect to those whose efforts are needed to produce war materials. But, Mr. President, I do not intend to go into that matter. There are those who believe in what is known as the voluntary principle. The Revercomb amendment is consistent with the voluntary principle except as to loafers and the other classes to which I have referred.

My whole case against the voluntary principle is that it will not do the work. Heaven knows I would try to stick to the voluntary principle, but when I am told by the military authorities of our needs, and, what is more, when the committee itself, reporting the substitute, tells me, in the very plainest language, that the military authorities are right, then I am bound to invoke the same principle that was invoked with respect to the fighting men. I think they are entitled to it.

Let us see what the committee said. This is the report on the war manpower bill made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] for the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. President, I shall wait until Senators around me stop talking.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not mean to complain. I myself violate the rule at times, and I think I should be very tolerant, but the matter before us is of the very greatest importance. I must say that addressing the Senate of the United States is no pink tea business ordinarily, but right now it is a matter of the very gravest importance.

Let us hear what the committee said. This is the language of the committee report:

In January the President, in his message to the Congress on the state of the Nation, recommended the enactment of a national service law to accomplish the total mobilization of all our human resources for the prosecution of the war.

So the President is on the compulsory side, and, Mr. President, when war was declared, we pledged to our country and our fighting men all the resources of the country.

Let us see the next paragraph in the committee report:

Prompt and extensive study of the manpower problems which confront the Nation at this critical period of the war has convinced both the House and this committee that because of the past drains upon our manpower resources and intensification of our military effort, legislation is now essential to assure that critical manpower needs during the remaining months of the war are met promptly.

That is what the committee says. That is the report of the Committee on Military Affairs:

Our armed forces must be furnished, on time and in ample amounts, the supplies that will be needed for final victory at the earliest possible time.

That is what the committee says. Now, notice this:

Any other course of action on the home front is unthinkable.

I think the committee report is predicated upon the necessities of the situation, and it predicates, not voluntary action, but involuntary or compulsory action. It relates directly back, in this language, to what the President said, and that was compulsory.

Now let us go a little further. On page 2—and this is from the committee report again—I read:

But within the past few months there has been a sharp reversal in the trend of our war program. The rate of inductions into our armed forces is rising sharply in order to bring our Navy up to its full strength and to provide replacements for casualties, losses through normal attrition, and men released because they were not fully qualified for the exacting requirements of battle.

After full-scale military operations were commenced, several production programs required sharp adjustments in order to take advantage of battle experience. The Italian campaign resulted in a greatly expanded artillery program. D-day and the sweep of our armies across France called for enormous increases in the production of heavy trucks, tires, and tanks. The German counteroffensive and rapid advances now occurring and planned in the Asiatic area require the immediate stepping up of production of numerous other military items.

Mr. President, that is what we are called upon to do, and I am saying that neither the Revercomb amendment nor the committee substitute remotely has anything to do with just this language; it is not remotely responsive to just this language of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Again I read from the report:

Because of the increased tempo of military operations, our total munitions production must be restored quickly to the level of operations achieved in late 1943 and early 1944. Despite the remarkable and steady increases shown in the rate of production per man-hour, to attain that goal, our capacities will be taxed to the utmost because the required rise is not distributed uniformly among all munitions items. About half of our total war production scheduled for 1945 is in expanding programs.

It is rising, it is increasing:

These call for the speedy delivery of the most effective weapons most urgently needed. The increased requirements are, in many instances, for new or hard-to-produce weapons or materials, new and special planes, heavy trucks and heavy-duty tires, heavy ammunition and heavy artillery, and new secret weapons of the greatest urgency.

I omit a few lines:

The success of immediate operations on the battlefields depends upon the prompt delivery of these critical items.

Mr. President, that is from the Committee on Military Affairs. It is not a lot of sentimental talk. If we know any reality in the situation, there is the reality. Are we going to meet it or not?

Mr. President, I propose this amendment, applying the principle of the Selective Service Act and the act itself to all between 18 and 45 who are not engaged in essential war production. That will state the issue, at any rate.

Vote it down, and that will end my hope, so far as the Revercomb amendment is concerned. It will probably signalize our sentiment to the Nation, and I hope to the young men who have just taken Cologne. 'Cologne fell today, and

in Cologne many young American sons fell also. Our soldiers may have to go on through into Germany. Let them go, with the understanding that here at home we will do just as we please—that is the voluntary principle—that we will fold our hands and say, "We are free. You are under compulsion, but we are free. You may get munitions and you may not, you may get ships and you may not. We are free."

Mr. President, that is what the voluntary principle means right now. I am motivated by the same consideration which induced me to sit here and vote for the Selective Service Act, in all its compulsion, in all that it meant to the mothers and fathers of this country, as well as to the boys. By the same considerations and under the same conditions and for the same profound motives I shall vote for every possible compulsory provision which can be wrought into the pending bill. If that is not done, I shall take it as having at least convinced me, and, I fear, the country and the fighting men, that we are determined to be free ourselves, that we are determined to do what we please. God forbid.

Mr. President, I shall ask, and do ask, for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The clerk will state the proposed amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 3, of the amendment of Mr. REVERCOMB it is proposed to strike out the words "in a lawful occupation" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in an activity, profession, occupation, or industry essential to the war effort."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not at this late date and late hour in the discussion of this subject desire to review the conflict, and the differences, and the reasons for the differences between the theory of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the theory of the substitute measure which I have offered. I will say, Mr. President, that the substitute measure I have offered is based upon the voluntary theory, namely, that the working people of this country shall not be placed under the domination of a Government administrator. The theory of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina is the theory and the basis of the May bill itself. The Senator from North Carolina, as he always does in these matters, has fairly stated his position, that he will vote for any measure of force, and that is what he seeks to do in offering the amendment to the substitute measure when he would place in the bill the language:

Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not now performing substantial work in an activity, profession, occupation or industry essential to the war effort.

The Senator leaves in the hands of some tribunal, of some agency of the Government, the right to say who is performing work essential to the war effort.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Is not that precisely what we did in respect to the selective-service bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Exactly so. But we have drawn a distinction here, which has been debated now for several days, as to why the Senator stands for one theory in dealing with this matter and why others of us are against the compulsory features placed upon the working people of this country. Must we sum it all up again? If we must, let us put it this way, and I speak for myself and I believe for others, in view of their expressions on the floor of the Senate and certainly in the meetings of the Military Affairs Committee. If I believed for a moment that compulsion, that the taking of the workers, the free people of this country, and placing them under the control of a Government agency to say where they should work, and when they should work, and drafting them into labor, would help shorten the war and to win it, I would be for such a measure, however distasteful it might be to me. But, Mr. President, the evidence has been overwhelming to the effect that not only has America produced in great abundance for her own armies and navies, but for the armies and navies of the Allies.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I gather from what the Senator says that the committee sat and heard evidence and that the military men had already gotten the evidence which they produced and on which they reached their conclusion. Now, in dealing with this great matter, a group of civilians, in the character of Senators, set themselves up above the experts, the admirals and the generals and the Commander in Chief, who did find from the evidence that this legislation is necessary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say that not an admiral, not a general, or the head of the War Department or the head of the Navy Department—not one of them said that industrial labor of this country has not performed a magnificent piece of work.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me finish my statement and then I shall yield. Let me say that I recognize the high position of the Army chief and the Navy chief in time of war. They are going to fight this war, and we have backed them, and will continue to do so. We have given them authority over military affairs, but I do not believe the time has come when the military should fix the civil policies of the Government. That policy is fixed by the Congress of the country as the representatives of the people—a free people, I am thankful to say. But if we engraft into the law of this land such measures as are advocated here—and I say, with all respect to my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, such measures as I believe are contained in the May bill—then, Mr. President, we shall have taken the farthest step toward control by government, so often called a totalitarian state. That is why we are

opposing this proposal. We oppose it not only for that reason but because we feel it is not necessary. Our position is based upon the evidence adduced before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in its long series of hearings and shown in the record before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, not only by the military men and the heads of the War Department and of the Navy Department but shown by the manufacturers—by the men who know the work done by labor.

In addition to that, I, for one, have received letters from men who are working in war plants—men whom I know personally and whose word I respect very highly—who time and time again have said that plants are overmanned, that there is loafing, that there is not enough for workers to do.

I may say to the Members of the Senate that the War Manpower Commission itself has said that if the efficiency of the workmen and the use of labor were stepped up from 5 to 10 percent, as I recall, it would be equal to the addition of from 500,000 to 800,000 men to the workers in the plants of this country. When such a condition exists I do not feel called upon to place upon any segment of our population the shackles of Government control, particularly so in the face of the record which has been made by the workers.

We have been all over this matter in the course of the debate. I am repeating it in a way because it has been repeated by the able Senator who is advocating the amendment to the measure I have proposed. If the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is written into the substitute it will destroy the whole purpose of the substitute, because the substitute in substance is like the bill reported by the committee, with three distinct differences.

One is that it reaches out and gets the loafer, the man who will not work at anything. I am not going to place the shackles of control in time of war, if it is not necessary, upon the willing worker of this country, but I am willing to place control upon the man who is not willing to perform his work. I am willing to go that far. That is what section 2 of the substitute provides. It goes no further than to say to the man who will not perform any lawful work, "You must hunt a job or you will be put to work." We owe that to the soldier and to the willing worker. If the language proposed by the Senator from North Carolina is written into the substitute the whole purpose of the substitute is ended.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to call the Senator's attention to a portion of the testimony of Mr. Krug, the War Production Board Chairman, appearing at the top of page 127. How does the Senator answer this question? After praising the voluntary system and saying that it had produced amazing results, Mr. Krug proceeded to say:

On the other hand, the actual evidence of the last 3 months demonstrates that the voluntary plan is not working in this present crisis,

How does the Senator answer that statement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I believe I have answered it. Certainly I have tried to answer it. I tried to answer it in the discussion of this subject several days ago, but I will repeat the answer.

I believe that the sudden rush to control the workers of the country grows out of a situation which was created in the latter part of 1944, when we were all led to believe, and earnestly believed, that the war in Europe was about to end. Senators may recall that in the earlier discussion of the pending legislation I read statements made by the commander of the armies, by the Under Secretary of War, and by others. They said that the war in Europe was about at an end. What did that lead us to believe? It led many Members of this body, and certainly many workers in the plants, to believe that the war in Europe was about to end, and the workers wished to leave the war plants and find peacetime jobs.

Let me say further that Congress enacted a measure relating to the termination of war contracts. At the time we were discussing it and considering it, we wondered what effect such discussion might have on the people of the country. We know that that legislation was properly enacted, because we must have such legislation to terminate war contracts, regardless of whether the war is in process or not. However, the effect on the people, when we are enacting legislation providing for the termination of war contracts, is to lead them to believe that the war must be near its end.

Again, we enacted a law relating to the disposition of surplus property. It is only natural that workers in the plants should feel that when we are disposing of surpluses the Government must foresee an early end to the war. They were led so to believe when they left the plants.

Further, I am advised that in the month of January 50,000 persons returned to employment in the plants of this country.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I invite the attention of the Senator to that portion of Mr. Krug's statement in which he says that the shortage in the "must" plants, as he described them, was much greater on the 12th of last January than it had been in any of the preceding 3 or 4 months.

I should like to know whether the Senator has any evidence, in this record or any other record, which refutes what Mr. Krug testified, or what the other men upon whom we rely to conduct the war have testified. I am referring to the Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt. I am referring to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. I am referring to General Marshall and to the Chief of Naval Operations. I am referring to Mr. Krug, Mr. McNutt, and all the others who have been placed in charge of the conduct of this war. What evidence is there to refute what they say? We are deciding this question on the basis of evidence—not on theory, not on imagination, not on guesswork, not on conclusions drawn from newspaper

reports, but on evidence. Where is the evidence?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator—and he knows it as well as I do—that the evidence in most cases consists of conclusions by various officials as to what may happen.

Mr. STEWART. How does the Senator know they are conclusions? I am talking about facts.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not dispute the accuracy of the figures cited. I know that the Senator is espousing the theory of the May bill, passed by the House.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I am for even stronger legislation than that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the face of the facts as we have them as to the production today and in the past, there is no reason to saddle upon the people of this country a "force" measure such as this.

Mr. STEWART. Except for the fact that the needs of the future will be greater, and that the voluntary system will not suffice. That is what those who are conducting the war say. I ask the Senator, What is the difference between drafting a soldier and drafting labor, money, or any other utility we may need in this war, whether it be manpower or what not?

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that there is a vast difference between the organization of an army and the organization of the civilian life of America.

Mr. STEWART. There is no need to organize an army if we do not furnish it with the things it needs with which to fight.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Surely the Senator does not believe that we have not furnished our armed forces with the things which they need with which to fight.

Mr. STEWART. That is exactly the situation. They have not enough. According to the testimony of our experts, within 60 days there will actually be a shortage.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I say to the Senator that that statement refutes the statements of the ones upon whose testimony he is relying, because they have stated time and again that we have done a magnificent job in furnishing equipment, not only for our own Army and Navy but also for Russia and Great Britain. No one doubts that. Everyone knows it to be so.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if the Senator—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Those who testified in behalf of the bill told us that the good effect, if any, except as to morale, would not be felt on the war fronts for 6 or 7 months. The test is this—

Mr. STEWART. What is more important than morale?

Mr. CHANDLER. Just a moment. I do not even concede that it is that important. That is the only argument made for the bill.

The test is this: Our high peak of production in this country was in December 1943. Notwithstanding anything Mr. Krug has said in his testimony, the American people, by free, voluntary methods, produced \$64,000,000,000 worth of war equipment last year. Mr. Krug asks them to produce 64.5 billion dollars worth of war equipment this year. That is not a significant increase. The boys who took Cologne today took it with weapons made by the voluntary free labor of the American people.

Mr. STEWART. Still Mr. Krug says that we must have—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor. Does he yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. The complete answer is that every witness who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee admitted that there was no over-all shortage of manpower in the United States. The witnesses admitted that the shortage, if any, was scattered and spotty. They admitted that it was not more than 200,000 men, at the most, and they admitted that it could be met by using the present methods.

If we produced \$64,000,000,000 worth of war equipment last year, I should like to have someone tell me why we cannot produce \$64,500,000,000 worth this year, using voluntary methods. When we do that, we shall have reached the peak production of December 1943. I should like to have an answer to that question.

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

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have been asked a question, and I should have an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if there is complaint on the part of the Senator from Tennessee that he has not had an opportunity to answer the question, I yield to him.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Kentucky turned to me and asked me to answer the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to have an answer from any source.

Mr. STEWART. I answer the question by using the same argument which I have been using. The same men whose statements have been quoted say that the voluntary system will not suffice in the months to come.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh—

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator wish to have me read the statement of Mr. Krug again?

Mr. CHANDLER. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Krug said:

On the other hand, the actual evidence of the last 3 months demonstrates that the voluntary plan is not working in this present crisis. I do not think it is working at the present time, because we drained away so much of the working force into the armed forces and we have heaped on our productive machine such a load that that plan alone no longer works.

That is as plain English as I ever heard spoken.

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

Mr. STEWART. Just a moment. Let me make one further observation. I shall not turn back to the record to read the testimony of Judge Patterson, Secretary Stimson, or any of the other witnesses. It is all in the record. The Senator is just as familiar with it as I am. That is the evidence. Where is anything to refute it?

Mr. CHANDLER. That is opinion. That is not evidence.

Mr. STEWART. That is the opinion of experts, based upon their information. That is the opinion of the men whom we have selected to manage this war.

When one is ill and requires the services of a physician, he calls a physician, and takes the medicine which the physician prescribes.

Ordinarily, if a man is in his right mind, he does that. We do not manage the war from this Chamber; at least, I will venture the assertion that we are not going to manage it very successfully if we go into the war-managing business. We have at the head of our armies and navies men in whom I have confidence, and we have at the head of the various other Government agencies men in whom I have confidence. They are all of one accord; they say this bill is essential.

We have drafted millions of American boys and men. We have taken them from the coal mines, the farms, and the business houses of the United States. They are citizens of our country who are not professional soldiers. They are businessmen, laboring men, students—all Americans, every one of them, white or black. I wish to see them backed up 100 percent.

If we make a mistake, I would rather make it on their side of the ledger than on the other side of the ledger. It is no argument to say that because those in charge of the armed forces made a mistake in guessing that the war in Europe would come to a close early fast fall, therefore we should say they are not now correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, we have heard repeated time and time again the statement that the leaders of the armed forces want this particular law, that they want the Congress to enact a measure such as the May bill, under which, under the direction and dictation of the Government, they can move labor from place to place; and we have heard it stated that that is needed. With all respect to those military men and their views upon military questions, I do not accept their expert opinion upon this question. I should prefer to take the evidence of persons who have dealt with production and have dealt with the working people of this country, and who testified before our committee, one after another, that they could do the job.

Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a while ago the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] read from the report of the committee. I was one of the Senators, with the Senator from West Virginia, who did not agree to the report or to the bill. What is said in the report is not intended to be said in support

of the original May-Bailey bill, because the report is based on the Kilgore bill which was reported to the Senate.

I am glad the Senator made the issue he did make, because he really thinks and believes that it is time to put compulsion on the people of America. I do not think so. That presents the issue squarely here. I am glad the Senator makes the issue, because that gets away from all the nondescript bills which Senators have offered. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the Senators who have offered them, but they are just a hodge-podge of bills.

The Senator from North Carolina will vote for the maximum amount of compulsion. I will vote for the maximum amount of freedom. On that issue the Senate should take a clear position, one way or the other. If I did not sincerely believe that the American people in this crisis, in these tragic days, have not only put in the hands of American boys guns with which they have captured many cities and towns, including Cologne, but have put in the hands of the Russians and our other allies all over the world guns without which they could not have made a successful stand, I would not take the position I now take.

If we are going to say to them now, after all this magnificent effort, that we will put compulsion on them, in my opinion that is a pitiful reward for all the fine work which has been done by the people of America. I am not going to do it. But I am glad the issue is drawn, and I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina that he and I are absolutely in agreement as to the issue as it is drawn. He will vote for the fullest amount of compulsion. I will vote for the fullest amount of freedom. Let the issue be decided on that basis.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with the present discussion, I wish to state that the fact is that the committee's report from which I am about to read was made, not on the Kilgore bill, but on the letters and records offered to the committee with reference to the May-Bailey bill. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that the labor force did increase in January. But, Mr. President, why did it increase? Let us see what Mr. Krug said in that connection. I read from his letter:

During the past 3 weeks we have had the most successful results since 1942 in men voluntarily offering themselves for war work. There are undoubtedly a number of reasons which cooperated to bring about this satisfactory result. In my view, not the least important have been the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee. Men offered themselves for transfer not because they feared that they might be driven into jobs which they did not want, but because there was new and fresh evidence that production was critically needed for our armed forces and that more men were required if the production schedules were to be met.

Mr. President, that is the issue faced by the Senate of the United States. Much has been said about what the leaders of the War Department and the Navy Department have had to say; much

has been said about what our Commander in Chief has had to say; but little has been said about what the House of Representatives has had to say. The House of Representatives passed the bill. Those who are closest to the people under our constitutional system passed the bill long ago.

This is what Mr. Krug had to say, and this is what those of us in the Senate face:

If this legislation is passed, these forces will continue. But I say in great seriousness that if Congress were not now to legislate on this matter, the men and women of the Nation would have very good reason to believe that this has been nothing but a false alarm, that the situation is really not serious, and that it is perfectly all right for able-bodied men to continue in their less-essential jobs.

We are faced with the fact that General Marshall, Admiral King, President Roosevelt, the Secretaries of War and Navy, and other public officials, in addition to the House of Representatives, say it is necessary. If the Senate says it is not necessary, what will be the result in the shipyards and in the factories producing munitions of war?

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that of course we have heard the names of these military leaders mentioned over and over again, and we have heard their views on this matter expressed. I was very glad to hear the able senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] read from the testimony of Mr. Krug. If Mr. Krug thinks there is danger in the future, if he comes before us and, in unison with all the other representatives of Government agencies, urges that this force measure be enacted, if he really believes we are facing a danger, let me ask why the workers quit the factories. They did not quit them in 1944 until they were led to believe that the war in Europe was almost over. They did not quit them in 1943. Mr. Krug himself said that they were returning to work because of the war needs.

Mr. President, in debating this question we should consider the evidence and the history of production and the work of the people of this country, and then we should consider whether we will let them continue to be free men and women or whether we will put them in the hands of a Government agency. To my mind, in view of the great production record our people have made, there is no question as to what we should do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, referring to the language on page 3, which is sought to be amended by the Senator from North Carolina, namely, "any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in a lawful occupation," let me say that I understand that, by means of that language, the Senator is seeking to reach the loafers. Suppose that language is left in the bill, and suppose it should become the law, does the Senator have any doubt that every so-called loafer who can get any sort of a job, so long as

it is lawful, will flock to the nonessential jobs which are lawful? If that happens, what good will the Senator have done the war effort? What contribution will that make to the production of the guns, ammunition, airplanes, and trucks our boys need on the battlefields?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky speaks of essential work. Of course, the most essential work is the production of the materials of war needed by our soldiers, sailors, and marines. But today other work in this country is essential, namely, the operation of the stores, the operation of restaurants, and so forth. If we are going to maintain our Government and our civil life in this country free, all such work is necessary. I do not care very much whether the loafer gets into a non-essential war industry. But there is something further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Allow me to continue answering the question which was asked me. The person to whom the Senator refers should go to work and work where he can. I realize that if he is loafing he is not working. But there is something else to consider. I dare say that the majority leader has heard about it from his own State. I know I have heard about it from many persons in my community. There has been talk about morale. There is nothing more destructive in this country today of the morale of the mothers and fathers of boys who have been inducted into the armed services than for them to see men loafing around pool rooms and stores, performing no work whatsoever. I do not want the Government to put its stamp of approval upon such persons, and I am willing to go far enough to insure that penalties of force shall be applied in order to compel those men to work.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator speaks about men loafing around pool rooms. Of course, I can appreciate the lack of essentiality of loafing around pool rooms, but under the Senator's amendment we could not even reach the fellow who operates the pool room.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is correct; so long as the operation of the pool room is lawful.

Mr. BARKLEY. So long as the operation of a pool room is legalized—and most of such operations are legalized—we could not even reach its operator.

From letters which I have received from fathers and mothers who have boys in the Army, I judge that their resentment is not limited to someone who is loafing and doing nothing while their boys are fighting, but it extends also to those who claim they are in some essential work when their neighbors, who know them, do not believe they are so engaged. Many of them do not understand why we can take one of their boys and put him in the Army, but we cannot take another man on the same street, or in the same block, and put him in a war plant where he can help furnish material for the boys who are fighting.

I take it for granted that we are trying to enact legislation which will help produce material needed by our fighting men all over the world. We know that the

fighting has been stepped up. The fact that we reached a peak in production in December of 1943 is not, to my mind, necessarily a point one way or the other. We all know, of course, that last summer and early in the fall we indulged in the hope that the war was about over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. After a brief recess we returned to the Senate and were in almost a panic to enact reconversion legislation, because it was said that peace was just around the corner. We were almost in a panic to enact some law for the control and disposition of surplus property. We in the Congress of the United States contributed as much to the optimism of the American people at that time as was contributed by the admirals and the generals. They did not say anything about reconversion or surplus property. We ourselves were of the belief that the war in Europe would end before we could enact the Reconversion Act and the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the subsequent events did not happen as we had expected. Under the spell of the optimism to which I have referred, a recession took place in employment in wartime industry. The workers thought that the war was about over, and they wanted to obtain good jobs so that they would be in on the ground floor when civilian employment was reduced. Then the breakthrough of von Rundstedt occurred, and the situation did not look so rosy as it did back in September and October. We then began to talk about the needs of the Army, and a spurt in employment followed. But no increase in employment is taking place at the present time. There is a falling off in employment as compared with what it was in December and January. So I think that we should look forward to the circumstance that when another spell of optimism comes there may be an exodus of men from our war plants which will make the exodus of last fall look like a stationary army. I cannot help having that possibility in mind when I vote on the pending legislation. I think I am about to land, but I have not completely burned my bridges behind me. I do not see what good it will do to say we will take the loafers who are not engaged in lawful work in order that they may be rushed into lawful work, or certify them to the Army and Navy, and if they are not taken by the Army or Navy because of physical defects, have them certified for employment elsewhere. For that reason I think the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] as a substitute for the language proposed by the Senator from West Virginia is much to be preferred, and I intend to support it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to listen to the able majority leader. I was impressed by his appeal not to delay consideration of the pending bill, but I think his remarks have contributed very much to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator means that as a criticism, I may say that this

is the only time I have opened my mouth about the bill since last week.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am sure the Senator contributed very much to the argument.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for that concession.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it all comes down to the question of use of force on those who are lawfully engaged in work. The question is whether we shall exercise force upon them, as my able friend the majority leader seems to want to do, and as my able friend the Senator from North Carolina proposes to do by his amendment, or whether we will leave the workers and the other people of America free. That is the issue. It has already been stated here. If the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is adopted I am sure it will destroy the theory of free labor and put the stamp of approval of the Senate upon the theory of forced work in America at this time. That is the sole issue. I hope the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina to my amendment will not be adopted.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has made reference to poolroom loafers. To me, there seems to be an inconsistency between the power of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to close country fairs, night clubs, and race tracks, and his lack of power to handle in a similar way other groups of people. Why in heaven's name must he have control over the life of every man, woman, and child in this country in order to close a poolroom? The situation seems to me to be inconsistent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when I rose to address the Senate I did not expect to engage in extended argument. I may say briefly, in respect to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, that if the amendment is adopted we shall thereby be putting our stamp of approval upon the very thing to which the majority of the members of the Military Affairs Committee have been opposed. We would be making a "force" measure out of the proposed legislation which is meant to keep the workers of the country free and uncontrolled, with the exception only that we would be saying to persons who will not work, "You get to work." I therefore hope the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina will be defeated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have not taken much part in the debate, and rise now to say, from a very slight knowledge of modern warfare, that I believe the debate to a large extent has proceeded upon a false premise. It has been repeatedly stated by those who favor and those who oppose the Bailey amendment that the industrial leaders and the industrial workers of America have done a great job. I agree that they have; but that is not what is at issue in this dispute. The question is, have they done a great enough job?

I heard in the old days, before war broke out, when Hitler was getting ready to launch his first attack, and when he

had put a man in charge of producing and equipping his coming army with sufficient weapons and munitions to wage a successful campaign, that men would come to him and say, "We have plans for 5,000 airplanes. We think we will need 5,000, and therefore we are planning to build 5,000 airplanes of a certain type." Hitler would say, "Build 20,000." Another man would come and say, "We have planned to manufacture 20,000 cannon of a certain caliber. We feel they will be required for an army of five or six million men." Hitler would say, "Build 60,000." Why? Because in warfare the amount of matériel available at the spot, in time of need, very often determines the difference between success and failure. There is no such thing as producing a sufficient amount to fill the maw of war. When gentlemen rise and say that industry and labor have done a good job, that is a sort of a political pat on the back; but from the standpoint of the soldier and sailor, the question is, "Have you produced all that is needed to win this war, and shorten it by every conceivable minute?"

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. When we started out we could not make an attack on the coast of Europe until the 6th of June 1944, two and a half years after we went into the war. Why? We could not make an attack on the Philippines until 3 years from the time the Japs sank our fleet at Pearl Harbor. Why? We could not make an attack on Japan herself until nearly 3 years after Pearl Harbor. Why? Because we did not have the equipment, in spite of all that industry and labor had done, with which to manufacture the supplies and transport them to the spots where they would make the difference between defeat and victory. We do not have them yet, and the war in the Pacific, yea, the war in Europe, will not be decided finally until they are there.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should prefer to wait until a little later, then I shall yield to every Senator who wishes to interrupt me.

If there is any man who doubts what the verdict would be if there were 531, either officers or enlisted men, sitting in this body and voting on this question, let him stand up and give his verdict. Those 531 men would say, "Every additional gun, every additional shell, every additional ship, you make available, saves life and shortens the war."

What happens while the men stand and wait? What happens is that we see Douglas MacArthur leave Corregidor and go to Australia, and with a handful of men and a handful of equipment, plus his brilliant strategy and tactics, hold the enemy at bay while we begin to produce. After a while, because we are producing faster and faster, he turns the tide and gradually drives the enemy back, until one day he is back on the very soil he had to leave in defeat. Why is that? Because finally, after 3 long, hard years, we could put the ships and the equipment at his disposal to turn the tide. If we could have done it 2 years ago, the war

in the Pacific would have been just that much shortened, and God knows the thousands who are dying and will die might have lived.

When the troops get ready for a battle on the western front, as even every layman knows, they do not take just enough ammunition for 1 day, they have to build up ammunition dumps of every conceivable kind higher than this room, piles of bread as high as this room, piles of shells, more arms and ammunition, machinegun replacements, and the like. Why? Because no man knows, even General Eisenhower does not know, when he goes into a battle, that he is sure of success. He has to have plans and he has to have matériel and equipment in case he does not succeed.

It was only 60 days ago—what a merciful country we are—when we were standing in the marble room yonder with the newspapers trembling in our hands, while Von Rundstedt was raging toward the ports whose fall would have cut off the meager supplies which up to that time had trickled through to our Army. Now, because in the fortunes of war, 2 months afterward, we are at the banks of the Rhine, we are ready to say that the war is over.

Go and tell that to a man who has been fighting forward over there for the last 60 days, who is standing on the steep bank looking across the half mile of water, the other side bristling with all kinds of artillery and machine guns and mortars, and who must some day cross it before the struggle will be over, and tell him that back home it is proposed to let certain men do the best they can under the voluntary system. The answer is, "Why am I picked out, drafted, and sent over here under the involuntary system? Where is the justice, the righteousness, the fairness in the system which takes me from my wife and children, from my job, and puts me in uniform, at a pittance, and sends me over here, perhaps to die, and then lets the army of men back home do as they please in the field of producing the things I must have in order to have a chance to come back to those I am defending?"

The reason why the great German Army rolled through Poland in 19 days, and the following year through France in a couple of months, and then stormed a thousand miles toward Moscow, was that it had the stuff with which to do it, not only enough, but more than enough.

Our task is not to do merely a good job, our task is to do a complete job, so that these men—God bless them, who utter a little prayer and wonder what will be before them tomorrow morning—may have a chance to shorten the war and save their lives.

Mr. President, this is not emotional talk, it is grim reality in the tragic and stark days of warfare. Think of the men standing on the battle fronts in the dark learning that back home the great Congress of the United States has said that the people at home are doing a good enough job, nobody is to be bothered, a man can loaf if he wants to, and there will be no penalty. If Senators think that is helping the fighting man the next day to face the terror that is there be-

fore him—and it is terror—then they are mistaken.

No man wants to vote to take away anything from the people. No one likes to vote for high taxes; no one likes to vote for rationing; no one likes wartime controls on gasoline and travel and tires and trucks and farm machinery and all that. Well, if we do not want control and do not want hardship, then let us declare peace, and stop this nonsense of saying, "Unconditional surrender," while we strut out to the night club and spend our money at the race tracks, and drive where we please, go to work when we want to, and stay away when we do not want to go to work.

Thirteen million American men are out there somewhere. My God, have we come to the point where we do not care? Are we simply going to point to a pile of munitions somewhere and say, "Look at that. Is that not wonderful?" without considering all the if's and and's and possible changes of warfare? It was only 2 years ago that Rommel stood at the gates of the Suez Canal, and had the fortune of fate laid the feather of victory on his cap, God knows what the future would have been. How was the tide turned then? It was turned in large measure by the production of the American workingman and the American businessman—the mere trickle, as it were, of tanks and guns and planes and materials which gave to General Montgomery the balance of power he had to have in order to win and without which the whole fate of mankind might have been changed, for had the Suez Canal fallen into German hands it would have cut off the flow of supplies by way of the Indian Ocean to Russia, and a junction of the Japanese and the German forces might have taken place on the plains of Persia. That was quite possible, when we consider the scope of the ebb and flow of this World War.

Yes; I say this debate has proceeded on false premises. It is not enough to produce a great quantity of munitions and war materials. It is our duty, within the limit of human considerations, to produce the greatest supply of them we can produce and make them available to the men who depend on us not only for their own lives but for the lives of their families and the welfare of the country and the perpetuation ultimately of our democratic institutions.

Strange though the statement may seem, we can lose the war even yet, though, of course, I do not believe it will happen. We have not won it in the Pacific yet to the extent that we are winning it in Europe. We may have to land a great army in Japan proper, and one in Manchuria proper, and one on the China coast. And I want to tell you, Mr. President and Senators, although you already know it, that the Japanese do not surrender. It is necessary to kill and exterminate them in order to conquer. If anyone doubts that statement let him ask the marines on Iwo Jima.

