

protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

956. Also, petition of William N. Sayer and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

957. Also, petition of Fred Supper and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

958. Also, petition of August Meyer and 29 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. Also, petition of Frank Schuckman and 26 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

960. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Legislature; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 15, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 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, from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed, kindle, we pray Thee, in the hearts of all men the true love of concord, and guide with Thy pure and peaceable wisdom all those who at this time are taking counsel for the nations of this war-shattered globe, that in tranquillity Thy kingdom of justice and righteousness may stretch forth its frontiers until the mantle of Thy love shall cover a redeemed earth.

Where our deeds can help to make this a better world, where our words can keep despondent men on their feet, where our prayers can hasten the coming of a social order in which Thy will shall be done among men, there let us act and speak and pray. In the 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 Thursday, June 14, 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 nominations 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 the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3287. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national

encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Columbus, Ohio, September 9 to 14, inclusive, 1945;

H. R. 3295. An act to extend through December 31, 1945, the termination date under the Renegotiation Act; and

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution reducing certain appropriations available in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) authorizing the Special Committee of the House of Representatives Designated to Investigate Food Shortages to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before said committee during the current session, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 502) to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 55)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to an appropriation for the War Shipping Administration, fiscal year 1946, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that agency (H. Doc. 120, 79th Cong.) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighteenth report on the operations of the Chairman of that Board, transmitted to him by the chairman and general manager of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, for the period from April 1 through May 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INVESTIGATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by Captain Edgar Dale Post, No. 81, of the American Legion, Department of Kansas, at El Dorado, Kans., in regard to the investigation of the Veterans' Administration. I request that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution presented by Mr. REED was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to our attention through newspaper and magazine reports and from reports of patients in the veterans' hospitals that the Veterans' Administration, insofar as hospitalization is concerned, has become so bound up in red tape and handled

so inefficiently that it has almost become a national scandal; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Captain Edgar Dale Post, No. 81, of the American Legion of the Department of Kansas, at El Dorado, Kans., in regular meeting assembled this 5th day of June 1945, recommend and urge that our Senators and Representatives from the State of Kansas use their influence and efforts to the end that a complete, thorough, and impartial investigation be made of the Veterans' Administration.

CAPTAIN EDGAR DALE POST, No. 81,
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF KANSAS,
EL DORADO, KANS.,

By H. O. DENTON, Commander.

Attest:

DONALD J. RAYBURN,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 100. A bill to authorize an exchange of certain lands with William W. Kiskadden in connection with the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 371);

S. 159. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 374);

S. 708. A bill authorizing the State of Alabama to lease or sell and convey all or any part of the Salt Springs land granted to said State by the act of March 2, 1819; without amendment (Rept. No. 372); and

H. R. 2416. A bill authorizing the State of Alabama to lease or sell and convey all or any part of the Salt Springs land granted to said State by the act of March 2, 1819; without amendment (Rept. No. 373).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 911. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 377).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 480. A bill to authorize the sale of allotment of Henry Keiser on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 375); and

S. 486. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Fort Peck project, Mont.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 376).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 502) to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporation created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1150. A bill for the relief of John Leberman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE) introduced Senate bill 1151, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1152. A bill to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1153. A bill to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the teachers, officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Sanson Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1155. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Cassie E. Howard; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ) introduced Senate bill 1156, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.)

PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes. We have prepared an analysis of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the analysis presented by the Senator from Vermont will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1151) to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE) was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The analysis presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

BETTER NUTRITION, BETTER FARM MARKETS— HOW THE NATIONAL FOOD-ALLOTMENT BILL WOULD HELP BRING ABOUT BOTH

In the years ahead, the greatest single problem of the Nation's farmers will be to find markets for all they can produce. Food production last year was more than a third higher than the average for the 5 years before the war. This level of output is more likely to go up than go down in the future, even after emergency war and foreign relief needs have ceased.

Also it is likely that millions of the Nation's families will not be earning enough money to buy as much as they need of the

right kind of food. To some extent this is true even now, in the middle of record wartime employment and prosperity.

Unless active measures are taken, we can expect that, even with full employment, American families will be going hungry while American farmers are looking for places to sell their products. With less than full employment, the outlook for want in the midst of plenty would be far more serious.

The national food-allotment bill is designed to head off such an unfortunate situation. It is not, in the ordinary sense, either a "welfare" or a "farm relief" measure. It is an effort to put a floor under levels of nutrition for the Nation's families and to insure a large and stable market for food. It would say, in effect: "In this rich country with such great agricultural resources, every family, no matter how low its income may be, must have a chance to obtain at least a minimum adequate diet." In carrying out this guaranty, the market for farm products will be greatly broadened, thus strengthening farm prices and increasing farm incomes.

The food-allotment bill is based on the conviction that adequate diets for all families and better markets for farmers are in the national interest, and that it is a national responsibility to assist consumers and farmers in achieving those ends.

The food-allotment bill would enable lower-income families to increase their food purchases, and thus improve their diets.

It lays equal emphasis on consumers' need for better nutrition and farmers' need for broader markets, in the belief that efforts to help either consumers or producers of food, independent of the needs of the other group, would in the long run be self-defeating.

The basic principles of the food-allotment program are simple.

The first step is to determine scientifically the level of nutrition needed to keep an average person strong and healthy, and to translate that nutrition level into actual amounts of lower-cost foods.

The second step is to determine the value of the low-cost adequate diet periodically at current retail food prices. This cost, on a yearly basis, would be known as the food allotment.

The third step is to supplement the buying power of families that are not able to afford low-cost adequate diets.

In carrying out the third step, needless red tape that would limit the effectiveness of the program must be avoided. At the same time, Federal funds must be used in the most effective way to raise levels of nutrition and improve farm markets. To meet these difficulties the food-allotment program utilizes the fact that on the average, lower-income families spend about 40 percent of their incomes on food. Under the proposed program, participating families would continue their normal spending for food. The amount contributed by the Government would be used to buy additional food.

This would be accomplished by offering any family an opportunity to buy for about 40 percent of its income food coupons with a face value equal to the food allotments for all members of the family. Thus, while the value of the food coupons remained fixed, the amount that a family would pay for them would be determined by its money income. The Government would be bearing the difference between the family's contribution and the face value of the food coupons.

For example, suppose the food allotment per person was \$15 a month. In that case, a family of four could buy food coupons worth \$60. If the family had an income of \$100 a month, it could get the coupons by paying 40 percent of its income, or \$40. If the family income were \$125, it could buy the same number of coupons for \$50. But if its income were \$150, the family would have to pay \$60 for \$60 worth of coupons, and therefore would find no advantage in participating. A family of five with an income of \$150,

however, would again benefit by buying \$75 worth of coupons for \$60.

Thus, the Government's contribution would largely represent a net increase in family food consumption. An average family of four with an income of \$100 a month now spends about \$40 a month for food. Under the allotment program the Government would sell this family \$60 worth of food coupons for \$40. The net cost to the Government—\$20 a month—would in this case just equal the increased value of food consumed. Of course, it would not work exactly this way in all instances. Sometimes the increased food consumption might be a little less than the Government contribution, but, in general, the Government money would be used for food; that is, for better diets and larger markets for farm products.

Operation of the program could be relatively simple. It would not in any sense be a relief program; no "means test" or long investigations by welfare agencies would be necessary. A simple declaration of income, similar to that required in connection with the Federal income tax, would be sufficient. Any family would be eligible to buy coupons by paying the required percentage of its income. This would be in marked contrast to the food-stamp plan, which in almost every area was limited to families receiving public assistance.

Participation would not be limited to people in cities and towns. Many farm families are poorly nourished, too. Some of them, of course, could best help themselves by raising more family food. The food allotment bill has special provisions for taking home-grown food into account.

What of the possibility that the program might provide Government food hand-outs to people who won't work? The number of such families is undoubtedly small, and the question of whether lack of enough food is not a prime cause of shiftlessness is itself debatable; but a special provision of the bill is a safeguard against such a misuse of funds. A minimum charge is provided for the food coupons. No matter how small its income, no family may obtain coupons for less than a fourth of their face value. As an additional safeguard, employable male participants may be required to register with an employment agency.

Another special provision would make it possible to earmark up to one-third of the coupons for special foods or groups of foods. This action could be taken either in the interest of farmers at times when particular products of nutritive value were in surplus, or of the health of consumers in areas where increased consumption of certain foods were especially desirable. As an alternative to earmarking coupons, special free stamps good for particular foods could be issued along with the regular coupons. The bill provides for the appointment of a council on nutrition. This council should be made up of distinguished scientists, within the Government and outside. This council will advise on any nutritional aspects of the program, including the effects of earmarking coupons. This earmarking must be done in a way that is consistent with good nutrition.

Except for the possible earmarking of a limited number of coupons, families would be free to exchange them for any foods they wished. This latitude is in keeping with the democratic character of the food allotment program. Participation would be entirely voluntary, and persons buying the coupons could use them at the store of any food dealer who had registered his desire to accept coupons.

So much for the details of the food allotment bill. Its adoption would provide a new market for farmers, and the greatest single stimulus to better nutrition than any Government action has as yet supplied. Although great advances still are needed in methods of processing food and getting it

to market, and much educational work still must be done in selection and preparation of food in the interest of better nutrition, lack of purchasing power remains the chief cause of improper diets among millions of families. For most of them, more purchasing power means better nutrition.

How much would the program cost? Of course, that would depend on the Nation's level of prosperity and the number of eligible families who chose to participate. However, studies of what probably would have happened in past years with such a program in effect indicate that the cost of the food allotment program might range between \$750,000,000 in times of prosperity to possibly two and one-half billion in times of depression. One of the great merits of the program would be its tendency to level off the ups and downs of the business cycle. In good times, Government spending under the program would contract; in bad times, it would expand and counteract the tendency toward shrinking markets.

How would the food allotment program affect the Nation's levels of diet? Again the best way to find out is to go back to what would have happened in the past. Had the program been in effect in 1942, for example, participating families probably would have bought 60 percent more tomatoes and citrus fruit, 30 percent more milk, meat, poultry, and fish, and substantially larger amounts of vegetables and other fruits, eggs, and potatoes and sweetpotatoes. Purchases of other foods, such as grains, fats and oils, and sugar, would have remained about the same.

It is clear that such a pattern of increased purchases would result automatically in better nutrition. It is equally clear that a broad program of education would enable consumers to make selections that would raise the nutritional level of their diets considerably higher.

What could farmers expect in the way of better prices and incomes? The food allotment program not only would increase consumer food expenditures by about the amount of the direct Government contribution, it also would tend in many instances to strengthen food prices throughout the market. It has been estimated that a Government contribution of \$1,000,000,000 to a food allotment program in 1942 would have increased farm income from food products by about \$1,500,000,000.

The food allotment program is especially important as a means of carrying out the Government's commitment to support farm prices and farm income after the war. The soundest way of doing this is by insuring a large and stable market for agricultural products. We cannot long avoid a balance between supply and demand. Shall we reach this balance by a compulsory crop reduction program to reduce supply or by a voluntary food consumption program to raise demand? The second way—and the way provided in this bill—is certainly better both for farmers and for consumers, and it would lighten the burden of price support operations.

Additional measures to support prices of some farm products would, of course, be necessary, but if the food purchases of low-income families were maintained at a reasonable level, the problems of price support would be manageable.

Obviously, in either depression or prosperity, the food allotment program would be no cure-all for farmers. Markets for cotton, tobacco, and other nonfood products would not be affected. Demand for wheat and some other commodities would be stimulated only a little, if at all. Price support programs for certain commodities in weak demand, and other mechanisms for guiding production in the best direction, encouraging soil conservation, and for other purposes, still would be needed.

On the other hand, for the products that would be most affected—meat, milk, eggs and poultry, fruits and vegetables—farm prices would be strengthened substantially. Farm incomes would be strengthened even more, by the increase in marketings. Many of the producers of commodities not directly affected by the food allotment program would benefit through increased opportunity to shift to production of foods whose demand was stimulated by the food allotment program. This would be of special importance in reorienting the agriculture of the cotton South and of other areas where new markets must be developed for food products.

Granting the need for the food allotment program over the long pull, why be in a hurry to start one now, when the demand for so many foods is greater than the supply? There are two reasons why delay would be costly.

First, the need of better nutrition is considerable, right now in the midst of war prosperity. An estimated 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 families this year would gain by participating in the food allotment program, because 40 percent of their incomes is not enough to buy proper food for the household. Many families living on pensions or small wages, like retired couples, unskilled workers, families with many small children unable to migrate to war production centers, have not benefited from the general rise in wages under the war effort. In some neighborhoods ration points are not being used up because people can't afford as much food as they are entitled to buy. These families need assistance now for the sake of their own health and of the morale of sons, fathers, and brothers in the armed forces.

Second, a start must be made now so that the program will be able to assist the much larger number of families that will need help later. Whether we achieve national full employment after the war or not, the process of industrial conversion is going to bring unemployment problems in many areas. Perhaps these difficulties will be localized and temporary; they will be nonetheless acute. They are beginning to show up in a few places already and will spread widely during the next few months. Running a successful food allotment program will be a large administrative job—one that cannot be coped with overnight. If it is to accomplish its purpose 6 months or a year from now, the groundwork must be laid as soon as possible.

This is a new kind of program. It is substantially different from the prewar food stamp plan. It should be started soon, in order to develop and perfect the necessary administrative details and to acquaint consumers and farmers with its opportunities before the problems of nutrition, farm surpluses, and price support become acute.

PUBLIC LANDS IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. EATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. CHAVEZ] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill granting to the State of New Mexico certain public lands in that State for the use and benefit of public institutions of the State. I also ask consent to present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico relating to the bill and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1156) granting to the State of New Mexico certain public lands in such State for the use and benefit of public institutions of the State, introduced by Mr. HATCH (for himself and

Mr. CHAVEZ), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico is as follows:

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact a law granting 10,000,000 acres of land from the public lands of the United States of America, situated in the State of New Mexico, in trust to the said State of New Mexico, under the same restrictions and limitations as previous grants under provisions of the act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557), and for the benefit of the Home and Training School for Mental Defectives, Girls' Welfare Home, Carrie Tingley Crippled Children's Hospital, the Museum of New Mexico, Boys' Reform School at Springer, public buildings at the capital, water reservoirs for New Mexico irrigation purposes, for the establishment of a school of medicine, New Mexico Tuberculosis Sanatorium, and the common schools of New Mexico

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

Whereas the New Mexico Home and Training School for Mental Defectives, Los Lunas, N. Mex., a State institution of which the facilities are generally known to be definitely inadequate for the purpose for which such home and training school was established; and

Whereas the Girls' Welfare Home, Albuquerque, N. Mex., a State institution for delinquent girls, has inadequate facilities and funds for a progressive program worthy of its purpose; and

Whereas the Carrie Tingley Hospital for Crippled Children, a State institution for the care and treatment of crippled children, with emphasis on the treatment of those afflicted with infantile paralysis, while splendidly equipped for the work, is deserving of maintenance revenues; and

Whereas the three foregoing institutions are almost entirely financed by legislative appropriations and the service and needs are such that each is worthy of invariable basic income; and

Whereas the Museum of New Mexico, an important institution which was inadvertently omitted from the original group of State institutions receiving land grants, conserves and houses invaluable collections of the greatest cultural importance in the fields of art, archaeology, ethnology, and history; repairs and maintains various historic sites and State monuments; maintains an extensive research library in the fields of its interests; and operates 10 branch museums in various communities of the State; and

Whereas the Boys' Reform School, Springer, N. Mex., a State industrial school for delinquent boys, although the beneficiary of a previous grant of land, is greatly in need of additional facilities, equipment, and funds to accomplish the service for which the same was established; and

Whereas the public buildings at the capital, a program for which previous grants have been insufficient and many futile attempts have been made to finance the remodeling of present structures, and the construction of new buildings to provide greatly needed governmental office space; and

Whereas previous grants of lands to New Mexico for the benefit of its water reservoirs for irrigation purposes have proved insufficient to provide reasonable revenues for proper study, determination, and development of the water resources of this arid State; and

Whereas the State Tuberculosis Sanatorium, Socorro, N. Mex., the only free-bed tuberculosis institution in New Mexico, is supervised and maintained by a limited

allotment from the funds appropriated to the department of public welfare, said institution's capacity being therefore inadequate to meet the needs of the needy tubercular people of the State, and since the greatest need exists because of the increasing need and for the orderly development of the health program of New Mexico; and

Whereas a school of medicine and nursing, to be established at some future time and in connection with some established education institution, as the legislature may direct, is imperative to the future; and

Whereas the common schools, by reason of continuous growth and anticipated postwar expansion, will unquestionably require additional financial resources in order to meet these increased obligations to the children of New Mexico; and

Whereas the foregoing represent certain definite social and economic needs and services essential to the welfare and well-being of the people of New Mexico; and

Whereas the tax resources of New Mexico are both variable and limited and grants of public lands would give relief to taxpayers and insure correspondingly greater benefits to the people; and

Whereas there exists for administration of such lands as sought the New Mexico State Land Office, which has, under the several commissioners of public lands since statehood, administered previously granted lands at minimum cost in a manner worthy of the trust imposed, and unequaled in any other State of the Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of New Mexico:

SECTION 1. That the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States of America, now in regular session assembled in Washington, D. C., be, and the same hereby is, memorialized and requested to enact a law during the present session of Congress, as soon as may be done, granting 10,000,000 acres of public lands of the United States of America, situated in New Mexico, notwithstanding said lands are now or may hereafter be embraced within any Executive order of withdrawal, or grazing district authorized under the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), to the State of New Mexico, in trust for the use and benefit of the following-named New Mexico institutions or purposes in the following amounts or acreage, respectively: For Home and Training School for Mental Defectives, 1,000,000 acres; for Girls' Welfare Home, 500,000 acres; for Carrie Tingley Crippled Children's Hospital, 500,000 acres; for the Museum of New Mexico, 1,000,000 acres; for the Boys' Reform School, 500,000 acres; for public buildings at the capital, 2,000,000 acres; for water reservoirs for irrigation purposes, 1,500,000 acres; for establishment in the future of a school of medicine, surgery, and nursing at such educational institution as the legislature shall determine, 1,000,000 acres; for the New Mexico Tuberculosis Sanatorium, to remain under direction and management of the New Mexico Department of Public Welfare, 500,000 acres; and for the common schools of the State of New Mexico, 1,500,000 acres, making a total grant of 10,000,000 acres of land.

SEC. 2. That the lands requested to be granted shall be under the same restrictions and limitations as those of the enabling act, being the act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557): *Provided, however,* That the selections of same shall in no way be hindered by the reservations and established grazing districts authorized under the provisions of said act of Congress of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269): *And provided further,* That the Congress may make provision for protection of existing preference rights of permittees and lessees and further providing for lease after appraisal and classification of such lands, and authorizing the New Mexico Commissioner of Public Lands and agents of the United States to enter into cooperative undertakings with respect thereto.

SEC. 3. *Be it further resolved,* That engrossed copies of this house joint memorial be placed upon the permanent records of the office of the secretary of state of New Mexico.

SEC. 4. *Be it further resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forthwith sent respectively to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress.

Approved by me this 7th day of April 1945.

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor, State of New Mexico.

EXTENSION OF TRADE-AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

MR. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit two amendments to the bill (H. R. 3240) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask that they lie on the table, be printed, and printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendments were received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following new section:

"**SEC. —.** No negotiations shall be undertaken under the authority delegated to the President by such section 350, as amended, with a view to decreasing the rate of duty on any article which, in the judgment of the President is essential to the national defense if, in the judgment of the President, such decrease might result in reducing the quantity of production of such article in the United States to such extent as to endanger, in the opinion of the President, the national defense."

At the proper place insert the following new section:

"**SEC. —.** No proclamation shall be made under the authority delegated to the President by such section 350, as amended, decreasing the rate of duty on any article essential to the national defense, as determined by the President, if, in the judgment of the President, wages are paid at a lower rate in the manufacture or production of such article in the principal competing country than in the manufacture or production of such article in the United States, and if the increased importation of such article into the United States, in the judgment of the President might result in the elimination or substantial curtailment of an industry essential to the national defense."

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 3287. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Columbus, Ohio, September 9 to 14, inclusive, 1945; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3395. An act to extend through December 31, 1945, the termination date under the Renegotiation Act; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution reducing certain appropriations available in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE VEHEMENT VOLUNTEER—ARTICLE IN TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MCKELLAR

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "The Vehement Volunteer," by John

Taylor and Lynn Brannen, from the June 23, 1945, issue of Liberty, paying tribute to Senator McKellar, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL ON BOOK WRITTEN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH, ENTITLED "THE FOUR FEARS"

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 25, 1945, concerning The Four Fears, a book written by Senator Thomas of Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES A. FARLEY'S PROPOSALS FOR LIMITING SUCCESSION TO THE PRESI- DENCY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Limiting the Presidency," published in the Bridgeport, Conn., Post of May 13, 1945; and an editorial entitled "Presidential Succession," published in the Hartford Daily Courant of May 18, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH ANNI- VERSARY OF THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS

MR. BROOKS. Mr. President, June 16, 1945, is the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the Quartermaster Corps. The performance of the Quartermaster Corps and the Quartermaster General, Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, in this war will go down in history as one of the great contributions to the success of our armed forces. The multitudinous details of supply made a stupendous total job on a world-wide scale. Only an outstanding organizer and executive could have undertaken such a task in 1940 and from a small start developed a great team of 500,000 men to work so smoothly and efficiently.

I have a copy of General Gregory's message to his team on this one hundred and seventieth anniversary. His personal message to the men and women of the Quartermaster Corps is most inspiring. He also gives a very brief history of the corps for all to read and take pride in.

This most informative and inspiring message should be preserved for all our future generations to read. I therefore ask that it and the story of the Quartermaster Corps, entitled "On Being 170 Years Young," be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 16, 1945.
Subject: One hundred and seventieth anniversary of the Quartermaster Corps.
To: All Quartermaster personnel.

1. This is addressed to you, whoever and wherever you may be. Whether you are truck driver on the Stilwell Road, combat quartermaster in the Philippines, instructor in a cooks and bakers school, fumigation and bath operator in an Army rest area, Government girl, civilian or officer at any of the vast Quartermaster installations throughout the world, I want you to feel that this is a personal greeting on this one hundred and seventieth birthday of the corps.

2. Pride in one's self and one's organization is indispensable to achievement. Therefore I call to your attention the accompanying brief story of quartermaster accomplishments through the years, most noteworthy

of which are the accomplishments you yourself are responsible for in this war.

3. This anniversary comes at a time of triumph. We have only recently concluded a war against a powerful military machine. That war was, by the admissions of the chiefs of staff of both sides, largely a war of supply. Therefore you, who are at the very hub of the Army's supply system, are to be congratulated. For each of you, in your own way, helped make this victory possible. Without your willing sacrifices, the world would not now see the sun, if still hazy, dawn of peace over the horizon.

4. You have had many requests during the past years of war—requests to work harder, to produce more, to speed up the pace. I have but one more request, and that will be my last. Comply with this and the time for taking orders will have passed. My request is now that Germany is defeated, stay on the job. Not just physically but spiritually. Give it all you have. In the Pacific we will soon have a much larger Army to supply than we had in Europe—over supply lines more than twice as long. For the sake of the boys who long to come home, for peace's sake, finish the fight by fighting to the finish.

E. B. GREGORY,
*Lieutenant General, United States
Army, the Quartermaster General.*

ON BEING 170 YEARS YOUNG—THE STORY OF THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Look back 170 years from this very day. On an oak-shaded Boston street, a canvasser goes from door to door to collect clothing, pots and pans for the Continental Army. In those days an American soldier's uniform consisted of whatever he happened to have on (if it were a British uniform, a sprig of hemlock jauntily stuck in his hat would identify him as a rebel). There was no ration as we know it today—the army lived on rum, spruce beer, and such cattle as could be requisitioned on the spot. There was no time for planning and little experience upon which plans could be based anyway. The quartermasters, then as now responsible for gathering supplies and moving them up, had to meet problems as they arose.

Is it so different today? True, the vast complexity of modern war has forced standardization of clothing, equipment and ways of doing things. But fundamentally the success of our war effort has hinged on the ability of the quartermasters to meet successfully new conditions without recourse to previous experience. In 1941, facing enemies on opposite sides of the globe and a war under climatic and terrain conditions never before experienced, we were—from a supply standpoint—facing conditions as difficult for us as the conditions of yesteryear were to the revolutionaries of colonial days.

We had never fought major campaigns in jungles, deserts, on glacier peaks or coral atolls. We had given little thought to the kind of equipment that would stand up in those strange, distant places. We didn't have the housing or the clothing or the equipment for a large army at home, much less one spread over the earth. But we researched and developed and got what we needed where we needed it—fast. Like the quartermasters of the Continental Army in that fateful long-ago Summer, we used our heads and by using them—saved them.

This is the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the Quartermaster Corps. It is also the hour of its greatest triumph. You, who have written this most splendid chapter of its history should know the other chapters. That is the purpose of this booklet. It will give you the necessary inspiration to write the next and, we trust, final chapter—the defeat of Japan.

YANKEE DOODLE DAYS

Yours is one of the oldest military organizations in the United States. The Continental

Congress established the Quartermaster Corps on June 16, 1775. The Quartermaster General received \$80 a month (about the same as a sergeant gets today) and the Deputy Quartermaster General was paid \$40 a month (less than a present-day private).