Then, the word "totalitarian" seems to frighten many people. I myself do not like it. I do not like the Nazi system

or the Fascist system or the Communist system, all of which are totalitarian. For my part, I like democracy, and I know that the sooner the war is over the greater the chance democracy has to survive, and the longer the end of the war is postponed the less chance democracy will have to survive. The longer it lasts the more it will cost in money, the more it will cost in blood, the more it will cost in the relinquishment of liberty and in the imposition of a centralized governmental control. Those things are twins or quadruplets, if you please. It is totalitarian to draft men to serve in the Army. A certain amount of totalitarian philosophy is inescapable in time of war. But when we adopt totalitarian philosophy, as we did in the Selective Service Act, and put the State in ultimate control of a man's individual life, ordering him where to go, telling him what he can eat, what he can wear, where he can live—can those of us who claim to be Democrats, who believe in special privilege to none and equal privilege to all, after sending the soldiers forth with a complete totalitarian philosophy covering their every movement, rightfully permit those who remain at home to do as they please and say "you cannot do that to us"? If that is going to be the division on which our philosophy splits it would be a great deal better to call off this war right now.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I should prefer to continue, if the Senator will withdraw his request.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly all government is totalitarian even in a democracy. It is only different in degree. The imposition of a speed limit is totalitarianism. Every law we put on the books is totalitarianism. The imposition of the will of a government on the freedom of the individual is totalitarianism. But it is the minimum of totalitarianism, and when we impose a reasonable minimum we call it democracy. When war comes, however, what Senator on this floor has not with great emphasis shaken his finger and made the gesture downward and said that this is total war? Is it total war? Well, the word "total" has taken on a strangely new connotation here in this debate. It is total for those who wear the uniform, but completely untotal for those who do not wear the uniform.

One final thing we must keep in mind as to the quantity of goods we are to produce. Let me recall the old nursery rhyme:

For want of the nail the shoe was lost,
For want of the shoe the horse was lost,
For want of the horse the rider was lost,
For want of the rider the message was lost,
And for want of the message the battle was lost.

Senators, there is no one in this country, in this body, or in the humblest home in America, who is not hoping and praying—and when loved ones are in the service, praying fervently to Almighty God—to bring this terrible, unholy holocaust to a speedy and a victorious end.

Even though labor and management have done a good job, can we in this Chamber afford to be content with "good enough" when it is not our best? Is there a Senator in this body who will rise on this floor and say that either labor or capital or the Senate or the House or the Government or anybody else has done his or its best—anything in reasonable comparability to that grand best which the man in uniform does every passing second of every passing hour of every passing day?

One final thought comes to my mind. I read it in an account of a war correspondent who had just spent a year abroad, and who came back to this country after seeing the men engaged in combat and the great piles of supplies we had shipped abroad. The question of whether we were doing our level best permeated the philosophy of his argument, and he said, "Some day those men in Washington will look the survivors of this war in the eye when they come back." Mr. President, when we do look them in the eye we are bound to admit faults and shortcomings, we are bound to admit mistakes, but, Mr. President, there is one thing we cannot do: Here in this Congress we cannot fail to do our best to formulate policies which will give the men at the front the last full measure of our devotion and support.

We have appropriated nearly \$30,000,000,000 for lend-lease. Were the things we thus provided needed? I have been told by Members of this body, by writers on the spot, and by employers by the thousands, that lend-lease determined the difference between success and victory in the critical days of the Russo-German campaign. Had we had more production than we had, think how much more quickly the tide could have been turned. Think how many lives could have been saved, the lives of our own boys.

I do not blame business for not wanting to have the restrictions contained in this bill; I do not blame labor. On the whole, judged by any ordinary rule of conduct, both have done a great job. But, Mr. President, a great job is not enough in this war. It is all-out or nothing. It is total or nothing. It is the difference between the United States being on top or being at the bottom; and we cannot afford to calculate, to the fourth decimal place, whether or not it is democratic or totalitarian. The question is, Is it necessary to victory? This is the yardstick by which I think we should decide this question.

I think we are remiss here. Probably I shall be very severely criticized and called a Fascist for making this statement; but I will hazard the observation nonetheless. I think we are cowardly in this Congress, when we read of the casualty lists, when we read that up to this time 1,000,000 men have been killed, wounded, or are missing, and permit unlawful strikes to take place in this country in the face of that great and growing casualty list.

I believe that we should have a policy. Labor and capital are bound to have grievances. There should be a board on which each of them should be repre-

sented, and perhaps in the community where the grievance arises there should be a third member—a Federal judge, for example. The three of them ought to talk over the grievances and try to iron them out. If they cannot do so, the decision of any two of the three ought to be binding; and after such an impartial finding of justice and the facts, any man who strikes, whether he be a laborer or a capitalist, ought to be drafted for service in the armed forces, as a general policy, or otherwise made to serve in this war. I know that if a bill were introduced to carry out such a policy it would not have a chance; and yet I advocate it with all the candor I possess. I believe that all of us, from the top of the administration down, have a load on our conscience and a blot on our escutcheon when we draft men to go forth and die, and then permit thousands of men to go out on strike for a week or two, perhaps in the midst of the production of the most critical materials needed by our Army and Navy. Such strikes are, for the most part, over trivial things. If my opponents wish to defeat me at some time in the future for making this statement, I am perfectly willing to take my medicine; but every man, including the workingman, knows of the inherent justice of the proposal which I have advanced.

We now come to a proposal to continue the voluntary system. Voluntary in the midst of war? Do our people object to being told, "Men who are dying need certain things, and there is not enough of them. You are doing something which has no relation to the great drama which is being played on the world's stage, and we must ask you to go into this factory and make alarm clocks for 60 days, or a year." Shall we listen to that man when he says, "I do not want to make alarm clocks. I do not want to work. I am getting along all right. Why do you want to bother me. Is not this a democracy?"

Perhaps the war in Germany will be over in the next 30 or 40 days. Perhaps it will not be over for another 30 or 40 months. From now on the expenditure of men—the most important thing—and the expenditure of tanks, planes, shells, guns, and everything else, will proceed at a terrifically accelerated rate. When fighting takes place in the Pacific on a grand scale, it will proceed at an enormously accelerated rate. Is our production machine geared to stand the impact of both those loads should an unkind fate postpone the happy ending of this war with victory for our side? Have we great stock piles?

To go back for just a moment, if a year ago General MacArthur had only had what he had 60 days ago, what a difference it would have made in thousands of homes all over this country. If a year ago General Eisenhower had only had what he had on June 6, 1944, grief would not have come to many a saddened home.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any evidence that lack of manpower had the slightest thing

to do with the failure to have munitions a year ago on the same scale that we have them today? There is not an item of evidence to that effect. There was no shortage of manpower then in the United States. No manufacturer had trouble finding men to do the work he had to do. The Senator's argument is entirely fallacious.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator's tirade is over, let me answer. First of all, there is abundant evidence from Mr. Krug, who is charged specifically by the Congress with the job of production.

Secondly, I believe that General Marshall knows more about what is needed for the Army than does either "General" TAFT or "Admiral" TAFT.

Furthermore, I repeat that we should have stopped strikes in their incipency when men were dying. We asked the men on the battlefield to show the highest degree of courage, while we were not willing to show a modicum of it in this Government; from the top all the way down the line of those in authority.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under Secretary Patterson made the following statement:

Last year, which brought D-day in Normandy, and the landing in the Philippines, there were workers to produce and sell flowers and potted plants of the value of \$400,000,000—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator read that again?

Mr. MAYBANK. Under Secretary Patterson stated as follows:

Last year, which brought D-day in Normandy—

When the boys about whom the Senator speaks were dying—

and the landing in the Philippines—

Which the Senator has so eloquently portrayed—

there were workers to produce and sell flowers and potted plants of the value of \$400,000,000, and toilet and cosmetic goods selling for \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; we must have our lipstick. We must not do without Jergens lotion, or Sweetheart soap, or Camay, or whatever it may be. We must not do without those things. God! I wish we could all, with the promise of survival, spend 24 hours under fire, and then come back to the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I know that my friend the Senator from Maryland will not disagree with me when I say now that I would vote for any bill which I believed in my heart would shorten the war one second or would save one life.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly; I concede that.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it should be said that something more than that is involved. Certainly my friend from Maryland knows that if we were to pass a bill providing for the strongest form of compulsion, there would not be, as a result, any more material flowing to the

battlefields, according to the testimony of the experts, for 6 or 7 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator know that we will not need it six or seven months from now?

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me go on for a moment, please. I do not say we will not need it in 6 or 7 months; but I do say that we are asked to change our system now. If I thought such a change would bring about improvement, I would vote for the change, because I am not afraid to vote for anything which I think is good for my country.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that. Let me say that I do not clash with the Senator, because I know he will do whatever he thinks is best for the country; but I think we have heard so many slogans that we are confused. I have heard it said that labor and capital have done a magnificent job. Of course, both labor and capital vote. I do not think the statement that they have done a magnificent job has been made because they vote, but somehow it helps us to express our conscientious beliefs.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend yield further to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I say that we are asked to change the system which not only produced, last year, \$64,000,000,000 worth of war materials—materials which have been used not only by the United States but by our allies, as well—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator has forced me to take up a subject which I hoped I could avoid discussing.

Mr. CHANDLER. But we are asked to produce this year \$64,500,000,000 worth of such materials—an increase which is scarcely significant. That request is made of us after the strikes in our country, bad as they were, involved only one-tenth of 1 percent of all the workers in our country. Then I am asked to take chances and to adopt a system which the British adopted, and which in their case has worked much worse than the voluntary system in America has worked. Therefore, I do not think the voluntary system under which we have done so well should be changed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what is the percentage the Senator mentioned?

Mr. CHANDLER. One-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Did it ever occur to the Senator that if we had had one-tenth of 1 percent extra production, we might have had one-tenth of 1 percent less casualties?

Mr. CHANDLER. I would not quarrel with the Senator about that; but England experienced a 16-percent increase in strikes, last year, under the system which it is now proposed that we adopt.

Mark Twain said there are two times when a person cannot afford to speculate. One is when he can afford it and one is when he cannot afford it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think we should take England as an example for this country. I am not fond of taking England as an example.

Let us touch on the matter the Senator inadvertently raised.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, let me say that if I thought enactment of this bill would put a single gun in the hands of a single man so that he could shoot a single enemy quicker than he could if the bill were not enacted, I would join now with the Senator in supporting the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that; I am not arguing with the Senator on that ground.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the Senator is not. I sincerely believe, and I am bound to say it if I do, that at present the labor situation in the United States is better than it has ever been at any other time in the history of our country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Now let us tell the truth about the situation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me tell it. I say that at present the labor situation in the United States is better than it has ever been at any other time in the history of our country, and I say that by using the present methods we can get the men we need. I have ample evidence and messages to that effect in my pocket.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me continue. I shall yield later to the Senator.

Let me develop just one thought at this point. Let us settle the truth about this matter. I have heard it charged on this floor that this Government was the greatest hoarder of labor in the world. And here is the body which, with the House of Representatives, regulates everything which takes place in this Government. I ask what have we done about it. If we cannot clean out our own house, how in the name of common sense are we going to clean out the surplus of manpower in this, that, or the other plant.

Secondly, I have heard fervid statements on this floor about men of draft age who have been mothered and coddled by this Government. So far as I know, if they were blasted out it was months and years after the finger of public attention was pointed to that situation. Every one knows that in addition to many fine persons who went into the war plants as a patriotic endeavor or who were regularly employed there before the war started, there were also in those plants thousands of persons who went there in order to evade military service. Am I wrong? If so, let some Senator contradict me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute; I will give the Senator another statement to contradict, so that he can make his statement a double-barreled one. Everyone likewise knows that one of the reasons for the Tydings amendment was, not to stop men from being drafted from the farms, but to keep them from going from the farms to war plants, primarily, because then they would have the feeling that if they were working in some essential activity they would not be drafted.

Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

The record before the Committee on Military Affairs is clear that there are

very few deferments among the civilian employees of the War Department and of the Navy Department.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to say that I think the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is the chairman of the committee for the Senate which acts upon deferments, will also testify that with respect to the matters which come under his attention there has been a studious effort to make certain that all persons in the employ of the Senate and the House who are within the draft age shall perform their service in the armed forces.

I will say to the Senator from Maryland that my point is that when the Senator implies that the Government of the United States has been harboring in civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government men who should be in the Army or the Navy he is making a statement which is not in accordance with the evidence which has come to my attention.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will give the Senator some definite evidence which will come to his attention; and if he will investigate, he will find it to be accurate.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. In just a minute. Let us proceed with one thing at a time. I shall be glad to yield to my friend in a moment.

Let us take the Rural Electrification Administration. There was a time when the deferment of 35 junior engineers was requested by that organization, and it was granted until publicity brought about a change. Does the Senator take issue with that statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no knowledge about the Rural Electrification Administration and its departments; but I know that the evidence which came to the Committee on Military Affairs was that deferments in the executive branch of the Government have been materially reduced.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh. I am talking—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am talking; if the Senator will permit me to answer his question—

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is not answering it. I said that in the early days of the war men went into the war plants to escape the draft. They went there from the farms to escape the draft, and they went there from the Government to escape the draft. And I said it had taken years to shake them out. Everyone who knows his A B C's knows those statements to be true. The Senator is not answering the question. Does he not know that up until a year ago there were not many deferred Government employees in the service?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall say to the Senator—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall say to the Senator, if he will permit me, that the evidence which was presented before the Appropriations Committee, of which the Senator is a member, was clear that the

executive branches of the Government were studiously refraining from requesting the deferment of civilian employees.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] have been discussing two entirely different subjects. The present status in deferment of employees in the legislative branch of the Government is, I should say, excellent. The present status with regard to Government deferments is good. So the Senator from Wyoming is correct in his statement of the evidence before the Military Affairs Committee. The Senator from Maryland said that some time ago certain things had occurred which made it necessary for him to submit the so-called Tydings amendment, which I supported and voted for in the Senate. The situation then was very unsatisfactory and legislation was needed to correct it. I am happy to be on the side of both friends, even though they apparently differ. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Wyoming, and I also are members of that committee. We know that at the present time there are many Government employees being deferred who should be deferred as there were a year ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am now thinking about deferments connected with congressional committees. I am a member of some of those committees, but I do not know of any one of them, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which has had an employee under congressional deferment.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have one further thought which I should like to express. I assert to the Senator from New Mexico that we have had no complaints regarding any deferments of men connected with congressional committees of which I know, and if the Senator will submit the name of any employee in the legislative branch of the Government who has been wrongfully deferred, I believe I can speak for the committee in assuring him that the matter will be attended to, not at some time during the pendency of the bill now before the Senate, but by tomorrow night.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I cannot yield any further. What I said was

that all of us know that during the course of the war men in Government, industry, and otherwise had in many cases taken positions of the kind to which reference has been made in order to escape military service, and that we had great difficulty in getting them out of those positions so that they could bear their full share of the cost of being citizens in a democracy.

Of course, if while I am speaking the Germans ask for peace, or an armistice is reached, or the Germans surrender unconditionally, perhaps what I have said would not carry as much weight as it would if the opposite should occur. There is no guaranty in the world that a quick surrender will take place. We think we are on the road to certain victory. We all hope, and many of us believe, that victory is not too far distant, so far as Europe is concerned. But are we certain we shall not repeat the very mistake which it is now being suggested that we make? Many people thought that the war was about over when von Rundstedt ordered his troops forward and we had a new offensive on our hands. Who is the military expert in the Senate who knows what the cost in blood and in treasure will be before the Japanese will have been defeated? We do not have two fronts in our fight with the Japanese because the Chinese are not equipped sufficiently. We do not have much with which to equip them. And on the Pacific front we have not yet an ally like Russia, and we have no certainty that we shall have one, though we may hope to have one.

Suppose that 6 months from now things are not going so well, and there is a shortage at some place. Whose fault will it be? It will be the fault of each one of us if we do not do what we can to avoid such a catastrophe. The blood of many innocent men will literally be upon our hands. In my opinion, the blood of many innocent men is already upon our hands because of our—I will use the polite word—nonchalant treatment of the strikes. It is important to remember that if there had been no strikes whatsoever—and there have not been many, for which labor deserves a great deal of credit—the war would have been immeasurably shortened, and many soldiers who are now dead might be alive.

I think we owe it to the men in the service to do everything that is within our power to give every measure of support of which we are capable. Many Senators have loved ones in the service, and it may be that they will be the ones who will die because of a loss of production here and there which might have been furnished by logistics. The primary consideration of this Congress should be to shorten the war by every conceivable second.

I cast no reflection upon those who think that the voluntary system will accomplish that result; but I do assert that their premise that we have done a magnificent job, while accurate and while true, and while it is something which labor, capital and all others concerned may be proud of, is not the criterion for fighting the war. The criterion is, Have we done the best job we can do?

Recently I attended a meeting with businessmen of my State. They came to ask me to vote against the compulsory feature of the bill. I listened to their arguments, and discussed with them some of the facts which I have discussed here. I came to the conclusion that they had not made out a case, and I told them I could not go along with them; that I considered the American Congress must keep an eye single to one thing, namely, not whether a legislative act hurt or did not hurt them, or whether it gave them every measure of consideration which all of us would like to accord them, but whether it was transcendently essential to the successful prosecution of the war, the support of the men who are dying, and the hastening of a quick victory in a sick world already threatened with revolution in many places after the war shall have come to an end. I told them that all their troubles were infinitesimal, but would be aggravated to mountain size unless we could terminate the war quickly and victoriously ahead of everything else; that I was willing, so far as I could, to defer wherever possible; but that it was not fair to go into the city from which they came and take the sons of citizens of that city and place them before the enemy's shot and shell, and then have every one else in America do as he pleased, when there was a critical shortage of material, when the war in the Pacific was only in its genesis, and revelation was many, many, many chapters ahead in the war bible.

So, while I criticize no man who may differ from me, I consider it the highest privilege to stand by the men in uniform 100 percent. They are entitled to it, and, in my opinion, nothing else will do.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment I will yield. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Bailey amendments, I believe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have not been ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought they had been. If we could vote on the Bailey amendment, which is a simple proposition, I should like to have the Senate do so this afternoon. If we cannot vote on it without further discussion, I am ready to move a recess.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly desire to speak on the Bailey amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder if we could not arrive at an understanding about limiting debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Kentucky is trying to get an agreement on a limitation of debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during further debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Does the request apply only to the Bailey amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. That no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not more than once or more than 20 minutes on the Bailey amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to try to obtain another agreement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I shall not block his obtaining the agreement. I desire to add only one or two words, and I press for the opportunity to offer them now because I think they should be said immediately following the speech of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Everything the Senator from Maryland has said is based upon the assumption that the so-called May-Bailey bill would increase production, and would be of aid to the soldiers and sailors who are fighting the war. I say, Mr. President, in words which I cannot emphasize too strongly, that in my judgment the passage of that bill would result in delaying the delivery of munitions to the men on the fighting fronts. I say that the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, after the committee had diligently and carefully listened to the hearings and studied the terms of the bill, will do more than any other measure which has been proposed to the Congress to expedite delivery of munitions of war to the men who need them. There is no question in my mind whatsoever, Mr. President, that if the Senate were to approve and the President were to sign the bill which was passed by the House, it would cause much confusion in our war factories and reduce, not increase, production.

I say that the evidence before the committee is clear that the bill which the Senator from Maryland has so eloquently defended is not the measure which the public has been led to believe it is. It is not a national service act; it is not an act which calls upon all the citizens of America to rally to the cause and to produce. It is a partial act, which deals with only a fraction of the working population, with only one-third of our labor forces. It is not in any sense susceptible of the description which is to be found in the phrase bandied around here, "If we can draft men to fight, why cannot we draft them to work?"

When we draft men to fight, we draft them to fight for their Government. When we draft them to work under the terms of any bill which has been proposed, we draft them to work, not for their Government, but for some organization that is making profit from their labor.

Mr. President, I can read the list of those who have made millions out of the production of war materials sent to the soldiers. Am I to vote, are you to vote, to take a young man and send him to

work for the United States Steel Corporation, or the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, or for any of the other great organizations which are today in a better financial position than ever before in the whole history of the United States, and then have Members of the Senate stride up and down the floor and say that our action rests upon the ground that equal service is demanded of those who are to be drafted for work and those who are being drafted to fight? In my judgment, that is altogether irrelevant and beside the point, and altogether unsupported by any fact which can be adduced.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland said, in the course of his very eloquent speech, that we are accustomed to use catch phrases upon the floor of the Senate. I say there is no catch phrase I have heard which has less basis in fact or in logic than the catch phrase upon which the speech of the Senator from Maryland was based.

The members of the Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the bill do so in the firm conviction that by improving the system which has worked so well to date we shall speed the delivery of munitions of war for the fighting forces and strengthen the hands of those boys who are carrying the flag for us upon the fighting fronts. They support the bill in the conviction, Mr. President, that to do otherwise would be to introduce confusion and delay into the machinery whereby the people of the United States have produced the greatest quantity of materials of war in all history.

I have been very glad to point to the magnificent record which has been made, not because I think it is sufficient, not at all; not because I think we are doing the best that can be done, not at all; but because I know that it is a record of production of which America can be proud, that the production has been accomplished by our present system, and is the type of production which can be improved and increased. If with good sense, if with consideration for the facts, if instead of appealing to catch phrases, we read the language which is before us, if we improve the system we shall do more indeed for our fighting soldiers than if we produce confusion and delay and uncertainty and injustice, as would inevitably be the case if we should undertake to draft men to work for the profits of other men.

The way to proceed, Mr. President, is along that glorious road upon which we have been traveling, and I have no hesitation to say to my friends of the Military Affairs Committee and to other Senators who have thus far sponsored the work of the Military Affairs Committee, that that work has been done in good faith. After diligent study it is presented here in the conviction that it will do more good for our soldiers than anything that is supported and held together by the catch phrases which have just been uttered upon this floor.

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 consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, to be Federal Loan Administrator.

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

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army.

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

Pay Director William J. Carter to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral for a term of 4 years; and

Pay Director Horace D. Nuber to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, to continue while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

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

Sundry postmasters.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Brophy, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice John Collier, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

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

FEDERAL LOAN ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today, by unanimous vote, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported favorably the nomination of Judge Fred M. Vinson to be Federal Loan Administrator to succeed the Honorable Jesse H. Jones. In view of the situation which exists with respect to the loan agencies and the desire that Judge Vinson take charge as soon as possible in order that he may go forward with the work, I ask unanimous consent that his nomination be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in all ordinary circumstances I should feel like

insisting that the nomination go over; but this is a most important position for which Judge Vinson has been nominated, and it is highly essential that the work should be picked up and carried on as quickly and effectively as possible. Therefore, so far as I personally am concerned, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

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

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

FEDERAL LOAN ADMINISTRATOR

Fred M. Vinson, to be Federal Loan Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

William A. Brophy, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be passed assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated

Walter B. Quisenberry, April 18, 1945.
Alfred H. Lawton, April 17, 1945.
Henry D. Ecker, April 10, 1945.
Phillip H. Best, August 8, 1944.
William R. Rosanoff, March 3, 1945.

To be surgeons, effective March 6, 1945

Harry Eagle
George H. Hunt
Carroll E. Palmer

To be temporary surgeons effective February 1, 1945

Selwyn H. Drummond
James L. Baker
Richard K. Winston
John F. Oesterle
John C. Grier, Jr.
Benjamin Wolfman
James M. Hundley
Robert E. Miller

To be temporary senior surgeon, effective February 1, 1945

Harold R. Sandstead

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Mabel D. Hartman, Baroda.
Kathleen I. Adams, Lachine.
Martha Compeau, Munger.

TENNESSEE

Sam Spencer, Burns.
Creed B. Shockley, Spencer.
Etta E. Jones, Strawberry Plains.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 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:

The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork; day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard; their line is gone out through all the earth. Blessed Lord, as Thou hast many voices in the earth with their many ways and with their many messages of reaching the human heart, O let us hear the whisper of Thy grace.

Open our minds and attune our spirits to receive the interpretation of Thy holy Word. Enable us to join ourselves to an invisible truth, to a righteous cause, to stand by it, and to thrive by the love of it. O God, may we ever carry the sacred flame of love in our breasts; free us from pride and weakness, forgetting not that which is great and good. Gird us with prayer and holy contemplation and let the voices of the spirit world be vocal, permitting not our secret faults to have dominion over us but cleansing us from all our sins and serving Thee with quiet minds. In Thy name, O Master, may we learn how to conquer. 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 adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 91):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN MOSES, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution, the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. TAYLOR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government."

for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of Labor.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Department of State.
7. Office of Price Administration.
8. Selective Service System.
9. United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration.
10. War Manpower Commission.

DEFERMENT OF COAL MINERS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, time may prove that the Selective Service or Congress was not wise in deferring individuals or groups in our manpower effort. However, we did defer individuals and in a measure groups; particularly did we select the farm group for deferment. Now that we are in actual practice deferring farmers because of their need on the farms to keep the war effort in high pitch, the time has arrived when it is just as necessary for the draft boards to use the same discretion in deferring coal miners. This should be put in practice at once. In my county, Fayette County, we are 3,000 coal miners short today.

I understand the new selective-service regulations will take 70 percent of all the coal miners in Pennsylvania between the ages of 18 and 29. This means another 12-percent reduction in manpower in the industry. Practically 30 percent of the coal miners have been drafted into the service—a higher percent, we have been told, of any other one trade.

We need no law to correct this. The draft boards back home can correct it if they choose. If they think they cannot correct it under the present laws or rulings, General Hershey has the power to issue them authority to defer these coal miners.

We must not take any more of them away from the mines. We cannot make steel without coal and coke. We cannot make tanks without coal. We cannot make planes without coal. We cannot make guns without coal and we cannot make munitions.

We have been getting tens of thousands of Mexicans, Jamaicans, and Cubans each year to help the farmers. This year we will have 70,000 German and Italian prisoners working on farms. We have nobody—no groups—no help—in the mining industry.

I appeal to you to be with us in our plea for deferring the miners and getting help for the mining industry—I mean help to bring the coal out from under the hills.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. There should be no particular industry picked out from which to draft a certain percentage of men—especially the coal industry—for these men will be irreplaceable. It is entirely different from other industries in that coal mining requires skill; it is arduous, dangerous employment. It takes several years to become an experienced, skilled miner. Some States have a statute which requires apprenticeship for new employees. In Pennsylvania they must serve a 2-year apprenticeship before they are awarded a certificate as qualified miners.

To take 70 percent of the men under 29 years of age would mean a reduction of the coal production in the State of Pennsylvania of 12,750,000 tons in 1 year. Up until October 1944 the number of miners taken from the mines of the Nation was 130,000. In spite of this, the tonnage was kept within the range of consumption. Any further reduction would be hazardous to all industry.

I am well aware that we cannot win the war without troops, but neither can you place the implements of war in the hands of the troops without coal. I have many telegrams pointing out the danger of such a procedure from the loss of production. I would advise the Selective Service to review this order and instruct the local draft boards not to induct essential men from coal mines.

HON. FRED M. VINSON

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Judge Fred M. Vinson as Federal Loan Administrator should please every Member of the House, where he served so long and made such an outstanding record, as well as the entire country.

For 8 years Mr. Vinson was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I have never known anyone who brought to the discharge of his duties a higher degree of efficiency, or who performed his service in a more patriotic and satisfactory manner. A man of outstanding ability, of highest integrity, level headed, and sound in his governmental philosophy; in fact, a giant among public men. Fred Vinson is big enough to fill any public position in our Government. His appointment should be approved by the entire country—especially all forms of business, large and small, borrower and lender, and I bespeak for Mr. Vinson a most brilliant and successful career, bringing, as he will, to his new position all those splendid qualities and qualifications which have characterized his work in every position he has held up to the present time.

I congratulate Judge Vinson, the President, and the whole country on his appointment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday several Members made 1 minute speeches. Among them was the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and your humble servant.

Without consulting the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] or the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] or me, somebody down the line inserted our speeches in the Appendix of the RECORD and left the speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] in the body of the RECORD where it should be.

As I understand the rules of the House, nobody in the Printing Office has any right to change this RECORD. One reason I am raising this question is this: The Speaker is familiar with the fact that a short time ago, I made a short address on the floor and when it was sent down to the Printing Office it had a heading on it, and Mr. Battaglia, one of the Official Reporters in the well of the House here called down there at midnight and had that heading changed.

It seems to me that we have come to the time, if Congress is going to control the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that we might as well find it out. I understand it has been the ruling of the Chair that where a Member makes a 1-minute speech, if he asks to insert extraneous matter that contains more than 300 words, the speech must be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. But where a Member makes his own speech and extends his own remarks, he has the right to have that speech appear in the RECORD at that point.

I call attention to the fact that on the 5th of February a Member made a speech that covered several pages, under the 1-minute rule, and his entire speech went into the RECORD at that point. It does not cost a dime more, it probably does not cost as much, it does not take as much paper, it does not take as much ink, to print them in their sequence in the body of the RECORD where they are made as it does to transfer them to the Appendix of the RECORD.

Many people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which, as I have said before, is one of the few free and uncontrolled publications left in the world, regard everything that is printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as merely an extension of remarks.

I listened very carefully to the very able speech of the gentleman from Nevada, a former Senator from that State, Mr. BUNKER, on yesterday. My recollection is that he completed his entire speech, to the last word, and I submit that it should have been printed in the RECORD at that point.

I am propounding this parliamentary inquiry in order that we may find out

just what the rule is and whether or not, when Members make 1-minute speeches, some of them are to be transferred without authority of the Member to the Appendix of the RECORD, and others printed in the body of the RECORD at the point at which they are made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can reiterate what he has said many times. If he can go back, there was a time here when Members rose the day before and asked unanimous consent that after the approval of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk they might proceed for 20 minutes or 30 minutes or an hour. As chairman of a committee in those days I would sit here ready to go along with my bill, and probably it would be 3 o'clock in the afternoon before legislation was reached.

When I became majority leader, I made the statement to the House, after consulting with the minority leader, who I think at that time was Mr. Snell, of New York, that if anyone asked to proceed for more than 1 minute before the legislative program of the day was completed we would object. Since then Members have not asked to proceed for more than a minute before the legislative program.

Then Members began speaking for a minute and putting into the RECORD a long speech, so that 10 or a dozen pages of the RECORD was taken up before the people who read the RECORD would get to the legislative program of the day, in which I would think they would be the most interested. So we adopted the policy—there is no rule about it—of asking that when Members speak for a minute, if their remarks are more than 300 words, which many times can be said in a minute, their remarks or any extension of their remarks go in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Chair has on numerous occasions spoken to those who control the RECORD and asked them to follow that policy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I take issue of course with that policy, because these 1-minute speakers do not abuse the RECORD, as a rule. The only question that has been raised about any abuse of the RECORD in regard to these 1-minute speeches was with reference to a speech made on the 5th of February, I believe, wherein the 1-minute speaker used several pages.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might state also that when there is no legislative program in the House for the day, such speeches may go in, and they will go in as 1-minute speeches.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, verifying the statement, which, of course, needs no verification, I remember going to the Speaker and asking if it would be proper to put the speech in the body of the RECORD, and the Speaker said that there was no legislative program for the day and there was no reason why a Member could not do it. I assume that was on the 5th of February.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that on yesterday one of the Members made a speech that you will find in the RECORD almost or quite as long as the speech of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], or the

one of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], or the one that I made. It was placed in the body of the RECORD, and it was in excess of 300 words. I can go back through the RECORD here and find numerous occasions.

If we are going to adopt the policy that everybody who speaks in the well of the House and uses over 300 words must have his speech printed in the Appendix, it should apply to all of us.

I notice sometimes the Presiding Officer occasionally allows some people more than a minute. Some people have long minutes. We had one rise to speak the other day. I drew my watch. I believe it was 3 minutes. If you will check back you will find every word of it went in the body of the RECORD. I think this should be a matter to be settled by the membership of the House. Where they make these 1-minute speeches with the right to extend their own remarks, it should go in the body of the RECORD and not be shifted to the Appendix of the RECORD to make it appear as if it were an extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER. The House has that within its entire control at any time it desires to act upon the question.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if I may make a short observation, the complaint of the gentleman from Mississippi is due to the fact that some of the Members who make the 1-minute speeches withhold their speech and correct it and hold it until it is very late. I know that I myself have made some speeches, not under the 1-minute rule, but regular speeches on the floor of the House, and I have found them in the Appendix. That is because I withheld that speech and it was too late to be placed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no; that does not apply here. I watched Senator BUNKER yesterday, the gentleman from Nevada, and I heard every word of his speech. I submit it should have gone in the RECORD at that point.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair can only make suggestions to the Printing Office. The Chair cannot read the RECORD in the Printing Office before it is published. Therefore, until the House itself takes further action, that will be the procedure.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask the Speaker now, I want to know, because the Members of the House are all interested, if Members, when they make a 1-minute speech, use more than 300 words, it is to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and not in the body?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. So the rule will be applied to all alike?

The SPEAKER. The Chair tries to apply that rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the rule is going to be applied to one, it should be applied to all. When we make these 1-minute speeches, I submit we ought to have 1 minute apiece, no more and no less.

Now, there is another question I have been thinking I would raise. I propound another parliamentary inquiry at this time. Some time ago the Official Reporters of Debates ceased to take down

the demonstrations that are made in the course of debate, the only parliamentary body in the world that prints a RECORD in which that has been done, that I have been able to find. I occasionally get the RECORD of the British House of Parliament. I read it and in these trying times there is applause, cheers, their cries of "hear, hear," laughter, and other demonstrations that are made. You get the RECORD of the United States Senate and, as a rule, they do not have probably so many there to applaud, but when there is applause or a demonstration, it is placed in the RECORD. Our demonstrations have been cut out of our RECORD and I think it is a serious mistake because now a man can make a speech and extend his remarks and you have no indication as to where his speech left off and where his extension of remarks begins. I know it has been contended by a few Members in the House that the extension of those demonstrations in the RECORD have been abused. But that was done very seldom, and where the Member did abuse that privilege by inserting laughter or applause he has been subjected to the most drastic criticism and ridicule and, as a rule, has never attempted it again.

I submit that from this time on I, for one, am going to insist that whatever demonstrations are made on the floor of the House during debate be reported by the Official Reporters of Debates as it was for more than 140 years. Then if a Member desires to strike it out, and has permission to revise and extend his remarks, he may do so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not intend to be facetious, but the Chair would like to give the House his reaction to the expressions "Hear! Hear!" and "Applause" in the RECORD. When I came here 32 years ago on Sunday last, a gentleman had been elected by a split in the Republican Party in a particular State, and he had come here with Democratic and Progressive votes. He made a speech in the House. Whether it went into the permanent RECORD I do not know, but I know it went into the temporary RECORD. It closed in this fashion: "Loud and prolonged applause among Democrats and Progressives, followed by much handshaking."

In times past there appeared in the RECORD the word "Applause" where a Member spoke. In another place there was "Loud applause." In another place there was "Loud and prolonged applause." In another place there was "Loud and prolonged applause, the Members rising." If I had made a speech and had received "applause," and some Member had followed me immediately and had received "loud and prolonged applause, the Members rising," my opponent in the next primary might have called attention to how insignificant I was because I only received "applause" and the other Member had received "loud and prolonged applause, the Members rising."

The Chair has held that demonstrations in the House are not a part of the RECORD, and shall continue to hold that until the rules of the House are changed.

Mr. RANKIN. The unusual cases to which the Speaker refers were exceptions and not the rule and, in my opinion, do not justify excluding all demonstrations on the part of the Members from the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. On yesterday I offered an extension of remarks which contained more material than is allowed by the rule. Since then I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer, and I am informed the cost will be \$145.60. I renew my request that I may extend the remarks to include the document, notwithstanding the cost.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks on three topics and to include newspaper articles in connection therewith.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and to include two articles in regard to increasing the price of gold.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House under a special order after the legislative business on Wednesday, March 7, for 15 minutes, and also on Thursday, March 8, for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday after the regular business of the day and after all special orders heretofore made I be allowed to address the House for 25 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and to include a radio address on George Washington.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on a bill which he introduced to amend the Federal Trade Act.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

HON. FRED M. VINSON

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If nobody objects except the Chair, the gentleman may proceed for one-half minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice, I am sure the Kentucky delegation in the House of Representatives where he served with great distinction for 14 years rejoices, and Kentucky itself is honored in the appointment of Judge Fred M. Vinson as Federal Loan Administrator.

Judge Vinson resigned his seat in Congress to become judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In that position he made a reputation as a profound jurist. After the war was declared he willingly gave up his life tenure of the judgeship to assume the larger and more onerous duties as Director and Chairman of the Economic Stabilization Board.

He has now been appointed Federal Loan Administrator, where he will direct and manage the great lending institutions of the United States, the greatest financial institutions in the world.

Judge Vinson is a man of outstanding abilities with an infinite capacity for work. He will bring to the powerful position to which he has been appointed those same high talents and efficiency which have characterized him in the discharge of the duties of the other positions of trust and importance which he has held. His appointment has met with public and congressional approval that is seldom seen.

We wish him success and happiness in carrying out the great trust which has been imposed upon him. We know he will take advantage to the fullest extent of this great opportunity to render service to his country.

NATIONAL INSURANCE POLICIES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute on a very important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair stated to the gentleman from Kentucky, if nobody except the Chair objects, the gentleman may proceed for a minute.

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Harvard Business Review. It exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost \$299. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that the article may be extended.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object,

I wish to say to the gentleman from California who has just spoken that the insurance legislation to which he referred was re-referred to the Committee on Ways and Means by virtue of an amendment placed on it in the Senate. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation did not have control of that legislation or it would not have been in the condition of which the gentleman complains; we would have made it the same as the insurance legislation for veterans of the First World War.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, the extension requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech by Donald Sullivan, national champion of the 4-H Clubs at a victory breakfast this morning.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short talk made by Anne Lee Tipton, who has been 10 years a member of the 4-H Clubs.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a short resolution.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, entitled "New Jersey Earthquake." It has to do with the proposed canal.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next after the legislative program of the day and other special orders.

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

There was no objection.

"APPLAUSE" IN THE RECORD

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that on March 1 an address appears in the RECORD in which the word "applause" appears 20 times. It seems to be a part of the proceedings of the House.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair was not here; and, furthermore, that was a joint session of the two Houses of Congress. Both Houses were in recess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the farm labor draft.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by Marquis Childs on international peace control.

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a joint resolution adopted by the assembly and senate of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the National Rural Letter Carrier.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from the New York Times, and also to extend his remarks in connection therewith.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Sale of Surplus Property, and to include a short newspaper advertisement.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five instances, in three to include portions of an article about cartels and in the other two, brief editorials.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an editorial by Henry J. Haskell appearing in the Kansas City Star.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address delivered by Mr. William J. Neal, Acting Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

ASSOCIATED PRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been inaugurated by the Associated Press a new service to newspapers and radio stations in India. The Associated Press is entitled to the highest commendation for the establishment of this new service. There is thus established a wondrous bridgehead of good will between the people of this country and of India. There will be a mutuality of news extended between the two countries and there will be created a great medium for increased trade with India.

The 400,000,000 East Indians represent a great untapped trade reservoir. There exists over there a great demand for American goods, particularly as a result of lend-lease. We need a great increase in our export trade after the war in order to create new jobs and the new Associated Press service will aid materially in this regard. There is presently great lack of mutual information between the two countries. A. P. will now spread light where there is much darkness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my 1-minute speech at this point in the RECORD and to include remarks made by a former Democratic Congressman who was associated with us in the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker—

I want to congratulate both of you gentlemen for the fight you are putting up to stop this racketeering in public affairs and industry. The waste and extravagance cries to high heaven. Can't something be done to stop this thing? Here our farmers are working from 12 to 15 hours per day because they can't get help, and because they can't pay these outrageous high wages paid by industry.

How long is our Nation to survive with this thing going on? Will our country have to go through a revolution before this thing can be stopped? Cut down on the appropriations for these departments. That ought to help some. The people here are with you in this fight.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ENSIGN FREDERICK MATTHEWS MCCORD,
UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 211) for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, the sum of \$187.90, to Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of a fire in officers' quarters, Ferry Inn Annex, at United States Naval Base No. 2,

on December 14, 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 bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL SUM FOR PAYMENT OF A CLAIM FOR PROPERTY LOST IN THE FLOOD AT PARRIS ISLAND, S. C., ON AUGUST 11-12, 1940

The Clerk called the bill (S. 212) to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$1,333.33, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Lt. Col. Frank P. Snow, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940: *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 these claims, 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 bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST, DAMAGED, OR DESTROYED AS THE RESULT OF AN EXPLOSION AT THE NAVAL MINE DEPOT, YORKTOWN, VA., ON NOVEMBER 16, 1943

The Clerk called the bill (S. 214) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$2,000, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to pay claims, including those of naval and civilian personnel of

the Naval Establishment, for privately owned property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 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.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 1, line 6, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSING CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED AS THE RESULT OF A FIRE AT THE NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR FACILITY, ASTORIA, OREG., ON APRIL 2, 1944

The Clerk called the bill (S. 215) to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill 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, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$780; as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 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 any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEVE HLASS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 205) for the relief of Steve Hlass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Steve Hlass, of Russellville, Ark., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his minor son, Robert Hlass, when struck by a Government vehicle operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, while said vehicle was on official business, on October 14, 1940, on United States

Highway No. 64, near Russellville, Ark.: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED CLOUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 945) for the relief of Fred Clouse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Fred Clouse, Harrisburg, Pa., the sum of \$5,690. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred Clouse against the United States for the death of his son, Charles Clouse, and for expenses incurred in connection with such death, which resulted when the motorcycle on which the said Charles Clouse was riding along Highway Route No. 307 near Scranton, Pa., was struck on August 18, 1943, by a United States Army truck being operated by an enlisted man in the United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Clouse", insert "and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "of the said Fred Clouse."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "his" and insert "their."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO OR LOSS OR DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY ARISING PRIOR TO MAY 27, 1941, OUT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT OR OF THE ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 981) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Mayburg Chemical Co., \$370.45; Roland C. McNaughten, \$37.25; Daniel Ossa, \$9.43; An-

toinette Labas, \$41.22; C. O. Hatcher, \$15; American Central Insurance Co., \$179.79; Imperial Assurance Co., \$343.95; C. W. Elsea, \$555; Mrs. Ethel L. Harrington, \$97.90; Service Fire Insurance Co. of New York, \$152.29; Carl E. Stonebarger, \$691; Andrew Svets, \$25; Motors Insurance Corporation, \$102.57; Agostini Bros. Building Corporation, \$253.83; George C. Scheetz, \$146.50; Jessie S. Pugh, \$50.50; American Automobile Insurance Co., \$52.53; Edwin R. Chantler, \$25; Home Insurance Co., \$23.16; Hilde Christensen, \$356.03; J. C. Tune, \$85; William J. T. Yancey, \$136; Fred H. Merrill, \$121.50; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R. R. Co., \$12.50; Central Vermont Ry., Inc., \$15.62; David W. Barry, \$75; Alleman Fire Insurance Co., \$63.30; Francis Best, \$87.13; Benjamin Allen Albrow, \$197.75; George E. Townshend, \$536.75; Alfredo Sicon, \$136.50; Sinforsio L. Ordonez, \$48.25; Alhio B. Ayuban, \$71.50; Feli S. Abarca, \$341.75; Eulogio Sevilla, \$131; Salvador A. Caballero, \$286; Hans Buhman, \$93.75; Aurelle Proul, \$292; Christino Magasi, \$189; Vernon Lams, \$137.50; Ralph V. Reese, \$201.70; Domingo Dalman, \$124; William J. Hellstrand, \$128.50; Alfred Kirlew, \$327.50; Alejo Estigoy, \$75.50; Isabela F. Elison, \$121.50; Crispin B. Arevalo, \$79; Stanley Robert Scott, \$153.25; Lyman J. Crockenberg, \$153.90; John T. McDonough, \$166; Juan M. Isturis, \$173.50; Ruth P. Dennis, \$25; United Mutual Fire Insurance Co., \$59.80; Wisconsin Telephone Co., \$110.88; General Exchange Insurance Corporation, \$182.29; M. R. Stephenson, \$25; Earl L. Hutchinson, \$150; Mary A. Marlett, \$12; State Automobile Insurance Association, \$79.49; John Wesley and Hazel Wesley, \$500; Samuel Olmedo, \$112.50; Wheeler & Dusenberry, a partnership, \$321.50; James M. Noel, \$400; in full settlement of their respective claims against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of property incident to noncombat activities of the War Department or of the Army, determined by the Secretary of War to be meritorious, which by reason of having arisen prior to May 27, 1941, are not payable under the provisions of the act approved July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," which repealed or rendered inapplicable to the War Department various statutes under the provisions of which such claims could have been paid: *Provided*, That prior to receiving payment each of the said claimants shall file with the Secretary of War, in such form as he shall prescribe, an agreement to accept the sum so to be paid in full satisfaction and final settlement of his claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNICE B. COOPER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 988) for the relief of Bernice B. Cooper, junior clerk-typist, Weatherford, Tex., rural rehabilitation office, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MCGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 990) to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal prop-

erty lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$5,079, as may be required to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Arthur J. Campbell, James J. Saxon, and Kenneth Q. N. Wong, each employed or formerly employed by the Treasury Department, and William Henry Taylor, formerly alternate American member of the Stabilization Board of China, for the value of personal property lost or destroyed at their posts of duty as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila: *Provided*, That the reimbursement on account of any item of said property shall not exceed the purchase price of the particular item less such amount as may be considered appropriate on account of its depreciated value at the time of its destruction or loss: *Provided further*, That if any of the beneficiaries under this act shall have died before the payment herein authorized is made to him, said payment shall be made to his estate: *And provided further*, 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. MILLARD L. TREADWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1016) for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Millard L. Treadwell, captain, United States Army Air Forces, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$89.52, representing the cost to the United States of rail transportation furnished to him during the period September 3 to 8, 1940, by the War Department incident to his being ordered to proceed from Fort Moultrie, S. C., to Vancouver Barracks, Wash., for the purpose of assuming his duties as company commander, Civilian Conservation Corps. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Millard L. Treadwell the sum of \$21.25, representing per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence authorized to be paid the said Millard L. Treadwell while making such journey from Fort Moultrie, S. C., to Vancouver Barracks, Wash.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE MOTOR CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1148) for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DR. WALTER L. JACKSON AND CITY-COUNTY HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, the sum of \$130 to Dr. Walter L. Jackson; to pay the sum of \$48 to the City-County Hospital, of Ranger, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses rendered David C. Arterburn (586-669), machinist's mate, second class, United States Coast Guard Reserve, as a result of an emergency operation while on furlough May 10, 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALMA MALLETTE AND ANCEL ADKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1558) for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ancel Adkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Mrs. Alma Mallette, of Quincy, Mo., the sum of \$5,000, and to Ancel Adkins, the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries to Ancel Adkins, and as compensation to Mrs. Alma Mallette for the death of her son Harry Stewart who was killed as a result of an accident involving an Army truck at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., on or about March 11, 1942: *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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000", and strike out "Ancel" and insert "Ansel."

Line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,000."

Line 9, strike out "Ancel" and insert "Ansel."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ansel Adkins."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. WILLIAM PEYTON TIDWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1877) for the relief of Maj. William Peyton Tidwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill 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 Maj. William Peyton Tidwell, District of Columbia, the sum of \$770. Such sum represents compensation at the rate of \$8,000 per annum for services rendered as secretary of the Surplus War Property Policy Board for a period of 35 days ending on May 29, 1944. The said Maj. William Peyton Tidwell was assigned to the Surplus War Property Administration on March 27, 1944, on a military detail and since such date has functioned as secretary of the Surplus War Property Policy Board. Under War Department Special Orders No. 95, he was granted leave of absence for 35 days commencing April 24, 1944, and released from active military service effective on May 30, 1944. The compensation of the said Maj. William Peyton Tidwell as secretary of the Surplus War Property Policy Board commenced on May 30, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$770" and insert "\$254.47."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*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 committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GROWERS FERTILIZER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2092) for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MCGREGOR objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DANE D. MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1149) for the relief of Dane D. Morgan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Dane D. Morgan on account of the increased costs incurred in the performance of his architectural-engineering contract No. WA-1197, dated February 9, 1942, with the Federal Works Agency by reason of unavoidable delays in the construction and completion of the defense-housing project at Burlington, Iowa, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim

the amount of not to exceed \$8,400. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$8,400, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUBELL BROS., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1630) for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill 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 Lubell Bros., Inc., 806 Broadway, New York, N. Y., the sum of \$104,511.12. Such sum represents liquidated damages for delay in deliveries of certain shirts under contracts between the said Lubell Bros., Inc., and the United States of America (contracts Nos. W-669-QM-10585, W-669-QM-10618, W-669-QM-10697, W-669-QM-10759, W-669-QM-10787, and W-669-QM-10980) entered into between January 6 and February 11, 1941. Such delay in deliveries resulted in no loss or damage to the United States, and on March 3, 1944, the Quartermaster General recommended to the General Accounting Office the allowance of this claim. Such allowance cannot be made by the General Accounting Office under existing provisions of law.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*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 committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR GRIGGS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 177) for the relief of Oscar Griggs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 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 bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GALEN E. WALTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 243) for the relief of Galen E. Walter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. MADDEN objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 249) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Charles R. Hooper while employed in the United States navy yard at Washington, D. C., in the year 1894: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHERN BITUMEN CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 266) for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency is hereby authorized and directed to relieve the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala., of all claims of the Federal Works Agency, amounting to \$13,500, covering liquidated damages for delays due to unusual labor shortages, low priorities, failure to obtain rights-of-way, and exceptional inclement weather conditions, in connection with the completion of work under a contract entered into between the Federal Works Agency and the Southern Bitumen Co. for the construction of an outfall sewer at Anniston, Ala., project No. Ala. 1-160 (F).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR FACILITY,
ASTORIA, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 778) to reimburse certain Navy personnel for

personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, an identical Senate bill, S. 215, has just been passed. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this bill be laid on the table.

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

There was no objection.

MURRAY B. LATIMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 787) for the relief of Murray B. Latimer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Murray B. Latimer, Hobbs, N. Mex., the sum of \$884.91. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Murray B. Latimer against the United States on account of the destruction by fire of household goods, clothing, and other personal property while in transit from Roswell, N. Mex., to Fort Sumner, N. Mex. The said Murray B. Latimer, an aircraft sheet-metal worker employed by the War Department, was transferred on September 24, 1942, from the Roswell Army Flying School to the Fort Sumner subdepot. The War Department, which arranged for the shipping of such property, placed such a low valuation thereon that the said Murray B. Latimer sustained such loss of \$884.91.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 8, insert the following: *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 committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED LOWER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 904) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Fred Lower.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claims of Fred Lower, Wichita Falls, Tex., against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as the result of the discharge of sewage by the sewage disposal plant at Sheppard Field, Tex., into a creek flowing in close proximity to (1) the machine shop owned by the said Fred Lower and operated by him under the name of the Wichita Gas Engine Works, and (2) the home of the said Fred Lower. Any suit brought under this act shall be instituted within 1 year after the date of enact-

ment of this act. The liability of the United States in any suit brought under this act shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "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 Fred A. Lower, of Wichita Falls, Tex., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of property damage and personal injuries resulting from the flow of sewage waters from Sheppard Field, Tex., into a certain creek, which runs through the land of the said Fred A. Lower: *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 committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Fred A. Lower."

GLADYS STOUT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 980) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against Mrs. Gladys Stout, cashier-bookkeeper for the Baltimore defense housing project, Middle River, Md., in the sum of \$264, together with interest due thereon from date of loss of the public funds for which she is accountable and which were stolen from the safe in the defense housing project office, Middle River, Md., without her fault, sometime between Saturday, March 28, 1942, and Monday, March 30, 1942.

Sec. 2. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$85 to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to Mrs. Gladys Stout: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIDNEY B. WALTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1069) for the relief of Sidney B. Walton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, the sum of \$9,835.50, to Sidney B. Walton, of Irigoin, Oreg., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and damages sustained by him when he was struck by an Army vehicle at the Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Hermiston, Oreg., on November 23, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 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.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$9,835.50" and insert "\$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAY TAYLOR CATTLE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1094) for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, to the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,814.50. Such sum represents the value of 33 grade Hereford steer yearlings, the property of such company, which died during March 1943 as the result of arsenic poisoning suffered from grazing on land upon which arsenic was used in connection with the mesquite eradication project conducted by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, and medical expense incurred in the attempt to save the lives of such steer yearlings.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 4, insert the following: "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 committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MURPHY AND WISCHMEYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of Murphy and Wischmeyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CONTINENTAL CASUALTY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., the sum of \$9,202.12, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States, resulting from payments made by it to the following persons for personal injuries sustained as the result of a collision involving an automobile bus operated by Montgomery City Lines, Inc., and a United States Army truck in the city of Montgomery, Ala., on September 30, 1940: Lena Buffington, \$6; Mrs. M. P. Warr, \$5; J. D. Lee, Jr., \$5; Frances Burch, \$7.75; Jean Hall, \$5; Catherine L. McCue, \$77.22; Bessie Bunn, \$35; Alfred F. King, Jr., \$150; Mrs. Grace King, \$100; Pauline Ellis, \$75; Inez Miller, \$29; Mary Wash Burks, \$65; Mrs. G. Hall Walker, Jr., \$27.50; Florence Radford, \$2,500; Caroline Norman, \$20; Ruth Burnett, \$55; Joe Mac Walker, \$23.50; Tom Golsby, \$250; Pauline Cherry, \$825; Mildred McCue, \$1,600; Mrs. Sara D. Cobb, \$130; Gertrude Jackson, \$122; Lillian Earnest, \$145; Joe Guthrie, \$271; Arthur S. Townsend, \$1,297; James Stinson, \$124; W. M. Castleberry, \$358.15; Daisie Cook, \$400; J. E. Long, \$200; Aubrey A. Lewis, \$125; Herbert Mainor, \$15; Eleanor Walker, \$4; and George H. Rowan, \$150.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Montgomery City Lines, Inc., Montgomery, Ala., the sum of \$266.49, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by it as the result of the said collision: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST BY AN EXPLOSION AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1309) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$28,000, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to satisfy claims, including those of insurance companies and of naval and civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment, for privately owned property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1347) for the relief of Lee Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Lee Graham, Elizabeth City, N. C., the sum of \$1,170. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lee Graham against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on July 23, 1943, when the bicycle on which he was riding in Elizabeth City, N. C., was struck by a United States Navy truck: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BESSIE I. CLAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1598) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Mrs. Bessie I. Clay, of Pueblo, Colo., the sum of \$353, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained to her automobile as a result of a collision between her car and an Army jeep from Goffes, an Army post near Needles, Calif., in the service of the United States, on October 10, 1943, near Fontana Junction in the vicinity of San Bernardino, Calif.: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT LEE SLADE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of Robert Lee Slade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Robert Lee Slade, Dendron, Va., the sum of \$8,125.35. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Lee Slade against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained on December 5, 1943, when the automobile owned and driven by him was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of State Route 31 and State Route 460, near Wakefield, Va.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$8,125.35" and insert "\$8,625.35."

Page 2, line 2, insert ": *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 committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MURRAY W. MORAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1707) for the relief of Murray W. Moran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Murray W. Moran, Route 1, box 21-C, Spring Hill, Ala., the sum of \$2,055. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Murray W. Moran against the United States on account of the loss of his minor son, Milton Moran, who was struck and killed by a United States Army truck on October 13, 1943, while he was crossing the highway leading from Spring Hill, Ala., to the State of Mississippi, at a point approximately 2 miles west of Spring Hill.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the words, "Spring Hill", insert ": *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 committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAUGER CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1842) for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 the Mauger Construction Co., Columbus, Ohio, the sum of \$7,323.83, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for the amount of gross sales tax paid by such company to the State of West Virginia in connection with work performed under a Government contract dated May 14, 1941, in the construction of the Cumberland (Md.) Municipal Airport near Wiley Ford, W. Va.: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO GOTTLIEB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 259) for the relief of Leo Gottlieb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leo Gottlieb, of Cedarhurst, N. Y., the sum of \$16,010.54, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and expenses as a result of being struck by a vehicle of the United States Army on Hempstead Avenue, Elmont, N. Y., on May 29, 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$16,010.54" and insert "\$5,709.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL T. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Paul T. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, the sum of \$2,750 to Paul T. Thompson, St. Jo, Tex., for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses incident to and sustained as a result of a collision between the farm tractor on which he was riding and a United States Army automobile on Highway No. 82 near Nocona, Tex., on July 1, 1942: *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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Texas", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", insert "and property damage."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 987) for the relief of the New England Telephone and Telegraph Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., Boston, Mass., for the payment of a portion of the cost of the removal and relocation of the telephone cable lines of the said company which were located in the Shawnee State Forest, Mass., such removal and relocation of the cable lines being a result of the extension of the military reservation at Camp Edwards, Mass., and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed \$27,000. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$27,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the said claim: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. P. SCARBOROUGH AND J. D. ETHERIDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Etheridge.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. TRIMBLE objected; and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FLORENCE J. SYPERT, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Florence J. Syper, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 the estate of Leona Connor Childers, Florence J. Sybert, administratrix, of Kansas City, Mo., the sum of \$3,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Leona Connor Childers, who was killed on February 27, 1943, when a twin-motored Army plane plowed through the wall of a mess hall of the Missouri Aviation Institute at the Municipal Air Terminal of Kansas City, having done so because of the negligence of the Air Force in making the landing: *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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the balance of the page and down to and including line 5, on page 2, and insert "to Florence J. Sybert, of Kansas City, Mo., as administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers, deceased, the sum of \$3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said estate for the death of Leona Connor Childers, which occurred as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane on February 27, 1943, at the Municipal Air Terminal at Kansas City, Mo."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EFFIE S. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1540) for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell.

Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. MADDEN objected and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

KATHERINE SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1567) for the relief of Katherine Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Katherine Smith, of Pleasant Street, Marion, Mass., the sum of \$4,722, in full satisfaction of her claim for damages against the Government of the United States on account of personal injuries of a permanent nature suffered by her on April 20, 1942, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by Government vehicle numbered W-427233, belonging to the War Department and operated by a private of said department on Route No. 28 in the town of Wareham, Mass.: *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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$4,722" and insert "\$4,772."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "full" strike out the words "satisfaction of her claim for damages" and insert "settlement of all claims."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "Government of the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DOROTHY STOWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1669) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Mrs. Dorothy Stowell, Bruning, Nebr., for the benefit of said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and her minor children, the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and children against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Ralph A. Stowell, who was killed on November 19, 1943, when his automobile was struck by a United States Army ambulance near Bruning, Nebr.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

Line 5, after the word "to" strike out "Mrs. Dorothy Stowell" and insert in lieu thereof "the estate of Ralph A. Stowell, of."

Line 6, strike out "for the benefit of said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and her minor children, the sum of \$10,000 and insert in lieu thereof "the sum of \$5,000."

Line 8, after the word "claims" strike out "of the said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and children."

Line 10, strike out "her husband."

At the end of bill add ": *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 committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARDY H. BRYANT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2005) for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rules, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BOYD B. BLACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2006) for the relief of Boyd B. Black.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Boyd B. Black, the sum of \$20,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries sustained by him when struck by an Army truck on May 24, 1943, at Jasper, Tex.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, after the name "Black", insert "of Jasper, Tex."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Line 6, strike out the figures "\$20,000", and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$7,146.40."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Strike out "\$7,146.40," and insert "\$6,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Line 7, after the word "against" strike out the balance of the bill and insert the following: "the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck on May 24, 1943, at Jasper, Tex.: *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 and read a third time, was read the third time, was passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PENNSYLVANIA COAL & COKE CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2186) for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman reserve their objection?

The SPEAKER. Objections cannot be reserved on the call of individual bills on the Private Calendar.

Two objections having been made, the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GEORGE WEBB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1344) for the relief of George Webb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 George Webb, the sum of \$79.20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered by him as an employee of the Bonneville Power Administration from July 14, 1942, to July 28, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

After the figure "1942" in line 9, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent 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 committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. P. SCARBOROUGH AND J. D. ETHRIDGE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 106, H. R. 1012, for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge. The objections have been withdrawn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to return to Calendar No. 106?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, 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 A. P. Scarborough, of Chauncey, Dodge County, Ga., the sum of \$1,000, and to J. D. Ethridge, of Chauncey, Dodge County, Ga., the sum of \$1,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the injury of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge, who were burned on September 13, 1943, while attempting to rescue a pilot from a fallen United States airplane on the farm of J. D. Ethridge near Chauncey, Ga.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "\$1,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$509."

Line 7, strike out "Etheridge", insert in lieu thereof "Ethridge."

Line 8, strike out the figures "\$1,500", insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$906."

Line 11, strike out "Etheridge", insert in lieu thereof "Ethridge."

Line 13, strike out "Etheridge", insert in lieu thereof "Ethridge."

At the end of bill add ": 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 committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: Page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", strike out "\$509" and insert "\$300"; and on page 1, line 8, after the words "sum of", strike out "\$906" and insert "\$600."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, having heard no explanation of the amendment, I am at a loss to understand why it is proposed.

This bill arises out of an occurrence in my district that was brought to my attention by the American Red Cross. They have made frequent appeals to me in the last 2 years to give some relief to these two gentlemen.

It appears that on September 13, 1943, an Army plane, operated by a cadet on a routine training flight, developed engine trouble over the farm of J. D. Ethridge. The pilot bailed out and parachuted to safety and the plane went into a dive, crashing into a field on the Ethridge farm. Mr. Ethridge heard the crash, and he, with Mr. Scarborough, who was living on his farm, rushed to the scene of the accident, with the purpose of giving aid to any person who might be trapped in the wreckage. When they reached a point near the plane its gasoline tank exploded and both men were enveloped in flames, sustaining severe burns.

These two gentlemen, as best they could, were trying to do a service to humanity. They saw the plane crash, they rushed to the plane to render aid, but, fortunately, the pilot had previously gotten out of the plane. These men were burned very severely and the amounts involved here are the doctors' bills, with only a very small amount for pain and suffering.

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

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Has the gentleman disclosed to the House the recommendation of the War Department?

Mr. PACE. I have not.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the gentleman do so, please?

Mr. PACE. I do not have that recommendation before me.

Mr. DOLLIVER. May I read it?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. This is taken from the report on the bill:

The War Department recommends the sum of \$300 to Mr. Scarborough and the sum of \$600 to Mr. Ethridge.

It is in line with that recommendation that the amendment is offered.

Mr. PACE. All I can say about that is that it will hardly be sufficient to cover the medical bills. The original amounts requested were \$1,000 and \$1,500 as I recall it. The committee studied this and voluntarily cut it down to this figure. It seems to me the gentleman might withdraw the amendment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have no desire to quibble over a small amount like this. I merely offered the amendment to comply with the recommendation of the War Department.

Mr. PACE. I have no desire, either, to quibble. I do not know these gentlemen, I have never seen them in my life, but, as I said, the American Red Cross has appealed to me for 2 years to do something for these two gentlemen who rushed to this plane to perform an act of humanity and they were terribly burned. The Congress should compensate them for what they did. I hope you will vote down the amendment under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

NURSES' SELECTIVE SERVICE BILL OF 1945

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. 2277), to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces.

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. 2277, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, general debate had been concluded and the first section of the bill had been read, which section is now open to amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do I understand that the Clerk has read just the first six lines of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. That is section 1 of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Sec. 2. Hereafter male as well as female nurses may be members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps, and male nurses may be commissioned in such corps to the same extent as is now provided by"

law in the case of female members of such corps."

Remember the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, when the war-manpower bill was debated I presented this same amendment but it was ruled out on a point of order. Now that we are considering the Selective Service Act I believe that this is apropos and should be adopted.

I further believe that no woman should be drafted until every male nurse has been made available for duty. This amendment contemplates such a move. It simply provides that male nurses may take the same position in the armed forces as women nurses. It has long been a subject of favorable consideration on the part of nurses' groups and organizations in my district. I know that the House is hesitant to draft the women of the country until every man has been made available in the nursing facilities of this Nation. Already there are 6,000 male nurses in the armed forces of the United States serving as "buck" privates, whose talents could be put to the same end as the female nurses in the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can the gentleman give us any good reason why male nurses should not be drafted along with female nurses, if there is to be a general draft of nurses?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say to the gentleman that my amendment answers his question. It contemplates the taking of male nurses from civilian life and placing them in the same category as female nurses.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows, of course, that they are registered and classified under the Selective Service law and subject to induction already.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman also knows that no utilization is being made of the services of the male nurses of this country. There are, as I have said, 6,000 male nurses in the armed forces of the United States serving as "buck" privates.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. At the present time there are 2,500 males serving in the armed forces. They are utilizing their services as nurses as far as possible.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I answer the gentleman by saying that he is referring to the so-called medics connected with the armed forces. According to a distinguished news analyst and radio commentator the other night, there is no further consideration given to those medics, and they are not even paid the regular Army pay that the men in combat receive. I think I am right in that statement, and I think this radio commentator will back me up on that.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If we have that number of nurses serving as buck privates, while they may be inducted into the service are they being inducted as nurses? That is the gentleman's point?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is exactly the point. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

When I offered this amendment to the war-manpower bill the technicality seemed to be that we were not dealing with the Selective Service System and the armed forces of the United States. This is an opportunity for the House to adopt this amendment to include male nurses in the service and put them where they will do the most good, where they can attend to the wounded, the maimed, and the other persons who need them, the casualties on the war front.