The Act of February 5, 1778, provided for "carrying into immediate execution the important business of the Quartermaster General." That business, like the quartermaster business of today, included the supply of various articles, stores and services to the Army—among them, food, clothing, tentage, and shelter, forage, animals and transportation. But the manner in which supplies were procured was unlike anything imaginable today. House to house canvassing was as important as formal contracting. Lead was obtained from window and clock weights.

Salt, lead, gunpowder, and saltpeter provided the quartermasters with the most headaches. They had to be imported. The scarcity of salt produced in turn a scarcity of meat (inasmuch as salt was the chief preservative of meat). Complicating everything was a general lack of public faith in the Government's ability to pay off its contracts. This was not without some justification. The Continental Congress could not raise funds or make levies. It could only recommend such action on the part of the colonies, or States. Apparently the colonies did not respond promptly to the recommendations of the Congress. According to Maj. Gen. Nathaniel Greene, the second Quartermaster General: "the farmers of New Jersey and Pennsylvania in 1780 would rather chop up their wagons for kindling and take a chance on hiding their horses in the woods than allow the Army to hire them or to purchase them with certificates, which from all evidence of previous experience, would never be redeemed."

Even when arrangements to obtain necessary funds were successful, other things went amiss. In 1775, Congress authorized a deduction against the soldier's pay for uniforms. Cloth could not be obtained, however. By the fall of 1777, men were being forced from the battlefields for lack of clothing. The men of General Greene's army in the South were all but naked. The uniforms that did exist were in the main brown. Blue was the predominant color after 1778. Actually, uniforms were a contradiction of the term, for Army clothing was all but uniform. Corps, divisions, and even regiments all adopted separate uniforms. Only after 1779, when the apparel-wise French began to help us, did the clothing situation improve.

The food situation was nearly as haphazard. The first ration for the Army was prescribed by Congress in November of 1775. It included one pint of milk, one pint of Indian meal and one quart of spruce beer or cider per man per day. While the Army remained near Boston, the food supply was good. But as it moved south, formidable problems arose. First, foodstuffs were less plentiful. Second, roads were so bad that deliveries could not be assured. Moreover, Congress set up such stiff penalties for loss of supplies that nobody wanted to accept the responsibilities of commissary officer.

Obviously, something had to be done to remedy the entire situation. The remedy, however, created more problems than it remedied. Congress asked the States to furnish quotas of supplies needed to carry on the war. Due to transportation difficulties, food never arrived at the specified places at the right times. For days troops would be on meager rations. Then would come such a deluge of cattle as to make it impossible to slaughter and consume all the meat. Meanwhile there would not be enough forage to feed the cattle that were not slaughtered. When it came time to slaughter more cattle, the animals would be so thin as to make the proposition not worth while. And sometimes when the cattle could be slaughtered, there

was not enough salt on hand to preserve the meat. Aside from the difficulties with the supplies that were furnished, often as not the States would be reluctant to furnish any supplies. The whole system of attempting to supply an Army without money collapsed by mid-1781.

PRIMITIVE PROCUREMENT

There was only one worse system left and that one was soon tried. Oddly, it was a predecessor of the present system of letting contracts. But there was so little faith between contractor and Government and so little determination on the part of either to abide by the contract that the system was worse than no system at all. Contracting began on July 10, 1781, when Congress resolved "that the superintendent of finance be, and he is hereby authorized, either by himself or such person or persons as he shall from time to time appoint for the purpose to procure on contract all necessary supplies for the use of the Army or armies of the United States . . . and also the transportation thereof." The fatal fallacy of the system was that contractors were not required to maintain any reserve stocks. Worse than that, they did not, according to the ever-truthful General Washington, seem to feel any legal obligation to fulfill their contracts.

Through the Revolutionary War, the Army served without a War Department or administrative head. General Washington, as commander in chief, had no higher authority to which he could appeal for support. Withal, the Army triumphed over a powerful military adversary. Credit for the victory belongs largely to those early quartermasters who prevailed over impossible odds. Out of incredible chaos they somehow managed to supply an army. It is not too much to say that the independence of the United States is due in large part to their ingenuity and enterprise.

Soon after the Revolutionary War, the business of the Quartermaster General diminished to the vanishing point. On July 25, 1795, Congress abolished the Office of the Quartermaster General. For the next 15 years the Nation had no Quartermaster General. Actually, there was little or no quartermaster business on hand. The Army in 1790 numbered about 1,200 men. Its supply was handled directly by the Secretary of War, whose job in this respect was little bigger than that of a regimental supply officer. Not until 1795 was the Quartermaster's Department reestablished by Congress. In 1802 it vanished once more. On March 28, 1812, Congress again created a Quartermasters Department headed by a Quartermaster General and four deputies.

This act provided "that in addition to other duties in the field, it shall be the duty of the Quartermaster General, his deputies and assistant deputies, when there to directed by the Secretary of War, to purchase military stores, camp equipage, and other articles requisite for the troops, and generally to procure and provide means of transport for the army, its stores, artillery, and camp equipage." The act was highly significant insofar as it divided the Quartermaster's Department into three distinct services: Transportation, clothing and munitions, and subsistence. An act of May 14, 1812, relieved the Quartermaster's Department of its ammunition and artillery functions by establishing an Ordnance Department.

QUARTERMASTER ODDITIES

The reorganization of the department was very timely. On June 18, 1812, war was declared against Great Britain. We had about 10,000 men under arms, half of them recruits. Our supply system was still inefficient. General Hull surrendered Detroit to a British Army one-third the size of his forces. If we learned anything from the final marginal victory wrested from the British, it was that supply was the decisive factor in

any war. A poorly organized supply department could lose a war. This realization was to win us future wars. Adversity in arms had taught us the truth.

One curious historical fact to emerge from the War of 1812 was that a quartermaster captain had built Perry's fleet. That was the fleet that had won the Battle of Lake Erie and had done much to discourage invasion from Canada. A quartermaster proved that Americans could build boats faster and better than the enemy. Another curious thing about the War of 1812 is that we won our greatest victory after the treaty of peace with England had been signed. That was the Battle of New Orleans. News of the signing of the treaty of peace at Ghent did not reach this country until 2 weeks after the battle was fought and won.

Eighteen hundred and twenty-eight brought a new development in quartermaster history. During that year Congress substituted sugar and coffee for the spirit component of the ration.

BIRTH OF THE DEPOTS

During the Civil War the Quartermaster Department operated somewhat similarly to the Quartermaster Corps of today. There was Maj. Gen. Montgomery C. Meigs serving as the Quartermaster General. General Meigs had 5 brigadier generals and quartermasters serving under him, 39 colonels, 18 majors, 554 captains, and 9 military storekeepers. There were in addition about fifteen hundred regimental quartermasters serving with troops. Commissary officers were with each Army department, depot, corps, and division. On July 4, 1864, an act of Congress systematized duties of the Quartermaster's Department. Under this act the Office of the Quartermaster General was divided into 10 divisions—remount and draft animals; clothing, equipage, and individual accouterments; ocean transportation; rail and river transportation; forage and straw; construction; wagons, ambulances, harness, and fuel; inspections and reports; money and property accounts.

One of the most important provisions of the act was the setting up of field depots for the storage and distribution of supplies to the Army. The field depots corresponded to present-day Army or base depots. They in turn were supplied by larger, permanent depots which were located in or near the big manufacturing cities. The specialized manufacturing depots of today had their Civil War counterpart in depots in New York, Philadelphia, and St. Louis.

Another activity born to the Quartermaster Corps—this one of everlasting importance—was the establishment and maintenance of national cemeteries. The establishment of national cemeteries was authorized by act of Congress of July 17, 1862. The same act provided a portion of Lee's farm as a national cemetery—known today as Arlington. In 1867, the Quartermaster Corps was delegated the sacred duty of establishing cemeteries and the interment therein of those who had died in the war.

The Civil War was the first war in which there was a reasonably well-organized Quartermaster Corps functioning with adequate personnel. Its work won the praise of Secretary of War Stanton, who declared: "During the war this branch of the service never failed. It answers to the demand and is ever ready to meet the national call." Foreign observers, too, were generous with praise. The French general, Du Chanal, was impressed with the equipment of our soldiers, particularly the soldiers under General Sherman. The Civil War soldier carried 36 pounds of equipment in summer and 40 pounds in winter. He also was issued a rubber blanket poncho and a 5-pound blanket for bivouac.

HIBERNATION AGAIN

When the Civil War ended, the Quartermaster Corps had under its control a great

coastwise and river transport fleet, had perfected the handling of long wagon trains, had set up a fairly efficient system of manufacturing depots, and was expert in rail transport. It had demonstrated its ability to handle the important supply and transport functions of an army which, at the close of the Civil War, numbered approximately 1,000,000 men.

But the close of that war was the cue for a helter-skelter demobilization of the Military Establishment. On April 28, 1865, the Secretary of War ordered discontinuance of purchases of all supplies and release of all vessels and transports except those needed in moving troops to demobilization points. By 1866, the personnel of the Quartermaster Department had been whittled down to 69 officers and 16 military storekeepers. During the next year, the nine divisions of the Quartermaster General's office were abolished. Reduction followed reduction. By the time the war with Spain was about to begin, the United States Army had little more than 25,000 men, most of them engaged in subduing the Indians along our western frontiers.

Allowing the military to all but vanish during the period between wars had consequences which, against a stronger enemy than Spain, could have been fatal. Knowledge of military water transport was all but forgotten by the time of the Spanish-American War. We knew so little about the loading of transports that we had to ask the British for aid. Freight was backed up over 26 miles of rail lines behind Tampa. We failed to realize that depots must be in the interior to avoid crowding and confusion at embarkation points. We had great difficulty in loading and getting men off the boats. They landed in Cuba without personal equipment. Our mules, swimming ashore with small-arms ammunition strapped to their backs, saved the day.

QM'S IN TWO WARS

There were some entries on the credit side, however. Taken as a whole, the Spanish-American War taught us many valuable lessons in logistics. It afforded our Army its first experience with invasions of distant islands. The invasion of the Philippines during this war was made in five expeditions. Nineteen troop ships were used in all. None was lost and all men reached their destination in good health. The invasions involved the transportation of over 16,000 soldiers, their equipment, and the necessary supplies. Besides the important experience thus provided, extensive tropical service of American troops brought forth notable experiments in the development of khaki cloth.

Following this war, peace again brought the inevitable reduction in the Military Establishment. Nothing significant in Quartermaster history occurred until August 24, 1912. Then came one of the most important pieces of legislation in quartermaster annals. An act of Congress created the establishment known as the Quartermaster Corps by consolidating the Quartermaster, Subsistence, and Pay Departments. As set up under this act—except for certain changes made under the National Defense Act of 1916—the Quartermaster Corps approached the momentous tasks that were to be imposed by the World War.

Though the organization was not nearly equal at first to the burdens put upon it, we had the benefit of considerable supply experience. We knew how to load troops on transports. We knew how to load units for overseas service. We knew enough to avoid the British blunder at the Dardanelles of loading field guns on top of small arms.

Biggest headache of the corps was lack of adequate sources of supply. The corps was forced to buy commercial articles on the open market pending the time articles could be manufactured according to Army speci-

cations. More than 200 different makes of motor vehicles were used by the American Expeditionary Forces in France. The spare-parts situation can be easily imagined. Transport and construction activities of the corps grew to such magnitude as to become activities of virtually separate organizations. The operations of the corps reached astronomical proportions. Eight hundred million pounds of beef were purchased during the war; a billion pounds of sugar. The corps acquired nearly a half million mules by the end of 1918. More than a billion dollars' worth of clothing was bought. More than 200,000 civilians were employed by the corps on construction activities alone.

At the close of the war the Quartermaster Corps inventoried its vast stocks, prepared them for sale, and again gradually resumed its peacetime activities. The corps was all but abolished in 1919, then resurrected by the act of June 4, 1920. Under this act, the chief of the corps, Maj. Gen. Harry L. Rogers, renewed his title as quartermaster general. The corps reacquired control of the Motor Transport Corps, the Transportation Service, the Construction Division, and the Real Estate Service. Only the Finance Department remained a separate organization. In this form, the corps continued unchanged during the remaining period of peace.

THE GREAT EXPANSION

With the declaration of a national emergency in 1940, an era ended. Nothing that had occurred heretofore would match, either in scale or in scope, what was about to happen. Overnight, the United States was transformed from a peace to a war economy. No branch of the armed forces bore the brunt of the transformation as much as the Quartermaster Corps. Vast program followed vast program, each outdistancing the other with seven-league boots. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, over a billion and a half dollars was spent by the corps for construction. Yet this was small compared with what was to follow.

On May 1, 1941, most of the Army went from a garrison ration (which allowed organizations to buy their own food and prepare their own menus) to a field ration (which provided rations in kind to all organizations on the basis of a master menu prepared by experts in Washington). Research and development of rations, clothing, and various articles of equipment began on a vast scale. Famous explorers, geographers, and cartographers were called into the office of the Quartermaster General as consultants. Climatic experts began studies designed to provide clothing and equipment that would stand up in places ranging from the Arctic fjords of Norway to the hot, humid atolls of Oceania.

Although we were training a national defense army at the time, it had already become evident that embroilment in any future war would mean it must be waged on a global basis. Experts interpreted climatic data in terms of how far up on a soldier's shoes the mud would go when a division landed on some island beach; how wet clothing would become in rain and snow; how all wool and cotton clothing and equipage items would withstand varied climatic conditions.

WORLD WAR II. EUROPE AND THE DAYS PAST

None of us in our lifetime will forget the shock on the afternoon of December 7, 1941, when radio flashed the news to the world that Pearl Harbor had been bombed by the Japanese. Teletype operators of Quartermaster Corps headquarters in Washington and field depots left their Sunday dinners to go on 24-hour duty; soon fighting men began moving toward ports of embarkation and with them moved supplies—supplies not only for immediate needs but to build up reserves for the heavy offensive operations that were inevitable before defeat of the enemy.

As great as the problem of clothing and equipping the growing Army was—expanding from a defense to a wartime army of 8,000,000—on the food front the momentous task staggered the imagination. The Quartermaster Corps became the largest mass feeding organization in world history, at one time supplying 24,000,000 meals a day to the Army alone, each meal scientifically planned to sustain men in the toughest kind of work. Meals in mess halls, fox holes, tents, former luxury hotels, transport planes, ships. Our Army had to race where Napoleon's army could not even have crawled—across deserts, arctic wastes, jungle fastnesses. Rations for mobile armies had to be designed and processed to withstand heat, damp climates, subzero temperatures—and yet be fit to eat, with the nutritive content of a steak dinner and yet compact enough to fit a soldier's pack.

Faced with war on opposite sides of the world, obviously strategy demanded defeat of the Axis Forces in Europe first; even then the enemy had penetrated deeply into Russia apparently in an attempted sweep to join the Japanese via Asia. Supplies and men were moved swiftly across the Atlantic to England in preparation for massive landing operations. The Quartermaster Corps played an important role in those operations.

The Allies struck on November 8, 1942, by landing on the coast of north Africa. For this operation the Quartermaster Corps provided 38,000,000 pounds of clothing and equipment, 22,000,000 pounds of rations, and 10,000,000 gallons of gasoline to go ashore with the troops. These were supplemented by more and still more until it was necessary for the Quartermaster Corps to acquire more than 25,000,000 square feet of storage space for current and reserve supplies. For open storage, thousands of yards of canvas had to be supplied.

By the following September the Nazis had been driven from Africa and Sicily and a landing was made on the Italian mainland. Violent weather set in immediately, necessitating shipment by plane and ship from Sicily and Africa more than a half-million items of clothing, blankets, and overshoes and hundreds of thousands of other items to supplement supplies landed with the invasion forces.

In June 1944 the Allies struck at the Continent itself; quartermaster trucks loaded with clothing, rations, and gasoline rolled from the landing barges behind the hard-hitting troops. Illustrative of the huge amounts is a report of one armored division which alone required its quartermasters to furnish it with more than 2,300,000 gallons of gasoline, 76,000 gallons of engine oils and nearly 1,100 tons of small arms ammunition to carry it from Normandy to the Siegfried line.

A tabulation of quartermaster supplies discloses the following general totals for a few major items supplied the American forces in the Mediterranean and European theaters for the 2 years immediately preceding VE-day:

More than 15,000,000 pair of trousers, 11,000,000 field jackets, 81,000,000 pairs of socks (of all kinds), 10,000,000 blankets, 1,500,000,000 gallons of gasoline (exclusive of aviation gas), and more than 10,000,000 tons of coal. While the Russian Army was engaged in driving the Germans from the interior of Russia, Quartermaster trucks rolled continuously over 700 miles of Persian deserts and mountains with more than 1,000,000 tons of supplies.

More than 100 fixed laundries, 60 of which were shipped from this country, provided service for troops and hospitals in the communications zones; hundreds of mobile units, laundry and repair, serviced the troops in the combat zones.

WORLD WAR II. JAPAN AND THE DAYS AHEAD

Meanwhile, the story was being repeated in the Pacific although necessarily on a smaller scale, and under most difficult of conditions. On Guadalcanal, rations and supplies were passed across gullies on improvised rope tramways; on New Guinea, they were toted over the Owen-Stanley mountains and up the Buna coast on brawny shoulders; in Burma, tons daily were parachuted to troops from cargo planes.

Days just as stern still lie ahead. In Europe, we supplied a large Army some 3,000 miles from home; in the Pacific and Asiatic theaters we will have to supply a large force—seven to ten thousand miles away. Large groups of men more than twice as far from the main source of supply.

The prospect is sobering but not frightening as long as we continue to do the excellent job we have done so far. We must all pull together in order to win more quickly. And out of all the suffering and sacrifice, aside from the deliverance of our Nation from destruction, much tangible good will result.

This war has been the greatest proving ground ever known for new foods, textiles, and many kinds of materials and appliances. Here are working materials which but for the war might never have become available—honest tests of new products, materials, and methods, honest because it was a matter of life or death to millions of American soldiers that we know the truth; new wrinkles in manufacturing and handling that will, if properly applied, reduce the peacetime cost of living for millions; developments in packaging and food processing that may change the concept and scope of perishable goods; diet discoveries and food preparation that may immeasurably improve the Nation's health; and countless other things to make living better and easier in the years to come.

And if we learn well from history, we will preserve the knowledge and experience of this war, particularly the logistical knowledge, as insurance against other national catastrophes. We will also retain a nucleus of a trained supply organization, able to expand overnight to meet such a national emergency.

Preparedness is not merely the maintenance of a sufficient number of trained combat troops; it is also industrial preparedness, supply preparedness, and research preparedness. It is a matter of constant vigilance in peace as well as in war. Let us not junk the knowledge born to us of our blood, and sweat, and tears.

That is the lesson and moral to be learned from the history of our organization—yours and mine—the Quartermaster Corps, today 170 years young.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] has said, today is a notable anniversary in the history of the American military service, to which I think at least brief attention should be called in an open session of the Senate.

The Quartermaster Corps of the Army is 170 years old today. It is a corps which antedates the Constitution of the United States. It was established before the Declaration of Independence was written. It was established, indeed, at the very outset of the Revolutionary War by an act of the Continental Congress on June 16, 1775. It was created to supply food, ammunition, clothing, and equipment for the militia units which the Continental Congress hoped to recruit in the various colonies and build eventually into a unified striking force in defense of colonial liberty.

In the war for independence and in every other military conflict in which

this country has been engaged, the Quartermaster Corps has rendered notably efficient service. Throughout the country today, in all the stations in which members of this organization are serving, notice is being taken of this anniversary. With pardonable pride in the achievements of this branch of our military forces, a branch that supplied the Continental Army to its final victory, and which has similarly supplied every American Army since.

I have had personal opportunities to witness what the Quartermaster Corps has done, and I feel that it would be an oversight if recognition were not given here on the floor of the Senate to the efficiency which has been demonstrated by this branch of the service through its 170 years of activity and particularly during this war. Although we know that the war is being carried on on a global scale, I think very few of us—even those of us who have sat on the Committee of Military Affairs and on the Appropriations Committee, and have made available the funds which have been expended—actually realize the scope of the transactions which have been carried on by the Quartermaster Corps. Senators who have had an opportunity to go abroad have, of course, seen visual evidence of what has been done.

We know that no American soldier anywhere in this whole far-flung war has been beyond the ken of the Quartermaster Corps. This organization has furnished the clothing, ammunition, and food which have made our Army the best fed, the best clothed, and the best equipped in all the history of mankind. Mr. President, I arise to give my personal tribute to the accomplishments of the 500,000 officers and enlisted men who, under the leadership of Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, with the cooperation of 75,000 civilian employees in depots and in domestic installations have established a record for which no parallel exists in all the history of military operations. It has been because of the efficiency of the Quartermaster Corps that our forces in Europe, in the Mediterranean theater, in the South Pacific, and in the China-India-Burma theater have been equipped with the supplies that were necessary to achieve victory. The gigantic industrial production of America would have been all in vain if the commodities of warfare had not been placed in the hands of the fighting soldiers all over the world. That was the task of the Quartermaster Corps. It was a task performed with efficiency and skill.

Each succeeding war through the 17 decades of the existence of the Quartermaster Corps has brought greater problems for the Quartermaster Corps, but the problems of this war were greater than were even imagined when we were first catapulted into the conflict in December 1941. No natural obstacle, no ocean, no mountain range, no difficulties of weather and wind, no other obstacle was great enough to prevent the Corps from performing its task. Time and distance itself were conquered, and wherever our soldiers fought, the fighting Quartermasters were there also.

In the 2 years preceding VE-day for the operations in the Mediterranean and in Europe the Quartermaster Corps handled more than 1,500,000,000 gallons of gasoline, not including the quantities used for aircraft. It handled more than 10,000,000 tons of coal, and as for clothing, more than 15,000,000 pairs of trousers, 11,000,000 jackets, 10,000,000 overcoats, raincoats, and ponchos, 10,000,000 sleeping bags were made available to our men. It would be impossible in the few moments available to me this afternoon to begin to catalog all of the articles which the Quartermaster Corps has handled. This 170-year-old organization in this war has stored and distributed approximately 70,000 different items.

Let me emphasize that the task has not been one of procurement alone, but of distribution often under the fire of enemy guns. Organizationally the Quartermaster Corps is a technical service rather than what is known as a combat service. Nevertheless it has more than earned the nickname bestowed upon it at Bataan—the Fighting Quartermaster Corps. It has carried on its work of supply under fire, moving in with the assault forces in every major landing operation. Its men and officers proudly wear nearly every type of military decoration possible to earn, including thousands of Purple Hearts, many of which were awarded posthumously. For more than a year and a half now the supply of not only food and clothing but medical items, guns, and ammunition to thousands of Allied troops—American, British, Chinese, and others—in the far reaches of Burma have depended to a large extent upon well-organized air dropping by quartermaster soldiers. On this dangerous run every cargo plane brought down by Japanese fire carried with it an Air Force pilot and three quartermasters. Two score of these intrepid supply men have flown more than 500 of these missions. Other hundreds have from 100 to 500 to their credit.

To make it possible to furnish this service, the Quartermaster Corps was compelled to undertake a gigantic task of training and organization. Most of the 500,000 men who did this job were engaged in utterly different occupations or had no occupation at all when they entered the service. The Quartermaster Corps trains the Army's cooks and does its baking. It operates laundries, many of them in combat zones, so that the men on the fighting front might have changes of clothing at every opportunity. It has conducted operations for the salvage and repair of all kinds of commodities, reducing the waste which is inevitable in war to a minimum. Men of the Quartermaster Corps move with the fighting troops, and gather up all items of issue damaged in combat or abandoned in the heat of battle or lost or overlooked by reason of sudden troop movements. Recovered items are repaired and returned to stock wherever repairable, and it can be said without exaggeration that literally hundreds of millions of tons in new procurement have been saved by the work of the Quartermaster Corps.

I have seen the training operations of the Quartermaster Corps in my own State at Fort Francis E. Warren. I know

the care and the skill and the great ability which have gone into the training of these youths. The boys who have been assigned to the Quartermaster Corps and who have received military training as well as the specialized training necessary for this service have received instruction which will be of permanent value to them throughout their lives.

Behind the training and the actual operations is the work of planning so that the long supply lines stretching from continental United States to every combat theater were kept constantly filled and constantly functioning. All of this activity stems from headquarters out through the Quartermaster and Army Service Forces depots and the 35 market centers throughout the United States, with similar depots overseas. Frequently these branches are formulated as much as a year ahead, but they must be kept under constant observation because they must be constantly revised as the war changes. It would be impossible to exaggerate the tremendous difficulties of the task. No Quartermaster Corps in history was ever confronted with such a task. The General Staffs of Germany and Japan did not believe that any nation on earth could organize and supply a two-front war. We did it. And I think it's altogether fitting that on this birthday we should pay our tribute to General Gregory and all the officers and men and women of the Quartermaster Corps who have observed this one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the corps by hard work in their stations throughout the world.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3240) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is recognized in accordance with a previous request.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I find myself differing with a large number of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber in regard to the question now pending before the Senate. However, I feel compelled to follow my convictions, arrived at after serious and conscientious consideration of this question, which has potential possibilities of bringing serious, if not destructive, consequences to the industries and toilers of my State and, indeed, I fear, to the economic stability of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have voted repeatedly against excessive high-tariff duties. I voted for the original reciprocal trade law and its reenactment when it has been before the Senate every 2 years since 1934, in an effort to remove some of the evil results of laws made by the Congress in fixing basic tariff rates, when the reduction of existing basic tariff rates was limited to 50 percent. Though it has not been possible to determine whether the

present law is a wise or unwise policy, for the war has prevented the reciprocal trade law from being operative, yet I intend to vote to continue the existing law. My opposition is to granting any additional power to increase tariff rate reductions at this time.