I do hope the House will give favorable consideration to this amendment and that it will be adopted, because I think there is a definite need for it. I am sure we are here today to give every possible consideration to the drafting into the nursing service of people who can do the most good for the greatest number of wounded men and casualties.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask if the effect of the gentleman's amendment would not be to commission the 6,000 men who are in the service now and use them as nurses?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but I do know that the effect as far as those drafted into the service is concerned will be to recognize them as male nurses. I hope that some consideration will be given the male nurses already in the service. I know we have a great opportunity to increase the number of persons connected with the nursing service. I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the number of male nurses is very small. The best estimate I can get is that there are about 8,000 registered male nurses throughout the country, and presently probably not over 50 percent of them are active nurses doing actual nursing.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It might be pointed out also that a great majority of the male nurses in the country are over 45 years of age.

Mr. DURHAM. That is true.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Is it not a fact that under the existing Selective Service law they can take these men as male nurses and use their services as nurses?

Mr. DURHAM. They are doing that as far as possible.

We must not forget that the nurse course is made up of different types of studies. Some of these male nurses do not take courses like obstetrics and pediatrics. There are five or six subjects along those lines that they do not take.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not anticipate any great number of casualties along that line, does he?

Mr. DURHAM. I will leave that to the gentleman, about the casualties. I think this amendment will confuse the bill, if we try to put this small number of men into this large group. I am in sympathy with the objective of the gentleman from New York, but I think it is a matter that should be dealt with entirely separate. I think we are confused about it, if we try to put into this measure this small group of nurses. I do not know what we could do at the present time about these 2,500 who are already in the service. They have been drafted under the Selective Service law.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have an amendment to the same effect which takes care of those men who are in the service. If I can obtain recognition, I want to explain my amendment which I think covers the situation. Also, does the gentleman remember we one day in committee voted by a big majority to include male nurses?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not recall that vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know whether the gentleman was present, but we voted in committee on that one day.

Mr. DURHAM. If the gentleman has an amendment which takes care of these 2,500 already in the service, it is certainly worthy of the consideration of the committee, if we are going to consider this amendment. I hope that the committee will consider it.

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

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAY. As I have already stated, these men are already registered and are inducted, many of them, under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act. The Army is utilizing them to the full extent of their qualifications just as female nurses are being utilized. The only misfortune about it is that many of them do not have the qualifications that the average female nurse has who goes through nursing school.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. To that extent, they are not utilized because of their incapacity, in that respect.

Mr. DURHAM. Another fact is the Navy is using these nurses at the present time.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. There may be 2,500 male nurses in the services of the United States, but there are not 2,500 being used as nurses in the Medical Department. I think there are less than 800. The special work which they do, and which they do so well, and where they are so desperately needed, is in the neuropsychiatric wards and in the closed wards and in some of the special wards.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. Therefore, they would be of invaluable use to the Medical Department.

Mr. DURHAM. They are at the present time. I served with nurses in the last war.

Mrs. BOLTON. They are used as ward technicians. They are used as medical technicians, sir.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. They are not used wholly for nursing except incidentally.

Mr. DURHAM. They are not used much for bedside nursing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire accord with the purpose of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from New York. But I do not think, in the first place, that the amendment is in the right place in the bill; and, furthermore, the way the bill is drawn, that amendment would require the redrafting of the entire bill.

I have drafted an amendment to the same effect, which should be section 5 of the bill. At the appropriate time I intend to present that. I might say the hearings disclosed there are about 8,500 male nurses in the United States. The estimate of the witnesses was that about 2,000 or slightly over that number of these male nurses would be available and able to qualify for service as nurses in the Army. In addition to that, there are about 2,500 male nurses in the Army. Probably a great majority of those would also be available for service as nurses. Of course, we have always thought of the nursing profession as being primarily a profession for women. But in view of the extreme need of the Army as disclosed by this record, I feel we should utilize every available resource to take care of this need. Certainly, the male nurses in the Army ought to be on the same footing as lady nurses of the Army will be if this bill is passed. Also, the Surgeon General pointed out that some of the men who are nurses are allowed to go to the officers' candidate school. In all justice, the objection to that is they are only commissioned for administrative work, and a very small fraction of those male nurses able to get into the candidate school will be commissioned and the rest of the men who are doing primarily nursing work will not be taken care of. Therefore, I want to read my amendment for the consideration of the House, and I hope it will consider it favorably. The purpose of my amendment is to add a new section, section 6. It reads as follows:

This act shall include male as well as female nurses and wherever the words "female" or "she" are used, it shall be deemed to include male nurses. The intent is that all nurses shall be registered but in the case of male nurses now in the armed services the President may provide by regulation that they may be inducted into the Nurses' Corps under the provisions of this act without registration with any local selective-service board.

You can see that with probably 2,000 to 2,500 male nurses in the armed services, it would be very cumbersome, if not impossible, to get them registered with the local selective-service boards, but by empowering the President to make regulations, he can provide by his rules and regulations how all those nurses in every theater of war and in every part of the Nation can be picked up and taken directly into the service without the cumbersome machinery of registration.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to congratulate the gentleman on this very carefully thought-out amendment, because I believe it will, without question, do the very thing we want to do. I hope we will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and then vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman see any reason why a qualified male nurse should have any more difficulty obtaining a commission as a second lieutenant than a qualified female nurse?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I cannot. That is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why are they not commissioned at the present time? I refer to those now in the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I simply wanted to get the parliamentary situation straight if I could. Is the gentleman offering his amendment at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. I am just striking out the last word to get my thought before the House. The amendment will come as a later section. It should come after section 5 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it virtually the same as the Hall amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. It is not the same. It is quite different. I think it handles the situation in a better way. I am in full accord with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is trying to accomplish, but I doubt if his amendment would accomplish it. It would make it more difficult to administer the law.

Mr. RANKIN. I wanted to know if there was enough difference so that it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not believe it would be subject to a point of order, because in the committee we struck out the word "female" in the first

section and included the word "qualified." The Chairman will remember he stated "that will take care of the male nurse situation," which I had in mind. Instead of taking up all the rest of the bill and making technical amendments, I assumed the drafting of the bill would take that in; but it did not do so.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, would not be in favor of passing any amendment that would require the commissioning of male nurses in the Army Nurse Corps, indiscriminately, without regard to their qualifications?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My amendment takes care of all that. They have to be qualified the same as female nurses.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman's amendment does take care of that matter, it ought to come up at this time on the merits, instead of putting in an amendment that is defective.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Originally the Army Nurse Corps, as now constituted, consists of females only.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is true, but when we are in such dire need of nurses I want to get every nurse possible, irrespective of sex. Perhaps after the war we may have to readjust the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] should offer his amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment.

I am very much disturbed about this legislation, for several reasons. There are some elements in this country who want us to draft all women for all kinds of work.

Of course, I am not in favor of that policy. That would be communism or fascism at its worst.

In my opinion, if we will pay these nurses what they are entitled to receive, we will get their services without drafting them. If you will raise their pay to the level of what you are paying people in defense industries, for instance, in my opinion, you will not have to draft any nurses at all. They are just as patriotic as the men of this country, or as anyone else.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand the gentleman means that if in these various army hospitals and naval hospitals in the United States they will use the registers locally, and call those nurses into the service of those hospitals, they could then release the Army and Navy nurses for service with the troops in the field?

Mr. RANKIN. And pay them commensurate with the value of their work.

Mr. BROOKS. Is the gentleman familiar with the pay scale given to nurses inducted into the service?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am not as fully advised as I ought to be, perhaps.

Mr. BROOKS. Nurses brought into the service are given the rank either of ensign or second lieutenant.

Mr. RANKIN. By this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. By this bill. That is the policy of the Department under this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. BROOKS. That gives her a salary of \$1,800 base pay plus commutation of quarters and rations.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. Altogether it adds up to \$2,590 per year that she is receiving.

Mr. RANKIN. How does that compare with the ones working in defense plants?

I wish to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that, as chairman of the Veterans' Committee, I have had a great deal of experience with legislation of this kind for the last few years. We have had to consider this question of nurses in our veterans' hospital legislation.

I am of the opinion that you are likely to do more harm than good by this bill. I have supported all legislation of this kind since we first got into this war, when we lifted the embargo in 1939. I told you then that we were getting into the war, and since that time I have voted for everything the Army and Navy said would help win the war.

Here is what you are likely to do by passing this bill: Instead of raising the pay sufficiently to induce these girls to come in voluntarily, I am afraid you are going to discourage young girls from studying to be nurses and bring about a greater scarcity of nurses than we have today; I am afraid that by this bill you are going to discourage not only the girls but their parents as well.

If you pass a measure of this kind male nurses should certainly be included.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I feel very strongly that unless this section 2 (b) goes out which drafts girls not because they are graduate nurses but because they are members of the Nurse Cadet Corps, will not only discourage the girls, but frighten their parents and a lot of 17- and 18-year-old girls will not take up nursing.

I wish to advise the gentleman that at the proper time an amendment will be offered which will permit this draft to go into effect only if the number of volunteer qualified nurses falls below the quotas. Then it is up to the girls to come in.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I am favorably inclined toward that amendment. But what I am afraid of here is that you are going to frighten not only the girls themselves but their parents, and many young women who would otherwise study to become nurses will not do so if this measure becomes a law.

You are going to cause a great falling off in the number of young women who

will prepare themselves to be nurses and thus bring about a greater scarcity of nurses than we have today. That is the fear I have about this bill.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mrs. BOLTON. Just to correct the gentleman's opinion of the bill and of the situation with regard to the Nurse Corps, I may say that the Nurse Corps consists of commissioned officers of the American Army. The pay, therefore, is that of an officer. It is not a question of raising pay to get them; it is a question of a very different type of thing.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the lady from Ohio that after the last war the nurses were not cared for as the disabled servicemen were; and for that reason we have had more trouble getting the nurses we need. But I do not believe this is the remedy.

If we will pay these nurses what their services are worth we will not have to draft them; they will volunteer their services.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There has obviously been considerable confusion in this argument. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may again be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL to H. R. 2277: On page 1, line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 2. Hereafter male nurses as well as female nurses may be members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps, and male nurses may be commissioned in such corps to the same extent as is now provided by law in the case of female members of such corps."

Renumber the remaining sections of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had in mind the offering of an amendment to this bill which would provide against discrimination so far as persons belonging to any particular race, color, or creed were concerned; however, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has advised me that he also has prepared an amendment which he intends to offer on page 2, line 17, at which point he would insert the following words:

In the selection, induction, voluntary recruitment, and commissioning of nurses by the land and naval forces, there shall be no discrimination by reason of race, creed, or color.

In view of the plan of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to offer this amendment and because it is along the same lines that I also had in mind, I intend to support his amendment when offered.

Mr. Chairman, this bill to a great extent has to do with the Bolton Act, which we have heard a lot about during debate that has been going on.

Under the Bolton Act providing for the training of nurses through grants to institutions, there is the provision:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act on account of race, creed, or color.

Under this proposed bill, the cadet nurses are to be drafted first. It is easy to say that the Army and the Navy will not discriminate against the colored members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps. However, history over a period of years does not warrant such a conclusion. Further, the data compiled in connection with this bill shows that only 330 colored nurses have received commissions out of a group of 8,000 Negro graduate nurses. The ratio of colored nurses in the Army, based upon the number of Negro graduate nurses who are qualified and competent for the positions, is not more than one-fourth the number who should have received commissions already if they had been granted to colored nurses as freely as to white nurses. It is no answer to say that they have not applied. Their services have not been sought and the services of the white nurses have been sought.

The head of the American Nurses Association, Miss Densford, testified that her association considers the colored nurse as the equivalent of the white nurse. The Army doctors have testified that they are excellent nurses and are giving equally good service with the white nurses. They are being used in the care of both white and colored servicemen. Perhaps 2,000 more of these colored nurses are available by volunteer methods if they believe that they are wanted and if, in fact, no discrimination is practiced against them.

Our duty to see to it that there is no discrimination against the colored cadet nurses is more important in this bill than in the Bolton Act. By the terms of the Bolton Act, they have entered into the training schools for nurses in large numbers. They are protected by an antidiscrimination provision in the Bolton Act which we voted for. Today we should see to it that, having secured their entrance into the Cadet Corps, they are protected against any discrimination due to war conditions. So far as this bill is concerned, it is possible that they might have the same treatment as the male nurses. They would end up as enlisted personnel without commissions. They may be turned down or disqualified for trivial reasons.

This bill is far different from the "work or jail" bill which we recently passed. At that time it was urged against a similar amendment which I offered that it would cause loss of votes necessary for the passage of the bill. Certainly that was not a very profound argument for or against the amendment. It is not possible to argue here that the amendment is not necessary. All of us know that there have not been a proportionate number of colored nurses in

the Army and Navy even under the stress of this terrible war and the great need for nurses. Certainly since this bill provides for the drafting of all qualified nurses, it is more necessary that this amendment be a part of this bill than that it should have been included in the cadet nurse law. I hope that the leader of the majority will feel that he can support this amendment, offered in good faith, for the encouragement of the Negro nurses in our country who are giving splendid service in many of the great hospitals of New York, Boston, and other large cities. I hope that the gentleman from New York who opposed a similar amendment to the "work or jail" bill will, on this second occasion, support this antidiscrimination amendment. In fact, I believe that a large majority of the membership of this House are against discrimination in connection with the drafting of colored nurses.

If they cannot qualify, do not take them. If they can qualify and render efficient service at a time when our men need that service, let us treat them just as we would want to be treated ourselves. Let us make certain that insofar as this House can prevent it, no discrimination shall be practiced against them.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are asked to vote for this legislation on the theory that it is in furtherance of the war effort. As I recall, practically everything that has come before this House in the last 2 years has had the same label tacked to it. A few weeks ago the majority leader asked us to vote for a bill then pending here—the work-or-jail bill. That bill is still pending in the Senate. The Speaker of the House took the floor and it was stated at that time that the action was necessary and that we should put through that bill that day. The majority leader stated in his argument that we were attempting to undo something which we should not have done back in June of 1933. If we pass this kind of legislation, or the type of legislation so often requested by the administration, we may find that again we are doing something that we should not do. That legislation—and I am talking about the work-or-jail bill—we were advised, was absolutely necessary at that particular time, yet the bill went over to the other end of the Capitol and there it is buried today. So, it could not have been necessary because certainly the Senate would back up the administration's worth-while war efforts.

Now we are told that the purpose of this bill is to get nurses into the Army. When I remember that for more than 2 years the people of Australia and New Zealand and South Africa and Canada, all integral parts of the British Empire—and if ever a war was being fought for the existence of a nation, this war is

being fought for the continued existence of the British Empire—refused to draft their men for service abroad, I am asking why we should draft women for war work.

We have been told that we should cooperate with other nations. I will be happy to cooperate, but as I understand that word it is not a one-way word. All of the things are not to be done by one party when people are trying to cooperate, and yet we are the only nation that is asked to draft its women. We are told that we need nurses. I will tell you what my opinion, at least, is, and that is this, that in most of this legislation which Congress has been asked to adopt, the purpose is not the avowed purpose, but the purpose is to give to the administration—and here are the two things that it always has wanted—more money and more power. Greedy for power, this administration, if it has its way, will leave our citizens without liberty and with a debt that will enslave them for hundreds of years.

Just a few days ago I talked with a gentleman on the majority side who is in a position to know, and this has reference to the amendment which was proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], who just left the floor. He said that the Government, the administration, went down to one of the factories where there are 5,000 employees making shells, and insisted that that company take on a certain percentage of the members of a certain race. The question was put up to him, and he said, "Now, what do you want? Do you want jobs for a certain group or do you want shells?" The Government finally said it would take shells.

In this particular situation I am wondering whether the Army wants nurses or whether it wants to bring under the control of the administration—for our experience with General Hershey shows that the administration, the President himself, tried to change the law when it came to the drafting of agricultural workers; that experience is in your mind—I am wondering whether the administration wants nurses or whether it wants control over another segment of the population. It has the young men over 18. Shortly it will be asking for the 17-year-olds. In my judgment, that is what it is after—control of the women so it can send them to foreign lands to serve under the Russians and the British as well as with our forces. I will not vote to make our women, our young girls, subject to the orders of either Russian or British officers. I do not propose to be frightened by this cry that if you do not vote for a certain bill you are opposing the war effort. I do not propose to vote for a bill just because someone says it is in furtherance of the war effort.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who is on his feet over there, asked just a moment ago that if you tell all the women in this country that when they become nurses they will be drafted into the armed services and put under the orders of some admiral or general or subordinate, do you think those girls are going to take up nursing and become qualified? If you do, in my judgment you are mistaken.

The women will volunteer whenever needed. This administration has been very successful in destroying our hard-won freedom and independence but there is a limit, and it may be found if the daughters and sisters of servicemen are grabbed by the thousand and sent to aid the political ambitions of a Stalin or a Churchill.

Those in authority cannot always fool the people as to their purpose.

If the sole purpose of this bill was to get nurses, the authorities would have accepted many of those who have volunteered; they would not discriminate against male nurses; they would not limit the age to 45, for they know very well that many a woman over that age is fully capable of rendering aid to the sick and the wounded.

If this bill becomes law and those who are at present qualified as nurses or are in training to become nurses are drafted, those who do not want to serve in the armed forces will escape the draft by choosing some other occupation or profession.

Only those who have more than the average amount of charity, of self-sacrifice, volunteer to become nurses. Nursing, as everyone with experience knows, is one of the most arduous and at times disagreeable, exacting, and heart-rending occupations or professions.

There will be no scarcity of nurses, if they are given full opportunity to serve, rewarded with compensation somewhere near approaching that paid workers in war industries.

Part of the fault for the present scarcity of nurses grows out of the fact that, after Normandy, while the political campaign was on last year, the people were given to understand that the war would shortly be ended and the Army itself reduced its estimate of nurses needed by 10,000.

Given opportunity, the sisters, the wives, and the mothers of those in the service will see that the sick and wounded are given proper care, and a draft of nurses will not be needed.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Every female residing in the United States who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration under this act, has reached the twentieth anniversary of her birth but has not reached the forty-fifth anniversary of her birth and (1) who has been, or on such day or days is, a registered nurse in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or (2) who on such day or days is (A) a graduate of a school of nursing and (B) eligible to apply for examination for registration as a registered nurse in the jurisdiction in which such school is situated or in which she resides, is hereby made subject to registration and selection for and induction into the land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Except as provided in this act, and except as may be provided in regulations issued pursuant to this act, such registration, selection, and induction (including the classification and deferment of such females) shall proceed in accordance with the same procedures and be subject to the same ex-

emptions, rights, penalties, and obligations provided for male registrants by said act and regulations thereunder.

(b) No person registered with a selective-service local board under this act shall be ordered by such board to report for induction until after all qualified graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps registered with such board, who are not deferred pursuant to the provisions of this act, have been ordered to report for induction. A graduate of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps may be deferred from service under this act in the land or naval forces only on grounds described in section 5 (e) (1) (other than the first sentence thereof) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

(c) (1) In order to assure that the Nation's limited nursing skills are wisely utilized and that the national health and safety is protected against unwarranted depletion of essential nursing services, no person shall be classified by any selective-service local board as available for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States under this act, if she has been declared by the Procurement and Assignment Service, functioning through its local, State, and National committees and appeal agencies, to be engaged in essential nursing services and not available for such induction, and no person employed as a nurse in a hospital facility operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be classified by any selective-service local board as available for induction into the land or naval forces unless and until she has been released by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This paragraph shall not apply to graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps.

(2) No provisions of this subsection shall be construed to deny to any persons covered by this act a right to a hearing and determination by a selective-service local board and to an appeal from such determination in the same manner as provided in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNES of Indiana: On page 2, line 17, after the period, insert "No person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act unless she is acceptable to the land or naval forces as a commissioned officer, and no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act except as a commissioned officer."

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the draft of women for the military services to serve as nurses is a drastic move, and I think that most of us reluctantly support the measure only because of the immediate pressing need. If we must resort to this method of obtaining nurses, it is only fair that we provide in the bill that those inducted through the draft be given commissions in the Army and Navy Nurses Corps. The amendment does not infringe upon the prerogative of the Executive in commissioning people in the armed forces, but does preclude the selective-service boards from drafting a woman who does not meet all the qualifications of the Army and Navy Nurses Corps, and who could be inducted and forced to serve in a noncommissioned grade. The amendment also would make it mandatory for the services to tender commissions to those women inducted. War Department officials promise that the women inducted under this authorization will be commissioned, and I have no reason to believe that that policy will not be carried out. However, by writing that policy into the law will give greater assurance

to the women covered by the act, and I hope and believe will encourage voluntary enrollments.

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

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I think the gentleman's amendment is perfectly in order. As a matter of fact, every representative of the War Department who testified before our committee said that the intention of the Department was to grant a commission to any nurse inducted under this act.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Yes, I understand that is the War Department policy as of today. That policy could be changed tomorrow by the War Department, however, if it is not written into the law as proposed in this amendment.

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

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. I think it meets a situation which should be met here. For my personal information, I desire to make inquiry as to whether or not all the nurses now serving in the Army Nurse Corps are commissioned, that is, if the gentleman knows.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. So far as I know, they are, if they are serving in the Army Nurse Corps. There are a number of women serving as WAC's and WAVES and in other capacities who are doing some nursing or aide work.

Mr. SPRINGER. Are they serving in the regular Nurse Corps?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. No, I do not believe so. I think they are merely auxiliary to them.

Mr. MOTT. I agree that the gentleman's amendment is good as far as it goes. I do not agree that the amendment will assure the commissioning of all nurses drafted into the service. There is no limit in the number of nurses which may be drafted under this bill. I think under the gentleman's amendment the War Department would be precluded from drafting any person who was not a qualified nurse. She would not be sure of getting a commission.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Oh, yes; I will read the amendment again:

No person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act unless she is acceptable to the land or naval forces as a commissioned officer, and no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act except as a commissioned officer.

They cannot use this act for obtaining any nurse unless the woman is a qualified nurse and will be commissioned.

Mr. MOTT. That may cure it. I would like to ask another question. Is there anything in this bill, including the language of the gentleman's amendment, which would require that these women shall be drafted as nurses? The language of the bill is that they shall be drafted as members of the naval and military forces of the United States.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Yes. The bill itself provides for the drafting of qualified nurses.

Mr. MOTT. It does not provide for the drafting of women as nurses?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman's amendment have any effect on the drafting of colored nurses? I am wondering if, under the present regulations and policies of the War Department, if it is required that the nurses be drafted, there will be any tendency to take a lesser number of colored nurses than otherwise?

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

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. It does not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not think it would have any bearing if the amendment would provide that there be no discrimination because of race or color. I think that both amendments should be adopted.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Certainly this amendment would have absolutely nothing to do with color or creed.

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

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment. It would appear to me that the gentleman's amendment would be stronger if he would omit the first sentence. Who is going to determine what the qualifications are?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that it is quite difficult to write into law a direction to the War Department to commission certain individuals without infringing the prerogative of the Executive. Here we seek to limit the induction of women to that class qualified as nurses and commissioned officers.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. The Selective Service will not be able to take women who are now doing regular and essential nursing service at home, and put them in as medical WAC's or orderlies, under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. They can be taken out of essential nursing service if taken in as nurses in the nursing service?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Yes. We all remember the rigid and silly regulations of the War and Navy Departments that rejected otherwise qualified nurses from commissions because the women were a half inch too short or tall, or because of a few pounds over or under weight. This amendment will prevent the drafting of women who do not meet all the qualifications of nurses and commissioned officers, and protect such

drafted nurses from serving in noncommissioned status and in performing duties other than nursing.

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

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

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, of course, this amendment sounds very desirable and very simple, but before you vote on this you must understand how this amendment will fit into the law which controls the commissioned personnel of the Army.

This amendment, if adopted, will eliminate from the bill all compulsory features and all ability to draft nurses into the armed forces, for this reason: No one can be compelled to accept a commission. A commission does not become effective until it has been accepted. The only case in which that is not true, is under the law which was passed at the last Congress, because our commissioned personnel was scattered all over the world. We passed the law under which he is presumed to have accepted the promotion unless he files a rejection. That is the only instance in which you can have a commission without specific acceptance. That applies only to promotions. But you cannot commission a person who does not voluntarily accept a commission.

Under the amendment as written the Department is prohibited from inducting into the land or naval forces anyone they are not willing to commission, and that they shall be inducted in no status other than as commissioned officers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield for the purpose of correcting any misquotation of the gentleman's amendment, and for no other purpose.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Did I quote the gentleman's amendment correctly?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not know whether the gentleman correctly quoted me or not, I just want to take issue with the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman may take issue in his own time. I will not yield for the gentleman to make another speech. He has had more than his allotted time.

If you cannot take them in any capacity other than commissioned officers then you can take nobody but those who volunteer to enter the service, because you cannot induct a person as a commissioned officer; you cannot induct a person who does not voluntarily accept a commission. So, if you want to put this provision in the law the thing to do is to vote down the bill entirely, because under it anyone who does not voluntarily enter the service cannot be taken into the service. We have gone as far as we are able to go to secure commissions for these women by getting the unqualified commitment from the Surgeon General of the Army that he proposes to use them in no other capacity under existing law and under the law controlling all of the commissioned personnel of the Army. This kills the bill entirely and it would

leave it entirely on a voluntary basis as in the past.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. MAY. It is also discriminatory in that we have taken several groups of women into the service already without guaranteeing any commissions to them.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree that these women should be commissioned because that is the policy of the armed forces, and those who have come in their professional capacity have been commissioned. We cannot make it any stronger than it is under existing permanent law. We have done all we can in securing the unqualified commitment of the officials of the Army that they will use them in that group.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman does not mean to say—I hope he does not mean to say—that he wants to give the Army the authority to draft nurses and not commission them, or to use them in any capacity other than that of a commissioned officer.

Mr. KILDAY. I am facing the situation that exists and the law as it is written, unless you are going to change existing law. The amendment the gentleman offers nullifies this proposal entirely.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman knows that is not true, because it gives them the right to draft a nurse if she is qualified to accept a commission.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the proposition is not that she is qualified, but if she is acceptable. There is no qualification in it.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct. There is no doubt about it. This provision removes all compulsion from the bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask one of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, either the chairman or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a question: Suppose a woman who is a qualified registered nurse is drafted under the procedure that has been set up in this bill, but for reasons of her own, whatever they may be, decides that she does not want to become commissioned in the Nurse Corps; what disposition is intended to be made of that woman?

Mr. KILDAY. I may say to the gentleman that I believe the disposition made in such a case would be exactly what one would expect when so many members of the nursing profession have already volunteered and are now discharging such important duties. If a qualified woman is tendered a commission and just arbitrarily refuses it, insists upon being recalcitrant about participation in the war effort, they ought to be able to use her where they see fit, as an attendant in a hospital, or anything else. Such a case as the gentleman supposes is conceivable, of course, but I doubt if any such cases occur.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want to know what disposition would be made in such a case. Would the person concerned be assigned to the WAC's or the WAVES, as the case might be, as an enlisted person? Or what disposition would be made?

Mr. KILDAY. If this amendment is adopted she would become a member of the Medical Department of the Army in an enlisted capacity.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a WAC, as a member of the Women's Auxiliary Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. Not necessarily in the WAC's. They could assign her to whatever they wanted to. They could assign her to the WAVES or to the SPARS or to any of the others.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman mean she would have to wash dishes or to scrub floors or to do any of the other work that they do?

Mr. KILDAY. If she refuses to do anything in the nursing line. Of course, I think she ought to do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want to find that out.

Mr. KILDAY. I have a much higher regard for the nursing profession than the gentleman seems to indicate he has.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, that is not fair to me, nor is it fair to the nursing profession, because certainly a lot of women have applied under this Nurse Corps program and they have not been accepted by either the Army or the Navy, but not all of them have applied, and I assume, if they all wanted this service they all would apply.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS. May I say, in reply to the gentleman's question, that this will work out more or less as the induction of physicians has worked out under the present practices of the Army and Navy. When the requirements are such that a physician may be released from civilian life for the armed services, the armed services then go to the man and offer him a commission to come in voluntarily. In practically 100 percent of the cases the physicians have come in voluntarily and have accepted commissions and are serving their country today in the capacity of commissioned officers in the Army or Navy. I think the matter in reference to nurses will work out in the same way.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his observation, but I know of a number of instances where qualified physicians have been drafted into the Army and are serving as privates in any capacity other than a medical capacity and whose medical services are being completely lost.

Mr. BROOKS. They are serving as privates?

Mr. HINSHAW. They were inducted as privates.

Mr. BROOKS. Were they offered commissions?

Mr. HINSHAW. They refused commissions because they perhaps believed that with their experience and their reputation they were of a higher quality and character than the small commission of-

ferred to them justified. In other words, they might have been offered a commission as first lieutenant where they would be serving under men with commissions of majors and lieutenant colonels who had worked under these same physicians in hospitals or elsewhere.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman think that when a physician refuses to accept a commission he ought to be inducted?

Mr. HINSHAW. No, I cannot agree with the gentleman on that score. With the shortage of qualified physicians their services as physicians are far more important than any other service they could perform.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to another thing. I have looked over the hearings on this bill and nowhere in the index of those hearings do I find that the Committee on Military Affairs has consulted with the Selective Service System of this Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the membership of the committee very long in discussing this bill. I wish here and now to state my views so that they will be forever after known in regard to this particular legislative measure.

This is the first time in the history of the world that it has been alleged to be necessary, if at all necessary, to draft "angels of mercy." I know something about the service of nurses during the last war. I saw nurses who were not drafted. I saw them in action in the last war in various hospitals in France. I saw nurses working over the boys in large rooms, about half as large as this, where there were cots that were placed close together. All of the boys at times were under an anesthetic. Some were just coming out, some crying for their mother or father. I saw the nurses working in the operating rooms where the blood was over the soles of their shoes, where they worked until they dropped in their tracks in an effort to save those boys, sleeping for a short time, then getting up and going about their work again. Now it is said that these "angels of mercy" have to be drafted, when the finest young men of this country or any other country are over there fighting and being killed, maimed, and murdered. I cannot imagine the Congress of the United States indicting, prejudging, and precondemning a patriotic group of women in this country by such legislation as this.

The figures all show that you will have an ample number of nurses long before July. They will be available. They are being trained to get into this work. It is just about as sensible as it would be to try to draft the mothers of this country and say, "Your son is sick; you will have to go to his bedside." These nurses are good samaritans, and they will respond to the call for patriotic duty. They will not have to be dragged in by the heels by any such draft bill as this. As far as I am concerned, I am ashamed of this at-

tempt to brand the followers of Florence Nightingale as "slackers."

I would be willing to venture that when the splendid and patriotic Mrs. BOLTON walked down the corridors of the hospitals abroad, as she did recently, more than one injured soldier in his agony said to himself, "Here comes my mother." That is what the nurses mean to our injured fighting men. Our patriotic women are willing to go, and they always have gone where duty and patriotism called for sacrificial service. There is no evidence here that they will not go now, go without legislative coercion.

I, for one, will not by my vote place this proposed indictment against the patriotic nurses and the patriotic women of this country. If adopted, it will be a blot on their record forever afterward. Their children or their grandchildren will say, when they look at the record, "So my grandmother or my mother had to be drafted, did she? Yet she was pledged to humanity when she entered the nursing profession." No, gentlemen, I glory in the record of the nurses of this country throughout all wars, and I am not going to be a party to smearing the reputation and character of our patriotic nurses by casting a vote for this iniquitous bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 107, noes 69.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: Page 3, line 7, after the word "services", strike out the remainder of line 7, all of lines 8 to 13 inclusive, the first two words of line 14, and substitute the following: "in the classification, reclassification, or deferment of any individual under this act, the selective-service local board shall give consideration to the recommendations, if any, with respect to whether such individual is engaged in essential nursing services, filed with such board by the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission, functioning through its local, State, and National committees and appeal agencies."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. As subsection (c) of section 2 is now written, no person shall be classified by the Selective Service until the Procurement and Assignment Service in the War Manpower Commission has passed on the question of whether or not such person is available for induction. In other words, as the act is now written, if the Procurement and Assignment Service should say that a nurse is not available for military service, that ends it so far as she is concerned. On the other hand, if the Procurement and Assignment Service

decrees that she is available for induction, she then is turned over to Selective Service, whose only function is to see that she is inducted into the service. As it now stands, there is no appeal whatever on the part of the nurse on the question of her availability or nonavailability for military service. I appreciate that in the section reference is made to "appeal agencies." That obviously refers only to such appeal agencies as might be set up by the Procurement and Assignment Service itself. I cannot conceive of a more iniquitous practice than for any Government department to make a decision and then set up its own appeal agency to pass on its own decisions. Yet that is exactly what will happen here if my amendment is not adopted. I think it was the intention of the Military Affairs Committee that nurses should have all of the privileges accorded a man under the Selective Service Act, including the right of appeal. Any man who is not satisfied with his classification under the Selective Service Act may appeal to a district appeal board; he may appeal to the State director; and finally to the President of the United States. Section 2 (2) provides for an appeal under the Selective Service Act, but that applies only to those nurses who are referred to a selective-service board by the Procurement and Assignment Service. Moreover this section refers only to appeals on questions on dependency or physical, mental, or moral disabilities.