The full effect upon domestic production of the agreements already made is unknown. Without any normal period in which the existing reciprocal trade law could be tried out, it is now proposed to grant authority to reduce basic rates on a large number of commodities produced in this country up to a maximum of 75 percent without fixing any standards or yardsticks or other conditions, such as the consideration of the cost of production at home and abroad, to guide the bureau in the Department of State that negotiates these treaties. In my opinion, this is a move in the direction of free trade, sincerely advocated by many who believe that the opening up of the trade markets of Europe to all nations is one of the major factors in world peace. In brief, it is a move to reduce agricultural and industrial tariffs to what could be the lowest level in the history of the country.

Mr. President, no one can predict with any degree of certainty what sort of a world we will face when world hostilities cease. Likewise, no human being knows at this time what effect the power already granted and exercised in trade agreements already made will have on American industry and labor in the immediate future. It is an extraordinary power. It is a power to destroy any industry which a bureau, set up in the State Department, considers unable to produce goods here as cheaply as they can be produced in a foreign country. If this policy had prevailed in the past, many small and struggling infant industries which have grown to become strong and powerful and prosperous would never have come into existence.

It is futile to discuss postwar trade problems without a realistic examination of the leading factors certain to be involved. England, our highest-cost competitor, pays wages that are 50 percent below those paid in America, and they go from 50 percent down to perhaps 80 percent below in some countries such as Czechoslovakia. Wages paid in America today are higher than ever in its history, and we desire to maintain them. We are exerting all possible effort to prevent large and widespread unemployment during the postwar period, and it is inopportune to lessen any existing agency of production by competition with imports from abroad. With the increased cost of production that it is necessary to maintain if wages are to be kept at present levels, we are proceeding, through this proposed legislation, to increase imports from other countries, in competition with our producers on a more favorable basis to importers than ever before.

At the present time our foreign competitors have full knowledge of our patents and efficiency methods and are capable of producing machine tools and machinery of the highest quality and efficiency. They have learned during these war years the methods of mass

production which we have taught them directly or by example. The United Kingdom has, according to evidence presented, greatly increased the efficiency of its manufacturing plants and has enough cotton-spindles production capacity to supply the entire world.

India, where the wages paid labor are notoriously small, has become one of the leading producing nations of secondary rank. South America has rapidly expanded not only its production capacity for consumer goods but also the production of minerals and other primary commodities. Russia and Czechoslovakia are contemplating increasing their production, agriculturally and industrially.

A press dispatch of May 30 from London states that plans are in contemplation for transferring thousands of India workers from agriculture to industry; that a large number of British companies plan to start factories there, particularly in the manufacture of textiles; that it is expected efforts to prove India's place as a potential postwar market will bring about industrial production to several hundred million dollars annually.

Mr. President the cost of living is lower in other countries than in this country. The cost of cotton is lower. The cost of wool is lower. This proposal is a proposal to reduce all tariffs to all nations whether they need it or not. Without first having tried out a plan which has resulted in leveling the tariffs on dutiable products to an average of 31 percent, we should hesitate to grant power now to make it possible, without having knowledge of the effect of what has already been done, to reduce the tariff to 16 percent on dutiable goods. It is said the power will not be exercised; we hear that again and again. But we are asked to grant the power without any condition attached, and, in my opinion, the tariff would certainly wipe out a considerable number of industries if the power were used.

Frankly, much as I believe we ought to help rehabilitate the war-stricken countries of Europe by all practicable means within our power, I am unable to accept the additional proposal that we now open our domestic markets to them in a larger degree than ever before in what may prove to be destructive competition with our producers and workers.

Proponents of this measure, sincere believers in free trade—and I do not now refer to the officers of the State Department who are negotiating the treaties, but many of the advocates—actually argued before the Senate committee in favor of the elimination of all industries in this country except those that can produce commodities cheaper than they could be produced abroad. They said the thing to consider was that the consumers would get goods more cheaply if they came from abroad than if produced in this country.

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

Mr. WALSH. I should rather not. I should prefer to have the Senator wait until I conclude my prepared remarks.

I do not assert this policy would be followed, but, if this theory even remotely prevails among those who will have the power to negotiate trade agree-

ments in secret, without approval by the Congress, it could mean overnight the depletion of the woolen fabric industry, the cotton-textile industry, the watch industry—which these treaties have already almost completely destroyed—the boot and shoe industry, the fish and jewelry, the paper and plastic industries, the dairy industry—and, in fact, nearly all our industries, except automobile and like heavy industries.

The Tariff Commission, in response to a resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], named approximately 40 important commodities, the imports of which they stated would be materially—note the word “materially”—affected by reduced duties below the levels in the reciprocal trade-agreements law.

Mr. President, I ask that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Is there objection?

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

Cattle and beef, cheese, barley malt, alfalfa seed, tomatoes, brandy, wool-knit underwear, machine-made carpets and rugs, raw wool, woollens and worsteds, cotton yarns, countable cotton cloth, cotton tapestries, cotton table damask, cotton quilts and bedspreads, broad silks, knit gloves, yarns and threads of flax, rayon staple fiber, hats and hat materials, jewelry, lace and lace articles, embroidered household articles, handkerchiefs, leather shoes, leather gloves, silver-fox furs, perfumes, coarse linens and linen towels, dolls and toys, watches, art and decorative pottery, pottery tableware, glassware, hand-made, aluminum, aluminum foil, zinc, lead, copper.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, with the knowledge that the countries of Europe have obtained during the war of our mass-production methods, and the possession now of the tools, implements, machines, and patents, such as we have in this country, who will dare say that even the automobile industry and like industries may not soon fear the destructive effect of importations from abroad, which are bound to be developed in Europe following the war?

New England and the eastern seaboard have special reason to fear this legislation. Already 1,226 rate cuts have been made in commodities and many of these are comparable to those produced in domestic factories, including almost every product they manufacture.

Much as I would be willing to sacrifice in the hope and expectation of helping to contribute to world peace, I cannot bring myself to experiment at this time with any law which could, and, in my opinion, would, operate to create unemployment and destroy some of our industries. It seems to me the sensible thing—indeed, the only thing—that we ought to do at this time is to let the situation remain as it is until we see what develops in the postwar era. The bill, if enacted, would permit the making of trade agreements for a period of 3 years, with any country at any time between July 1, 1945 and 1948—thus permitting the binding of ourselves to international trade agreements that, if made during the latter one of these years, could extend and

bind us until 1951. The postwar situation is too unsettled to take the chance. I have seen in my lifetime too many smokeless chimneys of once prosperous industries in cities like New Bedford, Fall River, Lowell, Haverhill, Lynn, Lawrence, and other manufacturing centers, not to be fearful of the effects of competition through low wages.

New England once had 80 percent of the cotton spindles of the country. Today it has only 20 percent. New England lost that predominance to the South, which now has 80 percent, and it was lost on the basis of a 10-25 percent lower wage standard than was paid in New England. If New England could not compete with the South at 25 percent lower wages, how is the textile business of the United States today, both North and South, going to compete with the world that may be 50 to 75 percent less than the wages paid here? Perhaps the textile industry ought to be sacrificed, but we ought to realize that we are delegating the power to do this. Some think it should be perhaps wiped out, but if another war comes, where are we to get our woollens and cotton products to clothe our people and protect their health?

The textile business is the most vulnerable of all, and in the most dangerous position of all, because it has live, active competition, particularly in Great Britain, in France, Switzerland, and now in India, and of course before the war had serious competition in Japan. It is vulnerable because it has the highest percentage of man-hours in its unit of production and has already experienced heavy cuts in its protective duties. Fifty percent of the cost of production in the textile mills goes to labor. The labor item is exceedingly large. One witness has developed this point before the Finance Committee very effectively:

You have got to make the tariff low enough to let the material come in. Otherwise, reciprocal trade business is no good. To make the trade agreements effective you have got to bring the tariff down so that goods can come into this country, and when commodities do come into this country it is going to displace man-hours in this country.

The threat and fear of the cotton and woolen textile industry extends also to paper, toy, woodworking, boot and shoe, and the recent plastic industries—in my town alone five of these small industries have been developed recently. Frankly, I sincerely believe the woolen industry cannot survive the tariff reductions already made in these trade agreements—certainly further reductions will be destructive.

It is alarming to think that at a time when there has been such widespread agitation over the country to protect and save small businessmen and small industries, there should be proposed a measure that has such injurious possibilities to many small industries and their workers. I was impressed in hearing the evidence before the Finance Committee and in reading the evidence presented before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the debate in the House, at the more or less contemptuous manner in which reference was made by some witnesses to small

industries. For instance, when questions were asked as to how many a given industry employed, and in the case of the hand-made-glass industry the number was stated to be 6,000, there was displayed an attitude of "Oh, that is inconsequential." When one considers that more than 90 percent of all manufacturing establishments employ less than 100 people, such an attitude is highly dangerous and does not indicate much sympathetic interest in preserving and protecting the small industries of the country.

Mr. President, I have voted and supported all legislation that related to better working conditions, higher wages, restricting the employment and hours of labor of women and children and the rights of workers to bargain collectively with their employers. In fact, I have reported from the Committee on Education and Labor several bills dealing with the subject, which later became law, and defended them on the floor. These and a large amount of social legislation have undoubtedly, while improving the lot of the workers, added to the cost of production in this country. In my opinion, now, when working conditions in the world outside our own country are at the lowest level and the cost of production at the highest peak in our history and when taxes are the highest we have ever known, the reduction of tariffs would inevitably tend to destroy the benefits of all the above-mentioned legislation and prove injurious to our producers and workers.

The main purposes of the pending legislation are to open our markets so that other nations can sell us more competitive goods—noncompetitive goods like coffee, rubber, and other commodities not produced here which are on the free list constitute the major part of our imports today—by reason of an additional 50-percent reduction in tariff. Otherwise there would be no reason for the measure. The reasons behind this proposal can be nothing short of a direct movement away from the protective tariff policy that, with all its limitations and evils—and it had many—has contributed tremendously to the industrial growth of this country and to higher wages and the American standard of living, in the direction of free trade.

In brief, the bill proposes to reduce farm and industrial income further by paying the way for the purchase abroad of agricultural and industrial products that must be produced at home if farm and industrial income is to be maintained at its present level.

We should be prepared at all times and under all circumstances to protect our own market and strive to increase our domestic production rather than lessen it by seeking for import trade. So far as lies within our power and influence, we must aid other nations and peoples to attain higher standards of living and to work, enlarge, and enrich the markets of the world. In so doing, let us not be unmindful that the interests of America are of foremost consideration, that the protection of our own markets and our own people is primary. But regardless of whatever policy of relationship is to govern, it should be arrived at, not in se-

cret, but in open concert by a democratic procedure and not by bureaucratic methods or means.

Let us hesitate to trade off our American standards of living for the hypothetical good will of foreign producers.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD several letters and telegrams which I have received supporting the position and attitude I have taken in this address.

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

NAUSET WAREHOUSE Co.,
New Bedford, Mass., June 1, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: We address you regarding the pending extension of the reciprocal trade-agreements bill now before your Senate Finance Committee for hearing, and to pass along a suggestion that seems to us to be constructive and worthy of consideration.

We note that the power to cut the existing tariffs by another 50 percent through negotiation for reciprocal action with other countries appears to be the only figure used by anyone any time. Why should we, at this time, cut 50 percent more, leaving a net tariff of 25 percent as the protective feature for our great mass of New England labor, their wage and living standards, as well as the huge New England capital investment in manufacturing enterprises?

Why not have the extreme limit of power to cut reduced to 25 percent and see how that works out? Then, in the future, as and if we become adjusted to that figure, survey the whole matter again—say, in 3 to 5 years—and make another extension of the act if found feasible and safe to do so.

The severity of the adjustment to another 50-percent cut, in our opinion, will work havoc upon our woolen, cotton, rayon textile, and other industries. The hundreds of thousands of jobs dependent upon those industries and the allied and supporting supplying trades, as well as our whole New England and northeastern economy will receive another kiss of death, and we have had several such during the last 25 years, as you well know. We may not be able to stand up and take it much more and remain vigorous.

New England and the Northeast, willing to be liberal and helpful to others, see no reason to participate and concur in industrial suicide to please some other sections of this country of ours which are publicly out to "get us," if they can, and, in addition, give way to other countries which want all they can get from us—always, all the time—and pay us little or nothing in return, as usual.

With assurance from the writer of his continuing good will and esteem,
Respectfully yours,

C. A. W. BEST,
Treasurer.

OVERSEERS' ASSOCIATION,
PACIFIC MILLS, WORSTED DIVISION,
Lawrence, Mass., April 24, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The Overseers Association of the Pacific Mills view with a great deal of concern the proposals embodied in H. R. 2652. We are cognizant of the fact that the greater portion of the woolen and worsted textile industry in the country is centered in and about Lawrence and are also aware of the fact that in labor alone there are nearly 90,000 textile employees who obtain their livelihood from the textile industry. We feel that it will be utterly impossible for industry to continue to maintain

the present employment and wage levels if they are practically devoid of any protection in the form of an equitable tariff rate.

There has been an increasing tendency on the part of various governmental bureaus and labor organizations to attempt to standardize and stabilize wages and competitive conditions in the textile industry in the United States. In addition, there has been an ever-increasing tendency to raise wages until we have reached a point where our wages are approximately two and a half times those paid to British woolen and worsted employees. We are firm believers in high-wage levels if our goods can be manufactured at a price that will permit fair competition and a just distribution of production. We know, however, from our experience that without suitable tariff protection, Greater Lawrence will soon be reduced to the level of a forgotten city. We can see nothing but ruin and disaster to the textile industry just for the sake of sacrificing those who would give away to the rest of the world everything that we have worked hard to build up. We are afraid that this is just a part of the proposed schedule and scheme whereby our system of free enterprise will be abolished and taken over by the Federal Government. The only groups of persons who will be materially affected will be the importers and for the time being the automotive trades which look forward to a tremendous volume of export business of equipment which cannot be made in sufficient quantities in the foreign countries and which is sorely needed by them. The exports of American machinery and heavy equipment will then be paid for by textiles of foreign manufacture with the ultimate result that Massachusetts and New England especially will cease to exist as economic and industrial entities.

We urge you to exert your full power and influence to defeat H. R. 2652.

Yours very truly,

ANDREW HALDANE,
President.
HARRY LAMBERT,
Vice President.
JAMES L. BATTIS,
THOMAS R. BEE,
EARLE R. RUTTER,
Directors.
A. N. SILLOWAY,
Secretary.

LAWRENCE, MASS., June 5, 1945.

SENATOR DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Ninety thousand Massachusetts textile employees and their employers dread the consequences of H. R. 3240. They look to you for opposition to this bill.

U. J. Lupien, Public Relations Consultant for Pacific Mills, Lawrence, and M. T. Stevens, North Andover, Mass.

PACIFIC MILLS, WORSTED DIVISION,
Lawrence, Mass., May 7, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Under separate cover we are sending you lithographed copies of petitions which were signed by the employees of the Pacific Mills in Lawrence. Attached herewith you will find a copy of the letter which was sent to Congressman LANE, together with the originals of these petitions.

Whereas you need no further information as to the disastrous effects of H. R. 2652, we nevertheless wish to reemphasize that the passage of such an act will be detrimental to the thousands of your constituents here in Massachusetts. Let us urge you again to do everything within your power to prevent such a catastrophe.

With the kindest of personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

U. J. LUPINEN,
Director, Public Relations.

PACIFIC MILLS,
Boston, April 11, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: We realize we are entering a new era and reciprocal trade agreements are designed to help in making a lasting peace in the world.

As a woolen and worsted manufacturer we think we can maintain employment and make both ends meet if there is no change in the present tariff schedule. It is our belief that any further reduction on manufactured goods would be disastrous to our industry as well as to our employees.

Those responsible for the reduced tariff argue that reduced tariff would affect only the high-priced fabrics, and reciprocal trade agreements were designed to protect us on medium-priced goods. However, this proved not to be the case as in the first 5 months of 1939 under reciprocal trade agreements imports on worsteds increased 131 percent, and on woolens 150 percent, and these tremendous increases consisted largely of medium-priced goods.

The war has shown that our industry must remain intact for national safety. Most mills are running 100 percent on military fabrics. If it were not for our industry our armed forces could not have been clothed.

England manufactures under about the same conditions as we do, with the exception of labor costs. Average hourly earnings in the United States are 49 cents and in Great Britain 19 cents (Tariff Commission report, May 1936). The same report reveals that Japan's hourly earnings are 5.4 cents.

Foreign trade is the exchange of labor values and tariff should protect labor values in this country.

Therefore, it is imperative for national safety, for protection of American labor, and for protection of the worsted and woolen industry that no further reductions in tariffs be allowed. We urge you to vote against the Doughton bill (H. R. 2652) inasmuch as section 2 of that bill allows a further 50-percent reduction.

I expect to be in Washington in the near future and it is my hope that I may have an opportunity to discuss this matter with you further.

Most sincerely,

RUFUS F. HALE,
Assistant Treasurer.

PACIFIC MILLS, WORSTED DIVISION,
Lawrence, Mass., April 9, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The textile industry of Lawrence, as well as New England, views with great apprehension the provisions of H. R. 2652 which has been introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Apparently section 1 of this act would extend for 3 years more the powers of the President and the Secretary of State to extend reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries. Sections 2 and 3 would permit a further reduction in existing tariff rates of 50 percent.

As you already know, the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 permitted a reduction of 50 percent in the then-existing rates. Hence if this act were to be passed in its present proposed form, the result would be that the new tariffs would be 75 percent less than they were in 1934.

The average hourly earnings in the woolen and worsted industry in Great Britain are approximately 40 percent of the rates paid in Lawrence and New England. Hence, it can readily be seen that further reductions in existing tariffs can only mean the complete ruin of our textile industries upon which so many thousands of persons in the New England States depend for a livelihood.

It is certain that Lawrence and New England will not be able to afford to maintain even its normal employment levels if this bill is enacted in its present form.

I would therefore strongly urge you to oppose the passage of this bill for the best interests of your constituents.

Yours very truly,

E. D. WALSH,
Vice President.

BOSTON, MASS., June 7, 1945.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building:

Appreciate your efforts to defeat section 2, Doughton bill. Hope you will continue your good work in helping to protect American labor and industry.

PACIFIC MILLS,
R. F. HALE.

MIDDLESEX WORSTED SPINNING CO.,
Lowell, Mass., April 11, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is before Congress and the Senate a bill to extend the State Department's power to reduce tariffs. I feel it my duty to write you and to ask you to vote against the passage of this bill, namely, H. R. 2652. Having been connected with the textile industry for over 30 years, I am keenly interested in the welfare of this industry and all who are connected with it.

You are, no doubt, aware that all the large textile centers of the European Continent have been untouched by bombs, this makes them potential competitors when this war is over. You also are familiar with the lower wages that are paid to those textile employees in Europe, and the lower standard of living which they are accustomed to and which they do not want America to change. You also must be aware of the fact that those same countries that are going to be our most serious competitors at the present time have no collateral with which to do business with, unless they are permitted to export to America the textiles which they are now making in large quantities; of the fact that it is the only industry over there that is, for the most part, intact.

This may seem a little mite selfish, but if we do not do something now to protect this second oldest industry in the world, we may wake up one day and find that the continent of Europe has taken it away from us, and that thousands of our returning soldiers, sailors, marines, Wacs, and Waves will be without jobs.

I therefore urge you to do all in your power to prevent the passage of this bill.

I remain,

Yours truly,
NORMAN CHADWICK,
Superintendent and Manager.

ABBOTT WORSTED CO.,
Graniteville, Mass., April 20, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Bill H. R. 2652 is now before Congress, to extend the State Department power to further reduce tariffs under reciprocal trade agreements.

We wish to register a very strong protest against this bill, particularly against the section giving permission to reduce tariffs on textile products an additional 50 percent. The United States tariff at the present time is approximately sixth lowest of some forty odd principal countries, including Japan.

The textile industry has made an outstanding showing in production to supply yarns and fabrics to the armed forces during the present war. If this tariff were to be reduced to the point allowed under this bill, it would be impossible for us and other textile concerns to remain in business, paying

as we do an average wage of three times and more as much as is paid by England and other European countries.

Where would the United States have been without the textile industries in this war?

We believe that the bill to permit additional reductions should be defeated, otherwise Congress will throw very large numbers of people out of employment.

Even under today's conditions, woolen textile materials and made-up clothes are being imported into this country.

Very truly yours,

ABBOTT WORSTED CO.,
EDWARD M. ABBOTT,
President.

HAYWARD WOOLEN CO.,
East Douglas, Mass., April 20, 1945.
HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter in reference to the bill now before Congress—H. R. 2652—to extend the State Department's power to further reduce tariffs, which have already been very drastically cut.

I am particularly interested because of the effect it would have on our business. As you most likely know, a textile worker, for the first time, is now being paid substantially more than ever in the history of the textile business. The minimum wage in our industry today is 55 cents, whereas if this bill is passed, we will have to compete with the textile industry of Great Britain where the average textile wage is only 35 cents an hour. Our citizens deserve better protection than this, and it is not fair to have them compete with the import of foreign goods made by cheap labor.

I know you will do your utmost to see that the American citizen is protected.

Very truly yours,

LEO J. MURRAY, Treasurer.

HAYWARD WOOLEN CO.,
East Douglas, Mass., April 20, 1945.
HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter in reference to the bill now before Congress—H. R. 2652—to extend the State Department's power to further reduce tariffs, which have already been very drastically cut.

I am particularly interested because of the effect it would have on our business. As you most likely know, a textile worker for the first time is now being paid substantially more than ever in the history of the textile business. The minimum wage in our industry today is 55 cents, whereas if this bill is passed, we will have to compete with the textile industry of Great Britain, where the average textile wage is only 35 cents an hour. Our citizens deserve better protection than this, and it is not fair to have them compete with the import of foreign goods made by cheap labor.

I know you will do your utmost to see that the American citizen is protected.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD P. MONE,
Assistant Treasurer.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., April 24, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building:

We believe that the responsibility of writing tariffs should be the responsibility of the Congress rather than having the responsibility delegated to any one man. We believe, if the country desires any particular degree of free trade, that degree should be publicly arrived at rather than to be fixed privately. From a viewpoint of the worsted industry, it is essential that not only no further lessening of duties occur but that the industry be sure that none can occur. At least

until a new tariff act is passed by the Congress. We, therefore, believe H. R. 2652 should be defeated.

ELMVALE WORSTED CO.

THAYER WOOLEN CO.,

North Oxford, Mass., April 19, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We want to register our opposition to measure H. R. 2652 now in hearing. This measure is to enlarge the State Department's power to further reduce tariffs which have already been drastically cut, not only on wool textiles, in which we are vitally interested, but on other production.

We fail to see how we can compete against European labor on a practically nonprotective basis. We are very anxious to give full time employment to our employees and be able to take back on a desirable basis the people from our organization now in the service.

Competition from low-paid European labor would be disastrous for us and we would be very loath to have to compete on that basis. There is no question but that low tariffs would lower the living conditions, and as we pride ourselves on the fact that we have the best-paid and the best-equipped Army in the world, we feel that we should also have the best-paid workers in the world.

We feel that it would be much better to aid devastated areas in the form of outright gifts rather than open markets.

Very truly yours,

WALTER S. POMEROY, *President.*

LAWRENCE, MASS., May 12, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Lawrence Central Labor Union representing 10,000 AFL workers in Lawrence vigorously oppose extension of reciprocal trade agreements on grounds that such extension would result in postwar unemployment for thousands of textile workers. Urge your support in defeating extension.

JOHN J. HAVY, *President,*

FRANKLIN J. MURPHY,

Secretary,

LAWRENCE CENTRAL LABOR UNION.

STEVENS LINEN ASSOCIATES, INC.,

Webster, Mass., May 8, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: As you know, there has been considerable agitation and discussion for and against the enactment of the extension of the Trade Agreements Act before the House Ways and Means Committee. Both employers of labor and employees are considerably disturbed over the possibility of the enactment of this bill as outlined. We feel sure that you are giving this matter considerable thought and taking a great deal of interest in it, as the communities which you represent are probably more vitally interested as a group than any other section of the country.

We, being members of the Soft Fiber Institute, will be represented at the hearing by Mr. Maloney, chairman of the tariff committee of the Soft Fiber Institute. It is our impression that he will mention, among other things, that the accepted union wage in Great Britain and Ireland for workers in textile industry is \$10 weekly against a wage for like employment in this country of better than \$40 per week, or a difference of 400 percent. Naturally if tariff protection is reduced it will be impossible for textiles, and more especially the linen industry, to compete with this sort of competition.

We have a very substantial investment in machinery and equipment and have been one of the main means of employment in Webster and Dudley for many years. We

have given a great deal of thought to postwar planning and it is hoped that, all things being equal, that we can give employment after the war to more than 500 additional people. It is also our intention to purchase additional machinery and equipment and to take other steps to increase and maintain a high rate of employment. Naturally we hesitate to make any plans if there is a possibility of lowering protective tariffs.

Knowing your interest in the problems of the manufacturers and your desire to see labor employed, we feel sure that you will make every effort to see that their interests are protected.

Thanking you for giving this matter consideration, and appreciating your cooperation, I am,

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. CASH,
Treasurer.

METHUEN, MASS., April 23, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, while subscribing to the principle of assisting foreign nations to get back on their feet, do not feel that tariffs should be lowered any more, to do so.

The American way of life, the best in the world, that our relatives and friends are fighting for in foreign lands, should in no way be endangered by insufficient tariff protection.

We who derive our living from the textile industry feel that if tariffs are lowered by the passage of this measure, it will mean a great set back to our way of living by unfair competition, lowered wages, and unemployment. We, therefore, urge your help in defeating H. R. 2652.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. HOUGHTON.
BEATRICE L. HOUGHTON.
AGNES G. HOUGHTON.
CHARLES W. HOUGHTON.

UXBRIDGE, MASS., May 31, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Regarding reciprocal trade agreement we urge you to support amendment which will be introduced making quota protection mandatory in all cases where serious unemployment and disruption would result from uncontrolled flood of imports.

WAUCANTUCK MILLS,
J. T. BRADY, *General Manager.*

UXBRIDGE, MASS., June 14, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH:
Pleased at your stand regarding reciprocal trade treaty.

STANLEY H. WHEELLOCK,
STANLEY WOOLEN CO.,

MEDWAY MILLS, INC.,

West Medway, Mass., June 1, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are very much opposed to the new reciprocal trade agreements amendment to the tariff act, which has been passed by the House. I hope you will exert every effort possible to see that this amendment is not passed by the Senate.

Thanking you kindly for past favors, we are,

Very truly yours,

R. G. BUCHOLD.

PACKARD MILLS, INC.,

Webster, Mass., April 12, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Together with all other woolen manufacturers, we are worried about

the possible passage of a bill before Congress (H. R. 2652) which would give the State Department power to further reduce tariffs.

In spite of all arguments to the contrary, two and two still makes four. Every yard of woolen cloth which is imported into this country is one less yard for our workers to make. We cannot compete against the textile wages of Europe.

You represent a great woolen manufacturing State and we hope you can see your way not only to vote against this bill but to take an active part in its defeat.

Very truly yours,

RALPH K. HUBBARD,
President.

DAVID N. TAFT MANUFACTURING CO.,

Oxford, Mass., April 12, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is before Congress H. R. 2652, a measure to enlarge the State Department's power to further reduce tariffs which have already been drastically cut by State Department reciprocal treaties, not only on wool textiles—in which we are interested—but on other products.

This bill must be defeated, as we cannot compete against the lower-paid foreign worker.

We hope you will agree with us that this bill must be defeated, and that we can count on your negative vote.

Yours truly,

D. T.

DENVER, COLO., April 10, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 expires on June 12, 1945. I note considerable activity looking to an extension of this act.

I fail to understand how a reduction in tariff rates, which will permit foreign manufacturers to undersell us in our own markets, fits in the picture with the avowed aim of the present administration to create 60,000,000 postwar jobs in this country—a figure which they estimate necessary to permit our economy to function.

I am particularly concerned with the hand-made glassware industry. It is a recognized fact that our domestic glass manufacturers had a very difficult struggle competing with imports from foreign countries—even with the full tariff rates as provided in the Tariff Act of 1930. This was obviously due to the great differences in American wage rates and the low wages paid in European glass-producing countries. That disparity in pay rates will be still further aggravated after the end of the present European war.

If the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is extended at this time, plus an additional reduction of 50 percent—just asked for by the administration—we can look for a wiping out of the American glassware industry. Passing of the extension of the act, with the further 50-percent reduction, means that the 1930 tariff rates could be reduced as much as 75 percent. And I maintain that no matter how efficient our domestic glass houses are, we cannot meet such competition.

It is an open invitation to all foreign glass-producing countries to help themselves to our national market.

That, indeed, is the picture facing the glassware and ceramic manufacturers of this country, and in like measure every manufacturer with foreign competition.

I strongly appeal to you to vote against the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

Cordially yours,

C. N. ABENHEIMER.

COMINS & Co., Inc.,
Rochdale, Mass., April 13, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: We oppose the proposed reductions in import duties.

We call your attention to the records of the United States Treasury Department which show that the woolen industry as a whole operated at a net loss for a period of 15 peacetime years.

We need legislation to help this industry rather than to contribute to its destruction.

We urge your opposition to this reduction.
Very truly yours,

EDWARD I. COMINS.

—
ARLINGTON MILLS,
Lawrence, Mass., May 7, 1945.
The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In my opinion, this bill should be defeated because, first, should it go through as planned, when we get back to a normal basis after this war is over and the other countries get producing again, it just means that the textile mills will not be able to compete.

This will cause curtailment of operation of the mills; also, a cut in wages.

Cannot see the justification of increasing the output from the mills abroad and bringing untold hardships on our local citizens.

I sincerely trust you will do all in your power to kill this bill, H. R. 2652, when it comes up.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. JOHNSON.

—
ARLINGTON MILLS,
Boston, Mass., April 12, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I thank you for your letter of April 9 and I appreciate very much your position with reference to the proposed changes in the reciprocal trade agreements. I suppose it will be impossible to prevent the adoption of some sort of an extension but certainly there should be no changes in the rates. I question very much whether the textile industries of New England can survive even under the present rates.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN W. HOBBS.

—
BOSTON, MASS., May 31, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building:

If any tariff reductions made on wool or wool fabrics we think the quota system will have to be adopted. Otherwise the wool textile industry with any reduction in tariff will face extermination.

ARTHUR O. WELLMAN,
President, Nichols & Co., Inc.

—
NICHOLS & COMPANY, INC.,
Boston, Mass., April 16, 1945.
The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Nichols & Co., Inc., is the largest worsted top manufacturer in this country, employing a large number of workers as well as indirectly furnishing employment to many thousands of others through the various stages of producing worsted tops and the resulting finished products, woolen and worsted materials.

Consequently, we are very much opposed to the bill (H. R. 2652) which is before Congress, as it would extend to the State Department the power to further reduce tariffs on wool and its manufactured products.

The State Department is advocating the reduction of tariff which would result in the importation of additional quantities of woolen fabrics produced abroad under a cheaper labor structure than our economic conditions will allow. The average textile wage in foreign countries favorably affected by a lowering of tariff would create competition in this country that could not be met without undermining the standards of living of all workers in our industry.

Also, we feel that it is very important that this bill be opposed in the interests of the men who are now in the armed services who hope to return to the textile business for which they were trained before their work was interrupted by the war. Their future possibilities for making a good living should not be risked.

If this bill is passed, it will seriously affect all textile workers, and in the New England States where the textile business is one of the chief industries, the result would be disastrous. We feel that if the tariff is lowered, the very existence of the whole wool and worsted textile industry in this country would be jeopardized.

We believe that H. R. 2652 should be defeated and we hope you will do everything in your power to help defeat it.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR O. WELLMAN,
President.

—
MAYFLOWER WORSTED CO.
Kingston, Mass., April 11, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALSH: As president and manager of the above-named concern, manufacturing fine men's-wear fabrics in the town of Kingston, Mass., I have been requested by the employees to write a letter to you protesting against any further reduction in the tariff on cloth being imported into this country.

The names of the employees attached to this letter are all trained textile workers who have always worked in the textile industry, who have homes and families here, and there is no other opportunity for employment. They realize that should the duty be further lowered to allow cloth to be imported from England and other countries where wages are a great deal less than here that it would be impossible for the textile mills to continue to run, and they would be out of employment.

On their behalf I trust you will give this your personal and serious consideration.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD J. WESTON, President.

—
LAWRENCE, MASS., May 28, 1945.
DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:
I sincerely believe that the bill which has just been passed by the House extending reciprocal trade treaties and authorizing the President to further reduce present tariffs constitutes a serious threat to the greater Lawrence and New England textile industries. People of this district like those of every section of the country have cheerfully made many sacrifices to help win this war and I do not believe that they are willing or should they be asked to sacrifice the opportunity for future employment and prosperity on the flimsy altar of internationalism and the idealistic theory that free trade will further a lasting peace. Therefore, I urgently request you to work, fight, and vote against this vicious legislation when it reaches the Senate.

JOHN P. S. MAHONEY, Jr.,
Publisher, Lawrence Sunday Sun.

WASHINGTON MILLS ABRASIVE CO.,
North Grafton, Mass., April 20, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: One of our volume users of abrasive refractory grain has contacted us regarding possible effects of bill (H. R. 2652) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

We are informed by our customer, who is a manufacturer of vitrified china ware, that this bill carries a provision to allow further cuts in tariff rates on bone china and earthenware items, inter alia, on which tariffs were already greatly reduced in 1939.

Our customer further informs us the wage rate in his industry is 85 cents per hour in the United States, against 25 cents in Great Britain and 7 cents in Japan.

We feel concerned in the matter, as lowering a tariff on our good customers' foreign competitors' chinaware products, to a detrimental extent in view of the wage rates in competing countries, will evidently injure our customers' business and ours equally. We are all vitally concerned to maintain high wage rates for our workers and financial stability for our companies. We submit to you that extreme caution be applied before permitting reduction in a tariff rate such as in this case. To transfer a foreign country's troubles to our own workers in our country-side, by way of international cooperation, is a measure which we do not think will commend itself to you. We, indeed, trust that this and similar measures will have your definite opposition whenever their effect is to impinge on our own ability to pay high wages and maintain our men at work.

Yours very truly,

HOWARD D. WILLIAMS,
Treasurer.

—
W. H. BAGSHAW CO.,
Lowell, Mass., May 31, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senator from Massachusetts,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As president of W. H. Bagshaw Co., a Massachusetts corporation, located in Lowell, Mass., I am writing this letter to let you know how this company feels with regard to the so-called foreign-trade-agreements bill recently passed by the House of Representatives and now pending before the Senate.

This company is now, and has been for a great many years, engaged in the business of manufacturing textile pins and other equipment for the textile trade. We feel very strongly that any reduction in the present tariffs would result in substantial injury to small business, so-called, in Massachusetts, and especially to companies engaged in textile pursuits. Many of these companies have already felt substantially the results of war shortages in necessary materials and labor and have also been adversely affected by greatly increased corporate taxes.

The opening of this country, and especially this Commonwealth, at the close of the war to competing materials and merchandise manufactured abroad by cheap labor would have a very serious effect, in our opinion, and cause substantial loss to many concerns which otherwise might at least break even; in fact, some would have to face the necessity of going out of business entirely or seeking some other part of this country where labor and other conditions might not be so oppressive.

I have not the number or exact name of this proposed bill before me, but I am sure you will recognize it as a matter of great importance to this country at large, as well as to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

We hope that you will find it possible to oppose the proposed bill and the tariff reductions called for.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN E. EATON,
President.

P. S.—I am sending a similar letter to our other Senator from Massachusetts.

JOHN T. LODGE & Co.,
Watertown, Mass., April 9, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to register with you my disapproval of bill, H. R. 2652.

The textile business, in my opinion, needs more rather than less protection even as of today.

The wool and worsted manufacturing industry ranks about seventh in the number of workers employed and about fourteenth in the dollar value of its products. From these figures you can readily know the percentage of labor cost to the value of the finished product.

As I understand it, the average wool or worsted textile worker abroad averages about 35 cents per hour and in this country comparable work commands an average of 80 cents per hour.

I believe you will agree that the woolen and worsted industry has done a remarkably efficient job of producing fabrics for the various branches of our armed forces, and in addition have taken good care of the civilian trade.

If we are to have full employment in this country, which to the writer's mind is the first and principal Nation in which we all should have an interest, then how are we going to maintain high hourly wage rates with full-time employment for the 60,000,000 about whom we read and hear so much and face the ruinous competition of low-priced foreign merchandise.

As you well know, Massachusetts is one of the largest producers of woolen and worsted fabrics in this country, and Boston is the principal wool city in the Nation.

I trust you will do all possible toward the defeat of this bill, H. R. 2652.

Very truly yours,

JAMES T. DUGAN.

MERRIMAC HAT CORP.,
Amesbury, Mass., April 16, 1945.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: We know you are very much interested in any legislation which might materially act to the detriment of Massachusetts industries.

In the Tariff Act of 1922 Congress placed what is known as the flexible tariff provision, permitting the Tariff Commission to recommend to the President, after prescribed investigation, the adjustment of an existing tariff rate up or down 50 percent. This provision was reenacted in the Tariff Act of 1930 as section 336 and is still in the law.

In 1934 Congress passed what is known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, suspending section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as to all rates the subject of agreements entered into under the act of 1934. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act permits the President through negotiation by the State Department with a foreign country to enter an agreement reducing tariff rates without investigation or limitation other than the 50 percent in any agreement with a foreign power. When promulgated, these rates become effective to all countries of the world regardless of whether we have an agreement with them or not, unless, under the terms of the act, the President finds that a given country is unduly discriminating against our commerce, in which event he may except from the operation of the generalization clause that country. In all of the agreements entered into but one country—Germany—has been so excepted.

Under the operation of this statute, over 1,200 rates have been reduced, the majority of which were reduced 50 percent. A recent study by a well-known economist shows the Tariff Act of 1930, by reason of these reductions, to be on a level with the Free Trade Tariff Act of 1913. Only the war has prevented a demonstration of the great influx of foreign merchandise that these reductions will bring forth. When the war is over, sections of reconquered territory such as northern Italy and most of France will be in a position to immediately start production and shipment of competitive merchandise to the United States. This is particularly true of our own industry, wool felt hat bodies. While there has been no reduction in our rate under the reciprocal trade agreement policy, it is obvious that Italy will require our credit and will seek to place in this market as many wool felt hat bodies as possible. There will also be an incentive on her part through the reciprocal trade policy to secure a lower rate of duty.

Before the war, because of the effect on this industry of foreign competition, it was necessary to have Congress enact remedial legislation, giving us our present protection. We feel very strongly that we cannot, on an economic basis, compete with the pauper labor that we will face immediately after this war.

Since this remedial legislation, Congress has enacted the wage and hour law. Its administration has increased our wages and reduced the hours in a week, thus materially adding to the cost of production of our product in this country.

For the reasons which we have stated on previous renewals of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and for the reason that we feel that this act bestows upon the executive branch of the Government arbitrary power to adjust tariff rates which were specifically reserved to Congress by the Constitution of the United States, this act should not be renewed as is proposed by H. R. 2652.

We are further opposed to the renewal under H. R. 2652 for the reason that it is a further grant of power to the Executive to reduce by an additional 50 percent any existing rate on January 1, 1945. The net result of such an enactment would be that a rate of 50 percent in the Tariff Act of 1930, if reduced 50 percent (to 25 percent) before January 1, 1945, could again be reduced 50 percent (to 12½ percent). As stated above, all of this would be without recourse to Congress, without considering the economic factors and without a legislative yardstick.

The renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by the enactment of H. R. 2652, we feel, would be most unfortunate.

Very truly yours,

E. T. BROWN,
Executive Vice President.

HUNTINGTON, MASS., May 31, 1945.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate Building,

Very much trust you may see your way clear to oppose any bill which will permit altering present tariff on wool and woolens downward. Any such drastic act may seriously affect best interests of woolen textile industries as a whole and particularly in Massachusetts. Both the general public and textile labor particularly are bound to be seriously affected.

DON V. MESSER,
President, Huntington Textile Co., Inc.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOLEN
AND WORSTED OVERSEERS,
Holyoke, Mass., June 3, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The National Association of Woolen and Worsted Overseers representing at least 500 overseers in Massachusetts alone, wish to express their opposi-

tion against H. R. 3240. We feel certain that the illustrious record you have achieved in looking after the interest of the people of our State, will cause you to look with disfavor upon any measure that would tend to lower the standards of the textile workers of this Commonwealth.

May we have the pleasure of hearing from you.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH D. SCANLON,
Chairman.

TALBOT MILLS, INC.,
North Billerica, Mass., April 18, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: H. R. 2652, providing for the extension of reciprocal trade treaties and authorizing the President to reduce tariffs by 50 percent or to 25 percent of the original rates, will be fatal to the wool manufacturing industry.

It is inconceivable that competition with British labor, averaging 35 cents per hour, is at all possible.

I appreciate that the reciprocal treaties are part of the general peace program, but there will be no domestic tranquility if the workers of the seventh largest employing industry in the United States are on the street.

Where would our armed forces now be if we had not had a healthy textile industry and had been obliged to rely on our allies to clothe them? From an unbiased standpoint, I believe that the textile industry is vital to the best interest of the United States in both war and peace.

The reciprocal treaties are no doubt involved in the plan to receive repayment on our foreign debts in kind, the only way they can be repaid in any substantial amount. This plan is only sound as far as the imports are of raw materials or manufactured products not found nor produced in the United States. If the repayment of the principal of these debts involves displacement of manufacturing operations in the United States, it would be far better to forego the repayment of the principal and demand only interest payments, which in itself will undoubtedly present sufficient of a problem.

I sincerely believe that H. R. 2652 should be defeated and I hope that you can conscientiously assist to that end.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS T. CLARK,
Treasurer.

WOOLEN AND WORSTED
DISTRICT COUNCIL,
DEPARTMENT OF WOOLEN
AND WORSTED WORKERS,
Lawrence, Mass., May 2, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: At the regular meeting of the Greater Lawrence Textile Council, UTWA-AFL, representing 15,000 textile workers in Lawrence and Lowell, Mass., this communication was unanimously endorsed by the large number of delegates in attendance. The delegates representing the textile workers of our community strongly urge you, as their Senator, to exert your power to the end that the extension of the reciprocal trade agreement as it applies to textiles is defeated.

Senator WALSH, it has taken the workers in the textile industry a long, long time to achieve the gains they have made through collective bargaining in the past few years. These gains, we are confident, would indeed be jeopardized if the protection normally exercised through the protective tariff placed upon textile imports is now eliminated. We cannot too strongly place the case of the textile workers of our community before you and the danger confronting our workers in

their efforts to achieve a real standard of living. We feel we owe this protection to the thousands who have labored through long tedious hours to the end that our fighting forces may be the best clothed army that the world has ever known and to the thousands of boys and girls from our industry who are on the fighting fronts of the entire globe.

Thanking you for any cooperation you may give in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE F. DRISCOLL,
Recording Secretary, Greater
Lawrence Textile Council, UTWA-AFL.

LAWRENCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lawrence, Mass., April 18, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The Lawrence Chamber of Commerce requests your earnest consideration to H. R. 2652 and to the possible great threat to the woolen industry of greater Lawrence should the tariff rates and duties on foreign manufactured woollens be further reduced to a 25 percent tariff made possible by the enactment of 2652.

In the Lawrence area, approximately 30,000 workers are employed in the woolen industry and its accessory manufactures. The policy of our Government is to protect our high standard of living from the lower living conditions prevailing in foreign countries and their cheaper labor.

A possible lowered tariff authorized by the administration is not in harmony with the Government policy of sustaining high employment at good wages.

The practical action which should be encouraged by our Congressmen is to protect our industries and our labor from the foreign competition of cheaper labor costs.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. O'ROURKE,
Secretary.

STRONG, HEWAT & Co., Inc.,
North Adams, Mass., April 17, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We understand that hearings will start shortly on H. R. 2652 involving reciprocal trade agreements, which bill, if passed, will undoubtedly strike a death blow to many members of the woolen and worsted industries in this country. We, as manufacturers of fine woolen fabrics, strongly urge that you vote against its passage.

This bill not only extends the present reciprocal trade agreements, but provides for a 50-percent reduction in tariff rates. We believe that domestic industries must have the necessary tariff protection if we are to maintain the American standard of living and provide the jobs so essential in the rehabilitation program being outlined for our returning servicemen. Without tariff protection, our company could not possibly compete with British mills, whose wage scales before the war, were three times less than ours.

May we ask that you give this matter your serious consideration and do all within your power to assure the defeat of H. R. 2652.

Yours very truly,

DOUGLAS HEWAT,
Vice President.

MUNRO, KINCAID, EDGEHILL, INC.,
Boston, April 16, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As you well know, anyone connected with the manufacture of wool has always been favorable to a protective tariff on wool.

If the wages paid by textile manufacturers are to be maintained, cloth must bring a higher price than would obtain on cloth imported from foreign countries where labor is so much below the American standard.

I understand that there is before Congress now a bill, H. R. 2652, regarding a further reduction in tariffs. I hope that you will have the textile industry in mind when this bill is voted on, and that you will not be in favor of it.

Respectfully,

F. L. KENNEDY.

EMERY & CONANT Co., Inc.,
Boston, Mass., April 13, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: While we are not directly concerned with the lowering and altering of the tariff in regard to woolen and worsted goods, we are definitely very much concerned in the effect any change in the present tariff might have on manufacturers of wool. Also, we are interested if the duty on wool is to be reduced.

We understand the Ways and Means Committee of the House starts hearings on the Doughton bill (H. R. 2652) on Monday, April 16, and the matter of reciprocal trade agreements is therefore a matter of current business.

The writer is satisfied that the reciprocal trade agreements, so-called, are not in actual practice "reciprocal" trade agreements, but have to date worked out to be lowering of the tariffs. Some manufacturing goods and commodities may be able to stand less protection than at present, but from our close contact with the woolen manufacturing industry (who are our customers), we believe that present rates (which have already been lowered under present reciprocal trade treaties) are not adequate to protect the woolen and worsted manufacturing industries at present. You must also have in mind that these present rates have not been tested, due to the Second World War.

We therefore urgently request that you see to it that the present rates are not lowered in the manufacturing of wool, for the industry cannot stand it.

Yours respectfully,

RALPH W. CONANT,
President.

CHARLTON WOOLEN Co.,
Charlton City, Mass., April 16, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Hearings will start shortly on H. R. 2652, a bill to extend the State Department's power to reduce tariff rates. The textile industry is very much disturbed by this bill and believes it should be defeated.

Under the present Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, tariff rates on woolen goods have been substantially reduced. An increase in imports of woolen goods under the new rates began immediately, but was soon stopped by the war or the preparation for war by the exporting countries. We contend that no further reductions should be made until we have had a chance to determine the effect of the present rates under peacetime conditions. We believe that imports under the present rates will show a large increase and that any further reduction of tariff would be disastrous.

It has been said by the supporters of the bill that any loss of business by a particular industry would be more than offset by the increase in business by other types of industry, due to increased export. This is small consolation to the mill operators who face the loss of their investment, and to the workers who face the loss of their jobs.

Moreover, the textile industry is such a large industry that a substantial reduction in employment in this industry would throw more people out of work than could be absorbed by the rest of the country.

A strong woolen textile industry is essential to the country from a defense standpoint. This is now being demonstrated by the fact that the tremendous demands of war are being met with a minimum of Government financial assistance. A strong woolen textile industry is also needed to consume our domestic wool and to avoid the necessity of an expensive subsidy to the wool grower.

Most of the arguments for the protection of the textile industry apply with equal force to other industries. We cannot maintain our high wages and high standards of living and compete with low pay and low standards of living in foreign countries. Until the standards of the rest of the world are raised to our level, we will need adequate tariff protection. Let us give the present reduced rates a fair trial under peacetime conditions before we reduce them again.

Yours truly,

ROGER M. GRIMWADE,
Treasurer.

WUSKANUT WORSTED CORP.,
New York City, May 1, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am opposed to any reduction in tariff on wool goods because—

1. It is no time to try to adjust tariffs when the world is so upset that there is no accurate way to determine what either foreign or domestic wages will be after this war. Without this information, there is no basis for comparative costs.

2. I do not believe that the State Department is now, or ever has been, equipped to assemble the necessary data upon which to base a sound tariff policy.

3. The splendid job done by the woolen industry during this war was possible only because of the policy of protection in former years, which permitted this great industry to become strong enough to meet these unusual wartime demands.

4. I do not know of any other country which buys from us in normal times that which it already has in abundance. Certainly this country in normal times has more than it can consume of all kinds and varieties of wool textiles.

5. We are blessed with a good quality of labor, which is entitled to steady employment and good wages. This can be assured only under adequate protection. After this war is over, some of the distressed countries will be so eager for export business that their already cheap labor, subsidized by the state, will make competition that no American mill can stand up against.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD R. MERRILL,
Vice President.

DONALDSON & DURIE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 17, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As representatives of several textile mills, we are writing to respectfully request you to cast your vote against H. R. 2652.

The further reduction of tariff on fabrics would, we are convinced, place countless domestic mills in an impossible competitive position. This, in turn, would adversely affect other segments of our national economy, such as the chemical and dyestuff producers and the raw wool growers. The ultimate result could not help but greatly increase postwar unemployment.

We sincerely believe manufacturers of materials vital to national defense, which the

textile and allied industries have proved to be, should not be jeopardized.

The above considered opinion is based not alone on our experience in representing domestic manufacturers but also through previous connections in the importing trade.

Therefore, we again ask you to use your influence to defeat H. R. 2562.