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

Mr. ELSTON. I am very happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, under the section to which the gentleman has offered this amendment, no nurse who is not made available by the local committees of the Manpower Commission can be inducted by the Selective Service Board until she has been passed upon by the Procurement and Assignment Service functioning through its local State and national committees and appeal agencies.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct. I do not think any Government bureau should be given the power to say who shall or shall not be inducted without some provision for appeal.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman's amendment cure that?

Mr. ELSTON. My amendment cures that and gives the nurse and her employer the right to appeal her classification by the Procurement and Assignment Service to the appeal agencies of selective service. If this amendment is not adopted, it would mean, for example, that nurses could be taken from one hospital and sent into the armed services, while those from another hospital, doing the same kind of work, could be retained in a civilian capacity.

The hospital could not appeal nor could the nurse appeal. Certainly it is only fair that an amendment of this kind be adopted so that a nurse has the same rights accorded a man under the Selective Service Act. If we are going to adopt legislation of this kind, I feel we should throw every possible safeguard around those who are going to be subjected to its provisions.

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

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. As I understand, the gentleman agreed the nurse now has the right of appeal to the Procurement and Assignment Service, but in addition the gentleman wishes them to have a further appeal.

Mr. ELSTON. No. The nurse does not now have the right of appeal from any decision of the Procurement and Assignment Service unless that Service sets up its own appeal agency. If my amendment is adopted, it will not dispense with the Procurement and Assignment Service. I think that is a good service, provided it confines its efforts to making recommendations. It should not have authority to make a final decision.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The testimony of all nurses themselves would reveal the fact that the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission has done a most excellent job.

Mr. ELSTON. I am not objecting to the retention of that Service. I think it should be retained. I am sure its recommendations will be helpful to selective-service boards.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Procurement and Assignment Service will furnish the evidence on which the local boards will pass? They will determine whether a lady will be available for induction?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes. Selective Service is entitled, and I believe will be glad, to have the benefit of the advice of the Procurement and Assignment Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But the Selective Service Board will have the entire say as to who shall be inducted?

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the heart of this bill, in my opinion. In writing this bill, the committee, of course, was concerned as to essentiality and who should pass on the essentiality of the nurse in the immediate community. I think we must have this in mind: At the present time where are we going to get these nurses? There are 54,000 of them in private nursing. Practically all of that group are in the doctor's offices in this country. One hundred and eighty thousand are in the institutions of the country. Twelve thousand are in industry and about 15,000 are in the Public Health Service. What has worried me all the time is, who is going to pick out this one, who is essential and not essential, which you are going to have to do somewhere along the line. Either the draft boards will have to do it or the 867 procurement and assignment boards back in the local communities, who have selected most of the doctors and nurses and placed them in the service, are going to take that responsibility.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Elston] and I have disagreed somewhat on this. I do not have as much objection to his amendment at the present time as I did when he first offered it, because I think it is absolutely necessary to keep the Procurement and Assignment Division of the War Manpower Commission in the position of selecting these nurses.

On the question of appeals, I think the gentleman is right; that there would probably be no appeal from the doctor's decision. But the doctor would have a right to appeal his case under the present language as written in the bill, if that nurse was said to be not essential by the Procurement and Assignment Board. But I take the position that the doctors and nurses are more familiar with the medical services than any other group of people. When a doctor and a nurse in Procurement and Assignment pass on the essentiality of that individual, that is the end of it. When the draft board passes on the essentiality of an individual and takes this doctor's nurse and does not take this one over here, you know good and well who they are coming to to argue about it. They are coming to you as Congressmen. They will say, "You have taken my nurse. Why do you not take the other doctor's nurse?" That is why I feel there is not so much difference between the gentleman's amendment and the present provisions of this act.

He seems to be alarmed about it. I am willing, of course, to take his judgment on the matter and go along with him on the amendments, provided he feels that the Procurement and Assignment Division is still in and will be able to pass on—certainly their judgment—as to the essentiality of that individual in the doctor's office and in the hospitals of this country.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I stated in my remarks that I did favor the retention of the Procurement and Assignment Service. I feel that it is entirely optional with the draft boards and the Selective Service as to whether they take their recommendation but I want to see that no injustice is done, that these people have the right of appeal that is afforded by Selective Service.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking a few questions of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Elston] about his amendment.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment touches on the question of classification; and as I understood the gentleman's argument in support of the amendment, it is his contention that it not only gives the right of appeal to those who are classified or inducted contrary to what they think their rights are, but it also makes it possible for the Selective Service local boards to deter-

mine the question of whether or not the local procurement agencies set up under State laws have determined rightly or wrongly whether the man should be inducted. Does it go that far?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; that is correct; and it is up to the person who is aggrieved by the decision, if she wishes, to appeal to the agency set up in the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MAY. Then, according to the gentleman's contention, the only thing that the local procurement agencies will have to do with the matter will be to determine whether or not the person is a nurse eligible for induction.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; they will make recommendations to the selective service board, and I think the Selective Service will be very glad to have their recommendation.

Mr. MAY. Suppose they do not make a recommendation; what happens?

Mr. ELSTON. They are not obligated under the law now to make a recommendation. The Procurement and Assignment Service as you know has been set up by Executive order rather than by law.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows very well that I opposed in the committee the entire provision relating to the State procurement agencies, taking the position from the very beginning that it would hinder the induction of nurses rather than help, because it leaves to the local interested parties, in this instance two physicians and a civilian who may be employees or owners of a hospital where they are at work, to determine first of all whether or not they are available to be inducted through the Selective Service System.

What I want to get clear is that the gentleman's amendment does enable the Selective Service System to get them regardless of the recommendation of the local committee.

Mr. ELSTON. My amendment would permit that, but it requires that the selective service board give consideration to the recommendations, if any, with respect to whether such individual is engaged in essential nursing services, and so forth. It requires them to give consideration to the recommendation.

Mr. MAY. But they are not bound by the recommendation.

Mr. ELSTON. No; they are not bound, because there may be unfairness or discrimination. There may be a number of reasons why the recommendations of the Procurement and Assignment Service may not be followed.

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

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Do I understand from the gentleman's answer that someone other than the nurse they are undertaking to draft can appeal from the decision?

Mr. ELSTON. The employer can appeal under present provisions of the Selective Service Act. For example, a hospital might want to appeal against the induction of a nurse from that hospital.

Mr. THOMASON. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that the nurse her-

self ought to be permitted to appeal from any decision that she is not satisfied with; but does the gentleman believe that some doctor who has a nurse in his office and may for selfish reasons want to keep her, should be allowed to appeal from that ruling?

Mr. ELSTON. I believe he could if he were the employer; but, of course, if he did not have a good case he would not get very far with his appeal.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is not adopted, this act will have established a precedent that an interested group will have final say as to which of that group shall be deferred. In other words, it is not fair for the Procurement and Assignment Service or the local medical group to itself have the say as to whether or not a particular person should be inducted first. In connection with appeals boards and selective-service boards, as I understand it, any employer who is a board member has been prohibited from sitting on the case of one of his own employees; is that not correct? I believe that is a correct statement of fact. If it is not correct, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. ELSTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. HINSHAW. The members of this Procurement and Assignment Service who sit on these cases and decide whether or not a nurse is available are themselves employers of nurses or else some representative of the nurses' group. It is entirely unfair that they be the ones to determine whether or not the person is inducted because they have an interest in the case. The gentleman's amendment, I believe, corrects that situation and does not permit the establishment of such precedent.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I presume the following statement is correct, because it comes from all of the nurses' associations. Using voluntary methods 867 procurement and assignment committees, hospitals, and medical authorities have, since July 1, 1943, classified 235,000 nurses in one of the following categories: Available for military service and potentially eligible, available for relocation into more essential positions, essential in present position for limited time, essential for unlimited duration and, No. 5, not available for military or civilian duty. I assume it is the failure to be put in the proper one of those classifications that might raise the question of appeal?

Mr. HINSHAW. Perhaps.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Any nurse has the right today to appeal assignment to any one of those categories.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand the local units of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission for nurses are in fact the local units of the National Nurses' Coun-

cil; hence they would be interested parties.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and in support of this paragraph of the bill as presently written.

Mr. Chairman, Members have asked me certain questions and I think they are due an explanation on the point. There is a procurement and assignment board, local, State, and national, set up under the War Manpower Commission's directive. When it became necessary to draft doctors we set up local boards of doctors to decide which doctor and how many from each local area should be drafted by the local selective-service board. That procurement and assignment board sits on the eligibility of doctors in that area and they have functioned without any complaint at all. There have been no complaints of undue influence or unfair eligibility certificates.

It seems to me we are dealing with a problem here which is technical. How can a local selective-service board make its determination on the eligibility of a nurse without knowing something of the nature of the service which the nurse is required to perform? In other words, we are concerned with the drafting of technical people and it seems to me technicians should sit in on the eligibility of the people involved, taking into consideration local health needs.

In this particular case the board, composed of a procurement and assignment board of local nurses working with local doctors, will say that this nurse should stay for the good of the community in the community or that there is a surplus of nurses in that particular community, therefore these nurses are available to the local selective-service board. They do the same thing in the case of hospital needs in the local communities. They are the ones who have the technical knowledge as to whether a hospital needs the nurse itself or has a surplus of nurses. The selective-service board cannot sit in on the determination of a technical point like that. It has to be some one who knows the issue involved, and I say that the doctors and nurses are the ones who know that particular issue. I think the gentleman's amendment makes the procurement and assignment board a very weak thing. It takes out, you might say, the authority of the determination as to what nurse is eligible for drafting and what nurse is necessary for community service.

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

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

Mr. ELSTON. Does not the gentleman feel that the nurses should have the right of appeal?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They have that right under the Selective Service Board. They can go through with their appeal there.

Mr. ELSTON. Through the Selective Service Board?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; they have appeal rights through the Selective Service Board.

Mr. ELSTON. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman, but that is the very

thing I am trying to accomplish by my amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sure that they have the same rights under the Selective Service Board that any other draftee has.

Mr. ELSTON. No; if they had that right I would not be offering the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I disagree with the gentleman. He may be right, but I disagree with him on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the provision now in the law gives the right of appeal on the question of availability to the Procurement and Assignment group.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is where it should be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is where it should be as far as availability is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The point is this, that that group makes the determination first and then they pass on their own appeals. They correct their own mistakes. That is contrary to all fundamental principles of law to have interested parties pass on their own cases.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the argument is made that interested parties are involved. To be sure the doctors are interested in obtaining and keeping nurses in their particular offices, but the gentleman does not have such small faith in the doctors' profession that he would say they would deliberately hold nurses out of the available draft quota when the war needs are so urgent in the military theaters.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is not a matter of technical knowledge. It is a matter of having an independent party pass on the rights of these nurses, and the very group that has that right under the law as written is the group who has already classified that nurse.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is as far as the appeal for availability is concerned, but as far as the appeal of Selective Service is concerned, it is not.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We want to transfer that power to the local boards who can listen to all of the evidence and make a correct determination.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a slight correction of what I think is misapprehension on the gentleman's part?

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

Mrs. BOLTON. In the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio the words "the Nursing Division of Procurement and Assignment" are used. That is different from the Doctors Division. It is the Nursing Division.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

I believe that procurement and assignment boards of the Nursing Division will render determination of availability certificates just as honorably and efficiently in their profession as similar boards have in the Doctors Division. I

believe they will be of great help to the local selective-service boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was first talked about several weeks ago, I got in touch with General Hershey's Office of Selective Service. I mention this because one of the gentlemen on my left a few minutes ago mentioned that no one had been in touch with Selective Service. My purpose was to inquire whether or not Selective Service would be interested in the suggestion that since this drafting of women was revolutionary, that they be placed on the local draft boards. I might add that I am going to very reluctantly support the bill, but I suggest that consideration should be given to the placing of women upon the local draft boards or, at least, if the members would not agree to that, on the appeal board.

I was going to incorporate this statement of mine as an amendment, but I have just talked to Selective Service headquarters in the last 10 minutes, and they tell me—and I have a tendency to agree—that the administration of the Selective Service System Act as written would permit that to be done. But I do say to the gentleman who offered this amendment and to the committee that a woman should be sitting on the Appeals Board who can understand, should I say, the peculiar problems of the sex.

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

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

Mrs. BOLTON. Just to put a woman on the board because she is a woman might not help the situation at all. She must be a woman very well aware of all the problems that are bound to arise.

Mr. FLOOD. I agree with the gentleman and thank her for her contribution to my proposal.

I had in mind, since the drafting of women is such a revolutionary thing, that certainly, in fairness to the nurses, there should be a woman on the appeals board, either under the amendment offered by the gentleman or under the next section of the act providing for appeal, if and when they are referred.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I only ask the gentleman to yield because in the first sentence of his remark, I believe, he referred to a statement I made. I did not aver in that remark that they had not complied with the Selective Service System. I simply stated that the Selective Service System did not appear in the testimony in the hearings.

Mr. FLOOD. I understood the gentleman then and now. Now, I bring this matter to the attention of the House for the specific purpose of placing in the record of the debate on this bill the statement of Selective Service that the fullest consideration will be given within the administration of the Selective Service Act, to the appointing of women to local draft boards and if for the reason of the small number of women to be

drafted as nurses this is not considered practical in all local board cases then women should be designated as advisers to the local boards directly concerned—but that in all cases women should be appointed on all appeal boards. This should be done in fairness to the women who are nurses and subject to the act and to guarantee that one of their sex will be considered when their cases and problems are before the selective service local and appeal boards.

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

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the author of the amendment a question or two to clarify in my own mind, and perhaps in the minds of the Members, one or two points.

Under the gentleman's amendment, the Selective Service appeal machinery could be brought into operation only on somebody's appeal; is that right?

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. If the Procurement and Assignment Service determined a girl to be essential here at home because she is superintendent of a nurses' training school or something of that sort, and she accepted that classification and did not appeal, there would be no way that the Selective Service Board could overrule that finding of essentiality by the Procurement and Assignment Service? They could not go get that woman?

Mr. ELSTON. I would say they could, if they were not satisfied that the Procurement and Assignment Service in finding her essential had placed her in the proper classification.

Mr. JUDD. But what would inaugurate that machinery unless somebody appealed? The girl would not be likely to appeal if she were put in class IV and held to be essential here. If she did not appeal, how would the Selective Service Board go after her?

Mr. ELSTON. I have every reason to feel that the Selective Service Board would in every case accept the recommendation of the Procurement and Assignment Service unless some complaint was made about it, although technically they would have the right to overrule the Procurement and Assignment Service.

Mr. JUDD. As a matter of fact, is it not likely that practically always the appeals would be from persons who were put in class I but who thought they were more essential here at home, so that the appeal board in most cases would be deciding whether or not the Procurement and Assignment Service erred in putting them in the "available" classification when it should have put them in the "essential" classification?

Mr. ELSTON. Obviously it would not come up on appeal unless somebody was dissatisfied.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad for the gentleman's assurance. I feel that removes the danger of the Selective Service going over the head of the Procurement and Assignment Service to get nurses whom the doctors and nurses feel are essential here, unless the individual in question appeals.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It seems to me more than passing strange that we should apply this innovation in our law of drafting women and not give them the same rights that men have to appeal through the same machinery that is set up for the benefit of draftees who are about to be taken into the Army.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. This amendment puts them on an equality with men.

Mr. JUDD. More than an equality.

Mr. JENNINGS. They ought to have more. They have all the rights that men have and one more, that is, to be protected.

Mr. JUDD. It is more than an equality in this sense: that men draftees are passed upon by only one agency, a selective service board, while the nurses are to be passed upon by two agencies, first, the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service, and, second, a selective-service board. This amendment properly gives the right to appeal from the decisions of both of these agencies, instead of just from one.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brown of Ohio: On page 2, line 17, after the period, insert "In the selection, induction, voluntary recruitment, and commissioning of nurses by the land and naval forces there shall be no discrimination by reason of race, creed, or color."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply strengthens this bill as far as any discrimination is concerned for any reason of race, creed, or color. I feel certain that if any argument is made against this amendment it will be on the ground the bill covers all classes, races, creeds, and groups alike. However, in actuality we have here in America approximately 9,000 Negro nurses—accredited, registered nurses who are graduates of training schools or colleges or universities—who meet exactly the same standards as to qualification as are required of white nurses. While there has been no complete discrimination, the fact remains that in the armed forces today only a very few Negro nurses have been accepted and used.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it is only fair that the House should know that until sometime in December the ratio of white nurses to Negro nurses was somewhat according to the number of Negro troops. That has been waived, and now that method of apportionment is not being used any more. I think that accounts for the small number actually in service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. But by my arithmetic the ratio just does not work out that way. According to the mathematics that I was taught in school, the number of Negro nurses accepted in the armed forces is in no way comparable in ratio to the number of white

nurses or nothing near as heavy in proportion as the number of Negro men serving in the armed forces.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is in ratio of numbers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is not, either in ratio or in percentage. These Negro nurses are just as loyal and patriotic as any white nurse dares to be. I have letters from many Negro nurses in my district and State, college graduates who are desirous of serving their country and their fellowmen in this hour of crisis. Yet they are not permitted to do so for one reason or another. Their applications have been on file for a long time. This amendment will simply speak the desire of Congress and write into law the provision that there must be no discrimination against those women. As a matter of fact, I am told by those who should know that many colored nurses are every bit as well suited for military service as are white nurses. I know some people may argue against the greater use of colored nurses in the armed forces, but I can see no reason why these loyal, capable, and especially trained citizens of the United States who want to perform their duty to their country and to give of their ability and skill to the wounded and suffering fighting men of this war, should not be permitted to do so.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his excellent statement.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if he does not understand there is already a provision in the original Selective Training and Service Act which covers the very question covered in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAY. And it is proposed to put this in as title 2 of that act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes; I understand fully that such an amendment is there with all the provisions you have mentioned, and I also understand it has been disregarded to a great extent by the military leaders of this Nation. I would be very happy if the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, having under his authority an investigating committee set up by this body, would see to it that the provision of the law he has mentioned is obeyed. I think it would be very helpful, Mr. Chairman, if you would see to it that the law we have already passed is enforced. Perhaps if it had been, amendments such as this would be unnecessary. I hope this amendment is adopted.

Mr. BROOKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill itself as written permits induction into the nursing service of any qualified nurse. There is no stipulation in the bill which permits discrimination of any kind. In addition to that, I want to read to you a portion of section 4 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. This act writes into the law the provisions of the Selec-

tive Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. In addition to this, we have the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that he is going to present this as a part of the original Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The provision which I vigorously opposed at this time of this act is as follows; it is section 4.(a):

Provided, That in the selection and training of men under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against anyone on account of race or color.

I do not believe the law could go further than that. The provision is there. To rewrite it is mere duplication. Duplication in the same act, and there certainly is no necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

I rise in support of this amendment. I rise in support of it because when we had a similar amendment before this body in connection with the so-called work-or-fight bill I opposed it because there was an order by our Commander in Chief, Executive Order No. 8802, which assumed that in war industries there would be no discrimination, and that order has been obeyed, more or less, in increasing numbers in our war plants. However, as regards the nursing picture in this crisis, it is deplorable. It is absolutely unbelievable that in times like these, when the world is going forward, there are leaders in our American life who are going backward. It is further unbelievable that some of those leaders have become so blindly and unreasonably un-American that they have forced our wounded men to face the tragedy of death rather than allow trained nurses to aid them because those nurses' skins happened to be of a different color. Yet this is the inescapable conclusion forced upon anyone who will objectively consider the facts.

Our Commander in Chief, backed by the Secretaries of War and Navy, told us that we are facing a crisis in the nursing care of members of our armed forces. Steps could be taken immediately by the Secretaries of War and Navy to help solve this problem. Those steps were not taken. It is impossible to estimate how many lives of American men have been jeopardized and, in fact, are being jeopardized now as we deliberate, because of blind, unreasonable un-Americanism.

In World War No. 1 Negro nurses were assigned to the Army Nurse Corps, and the American Red Cross book, written after the war, called *The History of American Red Cross Nursing*, reads:

Since white and colored patients were not assigned to separate wards, Negro nurses were assigned to the general wards and they were serious-minded, quiet, and businesslike young women.

On January 18 I wrote Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Stimson and I asked them why Negro nurses were not used. Mr. Forrestal replied on January 26, "They are given consideration."

Mr. Stimson replied on January 29, "The Army is receiving all Negro nurses

who qualify physically and professionally." But this is not true. There is not one Negro nurse today in the United States Navy Nursing Corps.

This is not true as regards the Army Nursing Corps. No later than last week the Cleveland Call-Post reports that a Negro nurse who graduated as valedictorian in the Central High School of Cleveland made an application and Maj. Edna B. Grope of the Army Nurse Corps replied:

The Surgeon General directs me to inform you that your application is rejected because there are no facilities for colored cadets in the Army hospitals.

I repeat that was just last week.

The number of Negro nurses in the armed service to date is seventy-five one-hundredths of 1 percent. When this limited number is admitted it is admitted without segregation. For instance, in North Carolina at Fort Bragg, Negro nurses are nursing white patients. In Camp Livingston, La., white and Negro nurses are giving nursing care to both Negro and white patients on an integrated basis.

I ask this question: Are the lives of the men of this Nation less important than blind prejudice?

The truth of it is that the American people and the peoples of the world are far ahead of some of its leaders. It is time, therefore, that we reassume the leadership of the kind of a government that "will 'never perish from the earth,'" a government of the people—black and white—by the people—Jew and Gentile—and for the people—Protestant and Catholic.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment does much one way or the other. As the gentleman from Louisiana so well pointed out, in the Selective Training and Service Act we have already the provision that there shall be no discrimination so far as race and color are concerned. The only word that is omitted that the gentleman from Ohio includes in his amendment is the word "creed," and I do not suppose anybody assumes that anyone has been discriminated against because of his creed. In other words, it gets right down to the point of race and color.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If it makes no difference why not adopt it and not waste any more time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The law as it stands is working satisfactorily. I call attention to the fact that according to the testimony before us there are 9,000 Negro nurses. The same qualifications apply alike to white, black, or any other color. Only 2,000 of the 9,000 are eligible under present requirements. A breakdown of the 9,000 colored graduate nurses shows only 2,000 have been eligible for service. According to the testimony before our committee, out of that 2,000, 390 I believe it is—it is three hundred and something—have been commissioned and are being used by the service. If you figure out the number of Negro

nurses that have been commissioned in proportion to the number eligible and compare them to the number of white nurses you will see that they have been taken in just about the same percentage. I roughly estimated that it was about one out of every seven for both white and colored that have been taken; and, therefore, I do not believe that insofar as the Army is concerned, the charge of discrimination because of color is quite fair. When it comes to the Navy it may be. The Navy has not heretofore taken them in; but we have assurance before our committee and it is to be found in the hearings that have been printed assurance by the Navy that hereafter colored nurses will be taken in.

And there is this point to be remembered: It is not at all certain that the Navy is going to get its nurses under this bill, that is under the draft provisions of this bill. The Navy testified before our committee that they needed only about 2,000 nurses, I believe, and most of them had already been provided for, and that just a small increase from now until July 1 would meet all of their needs. They testified that they did not need them. Insofar as the procurement of their nurses is concerned, therefore, it seems to me that you are not going to get much out of adding this amendment. I do think, however, that the facts should be presented to this Committee of the Whole to the effect that insofar as the Army is concerned when one considers the number that have been taken in and commissioned as compared to the total number eligible, there is no great discrimination, if any at all.

According to my figure it is about 1 to 7, both white and colored.

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

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

Mr. MAY. I have been advised by authorities in the Navy Department that their estimate has been changed and that they really need 4,000 instead of 2,000, therefore they have got to get 2,000 more nurses on account of the future operations of the war in the Pacific, for instance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If that is true they will have to use this act.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. First, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs where he got that information since the hearings have been published that the Navy needs more nurses than they at first thought?

Mr. MAY. I said they needed 2,000 in addition to the ones that they have estimated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PFEIFER. The gentleman recalls the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana, when he read the amendment to the Selective Service Act to the effect that any men selected under this

act shall not be discriminated against because of race or color. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that if an amendment were adopted here in committee calling for induction of male nurses that would leave out female nurses insofar as discrimination is concerned?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, because the gentleman from Kentucky has announced that he proposes after we have perfected this bill, to offer an amendment incorporating this as title II of the Selective Training and Service Act and making all of the provisions of that act applicable to this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was very happy that the gentleman who preceded me brought out the fact so clearly that the testimony before the Military Affairs Committee shows that the Navy has no need for this bill. The complement of Navy nurses has always been up to the Navy requirements. The Navy has always had all the nurses it needed and the Navy will always be able to procure all the nurses it needs under a purely voluntary system.

If, as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs remarked a moment ago, it now appears the Navy will need 2,000 more nurses, I can assure the gentleman it will get the 2,000 additional nurses through the voluntary system and that it will not have to alter its present requirements as to age, experience, or other qualifications. I may say also that so far as the Navy is concerned even the general draft act would not be needed, because it could get its entire quota of Navy personnel in all branches by the voluntary system.

The testimony of Navy witnesses before the Committee on Military Affairs will disclose that the Navy favors this bill only because the Army needs it. In this connection I may say to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that if the War Department had used the same care, the same skill, and the same foresight that the Navy used in recruiting its nurses it would not be necessary now to bring in a bill of this kind.

I hope that an amendment which will be offered, I understand, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], providing for an intensive national nurse recruiting campaign, and providing, further, that the actual drafting of nurses shall not commence unless the voluntary system, aided by this campaign, fails to recruit a sufficient number of nurses within a specified time, will be agreed to. I know the Army needs the number of nurses it says it needs. If that amendment is adopted and the nurses of this country are shown the need for immediate voluntary recruitment, I believe we can get all the nurses the Army needs, and that we can get them as fast as the Army can process the applications for enlistment. I hope that amendment will be adopted.

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

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

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman know, as a matter of fact, that the National Nurses Association passed a resolution endorsing this bill and requesting its enactment at an early date?

Mr. MOTT. With certain amendments, recommended by the association; yes. And I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that although it is most unfortunate, largely through the delinquency of the War Department itself, that the bill had to be brought in, nevertheless, in my opinion we must pass the bill and I shall vote for the bill. We must have these nurses, even if we have to draft them, but I would much prefer to vote for the bill with the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], incorporated in it, because I believe that that amendment will enable us to get these nurses immediately without resorting to the draft.

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

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

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact there are approximately eight and one-half million men in the Army, while there are only about 3,000,000 men in the Navy, and that about 75 percent of the casualties are coming from the Army?

Mr. MOTT. The Navy, of course, is only about one-third as large as the Army; therefore it needs only one-third as many nurses. There is nothing significant in that. The significant fact is that the Navy has always procured its nurse personnel by the voluntary system, and I think that the Army could have done it also, had it not made so many mistakes and miscalculations in calculating its nurse requirements, and if it had pursued a vigorous, consistent voluntary recruitment policy, from the very beginning, as the Navy did. It is because that was not done that we are now confronted with the necessity of drafting women.

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

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in agreement with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Conceding all that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has said, I still believe that the amendment will give emphasis to the fact that the Members of this body, on both sides of the aisle, are determined that we intend to have this bill administered without discrimination as to race, creed, color or national origin, and to bring in all available nursing facilities that we can reasonably get, with justice toward all and malice toward none.

I feel, from some of the studies that I have made, that in actual practice discrimination has been practiced. It should be stopped. I do not believe that we should limit that charge to just color. You have Catholics, Protestants, Mexicans, colored, Jews, gentiles, and so on, down the line. It is about time that we recognize the fact that they are all Americans and the protection of their civil liberties as guaranteed to them under the Constitution will become a thing of fact. It does not make any dif-

ference to the wounded, suffering veteran either on or off the battlefield what creed a nurse belongs to or what color she is, or whether she is Jew or gentile as long as that angel of mercy is administering aid to him in need. The battlefield is a great leveler. One only need talk to those who have been under fire and they will tell you that bigotry passes out as the bullets fly and the bombs fall. As the gentleman from Ohio said, I think that in order to be sure let us adopt his amendment. Certainly the adoption of his amendment will not in any way interfere or in any way take anything from the effectiveness of this bill. It will just make more emphatic the fact that this Congress is truly dedicated to the proposition that the administration of this law and all laws will be such that all people, regardless of race, creed, color, or nationality, shall be treated justly and honestly in the American way.

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE: Beginning with line 18 on page 2, strike out down through line 3 on page 3; and on page 3, line 4, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; and strike out the sentence beginning in line 19.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I spoke about yesterday. All it does is to take any stigma away from the nurses of the Cadet Nurse Corps. It puts them on an equality with the other registered nurses under the draft provision of the bill.

I call to your attention on page 3 that the last sentence as follows:

This paragraph shall not apply to graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps.

I cannot understand why these women should not be in the same class as other women. It was never the intention of the Congress when the Bolton Act was passed that these women who were to graduate, in this high and great profession should in this emergency be placed upon a different footing from other nurses. That is all there is to it. That is all that is in this amendment that I have offered.

May I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he will accept this amendment.

Mr. MAY. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I prefer to leave it to the Committee to determine what they want to do.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then I ask that the Committee approve the amendment by an overwhelming majority.

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

Mr. Chairman, this matter is not quite as simple as the gentleman from North Carolina would have it appear. If this amendment is adopted, it means simply that the provision requiring the utilization of cadet nurses first will be stricken out.

Before debate on this amendment is over, you no doubt will hear that the young women of the Cadet Nurse Corps were made a promise when they went into the Corps that they had their choice of selecting civilian service or military service. That promise, I am informed, was made by the Public Health Service. If so, it was never authorized by Congress. When we passed the Nurse Cadet bill we enacted the following purpose clause:

To provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

Later on in the act we stipulated that before a nurse could be taken into this corps she had to sign an application indicating that in consideration of the benefits of the act, she was available for these services. The application which these nurses have signed contains, among other things, this provision:

In consideration of the training, payments, and other benefits which will be provided me if I am accepted as a member of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps, I agree that, if accepted, I will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war.

Since the passage of this act 110,000 young women have enlisted in the Cadet Corps. All of their expenses, excepting the few who were already in training, have been paid by the Government, including uniforms and tuition. In addition, cadets receive spending money of from \$15 to \$30 per month, depending on the period of time they have been in that service.

The nurses who did not enter the corps—that is, the nurses who have financed their own training—received no promise of any kind from anybody. So if this unauthorized and illegal promise that cadets can select their service should be recognized, it means that nurses choosing civilian service would not be referred to the Selective Service for induction.

It means they could go right on with their civilian service although the Government paid their expenses. The other nurses who paid their own way would necessarily be taken first. Therefore, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina should prevail, it means that those nurses who did not enter the corps and who have not the benefit of any promise from anybody, will be referred first to the Selective Service, and they will be the ones who will be taken first.

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

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman surely does not mean to say that the Public Health Service made an illegal promise to any one of them?

Mr. ELSTON. I shall leave it to the Members of the House whether we ever authorized anything of that kind.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I ask the gentleman if he has read the hearings on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. ELSTON. I have read the hearings, certainly.

Mr. BULWINKLE. There is not a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who will not tell you that this bill was passed primarily, and the first bill was introduced, for civilian purposes entirely.

Mr. ELSTON. I also read the act. The act speaks for itself and its terms are very plain. The act provides that cadets, after training, shall be available for the armed forces and the other services mentioned in the act. The armed forces are mentioned first. Certainly, the Cadet Corps was not created for the purpose of supplying civilian needs over military needs. Congress decreed they should be available for military use or civilian use, whichever one might be of greater urgency. This corps was trained for the purpose of meeting just such an emergency as we have today.

Let me say further, the cost to the Government, so far as to the 110,000 who are now in the corps are concerned, will be approximately \$132,000,000. Of course, it will amount to more as others come in. Yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] asked the question whether or not this might discourage women from entering the Cadet Corps. In this connection I am informed that in January there were 2,759 applications filed for admission to the corps. In February there were 8,027 applications, and the proposed admissions for March are only 4,977. This latter figure is the estimated requirement of the civilian hospitals. Therefore, the enlistments in the corps in February were almost twice what the requirements are in the month of March. That indicates very clearly that these young women have not been discouraged because of this provision in the bill.

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

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

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true that although the Government has spent \$132,000,000 on the education and training of these young women, except for a tacit moral obligation, there is no compulsion of any kind upon them to render any services back to the Government, notwithstanding that the Government has paid for their education?