Respectfully yours,

D. C. DURIE.

AMERICAN WOOLEN CO.,

Lawrence, Mass., April 24, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAVID I. WALSH: The writer is very much concerned about the bill H. R. 2652 and to the possible threat to the woolen and worsted industries of Lawrence and vicinity and I trust that you will give it the most serious consideration to protect the interests of this community.

In the Lawrence area there are over 25,000 employees in the worsted industries and a further reduction in tariff would most certainly penalize the necessary after-the-war prosperity of our industries and people. I cannot see how a lower tariff, which will slow our industries down, can in any way be consistent with the high wages and high standard of living that is so much promised after the war.

Your favorable consideration I know, will be very much appreciated by the entire community.

Very truly yours,

E. J. SCHULZE,
Resident Manager.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 22, 1945.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Member of Congress, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.:

As general president of 450,000 members of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, I wish to make my position clear in regard to my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. The majority report failed to refer to my position in favor of a mandatory quota control. I wish to repeat emphatically the position that I took, which is that we firmly believe that the American textile industry, because of its importance to our own and world economy and for various historical reasons cannot be subjected to indiscriminate international competition. It is our opinion furthermore that the potentially ruinous effect of indiscriminate foreign competition should be barred by quota restriction similar to the quota principle which has been invoked in tariff negotiations with Mexico. Mandatory quota controls, we believe, are imperative and just, and the bill should be amended to provide such mandatory quota controls.

EMIL RIEVE,
General President, Textile
Workers Union of America.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,

New York, N. Y., May 17, 1945.

To All Manufacturers Under Contract With
the Textile Workers Union of America,
CIO

DEAR SIRS: On Thursday, May 10, as spokesman for the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee in favor of extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Although the testimony was made available it is probable that the full import of the Union's position was not conveyed to a very large audience.

Believing that it is important that textile manufacturers, especially those working under agreements with our union, understand fully the union's position on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I

am enclosing a complete copy of my testimony.

By way of explanation, may I point out several salient angles of the testimony?

First, the legislation now being considered by the Congress is merely enabling legislation and does not in any way set up specific tariff rates for specific products.

Second, we propose the establishment of a National Foreign Trade Policy Commission to consider and set up appropriate and specific guides and principles for the conduct of negotiations under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and we set forth suggested criteria for the consideration of the Commission and the negotiators.

Again, we firmly believe that the American textile industry, because of its importance to our own and world economy, and for various valid historical reasons, cannot be subjected to indiscriminate international competition.

It is our opinion, furthermore, that the potentially ruinous effect of indiscriminate foreign competition should be barred by quota restriction similar to the quota principle which has been invoked in tariff negotiations with Mexico. Mandatory quota controls, we believe, are imperative and just.

I hope you will read the enclosed testimony carefully and I shall be glad to have your comment.

Very truly yours,

EMIL RIEVE,
General President.

BOSTON, MASS., April 18, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an employee of the largest worsted top manufacturer in this country, I feel that H. R. 2652, a bill giving the State Department power to reduce the tariff on wool textiles, must be defeated.

The passage of this bill would seriously affect thousands of textile workers, particularly in New England, where it is one of our main industries.

This bill not only extends the reciprocal trade agreements amendment, but provides that reductions as much as 50 percent may be made, not only in the 1930 rates but also in the rates which have been reduced by agreements existing on January 1, 1945.

If this bill is allowed to pass, thousands of textile workers will be out of jobs. Our boys now overseas expecting to return to their old jobs that have been held open for them, will find the mills closed and they will have to start anew. We cannot compete with mills in England, where textile workers are only paid 35 cents an hour.

Please do all in your power to see that this bill is defeated.

Yours very truly,

M. ALICE MCGINNIS.
BROOKLINE, MASS.

WALTHAM, MASS., June 14, 1945.
United States Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As usual you have proven that you are an outstanding American. Your vote in the Senate Finance Committee against authority to further reduce existing tariff an additional 50 percent proves you are interested in the American worker and his job opportunities. The employees of a century-old Massachusetts firm, the Waltham Watch Co., are indeed indebted to you for your courageous stand in their behalf to protect their jobs against unfair foreign competition. Your vote is in accord with your many previous votes in favor of the Walsh-Healy Act, the Wagner Act, social security, and the many other pieces of social legislation that you have always voted for during your tenure of office. Reducing tariffs further would destroy the benefits of all the aforementioned legislation to the American workingman.

New England industry and American industry and its workers truly have a champion in you. Trust your co-Senator, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, follows the wisdom of your years of experience.

AMERICAN WATCH WORKERS UNION, No. 6,
WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President.

WALTHAM WATCH CO.,
Waltham, June 1, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Waltham Watch Co., located in your State, is one of four jeweled watch manufacturers in the United States. It has been entirely on production for the military since 1942. It has made its usual complement of timepieces for the Government and in addition thereto other timing mechanisms, fuzes, etc.

We know you, as one of our State Senators, are interested in seeing this old industry of ours, in its ninety-fifth year, continue to give employment to skilled mechanics and be in a position to supply critical timepieces should we or our allies again have to go through another war.

Attached is a copy of the brief of the American watch manufacturing industry in opposition to the passage of the reciprocal tariff bill in its present form. We believe it will aid you in arriving at a formed opinion on the position of the industry.

Despite the fact that foreign producers already had the major share of the domestic market, watch tariffs were reduced in 1936 under the Swiss trade agreement by an average of 34 percent. As a consequence the Swiss, by 1941, were able to capture 60 percent of the domestic market for jeweled watches. Since June 1942 they have enjoyed the whole market inasmuch as the entire domestic industry has been engaged exclusively in the production of timing devices for the war effort. The War and Navy Departments have made public recognition of our contribution to the winning of the war and our only regret is that our industry, due to inadequate tariff protection, did not have greater facilities for handling the very heavy demands placed upon it.

If the domestic watch manufacturing industry is to survive; if it is to be able to keep its skilled workers employed at decent wages in the postwar period; if it is to be available as a vital cog in our national defense should the need again arise—it must have adequate tariff protection. From 70 to 90 percent of the cost of watch movements is represented in the wages paid to labor, and we obviously cannot continue to employ them and at American wage levels if we are forced to compete on virtually a free-trade basis with the cheap labor of other countries.

With the future of the American watch manufacturing industry already jeopardized by drastically reduced tariff rates, a further reduction of 50 percent might well prove disastrous. We, therefore, strongly urge the elimination of this feature of the pending bill or some definite legislation to protect this vital industry. Moreover, in view of the present unsettled conditions, we feel it inadvisable to extend the present act for as long as 3 years.

Very truly yours,

I. E. BOUCHER,
Vice President and Manager.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed herewith you will find an article which I had inserted in the October 6, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

in reference to dumping Swiss watches and movements in our American markets.

Any further reduction of tariff rates will create additional hardships in this as well as other industries in Massachusetts, and I hope you will have this in mind when the Senate takes action on this reciprocal trade agreements legislation now pending in the Senate.

Very truly yours,

PEHR G. HOLMES.

BOSTON, MASS., April 21, 1945.
United States Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Can we count on your support to preserve American jewel-watch industry? We are preparing petitions with over 150,000 names to present to the House Ways and Means Committee protesting House bill 2652, which would reduce import duties an additional 50 percent. Our postwar markets have already been raided by excessive Swiss imports. As the United States Senator from our State, we would like your signature on this petition. May we have it?

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President,
American Watch Workers Union, No. 6.

MILTON BRADLEY CO.,
Springfield, Mass., March 13, 1945.
The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Milton Bradley Co. manufactures games and toys. In prewar days our products were sold in competition with those of foreign producers. The postwar period will no doubt bring a return of such competition.

We are concerned about the reported desire of the administration to take tariff making out of the hands of Congress. In the past we have looked to our representatives when foreign competition seriously threatened our continued existence. We fear that similar appeals to the executive branch would not receive the same attention that we have received from you, our representative.

Is it true that such a change is contemplated? What is your attitude in this matter?

It is rumored that the administration will ask power to reduce duties more than the 50 percent now allowed. We are concerned about this as our company, and our industry as a whole, cannot survive without adequate tariff protection. Do you agree that wage trends are upward and seem destined to be even higher in the postwar period?

If our protection is bartered away through trade agreements, American manufacturers will be denied their right to judicial review. In what way could you act in our behalf under such circumstances?

We fear that we cannot participate in the proposed full-employment program if foreign producers are encouraged to invade our markets. Our continued prosperity requires adequate tariff protection.

What can you do about that in our interest?

We would be pleased to have your comment on this matter which is of such vital concern to us.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. SHEA, President.

PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 18, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to protest against the bill of Congressman DOUGHTON, H. R. 2652, to permit the President to further reduce tariff duties. I understand such proposal would give the President power to reduce by 50 percent any tariff duty in effect on January 1,

1945, which would mean 75 percent from the 1930 schedule.

I am sure that it is proper to extend the emergency powers by 1 year, but not to give power to reduce further. Our great need today is for some form of stabilization. This new tariff proposal means further uncertainty and, I fear, a renewal of the continuous attacks which have been made upon our tariff schedules since the rates of duty therein were originally established by the Congress in the Tariff Act of 1930.

Since the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930 we have had two downward changes in our rates of duty—the first, a reduction of 25 percent by the President under the flexible tariff provisions, and on top of that another reduction of 30 percent of the trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. I believe that is enough tariff tinkering until surveys can be made based on known facts.

Since the last reduction in duties our costs of production have greatly increased. What the costs of production may be in Belgium or Czechoslovakia is, of course, unknown. What the form of government may be, whether the glass plants will be privately operated, and whether the product of such plants will be consumed immediately in European reconstruction or exported to the United States to obtain dollar exchange, are also all unknown factors. This means, of course, that no basis whatever exists for determining any reasonable tariff duties affecting our products.

The domestic plants are equipped to supply all of the American needs of flat glass. They have not increased prices since 1938, despite increased costs. They employ many thousands of highly skilled workmen, receiving high wages. The plants are important economic units in the towns and cities where located. On behalf of all of our workmen, I ask that you actively oppose this additional grant of tariff power.

In view of President Roosevelt's untimely death, with changes in personnel undoubtedly to follow, I believe that provisions of the bill which would reduce the tariff further should be killed at once, and ask you for your opinion.

Yours very truly,

W. R. HARPER, Manager.

GUNDERSEN GLASS WORKS, INC.,
New Bedford, Mass., April 4, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are amazed and dismayed to learn of the bill introduced by Representative DOUGHTON of North Carolina (House bill 2652) which provides for extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1945, and authorizes tariff reduction of 50 percent below January 1, 1945, level. This means that countries such as Czechoslovakia, which has received a 50-percent reduction from the 60-percent tariff provided by the Tariff Act of 1930 will receive another 50-percent reduction, which will bring their tariff rate down to 15 percent.

This act would be ruinous to all glass concerns in the United States, as they would find it absolutely impossible paying American wages to compete with countries paying 20 to 22 cents per hour, where they work under sweatshop conditions and have a very low standard of living.

We have been told time and again that we must have 60,000,000 jobs after the war. How are we to create these 60,000,000 jobs if we open wide our doors to a flood of foreign-made goods, and how are we to keep our promises to our 11,000,000 boys that they shall have their jobs when they come back from fighting and sacrificing to maintain our American way of life, if we do not protect their jobs against foreign countries' starvation wages and low living standards?

What a disappointment to our brave boys to come home, after all their suffering, to find no jobs, nor any opening for them, but to learn that we have handed through this bill our work to the European and South American countries.

We earnestly urge you to do all you can to defeat this Doughton bill and help to preserve this high art of glass making for our American workers by raising the tariff on hand-made glassware instead of lowering it.

Yours very truly,

R. M. GUNDERSEN,
General Manager.

BOSTON, MASS., May 18, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate:

You are requested to oppose the provision in H. R. 2652 which authorizes the President to make additional reductions of 50 percent in the tariff rates on commodities specified in future reciprocal trade treaties. The President, following cost studies by Tariff Commission in 1932, reduced tariff rates on window glass and tariff rates on plate glass were also reduced in the Belgian Reciprocal Trade Treaty. Any further reduction in rates on either commodity will be disastrous to continued employment of American glass workers.

WALLACE R. HARPER.

HINGHAM, MASS.
GREENFIELD, MASS., May 25, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We wish to register our protest and request that you either vote against the proposed 50-percent decrease in import duties contemplated in House bill 2652 and the proposed time extension of a full 3 years, since any shorter yet reasonable period would be more desirable, or introduce or support an amendment to have firearms and ammunition reciprocally excluded from the application of the proposed trade-extension agreement.

JUREK BROS.

BIGELOW & DOWSE CO.,
Boston, Mass., May 25, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The United States has come to the rescue of civilization twice in the past 30 years, and the only reason we have been strong enough to do so is our policy of protecting home economy through tariff regulations. Tariff based on common sense, has enabled industry to maintain the highest standards of living, erect the finest manufacturing facilities, produce the best products and create the most inventions of any nation on earth.

The arms and ammunition industries, vital in the time of war, should receive all the protection we can give them so that they may continue a healthy existence and expansion. The normal home market is none too large to support this industry, therefore a reduction in tariff rates enabling cheaply made, dangerous to use, foreign firearms and ammunition competition is ridiculous.

We have all worked hard to obtain fair-trade laws to protect our home markets from cut-throat competition within; why then, encourage a worse condition by reducing the tariff on items which need the entire home consumption in order to function in the American way?

We have just had VE-day—we hope and pray for VJ-day. When this happens, we shall need a strong home economy to take care of the jobs that will be needed by the boys and girls discharged from the armed services.

Unless we stop undermining the very foundation of our economy by foolishly reducing tariffs and engineering trade agreements that

will wreck home industry, there will be no decent jobs for anyone.

It is time America began thinking about Americans! Let us help other nations in every way we can to acquire a better standard of living, without ruining our own country.

If we are ever going to reduce the national debt, now over two hundred billion dollars, we had better change our thinking about reducing tariffs that so adversely affect home interests.

Respectfully yours,

R. F. GRANT.

C. E. WALKER & Co.

Holyoke, Mass., June 9, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,

Senator from Massachusetts,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When the proposed new tariff bill, H. R. 3240, comes before the Senate, we ask you to oppose it for the best interests of our country.

With regard to the sporting arms and ammunition industry in particular we especially oppose it. While we earnestly hope for a lasting peace we do believe, should an emergency arise, there should be trained men in our arms and ammunition plants so that the industry can be expanded with the least possible delay. The record of this industry in this present emergency speaks for itself and we believe that anything that can be done to keep these manufacturers in their present state or to increase their business slightly without increasing the prices of arms and ammunition will be for the best interests of the country as a whole.

In the gun industry where the largest percentage of the cost is labor, it is apparent that wage and living standards are an important factor of the cost. For some time it is obvious that food, clothing, and shelter will be far more important in Europe than living standards.

Past experience has proven that importations of guns increase rapidly when duty is reduced and is therefore detrimental to our own industry.

A reduction in tariff will hamper all American industry as well as the gun industry.

Yours very truly,

ROY G. WALKER.

CHICOPEE FALLS, MASS., May 25, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Our company is largest manufacturer of bicycle tires and tubes in United States; about one-third company's production is made at this plant, which postwar is expected to provide jobs for about 200 persons at total annual wage of about \$520,000, and annual gross value of about \$2,500,000. We contributed financially along with others in bicycle industry to promote and create large demand for bicycles in United States prior to war. Foreign competition did not. Bicycle tires are part of and follow the bicycle. We cannot compete for cost with foreign competition plus present tariff rates. We wish to enter strongest objections to any further reduction in tariff rates and to extending 50-percent reduction under reciprocal trade agreement on bicycles which includes tires and tubes.

T. E. Q. CLARK,

Factory Manager, United States Rubber Co., Fisk Tire plant, Chicopee Falls, Mass.

IVER JOHNSON'S ARMS & CYCLE WORKS,

Fitchburg, Mass., May 31, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: We enclose confirmation of telegram sent you this morning. As we understand it, H. R. 3240 is now before

the Senate Finance Committee for consideration, and we sincerely hope that this bill will not be reported favorably by your committee.

If the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act which expires on June 12, 1945, is renewed for a period of 3 years with authority to lower the tariff on bicycles during that time it will seriously affect the bicycle industry. It is a fact that the tariff was previously reduced 50 percent, and this permitted a considerable number of foreign bicycles to enter this market in competition with American manufacturers.

Our industry has spent large sums of money to popularize the use of bicycles as an economical means of transportation as well as a health and recreation medium. Increased demand which resulted from this advertising increased employment in the industry beginning back as far as the year 1936. Manufacturers from Great Britain, with the 50-percent reduction in tariff, were able to enter this market in competition with American industry, and not only enjoyed the benefit of the business available through the regular demand, but were particularly favored because of the money spent by our own industry to create an increased demand.

It is estimated that the bicycle industry in this country provides employment in normal times for approximately 50,000 people from manufacturing to retailing. In some of the smaller communities it is probably the major industry. We think that it can be safely assumed any further reduction in the tariff will have an adverse effect on employment.

We hope that you will oppose favorable consideration of this bill.

Very truly yours,

R. H. MEYER,

Assistant Treasurer.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge your opposition H. R. 3240. Present tariff bicycles too low. Any further reduction disastrous; this industry employing 50,000 manufacturing for retailing.

IVER JOHNSON'S ARMS & CYCLE WORKS,

Fitchburg, Mass.

WESTFIELD, MASS., May 16, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

The United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

I doubt if a layman can be fully conversant with all the phases of the reciprocal treaties. I do know, however, that our company here in Westfield, whose yearly pay roll is a major factor in our town, cannot compete with the importation of foreign bicycles, even at the current tariff rates adopted just prior to the war. I sincerely feel that, if the Doughton bill just reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee becomes effective at a further 50 percent reduction, it will be ruinous to an industry which has taken years of building up, and which provides employment in small communities throughout the United States.

Will you please consider this seriously when this comes before your body, I understand early next week?

N. R. CLARKE,

President, The Westfield Manufacturing Co.

GLOUCESTER, MASS., May 31, 1945.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH.

DEAR SIR: The members of Gloucester Seafood Workers Union are most vigorously opposed to the Doughton bill empowering President Truman to lower tariff by 50 percent. Any further reduction in rates on fresh or frozen fish will automatically affect 68 percent of workers of Gloucester. Would appreciate your support in opposition to bill.

JOS. A. WHITE,

Business Agent, Gloucester Seafood Workers Union.

THE ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES CO.,

Boston, Mass., May 31, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The fishing industry of Massachusetts and, in fact, the domestic North American industry, is faced with most serious competition from Newfoundland, Canada, and Iceland.

These countries produce large quantities of salt fish which they market in Spain, Portugal, South America, and the West Indies. During the war, however, their production has turned to frozen fillets—England in 1944 having purchased 90,000,000 pounds of this new product. England heretofore has refused to use frozen fish. The 1945 quota for England is cut to 75,000,000 pounds and notice has been served on the fishing interests of Canada, Newfoundland, and Iceland that following the war England will rebuild her own fleets sailing from Grimsby and Hull, and produce all of the fish she needs and will no longer be in the market for the production from these three foreign countries.

It is evident that this production will be dumped into our domestic market in competition with the New England fishing industry.

Under the proposed reciprocity tariff arrangement a further cut in duty would be allowed on these frozen fillets.

It is to be noted that while other products had tariffs greatly increased in the 1930 Tariff Act that the fishing industry did not have its tariff rates raised at that time, but changes were interpretive for the coverage of new products. There was no increase in duty rates over the 1922 Tariff Act.

In the reciprocity agreement with Canada, and applying to Newfoundland, the fillet rate of 2½ cents per pound was not disturbed except that a quota was allowed at the reduced rate of 0.0175 cents per pound, the quota to be 15,000,000 pounds or 15 percent of the domestic consumption, whichever was larger. Before the war the imports from Canada, Newfoundland, etc., never reached the figure of 15,000,000 pounds. In 1944, however, approximately 25,000,000 pounds were imported from these countries.

It is most important to note that at the present time skin-off cod fillets from Newfoundland are marketed in Cleveland, Buffalo, and other cities at approximately 20 cents per pound while it costs the domestic producer of the similar product in Boston about 29 cents per pound. It is pertinent to note further that the 20 cents per pound charged to the wholesaler in Cleveland and these other cities is over the current duty rate of at least 0.0175 when within the quota, and 2½ cents on all amounts exceeding the quota. Therefore, the duty rate to protect the domestic industry would necessarily be raised from 5 to 7½ cents per pound above the current rates as provided in the present reciprocity agreement.

I strongly urge that a specific exemption be made when the Senate considers this reciprocity bill.

The fishing industry should be protected to the point of maintaining satisfactory development and promotion of the great North Atlantic fishing banks which constitute a natural resource—great wealth to our people—if we are allowed to bring this wealth to shore.

Canada and Newfoundland will strongly urge the lowered duties, because the fishing industry constitutes a major portion of their industry. It seems ridiculous, however, that our domestic market must absorb all of their fishery production and be charged with the duty of keeping those countries prosperous. If we are to have world planning and world government, why shouldn't England and some of the other countries—sister nations, in fact—assume part of the duty of keeping the fishing industries of Canada and Newfoundland in operation?

I urge your careful consideration of this and should appreciate very much your reactions.

Please note the new letterhead and that I am no longer with the Massachusetts Fisheries Association.

Very truly yours,

E. H. COOLEY, President.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Gloucester, Mass., June 4, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On Saturday, June 2, 1945, I forwarded to your office a telegram requesting opposition by you to the Doughton bill, which would authorize the President of the United States to reduce tariff on fish by 50 percent.

I am following up the telegram with this letter in order that I may amplify the information contained therein. A reduction of tariff by any percentage would seriously impair the earning ability of all persons along the Atlantic coast engaged in the catching and processing of the products of the sea. It would have the immediate result of preventing the return to gainful employment at their former vocation of many of the men now in the armed forces who are gradually being released to civilian life.

There is no urgent necessity for such a reduction which might ordinarily come about by reason of lack of production or lack of ability for the sea-food workers and the fishermen to meet the needs of our armed forces and of the civilian population as a whole. Fishermen sailing from Gloucester have brought into port the largest catches in its history and the sea-food workers, by putting forth their energy, have processed these fish in the least possible time, and there appears to be no lack of fish in the public markets or on the tables of the armed forces.

I am sure that if the necessity should arise by reason of the inability of the American sea-food workers to meet the demands of our Nation, the sea-food workers would be the first to endorse any plan by which the needs could be met.

I trust that you will extend every effort to prevent the passage of this piece of legislation by reason of its being at the present time nonessential to the basic needs of our country.

Yours respectfully,

CHESTER H. GRANT,
Past Department Commander,
National Retirement Commission.

GLoucester, MASS., June 2, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate Building.

The members of the Gloucester Seafood Workers Union are most vigorously opposed to the Doughton bill in empowering President Truman to lower tariff rates on fish by 50 percent. Any further reductions in rates on fresh or frozen fish will automatically affect 68 percent of the workers of Gloucester, Mass., and seriously impair the fishing industry in the entire commonwealth. I personally would appreciate everything that you may be able to do to prevent passage of this bill through the Senate.

CHET GRANT,
Past Department Commander
of the American Legion.

Boston, Mass., June 7, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate Building.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Fishermen and Sea Food Workers of the Atlantic, consisting of 5,000 members, are most vigorously opposed to the bill empowering Presi-

dent Truman to lower tariff by 50 percent. We feel any further reduction in rates on fresh or frozen fish shall greatly affect the fishing industry as a whole, therefore would appreciate your support in opposition to bill.

JOHN CONEAGAN,

President, Fishermen and Sea Food
Workers Joint Council of the Atlantic.

WARD HILL, MASS., June 1, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: It is our understanding that within the next few weeks the United States Senate will consider the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for three more years to June 1948. It is our understanding that this bill would empower the President to authorize further reductions up to 50-percent below existing rates.

This letter is for the purpose of letting you know that this firm is seriously protesting against the latter provision of this measure, whereby the President is authorized to further reduce tariffs up to 50 percent below existing rates. We believe that if tariff rates are allowed to be lowered 50 percent more, that not only the New England Shoe Industry but the employees in this industry will find themselves in an extremely bad competitive position. Such a reduction would mean serious unemployment in New England shoe manufacturing centers as well as serious losses for the shoe manufacturing industry in New England.

We also believe that any changes in tariff rates under trade agreements negotiated in the future under this act should be made subject to congressional approval.

We sincerely hope that your opinion on this matter is in line with the opinion expressed in this letter and that you will vote accordingly.

We are writing this letter in order that you may know what the opinion of your constituents on this matter is.

Thanking you for giving this matter your serious consideration, we remain,

Very truly yours,

KNIFE BROS., INC.,
FREDERIC R. KNIFE,
General Manager.

Boston, Mass., June 13, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Again referring to the bill to expand the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we trust you will support this bill as reported out by the Senate Finance Committee, which does not give the administration additional authority to make a further reduction in the present tariff rates of 50 percent.

Very truly yours,

HOWES BROS. Co.

Boston, Mass., May 25, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: If reductions in duty in United States tariffs of 50 percent should be authorized—which would be the case if the proposed bill to expand Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should become a law—we believe its effect on the tanning and leather industries would be more than serious. Among the most important reasons are the following:

1. These industries are already crippled by their devoted response to wartime demands. They are suffering from drastic shortages resulting from output to our armed forces, for which they have been compelled to rely upon

our domestic production in order to comply with military specifications; and from lend-lease commitments to our allies. Under these conditions, restrictions upon civilian consumption have been inevitable.

2. Competitively, our position is pathetic compared with that of foreign countries—especially South America—where world conditions have sharply stimulated the tanning of hides and production of leather. Unhindered by such regulations and responsibilities as we face, they have outgrown their own domestic requirements, and will be able to seek successfully greater foreign markets after the war, while our situation is the reverse. Prospectively, the span we must cross is further lengthened by the vast differences in wages which must be paid in the United States and those paid in foreign countries.

We are in sympathy with world trade and the strengthening of sound international relations. We do not, however, believe that our industry should now be called upon to bear the burden of further encouraging the expansion of industry in foreign countries when doing so checks our own healthy growth.

We trust you share our views, and will vote against the proposed bill.

Very truly yours,

HOWES BROS. Co.

HAVERHILL, MASS., June 7, 1945.
The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
Re Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

A further reduction of 50 percent in tariff duties would seriously affect the shoe and leather trade. We cannot possibly compete with leather imported from foreign countries and produced at low wages. We trust that you will help protect the American leather industry by keeping the present reciprocal trade agreement.

L. H. HAMEL LEATHER CO.,
LOUIS H. HAMEL,

Treasurer.

Boston, Mass., June 1, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate.

In behalf of the thousands of shoe workers employed throughout the United States, many of whom are members of the boot and shoe workers union, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, we ask you to use your good offices to oppose the extension of the reciprocal trade treaties. We urge that a limitation be imposed providing that competitive imports be denied entry in American markets when such imports are below American costs of production. Czechoslovakia will flood this country with cheap shoes, resulting in the unemployment of thousands of shoe workers, particularly in New England. We believe in the good-neighbor policy, but not to the extent of starving our own American wage earners.

JOHN J. MARA,
General President.

M. J. WHITTALL ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Worcester, Mass., April 30, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,

The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: We are enclosing a memorandum which has been signed by most of the carpet and rug manufacturers in the United States and submitted to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

We would very much appreciate it if you would read this over so that you might become acquainted with our views and opposition to H. R. 2652.

Very truly yours,

MATTHEW P. WHITTALL,
President.

THE CUNDY-BETTONEY CO., INC.,
Boston, Mass., April 4, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This refers to the reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries, which expire on June 12, 1945, and which the President requests be renewed, with permission to reduce tariffs still further—50 percent.

The tariff on woodwind musical instruments (which we manufacture) was reduced by an agreement with France from 40 percent to 30 percent in May 1936. Due to the chaotic conditions in France at that time and the outbreak of war since, we did not suffer, as importations from France (our chief competitor) ceased.

The situation in the future, however, is fraught with great danger. It appears to be the intent of the administration to reduce tariffs, at the same time helping our competitors by lend-lease and materials, to compete with us as soon as this war is over—probably soon after VE-day. At the same time we are restricted from obtaining materials by OPA restrictions.

We greatly fear the future and protest, first, the reduction which took place in May 1936, and the renewal of the trade agreement, with its added danger of a further reduction. We want to be able to employ the veterans who have left us to fight and who we hope will return.

Very truly yours,

HARRY BETTONEY,
President.

GREAT AMERICAN PLASTICS CO.,
Leominster, Mass., April 11, 1945.
The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand there are some discussions going on with a view to reducing the tariffs on merchandise such as we make.

We manufacture plastic toys and employ in the neighborhood of 700 people. We have just purchased the former Simonds Saw and Steel North Street plant in Fitchburg, and are fitting this up at present for war work. It will be converted immediately after cessation of hostilities for the manufacture of toys.

Before the war when we had foreign competition, even with the tariffs as they were, it was barely possible for the company to exist.

We, however, feel that with the new improved methods we have devised for manufacturing and economical production, we could go on employing the same number of people, or possibly more than we do now, if the tariffs remain at the same level. If they are reduced it may be impossible for us to continue at all.

We therefore sincerely hope that you will take this into consideration, as it will not only affect us but everyone in the plastic industry as well.

Very truly yours,

IRWIN COHN, President.

BOSTON, MASS., May 28, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We believe present reciprocal trade agreement legislation should be continued for a year or 18 months and oppose change permitting a 50 percent reduction in duty rates. Manufacturing methods, processes, size, and speed of machines equally available to all manufacturers everywhere in world. Result that only advantage in cost any country can have over another country in pulp and paper industry is in wages in pulp and paper mills, in woods operations, and in production of other raw materials. The country with the lowest wages and lowest stand-

ard of living is automatically the lowest-cost producer of paper. Prewar imports of paper and pulp far larger than imports any other commodity. Question of further reduction paper tariffs should be determined by considering if United States wishes become further dependent on foreign countries for one of its prime necessities, and whether it wishes directly to displace United States workers engaged in paper and pulp industry. This is a specific decision to be made by Congress; not decision as part of general determined policy to foster international trade. To mortgage future American industry in advance without knowledge of what may transpire in that time imperils entire financial structure of paper industry. When both wars over known economic developments can permit consideration of tariff problems on realistic basis.

HOLLINGSWORTH & WHITNEY CO.,
JAMES L. MADDEN, President.

HOLYOKE, MASS., May 28, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building:

Because of the serious effect upon the paper industry and the workers we urge you to oppose the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act proposed under the Doughton bill. However, we do not oppose the extension of the reciprocal trade agreement and the tariff adjustments in effect up to 1945.

W. J. NORTON,
Treasurer, American Writing Paper Corp.

BOSTON, MASS., June 11, 1945.
United States Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.:
The Boston Allied Printing Trades Council are opposed to any reduction in tariff rates and ask your cooperation toward this end.
JOHN V. CONNOLLY,
Executive Secretary.

EAST WALPOLE, MASS., May 24, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building:
Imports of paper and pulp into United States already far larger than imports of any other commodity. Believe domestic paper industry would be seriously affected if Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is changed to allow 50 percent reduction in present duty rates. Could well result in less than full employment particularly in small communities supported by paper industry.
HOLLINGSWORTH & VOCE CO.,
A. K. NICHOLSON.

EAST PEPPERELL, MASS., May 25, 1945.
Senator DAVID WALSH,
United States Senate:
Extension Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act authorizing 50-percent reduction in tariffs will seriously affect American paper industry and we therefore urge and hope that you will vote against it.
NASHUA RIVER PAPER CO.

FITCHBURG, MASS., May 23, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate:

Ways and Means Committee House of Representatives have reported out favorably extension Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act authorizing 50-percent reduction in tariffs. Action if approved by House may seriously affect production of many grades paper now produced by domestic industry throughout the country and particularly in Massachusetts. Urge opposition to extension this act as further reduction of tariffs to level below that of January 1945 would seriously affect paper industry.

GEORGE R. WALLACE,
State Chairman, Massachusetts Forest Industries Information Committee.

SMITH PAPER, INC.,
Lee, Mass., April 23, 1945.
To Each Member of the House of Representatives
Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Smith Paper, Inc., located in the towns of Lee and Lenox, Mass., is the manufacturer of a number of high-grade tissues included among which are cigarette, condenser, carbon, Bible printing, pottery, and various specialty papers.

We have from 750 to 800 employees in our several plants which are operated on a schedule of 24 hours daily, 7 days per week.

The above number of employees together with their families makes up the greater portion of the population of the town of Lee approximating some 4,500 persons, a considerable number being also from Pittsfield, Lenox, and other surrounding communities.

It is therefore with grave concern that we view the proposal to extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program for 3 years to which we understand consideration is now being given at a hearing before the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee.

In view of all the foregoing, we are consequently somewhat alarmed at the possibility of curtailment in the domestic use of any of our products which doubtless would be brought about if H. R. 2652 is approved in its present form, to wit: "To extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes."

Therefore for all these reasons as set forth we most respectfully petition the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee in its consideration of H. R. 2652, as follows:

1. That extension of the act be limited to a maximum of 1 year.
2. That provision 2 (b) of the act, allowing an additional 50-percent reduction be eliminated.
3. That any new treaties negotiated under the act be made subject to congressional approval.
4. That the original rates established for chinaware in the Tariff Act of 1930 be restored at the earliest possible date, since these latter rates do not nearly compensate for the wage differential in this industry of 85 cents per hour in the United States compared with 26 cents in Great Britain and 7 cents in Japan.

Trusting that we have presented the facts in this case insofar as they concern our company's and employees' interests in such a light as to make apparent to you the basis for our concern over this proposed extension of these agreements, as well as meriting your favorable consideration of our appeal, we are,

Yours very truly,

W. F. TATUM,
Vice President.

BOSTON, MASS., June 11, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate:

I understand reciprocal tariff bill will be considered by the Senate within next few days. Strongly request your support of action of Finance Committee in striking out section 2 of House bill, H. R. 3240. If fairly administered, bill as amended will offer least threat to the stability of American labor and industry throughout period of conversion from war to domestic economy.

WALLACE R. HARPER.

BINGHAM, MASS.
HAYWARD-SCHUSTER WOOLEN MILLS, INC.,
East Douglas, Mass., April 18, 1945.
Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Bill H. R. 2652 now in committee is a most dangerous piece of legislation for Massachusetts and New England.

As you very well know, this bill extends the present power of the State Department to further reduce import duties by as much as 50 percent of the present rates which were drastically reduced a few years ago.

We have never felt the results of the first reduction in tariffs because of the outbreak of the war, and it is a very serious question from both the standpoint of management and labor whether our textile factories would not have been forced to curtail their operations due to the influx of foreign goods.

I recognize the fact that we are in a changing world, and that we can no longer think only in terms of ourselves. I recognize the Reciprocal Trade Treaties Act passed a few years ago may have many meritorious points, but I beseech you to stop further reductions in tariffs until we can determine the effect of the present reductions. It is true that our textile industry is more efficient than in many other nations, but none of us are capable at this moment of determining the competitive position of foreign countries at the conclusion of this war. I believe it is a great deal better to let the present act stand status quo than to take the chance of rendering our own American industry, non-competitive and nonoperative, due to the ability of foreign countries to send their products over here at such prices that would make it impossible for us to compete in our own American market.

I earnestly solicit your careful consideration.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

C. A. CALLAHAN,
Executive Vice President.

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25,
1945, p. 5086]

The American Federation of Labor submitted to the platform of resolutions committee of the Republican and Democratic political conventions of 1940, presented in person to both committees by President William Green, a set of labor planks for insertion in the political platforms of both parties several proposals.

One, which concerns the legislation now pending, reads as follows:

"PROTECTION OF WAGE AND WORKING STANDARDS

"To protect and safeguard the employment opportunities of America's wage earners against unfair competition of the products of workers of low wage and depressed standards and conditions of employment of foreign countries and with which we are bound to be faced at the end of the present European and Asiatic wars, and in order to hold secure the advanced industrial relations and employment standards secured by America's workers through legislative enactments and collective agreements against competition from products of workers in countries of lower standards, it is essential that adequate and proper legislation be had to obtain these ends. We urge the adoption of this policy and procedure."

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25,
1945, p. 5065]

A survey of the reports of tariff hearings, Committee of Reciprocity hearings, and American Federation of Labor proceedings, shows the following national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor are affected by the importation of competitive products of workers in foreign countries:

Boot and Shoe Workers Union.
American Flint Glass Workers Union.
National Brotherhood of Operative Potters.
Glass Bottle Blowers Association.
Window Glass Cutters League.
International Typographical Union.
International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union.

International Photo-Engravers Union.
Stereotypers and Electrotypers Union.
International Brotherhood of Bookbinders.
Cigar Makers International Union.
United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers.
Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners.

International Union of United Brewery Workers.

Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen.

Garment Workers.

United Brick and Clay Workers of America.
Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers.

International Association of Marble, Slate, and Stone Polishers.

International Wood Carvers Association of North America.

Coopers' International Union of North America.

International Brotherhood of Paper Makers.
International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers.

Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, and Helpers' International Union.

United Leather Workers' International Union.

Lithographers' International Protective and Beneficial Association.

Wall Paper Craftsmen and Workers of North America.

American Wire Weavers Protective Association.

The membership of these organizations, 1939, more than 1,500,000.

Among unions directly affiliated with the American Federation of Labor whose membership are also seriously affected are those employed in aluminum, cement, lace, distillery, and other industries.

The metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, through its president, John Frey, appeared at the hearing on the British trade treaty and opposed any reductions on items in which members of unions in the metal trades department were employed.

M. G. WIGHT & Co.,
Lowell, Mass., April 21, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.:

It seems needless to ask your protection of textile mills in Massachusetts and New England, but I fear our Lowell mills cannot compete with goods made under foreign wage scale, and we do not want to see our wages reduced.

I expect considerable reduction, and possibly we may have to get along on lower scale of living, more in line with the rest of the world.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM H. G. WIGHT.

THE LINEN THREAD CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 24, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Our company has a plant in Gloucester which is engaged in the manufacture of fish netting for the commercial fisheries. This plant, in addition to cotton seine, pound, and trap netting, also manufactures gill nets and heavy manila trawls as used by the trawlers. Here also are made hand laid tarred lines used for taking bottom fish, such as cod and halibut.

Now, as you know, we are confronted with a 40-hour week, time and one-half for overtime, minimum pays, and the maintenance of differentials; and a time will come when this endeavor cannot survive if our domestic market is thrown open to the world at large on a free trade basis.

We are not inefficient producers at Gloucester or we would not have been in business as long as we have been. But we are relatively high-cost producers insofar as the wage ele-

ment of cost is reflected in our unit costs. We must have recourse to some equalizing protective device when the countries of the world are retooled and again set up in business. I will concede that this is not an issue at the moment; but the Congress, our duly elected representatives, should take back into their own hands the regulation of international trade. Today, many of us who make mousetraps and meet pay rolls find that our fate is held firmly in the hands of those who have no responsibility to the electorate. This, fundamentally, is all wrong.

I do express the hope that, at the appropriate time, you will vote against any continuance of the Trade Agreements Act. The proponents of free trade are undoubtedly high-minded, idealistic, sincere crusaders; but it is to be regretted that, in the great majority of instances, because of their vocation, they have no right or competence to speak for industry.

Before long, I hope to be in Washington, at which time I would like very much to call at your office. I will promise to make but a very brief trespass on your time.

Apart from the matters in hand, I would very much like to meet one who was a confrere of my brother, the late Senator Warren Barbour.

Very respectfully yours,
F. K. BARBOUR,
President.

MERRIMAC MILLS,
Methuen, Mass., May 31, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALSH: * * *. At the Ways and Means hearing the other day, Ralph Flanders, of Vermont, who was testifying, was asked from the bench, if as a good Vermont trader making a trade of a watch for a piece of land—would he then proceed to give a watch to every man in town?

He squirmed, but finally had to say "No." It was then pointed out to him that that is exactly what is happening on this so-called reciprocity. Tariff favors, for instance on rubber, are given to a little country like Peru who gives something in exchange; but these favors are then automatically applied to Great Britain, and the Netherlands, and every one else without them in return giving a single solitary thing.

The set-up is really dishonest and an infiltration of free trade policy under false colors.

You may be interested in copy of letter which I have just written to President Truman.

With kind personal regards,
Yours truly,
ALFRED C. GAUNT.

BOSTON, MASS., June 7, 1945.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I represent, as chairman of the board, the United States Smelting Refining & Mining Co., a large corporation which you will no doubt remember as having had for many years its general office in Boston and as having many Massachusetts stockholders. In behalf of this enterprise, its stockholders, and in the interests of its employees, I am respectfully calling your attention to the proposed changes in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act permitting further cutting of tariffs on strategic minerals. We believe that further cutting of these tariffs will not be in the best interests of the country. That it may seriously affect production of certain necessary minerals in this country at a time when it is most important to keep up such production. Cutting of tariffs may also seriously curtail opportunities of men now at work and men who may be returning from service in war and seeking to renew their

civilian jobs in connection with mining operations and mineral production. We know that you will use your usual broadminded and good judgment in this matter.

C. A. HIGHT.

FITCHBURG, MASS., May 21, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I thought you might be interested in seeing the enclosed, which is a factual statement made by Mr. D. K. Brown, president of the American Paper and Pulp Association, before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington on May 8, with reference to H. R. 2652.

While I happen to be in favor of as low tariff as possible, I am also in favor of wage scales which would not make it necessary to subsidize exports. I am afraid there is a tendency in this country to minimize the prices of finished products necessary on account of high wages, and perhaps to get wartime profits confused with our ability to sell our merchandise abroad, or withstand the effects of another 50 percent permissible reduction on the basis of the present tariff.

I am not an expert on any of these things. But I consider this a very well-prepared statement on the condition of the paper industry in this country as a whole.

Cordially,

NORMAN HARROWER.

DEDHAM, MASS., April 20, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The record of the woolen and worsted industry in clothing our Army and Navy, our civilian population, and in supplying cloth to our allies has been unexcelled by any other industry in the war effort. All this has been accomplished without great addition in manpower or machinery and none in bricks and mortar.

Due to the war the effect of the 1939 tariff cut on wool cloth has never been felt. By another cut, authority for which is now being asked by the executive department, you would further cripple an industry which has played such a magnificent part in the war effort, and on which you must depend to use the wool produced by our sheep growers.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. WALKER.

DRAPER CORP., INC.,

Hopedale, Mass., May 3, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I am enclosing a copy of letter which I have just written to the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON and trust you will take the time to peruse the ideas I have expressed.

I feel very strongly that great harm can be done by removing the responsibility from Congress of determining proper tariffs in the best interest of the country. I sincerely hope that you will be interested in combating the urge for free trade which apparently exists in some degree, in order to protect your Massachusetts voters, both employer and employee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

B. H. BRISTOW DRAPER, JR.,
Treasurer.

MILTON, MASS., April 20, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As an employee of the largest worsted top manufacturer in this country, I feel that H. R. 2652, a bill giving the State Department power to reduce the tariff on wool textiles, must be defeated.

The passage of this bill would seriously affect thousands of textile workers, particularly in New England, where it is one of our main industries.

This bill not only extends the reciprocal trade-agreements amendment, but provides that reductions up to as much as 50 percent may be made, but only in the 1930 rates, but also in the rates which have been reduced by agreements existing on January 1, 1945.

If this bill is allowed to pass, thousands of textile workers will be out of jobs. Our boys now overseas, expecting to return to their old jobs which have been held open for them, will find the mills closed and they will have to start anew. We cannot compete with mills in England, where textile workers are paid only 35 cents per hour.

Please do all in your power to see that this bill is defeated.

Respectfully,

JOHN J. RILEY.

BEKSHIRE WOOLEN CO.,
Pittsfield, Mass., May 3, 1945.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We call your attention to H. R. 2652, a bill to extend the State Department's power to reduce tariff rates, on which we understand hearings will shortly start.

We here in Massachusetts do not quite grasp what this is all about. We are told on one hand to prepare to create more jobs, but this bill would call for a reduction in the tariff rates on woollens, which would make it impossible for us to compete with European and other low-wage-paying countries, which have been producing and selling their product in this country, coming under our manufacturing costs even before the duty was reduced from 60 percent.

We therefore beg of you, as our Senator, to do something for the Massachusetts and other New England mills, as we believe this bill should be defeated.

Very truly yours,

D. T. NOONAN, President.

MR. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

MR. TUNNELL. I yield.

MR. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill (S. 3240) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I will discuss the amendment at a later date. It is short and reads as follows:

At the end of the bill to insert the following new subsection:

No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under this act shall take effect until the Senate of the United States shall have advised and consented to its ratification, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas will be received, lie on the table, and be printed.

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me so that I may send to the desk and have read a telegram which I have received?

MR. TUNNELL. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram, which I ask to have read.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

RIO DE JANEIRO, June 14, 1945.

Senator WALTER GEORGE,
Chairman, Finance Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

We look with alarm Finance Committee's action declining extend scope reciprocal trade legislation accordance President's recommendations. After 10 years' practical application here our opinion reciprocal trade treaty with Brazil has been beneficial to American labor, industry, commerce, and at same time has been one of the principal motives for increased mutual trade between two countries. Viewing postwar conditions we believe executive authority should be extended rather than maintained present levels in order to meet contingencies requiring new bargaining situations and changes which have taken place during war period in economy of this and other countries. Any other course now would deprive United States with dealing effectively with any adverse foreign legislation this subject.

AMERICAN CHAMBER COMMERCE, BRAZIL,
GEORGE MARROX, President.

MR. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the admirable address which has just been delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. My criticism is that it is not at all germane to the pending bill. The Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] have made speeches on the old tariff issue without reference to the bill before the Senate. I think it would be well to read the bill to see what it provides. I read from House bill 3240:

That the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1945.

In other words, the bill authorizes the President to enter into foreign trade agreements. There is not one word in the bill about there being a reduction of the wages of American workmen.

The second part of the bill, which seems to be that around which the disagreements arise, is section 2 which has been stricken out by the Finance Committee by a vote of 10 to 9, we are told. It is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a) (2) of such section, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1351 (a) (2)), is amended to read as follows: "No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any rate of duty, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress), or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists."

It appears that this is the matter about which the main disagreement arises. I call attention to the fact that that section deals with increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any rate of duty. There is nothing in it which by itself, as one would gather from the speeches made, would result in a reduction of the wages of United States workmen.

I was also interested a couple of days ago when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] speaking along the same lines, and making a general high tariff speech without regard to this bill, called

those who were interested in the bill "cockeyed." I do not know. I presume that almost anyone who is "cockeyed" sees "cockeyed," and believes that all his neighbors are "cockeyed." It seems to be a defect of vision which causes him to believe that everybody else is defective. Whether that is the position of our friend from Wisconsin I do not know.

But let us see who it is who is "cockeyed." The Senator from Wisconsin said that he was afraid of those who might fix the rates—that they might be some of those "cockeyed" persons. The only person who can either reduce or raise rates is the President of the United States. I did not know that he was "cockeyed." I had not heard about it. He sat in this Chamber for many years. He was considered fairly free in his expression, and pretty clear in his thinking. But the Senator from Wisconsin is afraid of "cockeyed" persons making the decisions. As this bill provides for only a 3-year extension, barring death or resignation, the President of the United States is going to be President Truman. Of course, I do not know what might happen after that; but certainly for the 3 years from June 12, 1945, to June 12, 1948, Senator Truman, as we knew him, or President Truman, will be the President of the United States, barring death, resignation, or impeachment. I do not think it is fair to call him "cockeyed." I do not think he is. I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin meant that.

The President, in his letter of recent date, gives his position with reference to these tariff rates. It will be found on page 7 of part I of the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, as to House bill 3240. It is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Supplementing our conversation yesterday, I wish to repeat that I regard the pending measure for the renewal and strengthening of the Trade Agreements Act as of the first order of importance for the success of my administration.

I assume there is no doubt that the act will be renewed. The real question is whether the renewal is to be in such form as to make the act effective. For that purpose the enlargement of authority provided by section 2 of the pending bill is essential.

I have had drawn to my attention statements to the effect that this increased authority might be used in such a way as to endanger or "trade out" segments of American industry, American agriculture, or American labor. No such action was taken under President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, and no such action will take place under my Presidency.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

There seems to be some doubt as to Mr. Clayton in the State Department. It seems that he has been brought into the situation. Day before yesterday Mr. Clayton was the subject of discussion. The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], on page 6035 of the RECORD, spoke as follows:

He—

Referring to Mr. Clayton—

said it would be impossible for the United States, under any development he could contemplate, and his knowledge of it, to be permanent participants in the world cotton market, and he anticipated also that the smaller cotton growers of the old South in any event would be eliminated.

We attempted to get this matter cleared up at that time, but I was speaking on the time of another Senator and, therefore, did not complete my discussion.

On the same page of the RECORD is found my interruption of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], when I stated:

MR. TUNNELL. I merely wanted to say, with reference to the interrogation of Mr. Clayton, that Mr. Clayton was very positive in his statement that the American people would have to reduce the cost of production so as to compete with the rest of the world. I was on the committee and heard his testimony; I think all his testimony, but that was his position; that we could not permanently continue to subsidize and compete with the world.

On page 30 of the record before the Finance Committee is the following statement by Mr. Clayton:

MR. CLAYTON. That is true, Senator BAILEY. I would just like to give as my considered opinion that if the production of cotton were permitted to seek the most efficient lands and most efficient producers, and most efficient means of production in the United States, we can grow cotton in the United States in competition with the rest of the world for the world market.

Farther down on the same page occurs the following:

MR. CLAYTON. I do not think I have made myself clear. If in the United States the production of cotton is permitted to seek the most efficient land and most efficient producers and most efficient means of production, then I believe that we can grow cotton in the United States in competition with the rest of the world.

That was his statement before the Finance Committee. But before the Foreign Relations Committee, at the time Mr. Clayton's nomination to the State Department was being considered, the following statement was made on page 211 of the record of the testimony:

Senator TUNNELL. Mr. Clayton, I thought perhaps there was an implied criticism in the thought that you had a different philosophy with reference to the production of cotton from some of the others. I understood your position to be that America could not long continue to produce cotton at a price higher than that which its prospective customers could or would pay, without some calamity.

MR. CLAYTON. That is correct, sir.

Senator TUNNELL. Well, that is not your philosophy; you are not trying to bring this about. That is what you believe to be an economic law; is it not?