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The girl can take her training at the expense of the Government and walk out. She can leave at any time during her course of training and there is nothing that can be done about it. I will say to the Members of the House that if these girls are taken first, this will be less of a draft act than if we are going to let the young women who paid their own expenses be taken first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Members of the Cadet Corps have obligated themselves to serve either in the military services or the civilian service of the Government, or in any civilian hospital. Having taken that obligation, having accepted the benefits, why should they not be drafted first, now that we are in a state of emergency? I say it is less of a draft act if these young ladies are used than if we reach out and take the nurses who got all of their training at their own expense. A nurse who does not go into the corps has to pay anywhere from \$175 to \$3,000 tuition alone and also has to buy all her own books and pay all her other expenses; she gets no spending money from the Government as cadet nurses do. Therefore, I submit this is not the trivial amendment the gentleman from North Carolina would make it appear.

It is a very important amendment and if we take the present provision out of the bill we will be doing an injustice to every nurse who has taken training at her own expense, certainly no injustice to the cadet nurses.

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

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman feel that when you single out any single group of eligibles for induction and require that they be first inducted, it will delay the induction of others that are not in a particular group?

Mr. ELSTON. No. On the other hand, I think it would speed it up, because cadet nurses are already registered. You are not picking out a particular class, because they said they would be willing to serve if accepted as cadets; they accepted the benefits with that understanding.

Mr. MAY. I know they said all that, but they are going to have to get 2,000 or 10,000 or 25,000 within that group before they can touch any other nurse.

Mr. ELSTON. If they are graduate cadet nurses registered with a draft board they have to be utilized first. You do not have to take every cadet graduate in the country first.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the primary purpose of this bill to get more nurses?

Mr. ELSTON. Certainly.

Mr. JUDD. Why should we encourage nurses who are already graduates to sit around and wait to be put in later because we must take these other girls first? I want nurses. I want these girls to be taken on the same basis as all graduate nurses in the United States. The main thing is to take care of the wounded and not just to get our money back.

Mr. ELSTON. I do not disagree with the gentleman on that. That is why I am opposing this amendment. Any qualified nurse can enlist, and they are enlisting. They have made a magnificent contribution in this war. But if this amendment is adopted and we do not take the cadet nurses first, the result will be you will take the other nurses first, and every one of these cadet nurses who received the promise, to which I referred, can sit back and watch the other nurses being taken knowing that she cannot be taken at all.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is the most important amendment to the bill. That portion of the bill calling for the drafting of cadet nurses first runs absolutely contrary to my own view of the matter of conscription. During the build-up of our conscription program we started with men from 21 years of age. Later we had to lower the draft age. I opposed that lowering of the draft age until I was convinced we had struck the bottom of the manpower barrel. You are getting the echo back now from death on the battlefields of a number of 18-year-old boys. That echo will be even greater in the matter of the hazards extended to the young womanhood of the country. I cannot, for the life of me, see the logic of turning that barrel upside down and starting in with the 20- and 21-year-old girls first. While we did postpone the drafting of young boys until we had reached the bottom of the barrel, here you have the barrel upside down and start with the young girls first.

In World War No. 1 we did not draft any man under 21. The testimony before our committee is that these nurses are 18 and in some cases 17 years of age when they start their training, which means that there are very few nurse graduates of this cadet-nurse program available at this time who are over the age of 22. Why do you reach down to the 20- and 22-year-old girls to start your conscription for women?

There is another point I would like to call to the attention of the House. I have a niece serving in the European theater of operations with the Red Cross. My niece had to wait until she was 25 before she could enter that service. Do you not think there is some sound reason for the Red Cross adopting a 25-year-old age limit before they will send girls out to the battlefields? If you have smelled powder on the battlefield at all, I think you will agree with me there are many objectionable things in the way of going down to the 20-year-old girls in your first forced service in the Nurse Corps. There are many factors that are sound and there is good logic and sound reasoning for the rule adopted by the Red Cross. There has not been an idea set forth here today to counteract the wisdom of the policy of the Red Cross in restricting service for girls in overseas operations to age 25 and over.

In my opinion, reaching down and forcing girls of the age of 20, 21, and 22 to be the first ones conscripted is the weakest and most unsound and most dangerous policy of the bill we now have under consideration.

I am very strongly in favor of the motion to strike this provision from the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I merely want to point out that accurate figures show that 80 percent of the members of the Nurse Cadet Corps are below 23 years of age.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I may say to the gentleman that the Public Health Service reports that there is not a single girl who has graduated from the Nurse Training Corps under the age of 20. Their ages range from 21 to 35.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Has the gentleman examined the record of the 9,000 to become eligible in the next 3 months.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Will every one be over 21?

Mr. ELSTON. They will be 21 or more after graduation.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. There were some exceptionally brilliant girls who entered the Cadet Corps at age 17.

I am opposed to going down under age 25.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The exact figures from General Parran's office show that of the Nurse Cadet Corp 25 percent are 20 and younger; 43 percent 21 or under; 15 percent 22 or under; 7 percent 23 or under; and from that on the percentage gets very small.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his figures; they are a real contribution to my remarks and I appreciate it.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, there are grave doubts in the minds of the Membership of this House as to the necessity for the enactment of this drastic and unprecedented measure which reaches out with the strong arm of the Government and seizes the women and girls of this country for nursing duty in the armed services. Whatever necessity or excuse exists for the drafting of women and girls for nursing duty cannot be charged to the nurses. If the armed forces are now confronted with an emergency, such a situation is wholly chargeable to the policies adopted by the War and Navy Departments and to their refusal to accept the services of thousands of competent nurses who have volunteered for service both in the Army and in the Navy. The applications of trained and experienced nurses have been turned down for no sensible reason whatever.

We are all in favor of furnishing the members of our armed forces who are wounded and who are sick adequate nursing service. And not only the Congress and the public favor this but the nurses of the country wholeheartedly favor such a policy.

The nurses of this Nation have not failed their country in this war.

At this time, by voluntary enlistment, more than 53,000 of the self-sacrificing, heroic women of this great profession

are now in the nursing service of the Army and Navy. Thirty thousand of this number are serving overseas. They are ministering to our wounded in hospitals all over the world; when necessary they attend them when they are flown from across seas to hospitals in this country.

We are not dealing with inanimate objects when we talk of laying the hands of the Government upon the young women of this country.

We have heard with amazement some of the arguments advanced on the floor of this House to the effect that when the Government contributed money for the education of these girls as nurses that the girls thereby, in a measure, became chattels of the Government and no longer had the right of the free choice given them by the statutes and the promises made to them when they were induced to enter the hospitals of the country for training.

Let us turn to the law itself and let us take a look at the facts under which these girls received this training. We are now considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]. This amendment strikes out of the bill the provision in section 2 thereof which provides that all qualified graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps shall be first inducted into the service before any other qualified nurse is required to enter the service under the terms of this proposed law. In other words, this act, as written and reported to this House, discriminates against the young girls who have graduated and who are about to graduate as members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps, fences them in and marks them for induction through this proposed draft measure before any other nurses in the country can be drafted. This feature of this provision of the law puts the Government in the attitude of asserting a lien against these girls for the small amount that it has contributed toward their education and attempts to make of this act a foreclosure procedure by which it enforces its lien for a recovery of the contribution it has made toward the education of these young nurses.

We now propose by this bill as it is written to place a stigma upon these cadet nurses, these girls who have been educated in the hospitals of this country; and we say to them in effect: "You do not intend to carry out your obligation to the Government; you intend to get your education under false pretenses; and to prevent that sort of thing occurring we intend to make certain that the Government obtains your services. We will put you out in front and induct you into the service before any other nurse is called."

This harsh treatment of these girls is advanced upon the theory that when they entered upon their training and education to qualify themselves as nurses they obligated themselves to enter the armed services of the country. There is absolutely no foundation either in law or fact to support this insistence.

Let us look to the law and the facts under which the Government made a contribution to the cost of educating and

training these cadet nurses. By the act of June 15, 1943, Congress provided "for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training." The act provides that the sums appropriated for this purpose should be used for making payments to schools of nursing or other institutions which are in a position to give such training. The statute further provides that no student nurse shall be included under the plan unless in the judgment of the head of the institution undertaking the training of such nurse she would be available for military or other Federal, governmental, or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war and such nurse so states in her application for inclusion under the plan. Pursuant to the terms of this act, Surgeon General Parran of the Federal Public Health Service issued an appeal to the girls and young women of the country to enlist in the nursing profession in which these words were used:

ENLIST TODAY IN A PROUD PROFESSION

The corps requires you to make but one promise: that you will remain in essential nursing—civilian or military—for the duration of the war. The choice is yours.

That the girls educated under the terms of this act did not thereby become members of the armed forces and primarily liable for nurse duty in the armed services, ahead of all other nurses in the country, is established by the fact that those who wish to impose this liability upon them seek to do it under the terms of the present bill. They do this because under the act of June 15, 1943—Public Law 74—these cadet nurses upon their graduation have the right to choose between service in the armed forces and service in civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries. What will be the inevitable effect of pushing these girls out in front and subjecting them to the draft before it applies to any other nurse in the country?

The evidence is overwhelming and undisputed that these girls and their parents will justly resent this treatment. Most of these young women entered training when they were minors, 17 and 18 years of age. They could not legally enter upon this course of training without the consent of their parents. And if this measure is enacted as written, parents will hereafter refuse to permit their daughters under 21 years of age to enter nurses' training schools and thereby subject themselves to induction into the armed services through a draft law.

There are three great hospitals in my home city of Knoxville. The Knoxville General Hospital, owned and operated by the city of Knoxville; Fort Sanders Hospital, owned and operated by public-spirited physicians and surgeons of the city; and St. Mary's Hospital, founded, promoted, and managed by members of the Catholic faith in our city. I have a telegram from Mr. T. H. Haynes, superintendent of Knoxville General Hospital, urgently requesting that section 2B of this measure, the section stricken out by the amendment offered by the distinguished Member from North Carolina,

be eliminated from the bill. This telegram reads in part as follows:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., February 27, 1945.
Congressman JOHN JENNINGS:

I respectfully but urgently suggest that section 2B and section 5 be taken out of nurses' draft bill so as to eliminate discrimination.

T. H. HAYNES,
Superintendent,
Knoxville General Hospital.

I also have a telegram from Mr. H. L. Maloney of Fort Sanders Hospital Training school, dated March 2, addressed to myself in which he states:

Please oppose preliminary draft of Cadet Nurse Corps graduates. These girls were promised before joining the corps that any draft law affecting them would be the same for all nurses of their age. This legislation if passed will ruin further enrollment of student nurses.

H. L. MALONEY,
Fort Sanders Hospital Training School,
Knoxville, Tenn.

I insert at this time as part of my remarks a telegram dated March 2, 1945, which reads as follows:

Representative JOHN JENNINGS,
House of Representatives:

Please protest preliminary draft of Cadet Nurse Corps graduates because: First, it would seriously affect present enrollment, many students will leave because it is unfair and contrary to their agreement; second, it will slow up future enrollment because even parents will object to students being enrolled under an agreement which is unstable; third, the Bolton Act provides "Your services are pledged to essential nursing, either civilian or military as you choose, for the duration of the war"; fourth, section 5 excludes married cadets. Cadets who did not avail themselves of the privilege of marrying are being discriminated against.

Yours truly,
Sister MARY LEO,
Director, School of Nursing,
St. Marys Hospital.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I just want to show the gentleman about 25 telegrams I have.

Mr. JENNINGS. These telegrams from the directors of the schools of nursing in Knoxville's three great hospitals together with the thousands of other protests that have come to the Members of the House from the great nursing schools of the hospitals of the country demonstrate the fact that we cannot look forward to the recruiting of any more girls for training as nurses if we pass this kind of a law.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subject of far-reaching importance. It crosses the thresholds of the homes of the country. We are dealing with the daughters of our people. These student nurses who have entered this great humanitarian profession in my section of the country, and I am sure this is true of all other sections, come from the best homes among our people, the homes of the finest citizens in my district and in my State. They entered this great profession to serve not only in the Army and Navy but also in other essential fields where their services are needed. The majority of these cadet nurses have brothers and other relatives in the armed services. They are entitled

to fair treatment and to be put on an equality with every other qualified nurse in the country. And it is my belief that this House will overwhelming support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. This bill will pass the House and it will go from here to the Senate. And it is my firm belief that before it ever becomes a law the nurses of this country will volunteer as they have heretofore in such numbers as that there will never be any necessity for putting this measure into effect.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the pending amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, I am convinced that it is discrimination to restrict the draft of nurses to members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps upon graduation in the hope of securing the desired quota before inducting nurses from the profession as a whole.

We are all in agreement that adequate nursing care must be provided for the gallant members of our armed forces.

The members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps comprise a loyal and patriotic group of young women eager to serve humanity in the best possible manner. They are not seeking exemption from being drafted but are entitled to take their chances as members of the nursing profession in the event that nurses are to be drafted for military service.

It is estimated that 80 percent of the care of patients in the 1,300 hospitals in the United States with nursing schools is provided by student nurses, and these hospitals contain 57 percent of the total number of patients in the 4,000 general hospitals in the United States.

Since the United States Cadet Nurse program was established the number of student nurses has increased 76 percent, and of the 1,300 hospitals with nursing schools, 1,110 of them are participating in the Cadet Nurse Corps program. The marked increase in student enrollment has aided the war effort immeasurably by releasing for war service graduate nurses formerly employed for care of hospital patients.

It is interesting to note that from July 1, 1943, to December 30, 1944, 10,000 cadet nurses were graduated and that approximately 5,000 of these graduates completed their training during the month of September 1944. Between January 1, 1945, and June 30, 1945, it is expected that 6,000 cadet nurses will graduate. From July 1, 1943, to December 30, 1944, 40 percent of cadet nurse graduates had applied for or had been assigned for military service.

At the present time the Cadet Nurse Corps strength is 105,000 and the small ratio of graduates is due to the fact that only a small percentage of the older student nurses in school when the cadet program was established joined the Corps. Then, too, the typical student

nurses' school and various State laws require a 3-year course for graduation and the Cadet Nurse Corps has been in operation only 20 months.

The adoption of an amendment specifying that the drafting of nurses must first be confined to graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps before such a provision is made applicable to the nursing profession in general will serve to seriously impair the cadet nurse program with the result that the 1,110 hospitals participating in the program will suffer greatly in their efforts to provide adequate nursing care for over half of the hospital patients in general medical and surgical hospitals in the United States.

We should bear in mind that when the recruiting program for the United States Cadet Nurse Corps was launched applicants were led to believe that upon graduation they had the choice of being available for military or other Federal governmental or essential services for the duration of the present war. The applicant subscribed to the statement, "I agree that, if accepted, I will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war." On the form the applicant pledges by her signature to remain active in nursing or civilian service if her health permits her to do so, for the duration of the war.

While the applicant at time of enrollment was not asked her choice between military and civilian nursing, applications were accepted from those who upon graduation might be available only for essential civilian nursing in Federal or other hospitals, and the publicity used for recruitment of cadet nurses emphasized that the type of nursing service after graduation was optional and that is the impression that cadet nurses had when they completed their enrollment.

Parents and legal guardians of applicants who had not reached the age of majority under State law had a similar concept when they affixed their signatures to applications, and it is not to be doubted that if they had known that compulsory military duty was possible they would have declined their permission for the enrollment of those applicants under legal age. The result would have been reflected in a sharp decrease in the number enrolled in the Cadet Nurse Corps if the cadet, her parents, or legal guardian understood the applicant was making herself liable for service overseas.

I firmly believe that it is a breach of faith to enact legislation that is nothing short of gross discrimination against the splendid young women in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps. That is exactly what will happen if we restrict the drafting of nurses to the Cadet Nurse Corps before drafting nurses from the profession as a whole.

A recent break-down of the age groups in the Cadet Nurse Corps reveals that 25 percent are not over 20 years of age, 43 percent are under 21 years, and 15 percent in the 22-year age bracket. Thus, 83 percent of the total enrollment does not exceed the age of 22 years, while an additional 10 percent are be-

tween 23 and 24 years of age and 7 percent between the ages of 25 and 30 years.

The American Red Cross has a minimum age limit of 25 years for women sent overseas for recreational programs and as entertainers and ambulance drivers.

It is my opinion that it is morally wrong to expect the Cadet Nurse Corps to furnish an overwhelming percentage of the nurses to be drafted for military duty, since it means the sending overseas of a vast number of cadet nurses barely over the teen-age limit and would of necessity force them to undergo the severe hardship of becoming accustomed to nursing battle casualties from front-line duty. Equal distribution of the liability for military duty should be sought by eliminating the proposal to draft cadet nurses before inducting nurses generally.

It is the opinion of many that the shortage of nurses could have been relieved by modifying the War Department requirements for the Army Nurse Corps at the beginning of the war, as it is reported many experienced nurses were rejected who could have been accepted by the waiver of defects not of a serious nature.

The commissioning in the armed forces of experienced male nurses would no doubt have assisted greatly in relieving the shortage of nurses and would have aided greatly in providing adequate nursing care for battle casualties in overseas theaters of operation.

I repeat that the cadet nurse is not lacking in patriotism, but in simple justice to this vast army of loyal and splendid American women they should be expected to answer the summons of the draft on an equal footing with all nurses in view of the fact that when the recruiting program was in effect for the United States Cadet Nurse Corps they were led to believe they had the choice of military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian service for the duration of the war.

I am in receipt of scores of letters from cadet nurses in my congressional district in which they state that they joined the Cadet Nurse Corps with the understanding that they would have the choice upon graduation of applying for military duty or selecting service in a civilian capacity at a Government hospital or in some essential war activity.

Time does not permit the reading of these score of letters from cadet nurses, but I do feel that the following letter from Mr. Robert L. Gill, superintendent, Altoona Hospital, Altoona, Pa., clearly explains the situation with regard to the rank discrimination that will result if cadet nurses are asked to supply the greatest number of the quota for nurses that will be established in the event that legislation is approved drafting nurses for military duty. Superintendent Gill's letter is as follows:

THE ALTOONA HOSPITAL,
Altoona, Pa., March 5, 1945.
The Honorable D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR MR. BRUMBAUGH: I am quite certain that all the members of the United States

Cadet Nurse Corps in our hospital have the impression that they would not be subject to draft if they joined the Cadet Nurse Corps any more than any other woman in the United States.

I also feel quite sure that the cadets in our school believe that they would be permitted to choose between essential civilian and military nursing. They were told this when the corps was started at the hospital. This was the understanding given in meetings with officials of the Cadet Corps.

In a communication dated August 12, 1943, from Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, the last paragraph reads in part as follows:

"In the enclosed memorandum from Mr. James Hamilton the need for your assistance is further explained. In the accompanying material full details are given as to how your participation can be made effective. I am sure I can count on your enthusiastic help."

With this letter from Dr. Parran we received a letter from James A. Hamilton, at that time President of the American Hospital Association, and accompanying material mentioned in Dr. Parran's letter. In this accompanying material, on page 2, is the section "What to tell applicants," from which I quote:

"4. The pledge of the United States cadet nurse is to remain in the type of essential nursing service of her choice for the duration of the war, either civilian or military. They are not required to pledge themselves to military service only."

"5. Nurses will not be drafted unless a national service act is passed affecting all women. Student nurses will not be more vulnerable to such action merely because they are members of the Cadet Nurse Corps."

In view of the official nature of these instructions, we read them to the nurses who were eligible to join the Cadet Corps. As far as I know, these instructions have not been revised.

There are other communications which bear out this information, but I believe the above is sufficient for you to feel sure of the understanding which the cadets have, not only in this school but probably throughout the country.

On a fact sheet published by the Public Health Service, dated October 1, 1943, one paragraph reads:

"In return for advantages received through the corps, cadet nurses promise that, health permitting, they will remain in nursing—either essential civilian or military—for the duration of the war. They are not required to pledge themselves to military service alone."

Another paragraph in the same document reads:

"All graduate nurses will be subject to any subsequent legislation affecting womanpower, whether or not they were members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps."

We all wish to give everything possible to the boys in the service, as they so richly deserve. We are most anxious that the men in the armed services have the number of nurses they need. Many of our girls have enlisted and we shall do everything to encourage them to join the armed forces.

We do believe, however, that consideration should be given, when it is necessary to change policies, which will allow us to plan as early as possible for civilian needs in a proper manner.

I trust that the above information will help you in your decision on this very vital question.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. GILL,
Superintendent.

In conclusion, I make a fervent appeal for justice and fair treatment for the cadet nurse and urge you to oppose any legislation that specifies they must be drafted first in an effort to obtain a quota

before the draft is extended to the nursing profession as a whole.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, there is no disagreement in principle among the Members of this House. None of us likes this kind of legislation. In peacetimes, or even in Wartimes, unless there is presented a very emergent situation like we are in now, this kind of a bill would not survive for 10 minutes. We all want to do what is best to solve the problem.

But we have to be practical about the matter. We do not want to draft anybody, and we want to be sure that we treat those who are called into service with absolute fairness. But there are a few things that I would like to call attention to here if you adopt the pending amendment, which I think you will. The Bolton law is a very fine one and I actively supported it, but it was passed in anticipation of war needs. It was urged to meet the very situation we are now confronted with. We were already in the war at the time of its passage. The situation was then getting more serious every day. Everybody knew we had to have more nurses and were sure to need many more than were available at that time. So at a cost of \$132,000,000 we set up this corps, and 110,000 worthy, active, ambitious, patriotic young women, anxious to get a free education and also learn a profession, joined the Nurses Cadet Corps. Out of that 110,000 young women, about 9,000 have thus far graduated and about 2,500 as of today are actually in military service.

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

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

Mrs. BOLTON. Most of those girls are still in training.

Mr. THOMASON. Certainly they are in training, and I am sure many will enter the service when they graduate. I am talking about those who are actually in the military service now. It is right now, today, when we must have more nurses.

Mrs. BOLTON. All right, but you cannot expect student nurses to go into the service, so will the gentleman kindly change his figures?

Mr. THOMASON. I am sticking to the figures that 9,000 have graduated, and out of the total number only 2,500 are thus far in active military service.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is different.

Mr. THOMASON. That is exactly the statement I made, and I will stand by what I said. I tried to illustrate it in perhaps a crude way yesterday that there is probably not a Member of this body who does not have 100 applications for West Point and Annapolis pending at all times.

Thousands of fine young men at West Point and Annapolis are educated and graduated at the expense of the taxpayers of the country. They obligate themselves not to resign from the Army or the Navy for 2 or 4 years. I am not questioning the patriotism or the good motives of these fine young women, but at the same time to say that those healthy, active, and ambitious young nurses who have sought to come under

this program that was set up for this specific purpose do not have to render any kind of service in return except that which is voluntary makes the program not quite consistent, I think, with the purposes for which the law was passed. I have an idea they would not object to being called first. They entered the corps with that expectation.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman knows that the language of the law we are discussing states, "To provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries." It was set up for four groups, not just for the military.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman is correct. I actively supported the Bolton bill and I believe in it. Nevertheless, in our present emergency, I see no good reason why these young women should not be called first. Do not forget that under the terms of this bill no nurse under 20 years of age is even considered, and with the 3 years' training she would probably be 23, 24, or 25 years old. That is probably the average age. Most of them are unattached, unmarried, with no small children or other dependents. In most cases she should go before the woman 35 or 40 years old who is perhaps usefully employed in some civilian hospital, or who may be doing essential nursing in a private home or doctor's office. We cannot let sentiment run away with us. I do not want these women placed in a separate group or separate class, but they sought this kind of service and they are being educated at Government expense. I repeat that we are spending \$132,000,000 on the program with no obligation upon the part of the beneficiaries. They can quit, resign, seek other employment, or do nothing.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman knows full well that week after week, month after month, there has been a campaign to recruit girls for this purpose.

Mr. THOMASON. I would say the campaign has been quite successful.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman ought not to put it that the girls were seeking it. The Government was seeking the girls.

Mr. THOMASON. The girls wanted the training and counted themselves fortunate to get it. It was an opportunity to get a free education and learn a profession. I contend there was a reciprocal obligation for them to enter the military service if and when needed.

The gentleman does not mean to say there was any coercion in getting them into this service?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

Mr. THOMASON. There are 110,000 of those active, healthy young women in the service now. It seems to me that it is a peculiar thing to continue the program which has already cost \$132,000,000 if there is no kind of obligation in return.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman's position would certainly be unassailable if the original law had stated that they had any such obligation.

Mr. THOMASON. I grant that there was no compulsion in that law. Nevertheless, the war was on then, and getting worse every day. I think most of the Members of this body must admit that the purpose of that law, its real purpose and intent, was to get some young women trained for perhaps an emergency just like this, but it did provide that they might be used either for military or civilian purposes. The great need now is for the military—succor for our wounded men. We civilians can struggle along some way.

A very small percentage of the women between 30 and 45 years of age can pass the physical examination, especially for overseas service. Thousands in that age bracket are needed in our civilian hospitals and in private homes. These are all young women in perfect health, or they would have never been inducted into the Nurse Corps. They are ambitious and will be trained and efficient by the time they graduate. I dare say most of them want to go into military hospitals, and many would like to go overseas. They will join the 42,000 now in service, most of whom are mature and seasoned women of wide experience. They will be integrated with their seniors just as young soldiers who are placed in outfits with older men. They have few dependents or family ties that would interfere with their service. They have been trained at the taxpayers' expense to meet this very emergency. They have at least a moral obligation, and I am sure they want to do their full duty. It is only right and proper that they should go before older women, many of whom have children and who are not as physically fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is ordinarily more complete in his thinking and more logical in his arguments than he was in the speech just concluded. You cannot apply the rule on these cadet nurses that the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Ohio have suggested unless you set up a different principle than Congress has already followed in providing medical education for young men. There is no requirement that the boys who are getting a doctor's education today at the expense of the Government serve even 1 year of internship in a Government

hospital. Personally I believed there should have been—but I am not in favor of setting up retroactively a requirement that was not made for cadet doctors.

When the Committee on Military Affairs provided authorization for putting boys into the medical schools, they made no such requirement. The Committee on Military Appropriations finally became a little discouraged with that procedure and provided that no more men would be started in medical courses unless they had already been taking medicine. But the fact remains that hundreds of young men have been given a course in medicine with no requirement that they give any professional service to the Government in return. Therefore, you cannot apply this rule of economy or this rule of obligation, unless you set up a different rule than is now in force so far as men getting a medical education through the Army or Navy is concerned.

And that is the only argument which has been advanced for retaining this nurse cadet provision in the bill. On the contrary, there are three good arguments for taking it out.

In the first place, this provision in the bill is not necessary. As soon as those girls are graduated, they go into the pool of graduate nurses and are registered and are available for selection by the local boards.

In the second place, there is the question of the moral obligation, the good faith on the part of the Government. That is the representation made by the Surgeon General when these cadets were recruited. There is a moral obligation to make good the word, the understood word, of the Surgeon General, that the nurse cadets would have a choice between military or other essential nursing service. Take out this requirement of drafting them first and they remain on a basis of equality, at least, with other nurses.

The third objection to retaining this provision is that it means taking the youngest girls first. And to me that is the most persuasive reason of all. It is the argument that was made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. We lowered the draft age for boys last of all; shall we begin drafting girls by taking the youngest first? To send to front line duty? I hope not.

I had a letter from the Surgeon General's office on my desk this morning. In it he said that the passage of this bill will tap a pool of 46,000 registered graduate nurses in the country. If that be true, many of them, most of them are older than these girls who are just getting out of this Cadet Nurse Corps.

If in the wisdom of some selective-service board they pick first the graduate cadet nurses in their particular community, all well and good; it will be because the board conversant with the situation confronting the available nurses makes an understanding decision. But let us not tell these boards that they are required to send the youngest girls first. Let us strike this nurse cadet paragraph from the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered

by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

By all means this provision relating to graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps should be stricken from this bill. There are not a great number of these girls who would feel the impact of this amendment, because it is to be expected that those who graduate hereafter will come under the effect of the bill, because of the very fact that they will have freshly graduated into the nursing profession and will not be attached to some essential work.

The use of West Point as an example, I think, is not very good. Certainly there is no analogy. When a boy is appointed to West Point or the Naval Academy he goes there with the definite understanding that he is pledged to the service. But these girls who go to the nursing schools under the Bolton Act, go there for the purpose of being trained at the expense of the Government for any of several various services. There is nothing new about this. All through this war we have been training boys in vocational trades. We have spent not \$130,000,000, but many times that amount training our boys, giving them training in mechanics and all of the various trades in order that they might help carry on civilian production. I venture the assertion that had anyone come on this floor and proposed that those boys be lumped together in a special category to be drafted in a block before other boys throughout the country were drafted, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] would have been the first to oppose it.

Mr. THOMASON. They were not entering a profession.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They were trained at Government expense, and entering a trade. I am not going to split hairs over the definition of "trade" and "profession." It does not matter. They are trained at Government expense, and I think by the gentleman's answer he implies that he would not agree to have them put at the head of the list and drafted before other boys in the country are drafted. Yet that is what he proposes to do with these girls who are trained in exactly the same way.

If we want to change the requirements under the Bolton Act, let us amend the Bolton Act. Let us amend it so as to require one of these girls when she goes into training to sign a contract agreeing to go into Government service in the event her services are needed. If you want to go further than that, let us say to all of those who are in training now, "You came in under a contract under which you pledged you would prepare yourself to enter into the armed services or into the Public Health Service or in Veterans' Administration or into essential private nursing. No particular place did you promise you would take. We have decided that is not the proper policy. If you want to continue taking this course you must sign a new contract. If you do not want to sign it, you just drop out." I think that would be fair; I think that would be reasonable; I think it would be in keeping with what we have done in other programs as we have gone along.

Let me tell you what will happen in the event the Bulwinkle amendment is not agreed to. General Hines testified before our committee that he was having a very difficult time getting and keeping nurses in the Veterans' Administration. Remember it is only a short step from treatment of the wounded in Army and Navy hospitals to treatment of the disabled veteran in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. Certainly one is just as necessary as the other. Yet, if you defeat this amendment you are providing that none of these nurses can go into the Veterans' Administration. Of those who have gone heretofore, every one of them must be taken out, because you provide they must be drafted first. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], relating to the Procurement and Assignment Service, left in it the last sentence in section 2, subsection (c), which provides that that provision shall not apply to graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a little confusion on the whole matter of the Cadet Nurse Corps which should be cleared up.

Let us go back to the year the bill was proposed. If you will read the testimony before the committee at that time you will find that the Army played a very small part in all the considerations. Several of the witnesses mentioned it at that time but many did not speak of it at all, but emphasis was laid upon the tremendous need of the entire country of nurses for total war. In 1940 the Army had opportunity to open up its nurses "West Point," the Army School of Nursing and refused to do so. I think this fact makes a definite contribution to the present discussion.

It then became necessary to find a way for civilian hospitals to enlarge their student facilities and so to supply additional nurses. It took 2 years to develop a plan which could raise the whole level of nurse procedure and methods of education and sufficiently increase the Nation's student body. It was as a result of that national need that the Congress passed what became Public Law 74. The statute as enacted included no provision for the assignment of students upon graduation. Proposals had been made for a federalized corps as I said a moment ago, the members of which would have been subject to direct Government control, but these were abandoned in the plan of enrollment in the various schools which furnished training. Then, in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor an amendment was proposed establishing priorities of availability for military,

Veterans' Administration, and essential civilian nursing service in the order named; but that was rejected. The act does provide for a definite preference at one point only where it provides for the compulsory transfer of students to Federal hospitals in the final period of training. Here, however, the compulsion was upon the school, not upon the student.

I have a letter which I wish to read from a cadet nurse:

CADET NURSES' DRAFT

NEW YORK HOSPITAL,
New York City, March 3, 1945.

MY DEAR MRS. BOLTON: In just a few days my class will enter its senior cadet period here at the New York Hospital Cornell University School of Nursing. I am president of our senior class. This letter is a small attempt to carry to you our thoughts on the nurse-draft bill as we understand it, about to appear before the House.

We were the first class to enter training after war was declared. With few exceptions we are composed of girls who would have entered training regardless of the acute world situation. At the end of our first years' training the Cadet Corps was established because "the armed forces required thousands more graduate nurses, and many hospitals had been forced to refuse patients due to insufficient number of nurses."

The girls in our class did not join the corps for either of these reasons, or for the financial benefits to be received, because we had passed this stage as we began to serve as we learned.

We enlisted in the Cadet Corps to assure the Federal Government that we would remain in essential nursing. When we enlisted we asked if our right to decide the branch of essential nursing we would be of the most use and do our best work in would be hindered in any way. We were always told that we signed to remain in essential nursing and this was all that would be expected of us.

Most of us plan to enter the service after we take State board examinations; but we feel that it is not fair to discriminate against cadet nurses for, after all, we signed to remain in essential nursing in good faith with firm intentions of contributing our best to the war effort.

The graduations from the United States Cadet Nurse Corps prior to January 1, 1945, were 10,000. Graduations between January 1 and June 30 of this year will amount to 6,000, a total of 16,000. None of these young women has received more than a part of her training from the Government.

Four thousand failed to meet Army standards, mostly for physical reasons. Four thousand entered military service prior to January 1, 1945, and 1,500 married. That is a total of 9,500.

The net available number of graduates from the United States Cadet Nurse Corps to June 30, 1945, will be 6,500. Many of these young women are volunteering for service. Many more will do so.

It seems to me that we have heard some very moving reasons for not taking this youngest of all of our groups. I wish you all could have been abroad with me, I wish you could have seen the situation into which this would plunge the very youngest, the most inexperienced in nursing and in life. I feel quite certain if you had you would vote in favor of the pending amendment.

I submit Mr. Chairman that the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] should be accepted.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, may I say just a word about this amendment in addition to what was said yesterday. These girls were recruited under this little brochure which was put out by the United States Public Health Service portraying what its legal counsel advised the Bolton law we had passed really meant. On the back of this brochure it says:

Enlist today in a proud profession. The Corps requires—

And the word is italicized—

you to make but one promise, that you will remain in essential nursing, civilian or military, for the duration of the war. The choice is yours.

In view of that language, how can it be maintained that these girls are already under obligation to go into military nursing and are slackers if they don't?

I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] said. If the girls should have been required to pledge themselves for military service, then it was the mistake of Congress not to say so plainly in the law. We should not punish the girls for our mistake. They entered in good faith on the assumption that we meant what the law and the brochure said. If we want to modify and amend the Bolton Act so that those who join the corps hereafter or who are now in the corps must take a pledge to go into the military service first of all, otherwise drop out, that is legitimate; but it seems to me for us to change the rules in the middle of the game and make the change retroactive is a plain breach of faith. I do not like a breach of faith, even if it would have some practical advantages, and I like it even less when I believe it will give poorer rather than better results.

That is the second objection I have to section 2 (b) of the bill, and the second reason why I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, namely, that under the bill as it is written it will not get all the nurses we need as quickly as it is said we need them. There will be only 6,500 of these Cadet Corps graduates available, if you take all of them, and the services want 18,000 or 20,000 nurses. Why should we tell all the other nurses who are available, thousands of them in this country, many of whom have even volunteered and have not yet been accepted, that they do not need to hurry, it is to be our plain policy not to take them until all the graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps who are under their particular Selective Service Board's jurisdiction are taken first?

The main objective of this whole legislation is to get more nurses quickly. And yet here we say to one group, "Wait until we take all in this other group." That, it seems to me, would defeat the very objective that we have in mind.

The third objection to the provision of the bill is that it endangers the whole

future supply of nurses in this country, in my opinion. The students in this corps are doing today about 80 percent of the nursing in the civilian hospitals of the country and if they are discriminated against and many of them withdraw, as they can and have a perfect right to do, it will greatly endanger our work in war industries, in our health agencies, in the civilian hospitals, and in the veterans' hospitals as well as in the military forces.

We can grab this one particular egg of 6,500 nurses but I do not want to risk killing the goose that laid that egg, and which, if we leave it alone, will lay a great many more eggs for the years ahead. Our nursing needs are going to be acute not only this year but next year and during the next 5 years, and we must not, in my judgment, jeopardize the flow of highly qualified and high-grade girls into this nursing corps. A spot check last week in 13 Washington hospitals revealed that 85 percent are intending to apply for military service. Last January a poll of the cadet nurses at the University of Minnesota Hospital, the largest unit in the United States, showed that almost 100 percent intended to go into military service. Thus, we will get all qualified girls anyway, either by volunteering or when they are inducted by their Selective Service boards—inducted just like other graduate nurses and not because they have been cadet nurses.

Thus, I cannot see any real advantages in keeping this provision in the bill. It will not get us as many nurses or as quickly as we need them, and it will not give our men as good nursing service as if these young girls had more experience or at least were taken along with older, more mature nurses. On the other hand I can see some real disadvantages to our essential civilian nursing services, now and in the future. Well, if there are no real advantages, and there are some real disadvantages in retaining section 2 (b) in the bill, then surely common sense dictates that we should strike it out by supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. PFEIFER].

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] striking out that provision demanding immediate service for these graduates in the Cadet Nursing Corps. Please remember that the majority of these young ladies are very immature. Some are still children. They are all active, all want to be loyal. They are undergoing a course of instruction that is far inferior to the graduate nurses of today; in fact, their instructors and instructresses are handicapped due to the war and they are going through an accelerated course, many of them getting out in 2 years or 2½ years on the average. Some will be taken out of their instruction courses within 6 months of graduation, and the Lord knows what is going to happen to these youngsters when they are taken and sent overseas according to this bill.

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

Mr. PFEIFER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Yesterday I talked with the supervisor of a very large medical school, and she told me that it would be tragic if this bill passed without this amendment. The average age of the girls is 19 to 20.

Mr. PFEIFER. That is true. Many of them are only 18 to 19. They are still so immature. Something must have happened to our young ladies of today because they are so anxious to serve; to see the girls in high school 15, 16, and 17 years of age speaking of and ready to go into the Nurse Corps. Our men overseas want experienced women. They want women who know how to take care of those where help is necessary. These girls are inexperienced and will be inexperienced for some time to come. They are inexperienced and inferior in the same proportion as we are turning out inferior doctors today. Many of the doctors cannot get internships, and if they do, they are taken out and given service overseas. Their accelerated course at college and lack of training, certainly does not make a good doctor and that comparison holds true as to the cadet nurse.

Let us be serious about this. Every one of the registered nurses I know of is only too anxious to serve if given the proper recognition. I feel if some more power had been given to the Procurement and Assignment Division of the War Manpower Commission, this bill would never have been before the House, for the Army would have had their quota.

I am in favor of incorporating in this bill the selection of male nurses, because there is a field for that particular group. They are highly trained, they are skilled, and why not recognize them as such? I hope the Members of this House will give it deep consideration and thought and adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], also the amendment that will be offered tomorrow to include the male nurses.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I know of no particular disposition to rush this matter through, but I have had so many inquiries that I should like to ask if it is the intention of the Committee to finish the bill today.

Mr. MAY. As far as I am concerned, being in charge of the bill, I have concluded that we shall probably not get all of the amendments disposed of by 5 o'clock, and it is my intention to move that the Committee rise at 5 o'clock. I hope to get as many amendments disposed of between now and then as possible.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it the gentleman's idea that if a separate vote is demanded on any amendment the vote will go over until tomorrow?

Mr. MAY. Of course, that vote will be taken in the House, after the Committee has completed its consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, lines 1 and 5, strike out "registered" in each such line and insert "graduate registered professional"; and on page 4, after line 2, insert "As used in this section, the term 'graduate registered professional nurse' shall be deemed to include the following designations which are in official usage and are protected by law in the various States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia: 'Registered nurse,' 'graduate nurse,' 'trained nurse,' 'certified nurse,' 'licensed nurse,' and 'professional nurse.'"

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, under the laws of the several States there are different designations of graduate nurses and the nurses who are registered under the laws of the different States are designated by the several terms embraced in this amendment. The only purpose of the amendment is to make it certain that whatever the designation is, whether "registered nurse" or "graduate nurse" or "professional nurse," or whatever it may be, it shall be included in the legislation.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, line 4, before "school", insert "State accredited."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this merely means that these nurses must be graduates of some State accredited school. This amendment has been requested not only by the services but by the nurse organizations.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 2, line 17, after "thereunder", insert "No person who, as a member of any religious organization, association, or sect, has taken a vow or vows, consecrating her life to religious service, shall be classified by any agency as available for induction into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act."

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am sure I have no objection to this amendment. There is one question I would like to raise as to the proper place for it in the bill. There has been an amendment adopted following the word "thereunder" and I do not know just what shape it will get the bill

into so far as draftsmanship is concerned.

Mr. O'HARA. As the gentleman from Kentucky will appreciate, I had prepared the amendment taking into consideration the language of the bill as it was presented to the House. I think this amendment should be contained in section 2 (a).

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment being adopted at this point with the understanding, of course, that if it is out of place it can be put in the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 8, line 14, after the comma, insert "and in each and every case before making any such decision the Procurement and Assignment Service shall ascertain and give full consideration to the number of nurses who were engaged in essential nursing services on September 16, 1940, in the territorial jurisdiction of the local board having jurisdiction of the case under consideration, the number so engaged on the date of the last prior available report thereof (which must be not more than 30 days old), and the number of nurses of the area who have been inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States; so that no such area shall be penalized because of an unusually large number of its nurses who have responded patriotically to the call for volunteers for nursing service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is just to make sure that no area under the jurisdiction of the local board will be penalized for the patriotism of its nurses. In other words, this bill covers all nurses in the age limits. In Dallas County, Ala., and there may be dozens of others, though Dallas County leads the Nation, we have a situation where more than half of all the nurses in that county have already volunteered and are already in the land or naval service of our Government in this war. Therefore, when you say that all nurses in that area shall be subject to induction without taking into consideration the number of those nurses who have already volunteered, it simply wipes the slate clean and takes away all of the few remaining nurses now doing double duty to meet civilian necessities. I understand that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], has in mind to offer an amendment a little later which will take care of such situations. If that be true, and if the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] will accomplish the same purpose this amendment seeks to subserve, then, of course, I have no objection to withdrawing my amendment. But I would like to have an official declaration by the committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I have already announced a couple of times on the floor, I believe, that at the appropriate time and place in the consideration of this bill and after I have

completed my amendment, I will offer an amendment, as an amendment or in the form of a substitute, as the parliamentary situation may require, which will put this legislation into the Selective Service Act as title 2 of that law, which as I understand takes care of the question of quotas. That will be done.

Mr. HOBBS. The opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is that that will cover the ground and cause Procurement and Assignment Service and the Local Selective Service Board to take into account, in ordering the induction of nurses, the number of nurses who have already volunteered and are in the military or naval service of our country?

Mr. MAY. Yes; that is the situation exactly.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. It seems to me if we rely on this being put in as title II of the act, that we may lay this open to the same condition which now pertains, namely that it is a question of quotas by local boards, assigned to it by some State headquarters or some Federal headquarters to a State, and so many for each local board. I would believe that the gentleman's amendment is good at this point, and in order to obviate exactly the thing he is talking about it should be agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, but in accordance with the assurance given by the chairman that this identical amendment would be covered by one he proposes to offer, and the further knowledge that my amendment is in line with the general practice under the Selective Training and Service Act, I have no desire to press the point, knowing full well that if it should be construed otherwise later, we will have the support of you and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs as well as the chairman in making the meaning of the law clear, that no such inequity and unjust discrimination against any patriotically cooperative area is to be practiced or tolerated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. In view of the fact that the Selective Service System is known to have issued rules and regulations pursuant to an agreement in the course of debate on the floor of one of these two bodies, it is quite possible that the Selective Service System may recognize that the House has agreed to the position of the gentleman from Alabama, but I am sure that the present regulation under title I, or what will be title I, will not be adequate for the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. HOBBS. As I understand, this bill is to become title II of the Selective Training and Service Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAY. On page 4 of the bill it provides for regulations and reads:

Such regulations may provide for the classification, selection for induction, and induction of females pursuant to this act under procedures and quotas different from those governing men.

At that point I expect to offer this amendment:

But the quotas shall be determined in a manner similar to that covering the determination of quotas for men, and in filling such quotas there shall be allowed credits similar to those governing the fixing and filling of quotas for men.

When that provision is adopted it will certainly take care of the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman. May I request further the gentleman's statement with regard to the Procurement and Assignment Service? Is not the purpose of that Service primarily to do this job in accordance with the manifest intent and purpose of my amendment?

Mr. MAY. My understanding is that that is the way it is done by the Procurement and Assignment Service, based on quotas, and that they take all those considerations into account when they make them available to the Selective Service System.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield, gladly, to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. On page A963 of the Appendix of the RECORD you can find this information in regard to quotas for the entire United States.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am so glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then I understand the gentleman's amendment proposes that the quota of nurses in the community on a certain date be retained so that there will not be an excess as between different communities?

Mr. HOBBS. Not exactly. I merely ask that on any given date the Procurement and Assignment Service be directed to ascertain what the facts are and then to give them consideration before they induct any additional nurse from the

area as to which the facts have been ascertained and fully considered.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would that be equitable in all parts of the United States?

Mr. HOBBS. I believe it would be, sir; absolutely.

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

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, under the assurance that has been given, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Any registrant under this act inducted into the land or naval forces shall be assigned only to duty in which her professional nursing skills and training will be used in accordance with military requirements. No registrant under this act shall be considered disqualified for nursing service in the land or naval forces merely because the school of nursing in which she received her training was affiliated with a hospital not having a specified minimum number of beds or patients.

Sec. 4. The President is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such regulations may provide for the classification, selection for induction, and induction of females pursuant to this act under procedures and quotas different from those governing men. The provisions of section 10 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, are hereby made applicable to the power of the President under this section. For the purposes of section 11 of such act, regulations issued under this section shall be deemed to have been issued under such act.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 4, line 17, before the period insert ", but the quotas shall be determined in a manner similar to that governing determination of the quotas for men, and in fixing and filling such quotas there shall be allowed credits similar to those governing the fixing and filling of the quotas for men."

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. MAY. I yield; yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What will be the effect of the language the gentleman suggests in this amendment in counties that have a very small number of nurses? I refer particularly to the language that states that the boards shall follow the methods used in selecting men. It presents to my mind the fact that some counties, especially those with no hospitals, may have a very small number of nurses, possibly only one or two. If they have any quota at all it might take the only nurses they have.

Mr. MAY. No; the quotas established for men under the Selective Training and Service Act were based on the number

of registrants available in the various communities. In some communities of course where the population was dense more were taken and where it was sparse fewer were taken. This will apply to nurses in the same way. If there were a nurse population in the community of 15, their pro rata number would probably be 5.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it the population of the community or the population of nurses that is used as a base?

Mr. MAY. The population of nurses available for induction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even so in counties or communities having very few nurses it might take the only nurses they have.

Mr. KILDAY rose.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. KILDAY. Under the existing law the quotas are based on those registered and not deferred. If you are going to fix your quotas on the basis of nurses that you have under the Selective Training and Service Act it will be based entirely on those registered with the local board and not deferred.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think possibly the point the gentleman brings up on deferment will take care of the situation.

Mr. MAY. That is the way I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DURHAM) there were—ayes 123, noes 3.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. This act shall apply to unmarried women only but shall not affect the voluntary recruitment of any qualified women for the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, or the Nurse Corps of Naval Reserve, or the appointment of members of such corps as commissioned officers as now provided by law.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON: On page 4, beginning in line 23, strike out "shall apply to unmarried women only but."

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, my proposal is that this act shall apply to married women as well as unmarried women. The married women who would be included would be those not deferred under the Selective Service Act because under section 5 (e) there is very ample recognition of dependence and home responsibilities.

The last thing in the world the Army wants to do or that any of us who are so reluctantly accepting the possibility of the need for a draft bill wants to do is interfere with woman's first responsibility, which is definitely her home, but homes today are subject to the war. In many instances married women are living alone, they are nursing here and

there, perhaps they have put their children, if they have them, under the care of mothers and fathers, and they are going to be just as carefully screened as it is humanly possible to screen them.

We recognize that there is a great deal of mail coming back from overseas. The men are writing to their wives and sweethearts, "Do not join up. We do not want you to come over. We married you to have a home. That is what we are fighting for."

That is such a human reaction that one has intense sympathy with it, but war is not a human thing; it is truly inhuman. There are a great many women who are married whose one longing is to get into it too. They want to do their bit beside their men, knowing that out of it is going to come a wholly new companionship and understanding, for each will speak the other's language. That language will be the language of tomorrow's world.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The bill as written now would not prevent the voluntary enrollment of married women as nurses?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, it would not prevent the voluntary enrollment of married nurses, but it might suggest marriage as a means of avoiding induction. It would not seem wise to open that up as a method of deferment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentlewoman not believe that that might be corrected by a simple amendment putting in the date on which they could be inducted?

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that is a very complicated thing to do.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am just fearful that the draft boards will do what they have done with the farmers and take them regardless of replacement or their necessary essential occupations.

Mrs. BOLTON. I recognize the dangers very well, but I do believe that we are not justified in taking only unmarried women. I think the scope of the bill should be broadened to include all nurses within the age bracket.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am one of those who has been concerned with what might be the effect if married women are subjected to the provisions of this bill. Would the gentlewoman point out to us specifically the protection that would be left in the bill, if her amendment prevails, to reach those cases of married women who have dependency responsibilities or family responsibilities who should be deferred?

Mrs. BOLTON. To answer the gentleman's question: Of course, in the bill as written it is subject to the Selective Service Act. Under section 5 (e) are the provisions to protect the home. I know that selective-service groups are working very earnestly, determined that adequate protection shall be given.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentlewoman from Ohio has, as we all know, been very studious and diligent in her investigation of this whole matter. Is it her opinion that if her amendment prevails, the provisions of the Selective Service Act generally apropos of deferments are sufficient to reach this particular type of selective-service action which undertakes to bring to the armed services the women who are registered nurses and for the first time proceeds to draft people by classification or skill?

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say to the gentleman that I cannot guarantee that, but the extent of the study I have been able to make of it and the talks that I have had in relation to it inclines me to say, yes; I think the protection is there.

Mr. HALLECK. One further question. In line with what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] has inquired about, he inquired as to whether it might not be possible to fix the date at which time a woman, to be deferred, must be married. Would it not be a perfectly simple matter to write such language into the bill and thereby reach those cases where it is said that registered nurses now unmarried may become married for possibly the only purpose of avoiding induction under this bill?

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman mean that that would exclude all other married women?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; it would exclude women who are married today and who would be married, say, up to the effective date of the act.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is just exactly what I feel is unfortunate, because there is a wealth of good nursing material that wants to go in and which should go in and should be taken in under a draft law if we have one, who would be exempted under that suggested specification as I understand it.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as I understand the situation which presently exists, a married woman who can meet the qualifications can now enlist in the Army or the Navy Nursing Corps.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; she may volunteer.

Mr. HALLECK. So that the thing we are dealing with here and now is induction rather than voluntary enlistment?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I have an amendment which would be in order if the gentlewoman's amendment fails, fixing the effective date when unmarried women who subsequently marry can be inducted.

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

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am opposed to this bill. May I ask the gentlewoman this question? I have noticed in the hearings and in the RECORD yesterday and in the proceedings today that several times the gentlewoman has spoken as if she were reluctant to accept the idea that this draft is necessary. Is that right? If the gentlewoman does not mind answering, does she really think this is necessary, or can we get the required number of nurses by voluntary enlistment?

Mrs. BOLTON. May I answer the gentlewoman in this way: I understand we may have an amendment before us which would make the draft effective only if and when voluntary enlistment does not provide the required number of nurses. I think there is no one in the House as reluctant as I to draft the nurses, who have been so magnificent in their response; but our boys are dying overseas.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is there a doubt in the gentlewoman's mind that they have given women an adequate chance to get in by voluntary methods?

Mrs. BOLTON. The difficulty is, as others have said, that had we done this and that and the other we would have had enough nurses: Had the War Department never said last year that it did not need more than 40,000 nurses, and had the administration never led us to believe that peace was practically here, we would have had the nurses. But that is all water over the dam. We are in a situation where we do not have the nurses and we must have them.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentlewoman knows they will never make a serious attempt as long as they think they can get conscription and use force.

Mrs. BOLTON. A serious attempt is being made at this moment, one that will bring all possible information to all who need it and which should apply the peculiarly American method of social pressure. I refer to the campaign formally launched on Monday of this week which began on the air several weeks ago.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON: On page 4, lines 23 and 24, strike out the words "shall apply to unmarried women only" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(other than the provisions requiring registration) shall not apply to married women."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make the provisions for registration apply to married women as well as unmarried women, but prevent their induction at this time. In other words, we would provide the armed services and the other associations interested with a complete inventory of the nursing profession in the United States, married as well as unmarried, but would not at this time permit the induction of married women.

It is true that this bill carries into the provisions affecting nurses the provisions for deferment, and so forth, of the Se-

lective Service Act, but we have had very unfortunate experiences with the Selective Service System, especially when under the control of the War Manpower Commission, which will have certain controls under this act. Our experience has been such that I do not believe we should rely upon them to enforce those deferments as we intend them to be and as we hope they will be enforced.

The gentleman from Indiana has mentioned our experience with them in connection with the Tydings amendment as to farmers. We also had the same and even a sadder experience, I think, with them in connection with granting deferments to men with families. I say we have not yet reached the condition that we should be disrupting families in the Nation. When you consider the alarming rate at which juvenile delinquency is increasing, in spite of all the efforts to control it, I say at this time we should not place it in the power of any administrative bureau to further disrupt family life in the United States.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield briefly.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. May I ask the gentleman if I understand correctly that his amendment seeks to make it mandatory that all women within these ages shall also register?

Mr. KILDAY. All qualified women or nurses.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. All qualified women should register?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is, married or single?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. But that only the unmarried women would be obligated under the provision of the law?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. In other words, if our experience shows that we cannot get an adequate nursing force, then all the information is available, the registrations are there, and it is a simple proposition to include them under the provisions of the law.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Does not the gentleman believe, even though we leave it as in the bill today, that only unmarried women are taken, that we should fix the date of enactment of this act as the date on which they must be unmarried?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not remember the position that the gentleman took in 1940 when we were working on the Selective Service Act, but the gentleman will recall at that time, even though it was especially true in time of emergency, a majority of the committee, and I think of the House, refused to include such a provision relating to men. I do not know why such a provision should be incorporated into this act at the present time. I think that the number of professional women who would marry for the purpose of avoiding service under this act would be negligible. But I do know some old boys down in Texas to whom you had better not say you are going to draft their wives. I know some down there who will take pretty quick personal action against a local board who sends out word that there is any

intention on their part of drafting the wife out of the home until such time as we find ourselves to be in that dire necessity. I think this is a mighty poor position for us to take—that we are going to draft the wives of soldiers who are at the front and for the soldier to come back from the war and find that his wife has been sent to the opposite end of the world for military service. At this time our situation is not so stringent as to demand this action.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH. Does not the gentleman believe that the married women without children should be included in this induction?

Mr. KILDAY. No, I can not agree that married women without children should be. I think at this time we do not need to go any farther than the unmarried women. Many of these women without children are wives of soldiers who are serving at the various war fronts. Those soldiers are hoping to come home and find their wives. I think when they come back home they should not be confronted with a situation brought about by the action of Congress by which the Congress has sent their wives to another theater of operation.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be given 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment which would put in a date so as to not make it possible for someone to marry after that date and thereby avoid coming under the provisions of the law?

Mr. KILDAY. I discussed that in response to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. It was not done with the Selective Service Act generally, even though it was at that time proposed. I do not think you are going to face any great deluge of these professional women rushing to the altar in order to avoid service under this act.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to say something that is not generally known. The gentleman is speaking of breaking up families. I agree with you, they should not be broken up. As a returned veteran, I would like to say there is a rule in the Army that a woman is not allowed to be in the same area where her husband is. So if you are going to draft these married women, we had better look into that rule that is quietly in effect, that if you are married, you are kept out of any combat area, but if you are single you can go into that same area with the same qualifications.

Mr. KILDAY. Which might result in a returned veteran finding his wife in the opposite theater.

Mr. FULTON. She might be in the Pacific theater while he is in the European theater. I have been trying to say that these people want to go over and join their husbands and work in the same combat area. I ask the Army—"Why not, if they have qualifications?"

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman that under my amendment, that class could still volunteer.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the amendment more or less penalize those who may now be unmarried? If they get married, would it not be implied that they are getting married in order to avoid service in the nursing profession?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I do not believe that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has again expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I simply wanted to say to the gentleman from Texas that I am heartily in agreement with him on this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. I am glad to hear that. It is the first time in 6 years that we have agreed.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think we have been in agreement on other things, but I hope the House will adopt this amendment. I think it would be disastrous to the legislation if you strike out the clause in the bill or do not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. I know of many organizations of highest repute who will oppose this bill if married women are taken.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment. I do not know how many other amendments there are. I should like to know before we agree to this.

Mr. MAY. I will modify it to make it 10 minutes after 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 10 minutes after 5 o'clock.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it has been my understanding that the committee was to rise at 5 o'clock. Already there is an amendment and a substitute. The matter is complicated. The question has been raised as to whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas should not have added to it some provision relative to the date upon which it might be effective.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman from Indiana have any suggestion as to how much time we should take on these amendments?

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding was that the committee was to rise at 5 o'clock. It is now 10 minutes until 5 o'clock.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman suggest the length of time for this amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know. It would seem to me that this is an inopportune time to undertake to limit debate.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendment thereto close in 30 minutes. I will make this explanation that I do not expect to insist that they be disposed of this evening.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, there are 3 separate amendments pending.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, 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. 2277, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a speech I made on Sunday which was proclaimed Poland Day by the Governor of Maryland, and also a copy of the Governor's proclamation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have just received from Judge Vinson, and several other newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain telegrams and letters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the debt limit. It exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing. I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that it will

cost \$104. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the estimate, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent to the Attorney General of the United States in reference to the Petroleum Administration for War.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial with reference to Hon. Fred M. Vinson, a former Member of this House.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I may address the House for 10 minutes after the completion of the legislative business for the day and the other special orders already entered.

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

There was no objection.

THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, our newspapers of late have been pouring out a veritable torrent of misrepresentation and abuse about Poland, her past and present history, as well as her government. The great bulk of this detraction and venom has been published by high-priced and supposedly well-informed columnists, although many editorials, too, have been written which are as unfounded and unfair as those which are written by prompted and sadly deficient column scribblers. That those articles are in error could be proved here in countless instances but rarely, if ever, do you see published an admission of error or a correction.

In the interest of fairness, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement of His Excellency Jan Ciechanowski, the Polish Ambassador, published in the Washington Post of March 5, 1945, and I trust it will be read attentively by Poland's defamers before adverse and unfounded comment is made for American consumption.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may extend his remarks as indicated.

There was no objection.

REPLIES TO MR. LIPPMANN

I have hitherto refrained from reacting to inaccuracies concerning Poland in some of Mr. Walter Lippmann's articles. However, the importance and number of Mr. Lippmann's misstatements concerning my country in his article Poland After Yalta which appeared in your paper on March 1 compel me to ask you in the name of fairness kindly to publish the following facts in rectification of Mr. Lippmann's assertions.

In his Poland After Yalta Mr. Lippmann writes about Poland's eastern territory—"territory which Poland conquered in 1922."

This statement is untrue; Poland came into possession of this territory not in 1922, but on March 18, 1921, by virtue of a freely negotiated peace treaty between Poland, Soviet Russia, and the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, signed at Riga. The official Great Soviet Encyclopedia in its edition of 1940 (after the Ribbentrop-Molotov partition of Poland) states verbatim on pages 247 and 248:

"On March 18, 1921, the peace treaty was signed. . . . The new Polish-Soviet frontier meant for the Poles much worse conditions in comparison to those which the Soviet Government suggested to Poland . . . in April 1920. The frontier determined after the Polish-Soviet War runs 50 to 100 kilometers to the west of the line which was suggested at the beginning of the war. This means that Soviet Russia emerged victorious also from this struggle against the forces of counterrevolution."

Mr. Lippmann continues:

"In 1935 this military dictatorship" (in Poland) "transformed itself into a totalitarian state."

This statement is likewise untrue. In reality the Pilsudski regime functioned from 1926 until 1935 under the Polish Constitution of 1921, which Mr. Lippmann himself called democratic. Twice free elections were held during that period, a fact which obviously disproves the author's accusation regarding the existence of a military dictatorship. During both these elections all political parties, including the Communist Party, and, obviously, the Ukrainian, Jewish, and White Ruthenian minorities, put forward and elected their own candidates to the house and to the senate. In the 1928 elections the parties opposing Pilsudski won a large majority. In 1930 these parties introduced into the house and senate a minority only slightly smaller than the pro-Pilsudski majority.

Contrary to Mr. Lippmann's assertion, even after 1935 Poland never became a totalitarian state. The new constitution of April 23, 1935, in article V, guaranteed to its citizens, "liberty of conscience, speech, and assembly"; in its article VII, stated that "the right of citizens . . . cannot be restricted by origin, religion, sex, or nationality"; in its article VIII, stated that "labor is the basis of the development and power of the republic. The state extends protection over labor and supervises its conditions."

The chief aim of the 1935 constitution, as compared with the one of 1921, was to strengthen the power of the President of the Polish Republic. The corresponding part of the new constitution was patterned upon the American Constitution without, however, extending the powers of the President of Poland as far as those of America's Chief Executive. To quote one basic instance, both the house and the senate had the right to demand "the dismissal of the cabinet or of any of its ministers" (vote of lack of confidence—Articles XXXI and XLVI of the Polish constitution).

Mr. Lippmann further states:

"All political parties were outlawed except one, known as the Camp of National Unity."

This statement is totally untrue. No political party was outlawed and all of them continued to function until the occupation of Polish territory by Germany and Russia in September 1939. Freedom of press like-

wise was maintained throughout the peace period, each political party freely publishing its daily, weekly, or monthly organs. This fact disproves Mr. Lippmann's gratuitous misstatement that Poland was a totalitarian state. Elections for mayors of cities and all other officeholders of local self-government were freely held both in the period preceding as well as after the enactment of the 1935 constitution. Many townships and communities had mayors and other officers elected on the opposition party tickets. To quote one outstanding instance: In the second largest Polish city of Lodz, the Social Democratic Party, a party strongly opposed to the government, won an overwhelming victory in free elections held in 1938, when Mr. Jan Kwapiński, chairman of the Polish Trade Unions' Federation and now a member of the Polish Government in London, was elected mayor of Lodz.

Mr. Lippmann writes that:

"The present Polish Government in London . . . was not created by free elections."

I must leave it to Mr. Lippmann to devise the means by which a government in exile could be freely elected by the people of a country under enemy domination.

Mr. Lippmann states: "Poland of 1939 with . . . its antagonism to all its neighbors, not only Germany and Russia, but also Lithuania and Czechoslovakia . . . with its totalitarian constitution, etc."

Every word of this statement is untrue. Poland had signed pacts of nonaggression which had not lapsed when she was attacked in 1939, namely, with Russia in 1932 and 1934, and with Germany in 1934. Poland re-established diplomatic relations with Lithuania in 1938 and remained in friendly relations with Czechoslovakia during the whole time of the independence of both states until the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Germany in 1939.

Mr. Lippmann's assertion that "Poland with its feudal landlordism" . . . is flatly disproved by the irrefutable statistical fact that due to the parcellation of large estates by the Polish Government in the prewar period from 1922 to 1939—five-sixths (over 81 percent) of Poland's farmland consisted of small farms of under 125 acres in size.

J. CIECHANOWSKI,
Ambassador of Poland.

WASHINGTON, March 2.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 2023) 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 (Rept. No. 267), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) 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. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and

the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] is recognized for 45 minutes.

SHALL UNCLE SAM AGAIN BECOME THE FINANCIAL SCAPEGOAT FOR THE WORLD?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after World War No. 1, Uncle Sam permitted himself to become the financial scapegoat of the world. Is history about to repeat itself? Is Uncle Sam again to become the financial scapegoat of the world—again destined to assume the financial sins of all the peoples of the earth? These questions are troubling me. They are questions that this Congress must face and answer in the days ahead. In the time allotted to me today I propose to review the past—especially the part we played as the financial scapegoat for the world after the last war, to take stock of the present, and to look forward to the future. I do this in the hope that, to some extent at least, I may impress upon the membership of this House the seriousness of the financial problems that confront us, and perhaps warn the Members against the financial dangers that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, mass delusions are not rare, but a delusion affecting the mentality of the entire world at one time was unknown until the First World War. That universal delusion affected the financial world. It pertained to the subject of international credits. It was a delusion which caused us to lose, in Government loans to foreign nations, \$14,523,593,627.73, and many billions of dollars more in private loans floated through the banks by our former allies, as well as by our former enemies. In addition to this, our South American and Central American neighbors floated other dollar loans which are in default. Altogether it has been estimated that something in the neighborhood of \$29,000,000,000 worth of goods and services were exported from the United States to foreign nations in the period from 1917 to 1930. When we ceased to give other nations the credit with which to buy our goods they quit buying the goods. This resulted in a depression greater than any hitherto known in America, and our debtors, with the exception of brave little Finland, proceeded to default on their loans. That was an expensive delusion for us.

The general shape of that world-wide delusion can be indicated by three of its familiar features:

(a) The idea that the cure for debt is more credit.

(b) A social and political doctrine, now widely accepted, based upon the false premise that people are entitled to certain betterments of life and must be permitted to secure them on credit, if they have not the cash to buy them with.