MR. CLAYTON. That is correct.

So, Mr. President, whether we take his statements before the Foreign Relations Committee or whether we take his statements before the Finance Committee, where he plainly said he thought we could grow cotton in competition with the world, there is nothing in the record of Mr. Clayton's testimony to indicate that he does not believe that the cotton industry in the United States should continue. I do not know any reason, as I said, for the suggestion that he holds other views, other than at this time some might think that it might be well to hit at the State Department which is to be one of the advisers of the President with reference to tariff rates.

This much is stated by Mr. Clayton on page 7 of the hearings before the Finance Committee:

Although the Trade Agreements Act has been in effect for 11 years, there are still hundreds of imported commodities on which the rates of duty are unduly restrictive—many rates are in excess of 50 percent, and in this group are many commodities with rates of duty running over 75 percent, and even in excess of 100 percent.

It is essential that the additional authority asked for in section 2 be granted because the full reduction permitted under the original act has already been made in respect of certain commodities supplies by our principal foreign customers. In respect of the United Kingdom and Canada, our two best customers, we have already made reductions under the program on about 90 percent of our total dutiable imports from these countries. In respect of the other western European countries and the principal Latin-American countries, we have also used up the major part of our bargaining power.

In other words, he argues that, having used up a large part of our bargaining power, there should be authority to make further reductions or decreases in order that the President may still have some bargaining authority.

On page 37 of the hearings before the Finance Committee, I find the following:

MR. CLAYTON. Yes, sir; so far as I know I think that no industry has been able to show, either in its representations to the State Department or in its testimony in hearings on this bill, that it has been seriously injured as the result of anything that has been done under this act.

He states that up to the present time he has not known of any proof that any industry has been injured under this act.

On page 44 of the same record he states something about what they hope to do under this program:

MR. CLAYTON. What we would hope to do under this program would be to make trades, and particularly if we do decide in the end, as I think we will, that our national policy should be that of assisting these countries to get on their feet again—what we would hope to do under this program is to make deals so we can export a lot more steel than we ever exported before, and take care of some of this expanded productive capacity that has resulted from the war. Certainly, that is the very type of product where we think there is a great opportunity to increase our exports—heavy-industry equipment, machinery, machine tools, and capital and producers' goods, generally, because they will be needed in enormous quantities, simply enormous quantities, after this war, in order to reconstruct and develop. If the Congress does approve Bretton Woods and does approve the trade-agreements program in the form in which we ask, we believe we can handle the two instruments together to give us a very expanded export market in things of that kind.

The claim that a man whose whole life has been devoted to business—and successful business—wishes to eliminate the very source of supply for his business is, to my mind, one of the most absurd arguments I have ever heard. I do not believe there is the slightest ground for such a suggestion. Not only that, but if there should be any such ground, the man upon whom rests the responsibility for the whole machinery for making the decisions is the President of the United States, and upon him must fall the responsibility or the blame, if blame there be.

The reciprocal trade-agreements bill was passed, as we have been told, and became a law on June 12, 1934. That was just after the low-water mark of business in the United States. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] told us that only "cockeyed" people believe there was any connection between the tariff bill under which we were transacting business, or failing to transact it, during that period and the depression. Well, Mr. President, one thing is certain: If the tariff law had nothing to do with bringing on the depression, it certainly did not stop it. I think I can call on former President Hoover and prove by him that there was a depression. I do not know whether I could do so by means of either the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Wisconsin, but I think I could by ex-President Hoover. I think he would have been delighted to have had the Senator from Wisconsin or anyone else say that the depression through which the country passed at that time, during his administration, was a world-wide depression, and one with which we in this country had nothing to do.

Until that time, from the days of the Civil War down to the date of the enactment of this particular tariff law, we had been told constantly, whenever anything went wrong, that all we had to do was to raise the tariff. Finally, I think the people who were working with President Hoover believed that. So when the depression came on, they raised the tariff. The result was not an improvement, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, or not a help; but, instead, 37 countries took it upon themselves to try to prevent the importation of American goods and to a very great extent they succeeded because there was no business left in this country from 1929 to 1933 or 1934, when conditions began to improve. They reached their lowest ebb in 1933, as I recall. So the tariff act which was passed in 1930 did not cure the situation.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has made a very statesmanlike statement. He said, in effect, that this issue was not a political one, and should not be decided along political lines. That is true. This bill should not be considered as a political measure. That it is not a political measure I can prove by the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who told us only a few days ago that there were five fat lobbyists and a political leader sitting in the lobby outside of this Chamber, and that they were checking up on how Senators would vote. I do not know who those fat lobbyists were. Apparently they were not bothered by the things about which we have heard so much on this floor, because they were still fat. That they were well connected, politically, was proven by the Senator's statement that they had with them a Republican leader. I do not know who that leader was. I have no way of knowing, and I do not particularly care. The fact is that the issue now before the Senate is one which is being lobbied for by at least five fat lobbyists who have been joined by a Republican leader. That is what the Senator from New Hampshire told us, and I think he was correct.

Mr. President, what is the reason for trying to make a political issue out of the

power proposed to be given the President to make certain bargaining arrangements with foreign countries? Certainly the arrangements with foreign countries should be made through the Executive. They are now made through the Executive.

I am not particularly disturbed about the argument of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He is very sincere, and I assume that he believes that the pending measure is not constitutional. From 1934 to the present time efforts have been made to establish that the present act is not constitutional. If there were only two roads to New York, one of them being passable and the other not, I believe I would take the one which was passable. I can remember various bills which became law with reference to the tariff. I can remember how business was stagnant during a period when people were trying to ascertain what Congress was going to do. I have a recollection of various kinds of charges with reference to lobbyists, some of them fat and some of them thin, but all looking after the interests of special groups. Perhaps this measure, if adopted, may cut into the employment of certain of those lobbyists. Perhaps it may be one of the instruments used in urging them to greater activity. But the fact of the matter is that the enactment of the tariff acts became such a paralytic influence on the Nation, and a source of such scandal, that everyone, except those who were benefitting by that particular kind of scandal, and that particular kind of activity, felt that it was fortunate when some other method of accomplishing the same result was discovered and used. It has been used fairly satisfactorily ever since.

Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] state that more than 1,200 changes had taken place in the Tariff Act. If that be true, it is a very large number of changes, and for Mr. Clayton, in the position which he occupies, to say that he has not heard or learned of a single business which has been seriously injured is a matter of great satisfaction to the people of the Nation.

On page 8 of the Finance Committee hearings there appear the following statements:

Section 2 of the bill gives us authority to make agreements involving reductions in our rates up to 50 percent of the tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1945.

I am reading from the testimony of Mr. Clayton, which has not been contradicted.

I continue reading:

It should be pointed out that in respect of 37 percent of our dutiable imports by value, no reduction whatever has been made so far in import duties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Hence, as to these imports, amounting to 37 percent of the total, the present bill gives no additional authority whatsoever.

In respect of another 21 percent of dutiable imports by value, reductions in duty have been made in varying percentages under 50 percent. Therefore some additional authority is provided in the pending bill in respect of these imports.

As regards the remaining 42 percent of our dutiable imports by value, agreements have

been entered into providing for the full 50-percent reduction in duties authorized under the original act. If Congress should grant the authority provided for in section 2 of the pending bill, the President would then have authority to reduce the duties on the commodities constituting this 42 percent of our imports by another 50 percent.

I find on reading in the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Ohio that while he omitted to state just how high this tariff was, he did state that it had been reduced practically the full 50 percent, and that it was still slightly more than 31 percent. If that is true, the last tariff act was approximately a 62-percent average tariff act. It has been admitted that it was the highest tariff act in the history of the country.

It has been further admitted that during its period of existence there took place one of the greatest panics the Nation ever experienced. The question as to whether the tariff act was the cause of the panic has been disputed, but no one can dispute that it did not cure the panic.

It has been stated, in effect, by both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Wisconsin that our foreign commerce is comparatively unimportant. There is some weight to be given to that statement if we compare the figures 5 percent or 7 percent with 93 percent or 95 percent. But I remember an illustration which has been used by our political opponents in reference to this argument. I remember that many years ago a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Illinois, as I recall, went to Europe and bought a watch for less money than he could have bought it for in the United States. It was an American-made watch. We were told that the reason for his ability to buy the watch for less than he would have had to pay for it in the United States was—the situation was quite widely publicized at the time—that the watch was surplus, and that surplus had to be disposed of. That is a matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country with reference to surplus. If it represents 5 percent, 7 percent, 10 percent, or whatever the figure may be, it nevertheless is something that we cannot use in this country; it is surplus, and, if we do not dispose of it to foreign nations, it will break the market of America. That is what will throw people out of employment; that is the important aspect of this bill, so far as foreign commerce is concerned.

I know there are those who say that foreign commerce amounts to just so many dollars. I heard the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] figure it out the other day and tell us by how many dollars our foreign commerce would be affected. In other words, we might increase it just so many dollars. Well, Mr. President, there is no human being who can tell with any certainty how many dollars of foreign commerce can be affected by this or any other bill.

There are those who believe in what is known as the static theory of government, who believe that the world is standing still, and there are others who even believe it is going backward. That

seems to be the theory of some of our friends with reference to this bill.

During the early part of this year the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and myself were in Europe, Asia, and Africa within a short time. During the course of that trip one thing that greatly impressed me was the wonderful possibility of future trade in the Eastern Hemisphere. If we are not going to develop it, if we are going backward, if we are not going to try to increase our market in those countries, I can see how a person might say, "Yes, we will just continue to be economic isolationists." That is what those people are who want to hold the trade of the United States entirely to our own market and who refuse to make the slightest concession or to give to the President of the United States the power to make any concession.

All countries are not taking that static view or that reactionary view as to world trade. In the Mediterranean area there are to be found the representatives of some of our competitor nations; and they have power to make agreements and power to place their countries in a position to get that trade. Regardless of partisan politics, regardless of fat lobbyists, regardless of special interests that are taking this occasion to talk tariff rather than to talk business, I hope the United States will not be prevented from taking its proper position in world trade.

I say to you, Mr. President, that the United States is under obligation to itself, to its factories, to its farmers, to its laborers, to see to it that we have a part of the business of the world. We will never get it all; neither should we try to build our tariff wall so high that it can not come into this country; neither should we try to arouse the antagonism of other nations of the world to such an extent that they will not deal with us at all. Let not Senators delude themselves into believing that our competitors are asleep. Our competitors are awake, and they are after this business. They are after it not only by radio connections but by airplane connections; they are making their connections. We have an opportunity to do so. We have an opportunity to deal with those nations.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said a while ago that the proponents of this bill are free traders. Well, maybe so. I am not a free trader when I consider the condition of the United States and the fact that our business has been built up artificially under a tariff system. I think that to remove suddenly or perhaps to remove at all some of the tariff pillars would result in unemployment. I think it would result in a depression, but it could not equal and would never equal the terrific depression which was brought on by a high tariff. I care not which high tariff may be considered, whether it is the one which was passed in 1930 or the one which was passed before that time. It became impossible for the world to transact business with the United States. Under the pretense of protecting business, we drove business away until there was no business except the business of feeding our starving people.

Mr. President, this sort of thing had better be looked at from the standpoint

of the people of the United States. A reading of the report of the Senator from Ohio and myself when we returned from the Middle East will disclose that we both believe there is a wonderful chance for an increase in business opportunities in the Eastern Hemisphere. Somebody is going to sell these goods; somebody is going to transact business. Are we going to try to follow the plan of making our prices so high that other nations cannot buy from us? Are we going to wall off our factories, our farmers, and our producers so that nobody can buy the products of America? Is that the theory?

When the war is over a situation will arise which many of our reactionary friends, and our static friends, have not contemplated. There is going to be a demand for somebody to transact the business of the world, and I am not sure but that our competitors will even want that business transacted.

Some time ago I made a speech to the captains and vessel owners of the city of Philadelphia. In the preparation of that speech I made a study of the shipping situation, and I shall read a short extract from what I said that night:

It has been suggested that there will be approximately 57,000,000 tons of shipping belonging to the United States at the time the war is concluded.

We had approximately 11,000,000 tons of shipping at the beginning of the war. We will have 57,000,000 tons.

Those who have made a study of this situation believe that not more than sixteen millions of tons will be required for the use of the United States for civilian work. It is estimated that the Navy will require 5,000,000 tons, and that at most we can sell to foreign customers twelve millions of tons. This will leave a surplus of 24,000,000 tons of shipping.

At the end of this war we are going to have the ships, 57,000,000 tons of them. We are going to have the money. There is now on deposit in the banks of the United States—I obtained this figure from the office of the Comptroller of the Currency this morning, though it was for January 1—\$142,310,824,000 ready for business.

It is not being used. We are going to have the shipping, we are going to have the money, we are going to have the goods to ship. There is no doubt about that. We are producing now more than we can consume. We are producing for ourselves, for our soldiers overseas, for those we are helping to keep from starvation by selling them food. We are in a position, and we are the only nation in the world that is in a position, to take charge of this business. What the President of the United States is asking is that we let him have the bargaining power to try to get this business, or a part of it.

When the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and I returned from our trip, I spoke to the State Department and told them that I thought there should be a bargaining agent with the countries of the world who would look out for our interests. I found in Jerusalem a man who was sent there by one of our greatest competitors, and who was there looking after the interests of his country. I found no one who knew what the policy

of the United States could be or would be. We do not know what Congress will approve, and, after all, it comes down to that. If the President of the United States, or the State Department, or some responsible agent, is not given the power to make some sort of contracts in as effort to increase the business of the United States, we are not going to be able to dispose of our surpluses.

Oh, it is said, those in foreign countries have not anything with which to pay. That has been something of a problem for many years. I recall when the Government of the United States, between 1920 and 1930, loaned to foreign governments in our own hemisphere billions of dollars. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] told us yesterday that the loans amounted to \$14,000,000,000, that much credit, and we took the bonds of many countries. There is no use in naming the countries, giving the number of them, or the particular amounts. I received a letter from a man today asking if I could not help him to get money for one of his South American bonds. He said he had had it for 14 years, and could not get anything on it. That was the method used at that time in the United States, and governmental agencies aided in floating those bonds. I know where the recommendations came from, and the floating of those bonds did result in the purchase of American goods, and also resulted in Americans losing what they paid for the bonds in this country.

Of course, we have used the metal method of paying since that. We have been taking the gold or the silver of various nations, and we have been selling them goods under that method of credit.

Mr. President, I realize that we do not want to flood our markets with foreign goods, we do not want to throw our people out of employment, nor do we want worthless foreign bonds. If we refuse to take gold or silver or something that is known to have some value, what are we going to take?

There are plans. We have now the plan of Dumbarton Oaks and the plan of Bretton Woods. We are trying to get credits for the nations with which we are dealing, the thought being that their power of consumption and their standard of living will increase from time to time.

Mr. President, I read a book just a few days ago written by a man named Ziff. He says there are 700,000,000 Chinese and approximately 400,000,000 Hindus. Take the list of the populations of Asia, and we find that there are, as nearly as one can figure, between half and two-thirds of the population of the world right there in Asia. The standard of living of those people is low, their wealth is meager, but right there, where the Garden of Eden was supposed to have been, in one pile, is the greatest amount of wealth in the way of merchandise that I know of.

The oil in that section is estimated at 200,000,000,000 barrels. Surely Asia was a place of wealth, and it is a place of wealth. The greatest oil pool is there, and we are going to need some of that oil, though at present our oil producers believe they can meet the requirements

of America, and so long as they can meet them I do not believe in driving American business from oil.

We have the ships, we have the money, we have the brains to solve this problem.

There are those who propose a loan; there are those who believe that the standard of living can be raised and that we can make customers out of this great mass of humanity. Whether we obtain this business or not, some country is going to obtain it, because after the war conditions will be somewhat different from what they were before the war.

I have prepared a short statement respecting conditions in Asia, and I read from it briefly, as follows:

In Asia the great problem of the future will arise. There are those who underestimate the Chinese Nation. We are told that China and the countries surrounding it have a Chinese population of almost 700,000,000. India is supposed to have a population of approximately 400,000,000. In other words, much more than one-half of the population of the globe is found in Asia. They are accustomed to the low standards of living. Will the future see an improvement in these standards?

As a result of this war, we can now see that there are four great nations. Each of these nations is great and powerful. Our own citizens number about 135,000,000. They are accustomed to the highest standard of living on earth. Great Britain has slightly more than one-third as great a population as ourselves. Great Britain is entering a new and different commercial era. Can Great Britain survive as one of the dominating commercial nations? In 1870, 25 percent of the international trade of the world was British trade. In 1938, only 15 percent of the international trade was British trade. In 1920, Great Britain's trade balance was £150,000,000. In 1938, Great Britain had an adverse trade balance of £50,000,000. In 1938, Great Britain's total exports were approximately one-half of her imports. This furnishes a serious problem for any nation. It cannot permanently continue to purchase more than it sells any more than can an individual. In many respects Great Britain will be in a worse position from a commercial standpoint at the conclusion of the present war than it was at the beginning. Its various dominions and commonwealths are now free to seek commercial connections with other nations. Canada, India, Australia, and all others of the British affiliates will be seeking products of countries which can furnish to them the things they need for the least money. Again, we must consider the changed position of the international commercial situation in both Europe and Asia. Two immense populations representing two mighty government will have increased their commercial opportunities at the end of this war. If Japan is defeated, which it must be, China must be reckoned with in Asiatic production and Asiatic commerce. Russia with its tremendous area which will cover a territory reaching from the Baltic Sea to the Bering Strait, and from the Arctic Ocean almost to the Indian Ocean, will be a competitor for world commerce.

Mr. President, we cannot deny facts which are so apparent, and we must consider these three nations, together with the United States, as possible sources for supplying the world trade. I think all the other nations will be glad for the assistance—for the aid which America can give at this crucial time in the history of the world. I do not be-

lieve the time will ever come when the United States will again have the opportunity it now has to grasp a sizable portion of that trade. If these people are furnished, by purchase, any considerable amount of goods, it will naturally result in raising their standard of living.

There is more money in the world than we are sometimes inclined to think. The other day we learned that the Germans are paying for the food which they are receiving. They are paying money which they have saved up during the pre-war period or perhaps during the early war period, and they are paying in cash for the food they are consuming at this time. We were so told by the military authorities in control.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if at this time we should fail to participate, and should show that we do not want the United States to participate, in this effort toward world trade, if we should refuse to adopt either the Dumbarton Oaks or the Bretton Woods proposals, if we should refuse to furnish credits, or if we should refuse to give the President the power which he has asked, we would be saying to the rest of the world, "We are really not very much interested in this program for world betterment; we are not very much interested in this program for the benefit of the United States"—if we want to put it on a national basis—for, after all, we cannot have prosperity in the United States and have all our industries producing to the full extent unless we are selling the surplus to people in other parts of the world.

What we should consider at this time is the strategic importance of having the world understand that we are going to participate in the commercial era which will follow—that we are going to be a part of the world relations.

Mr. President, I wish to read briefly from a book which I picked up last night and which attracted my attention. The title of the book is "The Gentlemen Talk of Peace." It is by William B. Ziff. I read:

After the war it will be possible for men to live on mountain tops, favored islands, or lake shores hundreds of miles away from their work, running down to the great airline taxi centers in little helicopters or combination airplane runabouts.

Wherever scenery is beautiful or life is favored and invigorated, men will live. Electric power will be cheap and more efficient. Plastics will be abundant and will replace many common materials. Houses will be air-cooled, cities laid out for beauty and efficiency.

The living standards of present-day nations reflect the continuous state of preparation for belligerency in which their national economies are always involved, and the wasteful expenditures consequent on a hopelessly inefficient political organization of the earth's surface.

Not only is there a profligate squandering of wealth on enterprises which bring no return to society, but there results an actual nullification of man's impulse to employ his achievements for the benefit of his kind. The state thinks in terms of deadly competitions and repressions. It considers its environment as a primeval wilderness containing infinite and everpresent menace,

a psychology which is imparted to its principal thinkers and most energetic men.

A small part of the effort put to the business of war would wipe out many plagues and pests which now are a recurrent feature of our existence, and would add automatically to the bankable wealth of humanity. Syphilis, crows, rats, and other scourges of mankind could be eradicated. In the United States alone, rats inflict a total damage of over \$200,000,000 a year. There are supposed to be more than 800,000,000 cases of malaria in the world, a disease which takes an annual tribute of over 10,000,000 lives. Its economic loss to the United States is estimated at \$500,000,000 a year. A fraction of the money spent on war would give the entire world a magnificently unified road and airport system.

The predatory instincts of aggressive men could be sublimated in long-range projects for the taming of nature, which could be attempted only on a hemispheric basis. Engineering works of massive scope could be undertaken, jungles cleared, deserts irrigated, swamps drained, and the forces of natural energy harnessed, as man moved to place his environment under control.

This is a dream and a vision which well could engage the attention of men and turn them from the petty hatreds and mean conceptions to which they addict themselves under the guise of patriotism, local interests, race, and even religion. In such a world the rewards would be great, and from its tranquillity and peace could develop, in addition to animal comfort and security, a true blossoming of the spirit and a creative mind. This would be the first of the golden eras of man, an age far transcending any humankind has ever known.

So all people in the world do not confine themselves to the things which are now in existence. They dream of a future in which there shall be a better life for those who today are poor, who have never known what could be done. They have never known how to live. The opportunity is ours to help bring it about.

Not only that, but this entire debate has shown that the opponents of this measure are suspicious that someone is going to injure the United States. They are suspicious that the President will not be diligent in aiding the United States and its citizens. I believe that we should take a different view. I believe that we should take the view that neither the President of the United States nor his advisers are anxious to bring about the dangerous, dastardly things that have been predicted. Certainly every American citizen wants to see progress and happiness. He wants to see brought about the very things we are told are necessary. We have different views as to how this can be done. I, for one, have no fear as to either the sincerity or the ability of the President of the United States in this or any other matter which comes before him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with many of the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Delaware. I have listened to his very eloquent address. I

agree with much of what he says. But when he comes to the point of saying that this is the responsibility of the President of the United States, I cannot follow him, for this reason: When I first came to the Senate, very frequently the State Department would notify me that it was about to enter into an agreement with a foreign nation. At one time it was with respect to sugar. At another time it was with respect to cattle and other livestock. At another time it was with respect to beans. At other times various metals were involved. I was notified that I would be given an opportunity to be heard with respect to the agreement which the State Department was about to make with a foreign nation.

Of course, my State was tremendously interested in such products. We produce such commodities, and it is important that we be permitted to continue to produce them. So I would go down to the State Department. I did not appear before the President of the United States. I did not even appear before the Secretary of State. I appeared before a board of clerks. That is what they were. I pleaded with them, almost on my knees, not to put the producers of Colorado out of business.

I could not help realizing that I was asking for something which the Congress, without my assistance, had voted out of its hands. In other words, I was pleading for something which should have been in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Delaware knows, as we all know, that the President's task is tremendous. As the present President said not many days ago, "I have so much work to do that I do not know where to begin." That is true of his office. It is a most arduous office, which makes exceedingly great demands upon the man who occupies it. The work it entails is far beyond any man. I know that the Senator from Delaware does not want the country or the Senate, or anyone, to believe that these matters are going to have the personal attention of the President of the United States.

I know that the President communicated with Congress and urged that this power be given to him. I know that he gave us his assurance that he would do the best he could to see that no one was hurt. But I know full well that he is not going to be able to enter into these trades. He is not going to use his good Yankee trading ability in this matter at all. Others are going to do it; and later Members of Congress will have to appear before a group of clerks.

Mr. TUNNELL. Let me ask the Senator from Colorado a question: Does he believe that Harry S. Truman meant what he said when he stated in his letter, "No such action was taken under President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, and no such action will be taken under my Presidency"? Does the Senator believe that he meant that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He undoubtedly meant it. He was stating as his opinion that nothing had been done under the former President to harm any

industry. That was his opinion, and he is entitled to that opinion. But that is only a statement of an opinion. That is not a statement of a fact, by any means. He has the right to state his opinion, and I respect his opinion.

Mr. TUNNELL. It is the fact, as set out by some of those who are members of the committee, that there was not brought before the committee any instance of serious injury being inflicted on any business in the United States under this plan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, there might be a difference of opinion as to whether there was injury. Take sugar as an example. The tariff on sugar from Cuba was reduced from \$2 to \$0.75. The Senator says that no one was injured by it. That is true. Why? Because the Congress provided a subsidy plan and made supporting price payments to producers of sugar to compensate for the difference between the former rate and the new rate. So no one was injured.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If we are going to do the same thing—

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I shall refuse to yield if the Senator does not let me talk to him at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want the Senator to talk. He has the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. Let me say to the Senator that I refuse to go into any schedule, because I believe that is a matter which, under the law at present, should be taken before the particular person who has the duty and responsibility of making the decisions. That is the President of the United States or such persons as he shall designate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I am saying—a board of clerks.

Mr. TUNNELL. Would the Senator hesitate to go before the President of the United States if he were confronted by a difficult question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I would not hesitate to go before the President of the United States. But I am sure I would find that he had so many tasks that he could not give the subject his personal attention. At present he has a multitude of tasks in conducting the war. Of course, the pending bill is a postwar measure, so the war will be out of the way. He will not have that job to do; but he will have plenty of jobs to do, and I know that he will not be able to give the subject his personal attention.