(c) The argument that prosperity is a product of credit; whereas from the beginning of economic thought it has always been supposed that prosperity results from an increase in and an exchange of real wealth.

The idea that the cure for debt is more credit began with the First World War. Without credit that war could not have continued longer than 4 months. With benefit of credit it lasted more than 4 years. Victory followed the credit, but the price was an appalling debt.

In Europe the war debt was both internal and external. In America the war debt was internal only. While engaged in that war we loaned our associates more than \$10,000,000,000. We do not know today how many billions of dollars we have given and loaned to our allies during this war, but we do know that the money we have loaned will not be repaid, that it will all be canceled or defaulted, just as the First World War debts were. Europe's method of meeting her debt, both internal and external, was a resort to further credit. She called upon this country for immense sums of private credit, sums which before the war were unimaginable. With one voice the European nations cried out that unless American credit provided them the ways and means to begin moving their burden of debt they would be unable to move it at all. We are hearing the same deafening chorus today.

Mr. Speaker, after the First World War when credit failed, when the United States was unable longer to keep sending its goods and services to foreign countries on credit, the standards of living of those countries fell from the planes on which credit had for awhile sustained them. Political dismay and disruption followed in those countries. Government itself was put in jeopardy because the peoples of these countries had been encouraged by this endless credit doctrine to live beyond their means. Again we hear the governments will be in jeopardy all over the world unless the United States pours more billions into these countries in goods and services, the same to be produced out of the sweat and energy and intelligence of America. We are told that social chaos will be the sure result if we do not extend credit. "How shall the people live as they have learned to live, and as they are entitled to live, without benefit of credit?" Uncle Sam is asked. "They will rise first," Uncle Sam is told. These emotional rhetoricians are careful not to say that what the people will rise against will be the payments of the debts for the goods they will have devoured.

As President Roosevelt said in the 1932 campaign, the credit of a nation is like the credit of a family. When either a nation or a family lives on credit beyond its means, debt overtakes it. If the people tax themselves to pay for it, that means they must lower their living levels. If they repudiate their debt, that is the end of their credit. Now, the President tells us, in the face of the repudiation of the debts due us, we must again extend unlimited credit—which means an unlimited flow of American goods and services to other countries—lest they fall into social chaos and go communistic.

Mr. Speaker, the argument that prosperity is a product of credit is as fallacious as the idea that we can borrow ourselves rich or spend ourselves into prosperity. Credit is a product arising

from the increase and exchange of wealth. It is merely a method of facilitating that exchange. Every dollar of credit that has been extended or will be extended to other countries of the world by the United States will be so much goods and services, human energy and national resources, raw materials and finished products, which we shall be denying our own people in order to send them out to the other peoples of the world, and for which we will receive no pay.

The idea that unlimited credit can be extended by the United States to other countries because we in the United States will merely owe the debt to ourselves is at the bottom of this whole fallacious scheme. It is used to rationalize the delusion as a whole. It became unorthodox after the First World War to doubt that by use of credit in progressive quantities to inflate international trade, the problem of international debt would be solved. All debtor nations were going to meet their foreign obligations from favorable balances of trade—but they did not do so.

The same fallacy lies behind the Bretton Woods scheme of today; namely, that all of the countless billions of dollars' worth of goods and services these foreign countries are going to get from us will be paid back in goods—which is the only way they can be paid back. Under such a condition, what would become of the American farmer and American laborer? Their American market would be literally flooded—would have to be flooded—with such an avalanche of low-wage, low-living-level labor products from the countries of Europe and the Orient that our whole economy would be swamped.

Mr. Speaker, a favorable balance of trade comes when a nation sells more than it buys. Is it possible for all nations to sell one another more than they buy from one another, so that every nation may have a favorable trade balance? The endless credit boys say, "Certainly." I ask, "How?" The endless credit boys cry, "By selling on credit. By lending one another the credit to buy one another's goods." They tell us that we must lend other nations credit during and after this war so they can buy our goods. After the last war they said all nations would not be able to lend equally, but each should lend according to its means. That meant that Uncle Sam was to be the principal lender—and he was. The Bretton Woods scheme of today is that some old plan all over again.

Following the First World War, the question was often asked: "Where is the profit in trade for the sake of which you must lend your customers the money to buy your goods?" The endless credit boys had an answer ready. It was: "Unless we lend them the money to buy our goods, they cannot buy them. Then what shall we do with our surplus?" When it appeared after the First World War that European nations were using enormous sums of American credit to build industrial plants to compete with our own, the question was asked: "Is this wise?" The answer of the endless credit boys, the international "do-gooders," was: "Of course it is wise. You must

remember that these nations you speak of as competitors are also our debtors. They owe us a great deal of money. Unless we lend them the credit to increase their ability to produce for export, they will never be able to pay us their debts."

That is exactly the refrain we hear again today as Bretton Woods and the international bank scheme are urged upon us. America loaned billions of dollars of American credit to her debtors after the First World War. We even loaned credit to our competitors, who in turn loaned it to their customers. We loaned credit to Germany who loaned credit to Russia for the purpose of enabling Russia to buy German things, including German chemicals. We are now asked to lend \$7,000,000,000 to Russia, in addition to lend-lease; \$5,000,000,000 to England; \$3,000,000,000 to France; \$1,000,000,000 to the Netherlands and \$6,000,000,000 to our Latin-American neighbors. This adds up to a total of \$22,000,000,000, to be used for the purpose of buying products from each other, while they all owe us debts which they can only repay, if at all, by producing a surplus of their commodities for export into the American market in competition with the products of our own farmers and wage earners.

The result after the First World War tells us what the result will be after this war if we follow this fallacious delusion. So much of our goods and services will be flowing out to other countries on credit that we will, in spite of ourselves, exhaust and prostrate our own internal economy, as soon as the false prosperity of an export business done on credit falls to the ground.

Those who plead that we should give some thought to the welfare of America are branded today as "isolationists" and are condemned to the nethermost hell of public scorn because they are sensible enough to want to keep their own country sound. We followed the doctrines of the internationalists after the First World War. What was the result? The result was that something like \$29,000,000,000 worth of American credits were defaulted, and the United States went into the worst depression we ever had in our history. Are we to repeat that experience?

Mr. Speaker, international-mindedness today has come to mean thinking not of ourselves first but of the world first; of our responsibilities to other people ahead of our responsibility to our own people. No other nation ever did think that way. Does England think that way today? Where would you find a more complete British Empire nationalist than Winston Churchill? And who blames him for it? Does Russia think that way today? Where would you find a more complete Russian nationalist, or realist, than Joseph Stalin? And who blames him for it? Should not Uncle Sam take a leaf out of Churchill's book or Stalin's book and place the welfare of our people first? Today all of the sharpers, the schemers, the planners, and the dreamers of all the other nations in the world, and of the United States as well, are planning to make Uncle Sam again the financial scapegoat for the world fol-

lowing this war. Is history about to repeat itself?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what of the present? What about the Bretton Woods agreements now before this Congress, which the President requests that we implement by legislation? What about the international T. V. A., suggested by Sir Walter Citrine, especially the financial part Uncle Sam is expected to play in electrifying the world? What about Sir William Beveridge's new plan to guarantee full employment for all, which the President approved when he announced he would guarantee 60,000,000 jobs for Americans, and which Henry Wallace has so enthusiastically and energetically adopted as the program for Uncle Sam? Let us scan these current congressional problems, one by one, to determine, if we can, the social and economic pattern that these well-meaning, idealistic, impractical "do-gooders" are trying to weave for us. If we decide to take the leftist road we should at least do it with our eyes open, realizing what our final destination will be.

THE BRETTON WOODS MONETARY AGREEMENTS

Mr. Speaker, the Bretton Woods plan is described as a program for international financial consultation and cooperation, aiming at stable exchange rates, with orderly adjustment when necessary. It is a program described as making for enduring peace, world-wide economic exchange and full employment everywhere. The Bretton Woods agreements fill 85 printed pages. In a nutshell, however, the Bretton Woods program is a lending program. It calls for an international fund or pool of currencies to be managed by 44 countries, and for an international bank under similar management, but with better lending safeguards. We are told the reason the administration backs this program is that the purchase of American goods, even when paid for with borrowed American dollars, will create jobs. However, we are beginning to ask ourselves the question, Jobs for whom?

Mr. Speaker, reasonably stable exchange rates facilitate foreign trade. But the value of a local currency, since the universal abandonment of the gold standard, can be measured only by its domestic purchasing power. This purchasing power is fundamentally affected by domestic monetary policies, entirely beyond the powers of an international organization, unless such an organization becomes an international government with supreme authority to direct the domestic affairs of every member nation. At present we, the Congress, have before us for consideration a number of bills carrying provisions which would affect the value of our dollar. One would reduce from 40 percent to 25 percent the reserve in gold certificates required to be held by Federal Reserve banks against their deposits and Federal Reserve notes in circulation. Another would authorize an increase in the Federal debt from \$260,000,000,000 to \$300,000,000,000. A third would authorize banks and other financial institutions to hold Federal securities at par; and a fourth would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to

guarantee financial loans made by private institutions. This proposed legislation adds up to a pattern for increased inflation and further devaluation of the dollar. Such a process would affect the exchange rate of our money with every other currency. When we plan such actions, we can expect less prosperous and less well-intentioned countries to carry out currency fluctuations and manipulations that would render our huge contribution to the Bretton Woods monetary fund utterly useless.

What do we get out of the Bretton Woods fund and bank? We agree to put in at the start \$6,000,000,000. If the fund and bank use up that money we get \$6,000,000,000 of export business. When this is done, we shall have equivalent I O U's of foreign countries. To collect these I O U's two things are necessary.

First. The foreign debtor must be able and willing to pay.

Second. We must be willing to receive payment.

Concerning the foreign debtor's willingness to pay, we have a record of experience, every nation defaulting with the exception of Finland.

And what about our willingness to accept payment? We have all the gold and silver we shall ever need buried in Treasury vaults, so payment can be made only in goods. But we like to make goods for the home market ourselves. If we are not willing to admit foreign goods here in competition with our own goods, then we must face the fact that the new loans and investments we are being urged to make will not be paid.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to try to make jobs at home by huge exports financed by loans we should keep in mind the ultimate cost to us in the event the loans are not repaid. The first cost, of course, is an increased public debt which means still higher taxes. The second cost of financing exports by long-term loans is the depletion of our natural resources. When we export oil from our wells, or copper from our mines, what we have left is a hole in the ground and a foreign I O U, which, judging by past experience, would not be worth the paper upon which it is written. The gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, in describing the Bretton Woods agreements, said:

Bolled down to the lowest common denominator the Bretton Woods agreements propose the establishment of an international bank, Uncle Sam to furnish most of the money, but the borrowers to control the bank.

Perhaps the key to the Bretton Woods agreements is to be found in the personality and background of the man who was its guiding spirit. The agreements arrived at were for the most part the proposals of Lord Keynes, a British economist. This is the same Lord Keynes who persuaded President Roosevelt early in 1933 to discard his economy program and embark upon the spend and spend and spend program of the New Deal. The Bretton Woods agreements, if accepted by Congress and implemented by law, would start us off on a spending spree to rebuild a war-torn world in the face of our \$300,000,000,000 debt. Why

should Uncle Sam follow the lead of Lord Keynes, a discredited English economist, one whom the English themselves refuse to follow?

THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL T. V. A.

Mr. Speaker, another titled Englishman, Sir Walter Citrine, in a speech at the recent London World Trade Union Conference, proposed an international T. V. A., which would include a Rhine Valley authority and a Danube Valley authority to develop electric power for European use. As usual, the only point about the whole plan that is clear is that Uncle Sam would be the fellow who would put up all the money. The method by which Uncle Sam would put up the money for these projects is set forth in the London Economist of December 9, 1944, in the following language:

Who would finance an international T. V. A.? If the proposed international bank of reconstruction and development materializes, its funds might be used either as direct loans to countries planning cooperative development, or as a supplement to private long-term investment in such projects.

One can easily see, therefore, that the Bretton Woods monetary scheme of Lord Keynes and the international T. V. A. scheme of Sir Walter Citrine are very closely related. The President's message to the Congress urging the passage of legislation to implement the Bretton Woods agreements came immediately after Sir Walter's speech at the London Conference. Can it be possible that the proposals of these two titled Englishmen add up to the fact that John Bull again wants Uncle Sam to pull England's financial chestnuts out of the fire, and once again get our fingers burned while doing it?

THE NEW BEVERIDGE PLAN

Mr. Speaker, the idea of "jobs for all" did not originate with President Roosevelt, although he stated in his economic bill of rights that every man had a right to a job. Neither is Senator MURRAY its creator, although in his full employment bill, he proposes that the Government provide jobs if private industry fails to employ everybody. Not even Henry Wallace with his much-advertised prophetic vision can be credited with the full-employment idea although in a speech before the American Statistical Association, he said:

"Jobs for all" should and will be the economic battle cry of all people of the world for the next 20 years.

Mr. Wallace, however, is the only one of our international "do-gooders" who is honest enough to tell us who originated the administration's plan for the expansion of Government economic activities. Mr. Wallace said:

Sir William Beveridge has just published a report on Full Employment in a Free Society, which I think transcends in importance his masterpiece on social security 2 years ago.

Wallace then goes on to show that every thought embodied in the President's economic bill of rights, in Senator MURRAY's full employment bill, and in Mr. Wallace's own Utopian plans for the future of America, are based upon the assertions and assumptions found in Sir William's new book. In this new book

Mr. Beveridge is frank enough to call his scheme a revolution. His American imitators are trying to bring about the same revolution in this country. We should be prepared for it, remembering that Mr. Wallace has told us before, "What we are experiencing today is not a war but a revolution." And we must not forget that in his testimony before the Senate committee in connection with his appointment as Secretary of Commerce Mr. Wallace very plainly said he would use the \$40,000,000,000 lending powers of the R. F. C. and the other Government loaning agencies to carry out his world-wide utopian plans.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is confronted today with the question: "Shall we accept and approve the dreams, the theories, the plans, and the demands of the Keyneses, the Beveridges, the Wallaces, the Hillmans, the Browders, and the Frankfurters?" Upon the answer we give to that question rests the fate of our American economy, our American Government, and our American liberties. In endeavoring to arrive at a proper answer to that question we must admit at the outset that the people of the United States cannot possibly work hard enough or long enough to support the other peoples of the world, to rebuild all of the war-devastated countries of the world, or to restore all of the destroyed agricultural and manufacturing structures of the world. We can exhaust our resources until we are pauperized without raising the rest of the peoples of the world to appreciably higher levels of living. And, unless we undertake an imperious policy of controlling the economic and the social government of all other countries, we cannot possibly impose upon them our American system of government, our American economy, or our American way of life.

After the First World War, we tried to rebuild the countries and the economies of our allies, and of our enemies, under the fallacious reasoning that they would be grateful and that they would pay their debts to us as soon as they were able to get on their financial feet. That program did not work out. Instead of paying their debts to us, they defaulted, and jeered at us for expecting repayment. Just as we are told now that it is impudent and insolent and unjust and un-Christian and selfish for us to expect any repayment on our vast lend-lease contributions to the rest of the world, so we will be told again, if we continue to pour out credit to the rest of the world, that we are "Uncle Shylock" if we ever expect any repayment.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to change or to raise the cultural, living, or governmental levels of other peoples by the simple device of lending them money, or goods, and services. Religious beliefs, age-old traditions, lack of capacity for self-government—all of these considerations enter into the reasons why, regardless of any amount of credit we may extend to the peoples of other nations, we cannot impose upon them or persuade them to adopt our system of government, economy, and society. The so-called credits which we are asked to extend these other countries are the very same kind of goods and services we are ex-

tending now. American people are not eating bacon today because we are sending the bacon abroad not only to our armed forces but to the peoples of other countries. Every shortage we have in America today is the result of sending our goods out to other countries as well as to our armed forces. We lend-leased to our allies last year 873,924,576 pounds of American meat. If America is willing to continue to be rationed and to go without and do without, or to go with much less and to do with much less for generations to come, then perhaps we can listen to the Keyneses, the Beveridges, the Wallaces, the Hillmans, and the Browders. If, on the other hand, we do not want holes left in the ground where our minerals and our oil have been taken out and shipped away to be consumed in other countries; if we do not want impoverished soil left from the growing and giving away of crops to other peoples in the world; then we must safeguard ourselves against the theory that upon the United States of America rests the whole responsibility for rehabilitating all of the blasted industrial and agricultural economies of the world; for raising all of the peoples of the world to an American level of wages, working conditions, and living conditions. It doesn't require a prophet to discern that if we accede to these schemes of the Keyneses, the Beveridges, the Wallaces, the Hillmans, and the Browders, our American living levels, our wage levels, our working conditions, will be dragged down much farther than we will be able to lift similar conditions in the other countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, America has a very proper and a very important place to fill in helping the peoples of the world to help themselves back to normal life and sanity. America has no desire, and has never had any desire, to avoid her full duty in that regard. It is one thing, however, to help an unfortunate neighbor who needs a little of what you have, but it is something else again to help a neighbor, who will not help himself, by giving him all you have.

We are told by these "international do-gooders," these "give-away theorists," that unless we impoverish ourselves and give away our goods and services and energy and resources to all the other peoples of the world, they will become discontented and will hatch another world war which will cost us more than it will cost us to give them now a great portion of what we have. That is a defeatist theory. It is the theory that unless we give away now what we have, somebody will later take it from us. The American people had better keep in mind the fact that if they give it away now it will have been taken from them anyway.

Mr. Speaker, the only kind of an America that can help lead the rest of the world back to sanity and a normal existence is a safe, sound, free, and solvent United States of America. We must see to it that America is kept safe, sound, free, and solvent. As Members of Congress that is our responsibility. We must always keep that responsibility uppermost in our minds. Shall Uncle Sam again become the financial scape-goat for the world?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LOYALTY TEST

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, recently I have heard the word "treason" bandied upon the floor of this House and in the columns of some of the least responsible newspapers in this Nation.

A recent incident, which I intend to discuss, causes me to recall to the Members of this House some earlier facts which too many of us tend to forget.

On December 11, 1941, a gangster, named Adolf Hitler, came before his Reichstag and read from an American newspaper. This newspaper, Hitler told the Reichstag, revealed a plot by the President of the United States to invade Germany.

Waving the paper, he demanded that the Reichstag declare war against the United States.

War was declared.

The newspaper which Hitler used to bring about his declaration of war was the Chicago Tribune, published by Robert Rutherford McCormick. The McCormick story, most of which was an outright fraud and fake, was published in the Tribune on December 4—3 days before the stab in the back at Pearl Harbor.

Actually, said Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, the so-called secret document which the Tribune used as the basis for its fraudulent story was simply "unfinished studies of our production requirements for national defense in this emergency."

And the Secretary asked the American people: "What do you think of the patriotism of a man or a newspaper that would take those confidential studies and make them public to the enemies of this country?"

But the Chicago Tribune not only publicized and distorted our defense plans. Its action became Hitler's justification for a declaration of war against the United States.

Another Tribune story came on June 7, 1942—6 months after—and I emphasize after—Pearl Harbor. We were at war with Japan.

This time the Tribune published "secret information" about the battle of Midway, declaring that the United States was fully informed in advance of the disposition of the Japanese war fleet.

What purpose could this story serve? It told the Mikado that our intelligence had been able to develop a leak inside the Japanese naval forces. It told the Japanese to change battle plans.

The Union for Democratic Action made a painstaking investigation of the facts in this case. It reported:

The story purported to come from naval intelligence and was date-lined Washington. Faced with the menace of severe punishment, the Tribune now swallowed its own words and claimed that its miraculously accurate list of Japanese ships was simply a deduction by its correspondent, Stanley Johnston, arrived at in Chicago. It never explained how it was possible to guess names and categories which are so secret that they are not included in Janes' Fighting Ships. Then it insulted its own profession by asserting that such fakery

is "common practice, and newspapermen all over the United States follow it."

What do our enemies think of this Chicago publisher?

How do they value his services?

I now quote from the Japanese commentator, Yasua Yamida, who told our troops via the Tokyo radio in 1943:

There is no doubt that Robert McCormick is an extremely charming character. I think America today needs many more dynamic characters like this Chicago veteran.

Thank God that the great majority of American newspapers are as devoted to the cause of America—to the winning of this war—to the defeat of our enemies—to a devotion to true freedom of press—as any of us in this land. Thank God there are only a few newspaper publishers whose praises are beamed by Tokyo and Berlin to our troops overseas.

That is why when, on February 19, the Chicago Tribune, with its fellow Axis helpers, the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald, published another of its "secret documents" we may be shocked but not surprised. Publication of secret Army regulations relating to handling of personnel whose loyalty is suspected could only have been intended to reveal to internal enemies the methods by which our Army Intelligence Service ferrets out those who are disloyal. It could only have been intended to tell those under suspicion the full story of the manner by which the War Department discovers their anti-war and anti-American activities. It could only have been to arm them so that they could more easily avoid the traps which our intelligence system sets for them.

And, like Hitler, the Tribune cloaked its own treason in a righteous indignation that the Army's procedure might result in the commissioning of Communists. The Tribune, of course, is well aware of how Hitler used the Red scare to spread fear, mistrust, and suspicion. The Tribune editors have read history. They know that it was the flames of the Reichstag fire and the fear of communism which this Hitler-faked "Red plot" created, which burned the Nazi swastika into the heart of Germany and plunged the world into war.

The indefensible disclosure of secret security procedure by Tokyo's Chicago darling has unfortunately been followed on the House floor itself by imputations of treason or near treason to the War Department; and the regulations whose purpose was to make for a more accurate sifting of loyal from disloyal personnel have been represented here and to the country as though their purpose were the opposite, as though the War Department were ordering the elevation of disloyal persons into positions from which they could sabotage the war and undermine the security and liberty of our country.

It is hardly necessary to state on this floor that the War Department, under that great American patriot, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, and under America's Commander in Chief and greatest world statesman, our President, is not guilty of treason or of anything like or near treason.

It is regrettable that the heat of expressing a point of view in opposition to a War Department directive should have given rise to such language on the floor of this body.

What the War Department actually did was, after long study of relevant legal precedents and theory, and after a tremendous experience in the handling of inductees suspected of disloyalty, to issue on December 30, 1944, the simple clarifying directive:

The basic consideration is not the propriety of the individual's opinions, but his loyalty to the United States.

That was all, just a plain, clear statement of the fundamental American truth that thought is free in this country.

Implementing this basic consideration, the directive continues:

Membership in, or strict adherence to the doctrines of, the Communist Party organization is evidence that the individual is subject to influences that may tend to divide his loyalty. However, many good soldiers are subject to conflicting influences. Such influences must be appraised in the light of the individual's entire record. No action will be taken under the reference letter that is predicated on membership in or adherence to the doctrines of the Communist Party unless there is a specific finding that the individual involved has a loyalty to the Communist Party as an organization which overrides his loyalty to the United States. No such finding should be based on the mere fact that the individual's views on various social questions have been the same as the views which the Communist Party may have advanced. Except in clear cases, no action should be taken against persons who are being trained for combat assignments and have demonstrated a high degree of ability to serve the United States in that manner, including a willingness to accept combat duty.

Testifying before the subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, the Honorable John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War, said:

The Army has not knowingly appointed as officers any individuals who seek the overthrow of the United States Government, or whose disloyalty has been otherwise established, and it does not propose to do so. The Army has not knowingly assigned to any sensitive duty any individual who seeks such objectives, or who is justly suspected for any other reason of any disaffection, and does not propose to do so. The War Department has not issued any instructions under which any such appointment or assignment could be properly made, and does not propose to do so.

Again, he testified:

The keystone of the entire structure of the Army is loyalty, and its preservation is a matter which must be handled with the greatest care. It must be done with vigilance but if procedures become overzealous and unfair, reactions set in which are detrimental to the Army and to the causes for which our armies take the field. It has been extremely gratifying that, out of the thousands of cases investigated by the Army, only a very small number of persons who have come into the service have been found to be disloyal or have been even suspected of disaffection.

And a third time, he emphasized:

The basic consideration remained, as before, the individual's loyalty to the United States of America, a loyalty to be measured not in terms of allegiance to any one alien belief, such as communism, but in terms

of all beliefs that might supersede his devotion to America.

The fair and reasonable application of loyalty tests to Army personnel is not just a "matter of justice to the individual," the Secretary continued, but necessary also "to avoid the obvious possibility that action on inconclusive proof might afford a ready means for numerous persons, without just cause, to avoid the hazards of combat service. At a time when the Nation's critical need was for expanding manpower, such an escape corridor was intolerable."

As long as this question has been opened, it should also be understood that the Army confronted some serious legal problems as to whether Communists actually do advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in *Schneiderman against United States* (320 U. S. 118 (1943)), testified Mr. McCloy:

Stated that it had never passed on the question of whether the Communist Party advocated the overthrow of our form of government by force.

And he added:

The language of the opinion cast such further doubt upon the administrative finding made by the Attorney General in 1942, * * * as to render it inadvisable thereafter for the Army to rely thereon as a basis for exclusion from military service. Indeed, the Judge Advocate General of the Army in an opinion to the staff, called attention to the dictum in this case and the doubt it cast on the prior ruling.

But—

The Assistant Secretary continued—

beyond any questions of legal theory, a study of the question and our experience convinced me that we were not on sound ground in our investigations when we placed our emphasis solely on Communist affiliation.

With such emphasis, investigations were prone to drift off into questions of alleged attendance, in the years before the man came into the Army, at meetings alleged to have been Communist meetings or at meetings of so-called "Reds," whereas the obvious need was to determine whether the man actually was loyal or disloyal to the United States in the light of all the circumstances which could be adduced.

A man's willingness, and in many cases his eagerness, to train himself for and to engage in hazardous employment in the Army, the testimony of his commanding officer, the judgment of his fellow soldiers after observation and questioning of the man himself all afforded in my judgment more reliable material on the issue of the man's loyalty than the generally doubtful evidence of membership in an organization or attendance at meetings alleged to have been Communist. Long experience in handling cases of this character finally convinced the War Department that mere sympathy with a given ideology or suspected membership in a given organization neither legally nor as a matter of abstract justice furnished sufficient justification for adverse action. It concluded that the only sound, though difficult, solution of this problem was to base action on the attitude and actions of the individual rather than on his alleged connections. For that reason a comprehensive restatement of the Army's basic policy was issued on February 5, 1944, which, without specific reference to any ideology, made unquestioned loyalty to the Government of the United States on the part of the individual the yardstick.

The concluding portions of Secretary McCloy's testimony is worth the serious attention of every Member of this House. He said:

Certainly neither this, nor any antecedent instruction on this subject has resulted in placing any person who, after thorough investigation is proved to be disloyal or disaffected in a sensitive position where he might have access to secret Army equipment or vital Army information. It is worthy of note that the instruction of December 30 has been for nearly 2 months in the hands of a large number of responsible commanders. It is these men who are most alert to detect, and are directly affected by evidences of disloyalty in their commands. Not one of them has reported to the War Department that the instruction is having or will have any tendency to weaken the Army's controls over subversive or disaffected personnel.

Clearly, the War Department is putting first and foremost the individual loyalty, ability, and performance of its personnel and will continue to do so.

Our Army is doing a magnificent job all over the world, and it has America's whole-hearted support.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Lecompte (at the request of Mr. Gwynne of Iowa), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. Kelly of Illinois, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 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., Wednesday, March 7, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be had on parcel-post rates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

275. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 776. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1104. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2348. A bill to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCOWEN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 385. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156-1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); without amendment (Rept. No. 255). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 388. A bill to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138-1139; 8 U. S. C. 601); without amendment (Rept. No. 256). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 434. A bill to provide that nationals of the United States shall not lose their nationality by reason of voting under legal compulsion in a foreign state; without amendment (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2013. A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 167. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2023, 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1270. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; without amendment (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 268. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; without amendment (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of Morris Burstein

and Jennie Burstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 271. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas; without amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 840. A bill for the relief of Toby Lena Rosenberg, alias Maria Louisa Nasco, alias Alejandro Nasco Echegaray; without amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 846. A bill for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo; with amendment (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1402. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 269. A bill for the relief of Charles Molnor; without amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 2491. A bill to increase the maximum monthly payment made by States to individuals for old-age assistance which will be matched by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2492. A bill to permit direct sales of surplus property consisting of vehicles and small machinery to veterans for their use in earning a livelihood, and to give veterans a preference for 10 days in the purchase of such property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2493. A bill to permit direct sales of surplus property consisting of vehicles and small machinery to farmers for their use in earning a livelihood, and to give farmers a preference for 10 days in the purchase of such property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2494. A bill authorizing appointments to the United State Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2495. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 2496. A bill to prohibit use of the mails or instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the sale or delivery of certain fabrics or materials containing explosive substances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 2497. A bill to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. R. 2498. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the

States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers, and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2499. A bill to permit the admission as nonquota immigrants into the Territory of Alaska of Finnish persons or persons of Finnish descent who have served honorably in the land or naval forces of the United Nations; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2500. A bill to provide pay for certain enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, retired after 30 years of service, Active or Fleet Reserve, who have served honorably as commissioned officers during both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2502. A bill readjusting the rates of postage on fourth-class mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2503. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act so as to require that the origin of vegetable seeds, if known, be stated on the label; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 2504. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 2505. A bill to make certain legally adopted children eligible for child's insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2506. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 2507. A bill to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2508. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

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 South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States on post-war military policy and Military Establishment and of the National Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the war effort for distribution to public bodies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging efforts in behalf of national and international agreements guaranteeing freedom of access to and transportation of news; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Jimmy Martin, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Patricia M. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Helen Alton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Edwin Alton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Chesley Brazil; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2515. A bill for the relief of Harland Bartholomew & Associates, St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 2516. A bill to provide that the name of Fred S. Knisley be added to the emergency officers' retired list of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2517. A bill granting a pension to Charlie Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2518. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States; 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:

137. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Taxpayers' Local Option Committee, protesting the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

139. Also, memorial of twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota, urging consideration and favorable action on House bill 538, empowering the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain materials not needed for the prosecution of the war effort; to the Committee on Agriculture.

140. Also, memorial of twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota, urging that the post-war military policy and military establishment include the National Guard, Officers Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; to the Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy.

141. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition signed by Mrs. Essie H. Pearce and 27 other representative citizens of Clay City, Ill., and surrounding community, requesting action to prevent the alcoholic beverage industry from directing high-pressure campaigns to increase

its profits at the expense of the home and of the youth, by prohibiting it the use of air, periodicals, newspapers, motion pictures, or any other form of advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

142. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the board of aldermen, city of Chelsea, Mass., adopted at their meeting February 26, 1945, urging that Chelsea Creek, Mass., be changed to Chelsea River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

143. Also, petition of the board of aldermen, city of Chelsea, Mass., in connection with the designation of Brotherhood Week in February 1945, by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, congratulating the President on his timely proclamation, praying for his continued health and strength to carry on his great life, and urging that the spirit of brotherhood should not be for 1 week only but should be for 52 weeks of the year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. By Mr. MUNDT: Memorial of South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

145. Also, memorial of Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America on the post-war military policy and Military Establishment and of the National Guard; to the Select Committee on Post-War Policy.

146. Also, memorial of South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

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

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

Almighty God and Father of all mankind, whose paths are mercy and truth, before the white splendor of whose purity every vileness must shrink away, lift us above the immediate and set our lives in the wide horizons of abiding verities. Take the mistakes of all our yesterdays, even the sins whose memory shames us, and by the mystery of Thy forgiveness transfigure our failures to love Thee and our fellow man with all our mind and heart into the jeweled mosaic of Thy redeeming grace.

With high resolves and selfless endeavors that take counsel, not of our fears but of our hopes, may we match these epic days with daring deeds that will clear a highway across all the nations for the feet of God. By all the pain and loss of these evil years, bind all peoples in a fellowship of suffering. In a world-wide fraternity of contrition, lead us all to hearty repentance for the sins which

have brought this blighting conflict. As servants of the common good, turn our feet diligently to seek the paths of righteousness which alone are the paths of peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Tuesday, March 6, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; and

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 214) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 205. An act for the relief of Steve Hlass;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 259. An act for the relief of Leo Gottlieb;

H. R. 266. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 904. An act for the relief of Fred A. Lower;

H. R. 905. An act for the relief of Paul T. Thompson;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 980. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout;

H. R. 981. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army;

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 990. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Sidney B. Walton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

H. R. 1260. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital;

H. R. 1307. An act for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.;

H. R. 1309. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb;

H. R. 1347. An act for the relief of Lee Graham;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Syper, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers;

H. R. 1558. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ansel Adkins;

H. R. 1567. An act for the relief of Katherine Smith;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Slade;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell;

H. R. 1707. An act for the relief of Murray W. Moran;

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.;

H. R. 1877. An act for the relief of Maj. William Peyton Tidwell; and

H. R. 2006. An act for the relief of Boyd B. Black.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

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

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and