There is another point on which I should like to have the Senator's reaction, if he will be kind enough to yield to me. I do not wish to trespass too much on his time. I refer to the matter of Yankee trading. We think we are pretty good traders; and we are; but here is the difficulty under the whole reciprocal trade agreement plan. We make a trade with Peru; let us say we make a good trade with Peru, one advantageous to the producers. Then we throw that trade wide open to the whole world. Everyone comes in under it. So the effect is, not a unilateral trade with Peru, but a trade with the whole world.

That is the reason why the authority which the Congress very generously gave to the President a few years ago, in connection with the reciprocal trade agreements, to make reductions up to 50 percent, has been used up, so that no more of it is left, in the case of 42 percent of dutiable products.

Mr. TUNNELL. But that is not true; 37 percent of the dutiable products have not been touched.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, and we do not need any additional legislation in order to give the State Department all the power it needs with respect to them.

Mr. TUNNELL. How about the 42 percent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. TUNNELL. Apparently the Senator is not willing to trust the President of the United States. Apparently the Senator from Colorado would prefer to trust to the corruption and logrolling of a long tariff bill which will not be introduced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, the choice is not as the Senator from Delaware has pictured it.

Mr. TUNNELL. No; it is not even that. It is either this plan or nothing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, those concerned with the products—the 42 percent—on which the tariff rates have been reduced up to 50 percent are going to continue to make the sacrifice.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator heard the chairman of the Finance Committee say there would not be any new tariff bill soon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suppose there will not be a new tariff bill soon. The Hawley-Smoot tariff bill was enacted in 1930, and many people have found fault with it. Many have blamed it for the depression and for everything else on earth.

Mr. TUNNELL. They were hungry when they blamed it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the old alibi I hear every day—"the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill."

Mr. TUNNELL. I hope it will be a good while before the American people forget it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no objection to that. The point I am trying to make is that the Senator from Delaware has been in the Senate quite a while. His administration and my administration has been in power for more than 12 years, but it has never brought forth a tariff bill to take the place of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. The administration has used the very act we are discussing as a substitute for the corruption, logrolling, lobbying, style of changing the tariff which was used before that time. The old procedure did not seem to benefit anyone except the lobbyists, and perhaps it helped raise some campaign funds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, Mr. President, that statement is an exaggeration; although there is considerable truth in it.

Mr. TUNNELL. Again it is a matter of opinion whether it is exaggerated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it is considerably exaggerated. I am not making a defense of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. In fact, I am very much opposed to many of its provisions.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am glad of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, bad as it is, has in it a flexible tariff provision permitting the President of the United States to reduce the tariffs under it by 50 percent.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator think that is constitutional?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not see why it is not constitutional. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] stated yesterday, as I understood his argument, that it was constitutional because Congress said those tariff rates would be effective following the President's proclamation, and that provision was placed in the tariff bill.

I am not arguing the constitutionality of the pending proposal because I am not competent to argue it with such a distinguished attorney as my friend the Senator from Delaware. I am not even a lawyer, and I shall not talk about the constitutionality of any of these provisions.

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not wish to show that it is not constitutional; I was merely asking the opinion of the Senator whether it is or is not constitutional.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My opinion is that the Senator from Wyoming made a very good point. It sounded very reasonable to me, as a layman. I am not an attorney; I am not a judge of these matters; I am not an expert on the question. But the statement of the Senator from Wyoming sounded very reasonable to me. He said it was entirely constitutional.

However, Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator from Delaware further.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado another question. Does he believe that the President or any individual or organization should be entitled or authorized to make an attempt to obtain a portion of the world trade, after the war, for our country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I do.

Mr. TUNNELL. Who should it be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It should be the President of the United States or his Secretary of State. But after he makes his proposal and after he goes ahead with his plan, the matter should be submitted to the Congress for ratification. Then, the people of the United States could say whether they favored it.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then we could have this whole tariff discussion over and over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Not necessarily.

Mr. TUNNELL. Well, we would have it over and over again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think that follows at all. I think the

Congress probably would ratify without very much difficulty the agreements made between nations.

When we make with one country an agreement whereby we obtain from it a concession relative to having goods from that country come into the United States and having our goods go to that country, we find that the whole thing is thrown wide open to the world. I think Congress might very well object, and should object to that. Such a multiple application of trade agreements is the thing which has caused all the difficulty at this time. I cannot help but feel that the State Department and the administration would be in a much better position today in their capacity to trade and in their capacity to build up American commerce if they had kept the trade agreements on a unilateral basis, instead of a multilateral basis.

Mr. TUNNELL. No matter where the arguments against the pending measure start, they always end in a vote of lack of confidence in the President of the United States. No other conclusion can be reached. Either we decide to give the President the power or we decide not to give him the power. The Senator has said he believes that after the power has been exercised, each agreement should be threshed out before the Senate of the United States. If that occurred, instead of having five fat lobbyists, we would have perhaps 500 of them, and instead of having one leader take action in that connection, 100 leaders would have a hand in the discussion.

So it is just a case whether we wish to do something or do not wish to do anything, whether we wish to go backward, or whether we wish to stand still. Someone should have authority to go ahead. Someone should try to aid the United States in getting its share of the world trade and doing its part to uplift humanity. The standards of living will be raised at the same time that the share of the United States in world trade is increased. I certainly hope the bill will have the support, not only of the people of the United States—which it apparently has—but of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I attended the hearings which were held by the Committee on Finance in connection with the bill now under consideration. I believe that each Member of the Senate has given a great deal of time to reading and preparing himself in order to formulate his own final decision in regard to the merits of the bill. Up to the present time I believe that very little has been said with reference to what effect the bill might have on the agriculture of America, and I wish to make a few remarks now with reference to what effect the proposal might have on the long-term agricultural policy of the United States.

Mr. President, the view is very widespread that the United States, while willing to cooperate internationally in the political field, is unwilling to do so in the economic sphere. This idea has been

built up very elaborately by the proponents in the State Department of the trade-agreements program as an argument in favor of the program. The stronger they make this argument, the better is their chance of selling the program. It is, however, a particularly erroneous and misleading argument in the light of the record of the past.

No nation has ever been more willing than the United States to cooperate with other nations in every field of economic endeavor; more than two-thirds of our total import trade is free from any duty, which gives foreign countries completely free access to the largest market in the world. Moreover, according to the best available studies on the subject, the tariff level on dutiable merchandise is not high in terms of the levels in other countries. Furthermore, we have never resorted to the imposition of the innumerable kinds of barriers to trade that other nations have employed, and in making trade agreements we generalize to all countries equally. This is more than can be said for any other country. There is nothing in our past history to indicate an unwillingness to cooperate, unless a protective tariff can be so construed. But even in this respect, every other industrial nation in the world maintains protective tariffs, and will continue to do so.

Evidence that our tariffs—high though some say they are—have not been in the nature of embargoes on imports or exclusive in nature, as certain people would lead one to believe, is the fact that in the 1920's, and particularly in the latter half of the twenties under the Republican Fordney-McCumber Act, our foreign trade was almost twice as much as it had ever been under the trade-agreements program until the war increased trade abnormally. Imports in this period were generally above the \$4,000,000,000 mark, which is also about two times higher than anything experienced since the trade-agreements program became effective. This is not evidence of a policy of unwillingness to trade with the rest of the world. In the light of these figures alone, it should be recognized that the argument that we are unwilling to cooperate in the economic field is raised primarily by proponents of the trade-agreements program in this country as a powerful instrument to shape public opinion. It is not a subject of complaint from foreign countries.

It should be noted that the excess of exports over imports under the Republican Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was no greater, on the average, than it was under the low Underwood Act. This means basically that it was no more difficult for foreigners to obtain dollar exchange by selling goods to the United States under a relatively higher tariff than under a lower one. Thus it becomes apparent that the argument that our tariff policy has been the cause of unbalance in our foreign trade, and has made it impossible for foreign countries to obtain dollar exchange because they could not sell to us, is without merit. The height of the tariff is not the predominant influence.

The level of the tariff in the United States is now slightly above what it was under the Underwood tariff law of 1913. Further reductions under the additional authority now requested would, according to Chairman Ryder of the United States Tariff Commission, reduce the level to that of the Underwood law or even lower.

In this connection, history provides a valuable lesson. A few years after the last war—in 1921 and 1922—with overstimulated wartime agricultural production seeking markets, and with every industrial country seeking outlets for its products in order to obtain dollar exchange, there was a tremendous flood of products into the United States from all over the world. Regardless of what the Democrats now say, at that time it was almost universally recognized that it was urgently necessary to protect American agricultural and industrial interests from ruin by increasing the tariff. The tariff was increased at that time and it was done with the assistance of a great many Democrats.

While devastation has been infinitely greater in this war than in the last, and while it may take a longer period before the flood begins, the basic situation is identical. There will be a tremendous world demand for American manufactured products following the war, and foreign nations will be under the necessity of selling in this market anything they can produce at any price they can get. Thus, with tariffs at the same or lower levels than the ones which proved to be so inadequate after the last war, there are present the makings of a repetition of this unfortunate experience which occurred a few years after the last war. If this is even a likelihood, caution should be exercised in granting the authority at this time to lower duties below the levels of the Underwood law. This is particularly true of agricultural production which has been so tremendously expanded throughout the world during the war.

The committee for agriculture of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in Report 18 of the two hundred and seventeenth board meeting in May 1945, shows that the possibility of maintaining a large volume of agricultural exports after the war is not very promising. There has been a large increase in production of major agricultural products abroad, and in the so-called backward agricultural countries there has also been substantial increase in production for home consumption and for export.

United States exports of agricultural commodities will have to compete with this overexpanded production throughout the world.

The committee in its report stresses the importance of the American market for the American farmer, and shows that this market is being jeopardized by the lowering of duties on competitive imports of agricultural products. Not only are domestic products being displaced by imports, but the domestic price structure of agricultural products will be governed in a large measure by the price at which

imports are available. A quotation from this report is as follows:

If the farmers of America are to have a standard of living equal to our industrial workers, who are protected by wage-and-hour laws and other legislation, they must be protected in the American market and they must have every opportunity to find new uses for their products. One of these new uses is the production of synthetic rubber made from alcohol made from grain.

According to studies made by the Tariff Commission, 74 percent of all dutiable imports of agricultural products are now subject to duties that have been reduced by trade agreements. This compares with only 55 percent of dutiable imports of nonagricultural imports and shows that a much higher percentage of agricultural products has been affected by reduced duties than the products of industry.

A further analysis of the Tariff Commission study of the effect of the trade-agreements program shows that for all agricultural products there has been an average reduction of existing duties of 44 percent. For industrial products, the duty has been reduced from 10 to the full 50 percent allowed under the law; but the average reduction for all is 44 percent. This means that, on the average, the authority of the original act has been almost used up and that the additional authority requested under the proposed act will in the course of time make substantial further reductions under this level.

Of the more important agricultural products, the duties have been reduced by the following percentages:

Product:	Percentage reduction
Sugar	50
Wool, not finer than 40's	46
Wool, in the grease	46
Cattle, less than 200 pounds	40
Cattle, 200-700 pounds each	40
Cattle, over 700 pounds	50
Tobacco leaf for cigar wrappers	34
Beef, including corned beef, canned	50
Flaxseed	50
Cigar filler tobacco	50
Long-staple cotton	50
Oats	50
Tomatoes	50
Caseln	50
Alfalfa seed	50
Cheddar cheese	40
Dairy cows, 700 pounds or over	50
Grapes	50
Tonka beans	50

Mr. Clayton states that they have used up about 90 percent of their bargaining power, and therefore must ask for more. This 90 percent represents largely the reductions on noncompetitive articles or the taking off of the excess protection. To go further at this point would mean that they would have to cut into the competitive list of products for the first time or to cut under the minimum that is necessary for adequate protection. This is the real significance of the additional 50-percent authority.

If Mr. Clayton agrees that the rest of the world will largely be busily engaged with problems of reconstruction and development and restocking of goods and will not possess surpluses in any consid-

erable volume out of which exports to the United States can be made, then why the urgency of the additional 50-percent cut at this time?

TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM HAS IGNORED ALL OF THE PRINCIPLES OF RECIPROCITY LAID DOWN BY THE GREAT STATESMEN OF THIS NATION PRIOR TO THE LAST DECADE

In order to confuse and mislead the public, the statement is constantly made that the great statesmen of earlier years, including such distinguished men as President McKinley and congressional leaders such as Dingley and Payne were proponents of reciprocal trade agreements, and it is argued that the present Trade Agreements Act is an attempt to carry out the policies which they advocated. Nothing could be further from the truth. The present trade agreements are not reciprocal in any important respects. The great leaders of this Nation who helped to build our country up to the highest levels of prosperity, believed that when the United States had important surpluses of farm products or other raw materials or manufactured articles, and when we desired to export these commodities, it would be sound policy to negotiate a truly reciprocal trade agreement with one or more foreign countries which needed the articles which we produced in surplus, and we in turn made equivalent concessions to them in the case of surpluses which they produced and which we either did not produce or produced in less than the quantities needed in the United States. These were truly reciprocal. In the first place, we always negotiated with the principal foreign supplier. We did not make a concession to a minor supplier and then extend all the benefits to all other countries without some concessions from them. Furthermore, in such agreements as were successfully negotiated—that is, the truly reciprocal trade agreements, illustrated by the treaty with Cuba, for instance—the concessions made by us were not extended to other countries and the concessions which we received from them were not extended to other countries.

The present program of trade agreements is therefore not reciprocal in any respect. When we make a concession in any case we immediately extend that concession to all other countries unless they are specifically discriminating against our foreign trade and we get no concessions from them in return. Furthermore, if a foreign country grants us a concession in a trade agreement, it very often immediately makes the same concessions to all other countries, so that we fail to get the real benefit of the program. The whole program is therefore one of attempting to bring about general tariff revision by the State Department without reference to Congress, and is merely a scheme cloaked under the false definition of reciprocity.

THE TARIFF AS A SOURCE OF REVENUE

During the last year very comprehensive studies have been made, all of which show that practically every foreign nation is largely dependent upon customs

duties or tariffs as the most important or one of the most important sources of revenue for some 60 different countries covered by these investigations. Out of about \$20,000,000,000 of revenue collected by these countries from all sources, something like four or five billion dollars came from customs duties or tariffs. That is the reason why foreign countries have not lowered their tariffs in return for concessions granted by us. And they cannot abandon this important source of revenue. The result is that most of their concessions to us consist of either agreeing not to advance tariffs any higher or similar devices.

When most foreign countries find it necessary to regulate their foreign trade, they resort to all sorts of exchange control, currency devaluation, inflationary measures, quotas, or other control devices. In other words, to them tariffs are largely a source of revenue and trade regulation is carried on along other lines. These are matters which will have to be worked out in commercial treaties dealing with unfair methods of competition, foreign discriminations, subsidies, dumping, and related subjects. They are not properly the subject of reciprocal trade agreements.

When we turn to the experience of the United States, we see that these studies show that during the first 75 years of our national existence customs duties provided substantially 90 percent of the total revenue of our own National Government, and during the 50-year period from 1860-1910 customs duties provided or averaged about one-half of all revenue collected by the National Government.

Although rates of duty during the past 25 years, from 1920 to 1945, have been no higher, and generally have been lower than during the 100 years preceding, the volume of imports has steadily increased, not only in proportion to population but so much faster than population that the amount of revenue collected through tariffs by our own National Government averaged about \$600,000,000 annually during the 5 years from 1926 to 1930.

In contrast it is important to add that during the recent 5 years under reciprocal trade agreements, revenue from customs duties fell to only slightly more than \$300,000,000 by 1939, and have been only slightly above \$300,000,000 during the last 5 years of the trade-agreements program.

Thus, under the present scheme of things, there is an attempt not only to upset the revenue policies of practically all important nations of the world but to sacrifice as much as two hundred to three hundred million dollars annually in revenue for our own National Government, just at a time when one of the greatest problems confronting us is to secure revenue required to carry on our own governmental work.

THE FOREIGN TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES INCREASES WITH NATIONAL PROSPERITY AND DECREASES WITH INTERNATIONAL DEPRESSION—OUR SHARE OF WORLD TRADE HAS BEEN LESS UNDER THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Without presenting an elaborate exhibit of statistical tables, all of which are

available in the Government records, it is well known that the United States has regularly furnished the largest possible market for imports from all over the world during our periods of greatest prosperity, without regard to the rates of duty imposed by tariff acts. During the years before World War I—1911-13—the United States, with less than 6 percent of the world's population, accounted for 8.4 percent of the imports into all importing countries. Thus, on a per capita basis, the United States stood out as one of the great importing nations of the world. After World War I, the Fordney-McCumber Act was passed, increasing many rates of duty above the level of the Underwood Act. It was in full operation during the prosperous period of 1926-30. Yet, during that 5-year period the United States accounted for 12.2 percent of all imports into all nations. In other words, on a per capita basis, the United States had imports twice as high as the average for all importing countries.

At the depth of the recent world-wide depression, in 1934, we were back down to the level of the base period 1911-13—the United States accounted for 8.3 percent of all imports into all countries. But perhaps the more significant fact is that by 1938, after 5 years of reciprocal trade agreements, our percentage of world imports stood at 8.2 percent in terms of dollar value, which was lower than over a long period of years. The trade-agreements program had failed utterly to solve the problem of building up foreign trade for this country, and it had likewise failed to build foreign trade throughout the world. Thus, while total imports into all countries of the world averaged more than \$33,000,000,000 during the era of prosperity between 1926 and 1930, world imports in 1938 were considerably less than fifteen billion, or less than one-half what they had been at the earlier period. The real moral of all of this is that we should do those things which will build up domestic prosperity if we would build up world prosperity and if we would build up world trade.

There are those who sneer at these figures, and say that the United States should have a very much larger proportion of world trade. The reason why these percentages do not appear higher is that, in the case of Great Britain and other European nations which have vast colonial empires, they include all trade between the home country and the dominions and colonies under the general classification of foreign trade. Fully one-half and in many cases more than one-half of the so-called foreign trade of European nations consists of trade between the mother country, and her dominions, colonies, possessions, and so forth.

Furthermore, Europe, which before the present World War consisted of 24 separate and distinct nations, regularly accounted for considerably more than 50 percent of the foreign trade of the world, even though Europe had considerably less than 25 percent of the world's population. But the reason for this was that

more than half of the trade of Europe consisted of interstate shipments between local units of government, all of which was called foreign trade. This not only included purchases of hams, bacon, and other meat, dairy and poultry products, and vegetables by Great Britain from Holland and Denmark, but even included the so-called imports of these same items by England from Ireland. All of this traffic in the United States would be listed as interstate traffic. When these items are properly segregated, it may be said that the United States was in fact the greatest trading country of the world during the period of prosperity under the Fordney-McCumber Act.

(At this point in Mr. BUTLER's speech the Senate took a short recess, during which the Members of the Senate were presented to Gen. Mark W. Clark, United States Army.)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, just before the recess, during which we all very much enjoyed the opportunity to meet so distinguished and honored a visitor as General Clark, I was speaking of the importance of the percentage that America has of foreign trade, and how we in the United States furnish the greatest outlet, the greatest market for all the other countries of the world. In order to tie in my ideas as to the importance of our domestic trade in the world economy I want to recite for a few minutes the story of an industry in Nebraska which is comparatively new. It is a product of the war, and I believe that it is a most practical illustration of the importance of the building up of our domestic trade, and that by so doing we become the greatest customer for the other countries of the world, and will be a good neighbor to them as well.

In Omaha, Nebr., my home town, there is a grain alcohol plant which was built with Government funds, but is operated by a private company formed by a group of very public-spirited citizens. This plant produces each day more than 80,000 gallons of ethyl alcohol, which is used in making vitally needed synthetic rubber and other top priority war materials.

I think Senators all noticed the statement in the press this morning that the great nation, Russia, has renewed its request for shipments from us of alcohol. I may say that the output of this plant at Omaha, totaling from five to six tank carloads a day, for a long time went exclusively to the Russian Government. At a certain stage the output was shipped elsewhere in our own country for the manufacture of various synthetic products. It appears that in the development of today Russia again needs shipments of alcohol from this country.

To accomplish the output of 80,000 gallons a day this plant extracts starch from 30,000 bushels of grain each day. The starch is converted into alcohol. A number of the byproducts are not being saved. In the course of developments we hope in the near future to save even the carbon dioxide, which now passes off as a waste into the air. From that carbon dioxide we can manufacture enough dry

ice to serve the entire central part of the United States.

Much of the grain that is now being used in the plant, in fact, nearly all of it, is high-moisture corn or otherwise damaged grain, which originates mostly from the farms in Nebraska, Iowa, and adjoining States, and which might spoil if stored and carried over into the heat of the summer.

But this plant does not use corn alone. Last fall, when Texas and Oklahoma and the other States in the southwestern area, had produced such a tremendous crop of sorghum grain, there seemed at first to be no way to handle their crops. Much of the sorghum crop was high in moisture content and storage was impossible. Prices on sorghum grains dropped more than 50 percent in a few weeks. Naturally, prices of other grains sagged proportionately. This price drop was wicked punishment for the farmers who were doing everything possible to feed millions of people and to help win the war.

As soon as the officials of the Omaha alcohol plant became cognizant of the facts, laboratory tests were made to determine if these sorghum grains could be used in making alcohol. The results of these tests proved that this was eminently practicable.

Immediately arrangements were made to ship trainload after trainload of these surplus grains to Omaha. Several other similar alcohol-producing plants did the same thing to save this spoiling grain.

A number of carloads of these sorghum grains arrived in Omaha in such spoiled condition that the grain had to be removed from the cars with pick and shovel. It was much like mining coal. But these sorghums made alcohol, which was desperately needed by industry for war production. And their use, of course, immediately advanced the price of sorghums so that farmers in Texas, Oklahoma, as well as those in Nebraska and adjoining States were paid a fair return for their efforts. The price-depressing effect that the sorghum grain surplus had had on other grains was removed, and grain prices generally advanced to their proper relationships.

I could cite other specific instances to show how effectively these alcohol plants fit into the agricultural price structure and into the American industrial picture of today, and as I hope they will tomorrow. For example, in the great wheat-producing areas it is a frequent thing for rust infection to change in a few hours a prospective high quality wheat crop into a poor quality wheat crop. Damaged offgrade wheat is not very satisfactory for milling purposes, but it works well in manufacturing alcohol. The Omaha plant has used great quantities of low-grade wheat from the fields of neighboring States, including the Pacific Northwest, and even from Canada.

I mention this Omaha plant and its operation both because I am proud that it is in my State and because it is illustrative of a larger opportunity which lies before America. That is the opportunity to look forward toward the coming years and to develop here a greater use in in-

dustry of American farm products, notably our great grain crops, which have caused us so much grief through the years because of overproduction, underconsumption, or restricted production, or failure both to produce properly and to consume adequately.

Of course, I am not the first to call for development of an over-all national agricultural policy which will include the full utilization, industrially, of American grains in American factories, but I do believe that now this suggestion is more timely than it ever has been before due to the lessons we have learned in the grim heat of war.

We know now that even with all America on a full and complete diet, plus a sizable legitimate export business, we will still have to find new uses for the products of at least 30,000,000 acres of good agricultural land in the postwar period. By new uses, I mean uses that did not exist at the time our country entered World War II. I emphasize these new uses because our farm production has increased almost miraculously during the past 4 war years, and at the same time that the farmers were increasing yields and production the scientists were finding new uses for agricultural products and industry was putting these uses into practical operation.

This is the traditional way in which America has progressed since our great country was born, and it is the road we must travel if we are to continue to set an example for the peoples of other nations and for our children. Agriculture needs research, as does industry and labor, and as each of these vital groups need each other.

Equally important for the national welfare, these groups must see to it that the new uses which have been found for agricultural products are continued and further expanded in the post-war period. Never again should our country be caught without rubber or a source of supply. Despite our admiration for our allies, the British and the Dutch, who controlled the prewar natural rubber supply and market, they were helpless at the time we most needed rubber.

No matter what Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace and visionaries of his complexion in Government say, we must insist that the synthetic rubber manufacturing plants in this Nation have saved the day for us in this war, and that they should be kept in operation, and not wiped off as having been expended when the war is over. I refer especially to grain alcohol plants. Further, we must see to it that every possible kind of research is carried out to determine whether or not it is possible for these plants to be operated wholly from American grains, grown by American farmers, and efficiently enough to compete favorably with natural rubber from other areas of the world.

At the same time, we must be realists as to the possibility—in the distant future—of our oil supplies eventually drying up.

Where, then, will our liquid fuel supply originate? For a few more years, we might find relief in the oil supplies

of South America, Iran, and elsewhere. But here again, should we rely solely on these foreign sources and risk the delay of developing our own fuel supply?

Certainly not, when we have the nucleus of industrial plants around which further to produce, develop, refine, and experiment with one of the most perfect-burning fuels known to man—ethyl alcohol, a product obtainable from many agricultural crops.

In the manufacture of industrial alcohol in the Omaha plant, only the starch in the grain is used. This starch is the material that vegetation makes by taking carbon-dioxide gas out of the air and uniting it with water and heat energy from the sun. The other parts of the grain, mostly protein, come largely from the soil. These products are saved in the making of alcohol, and can be used as feed for poultry and livestock.

By feeding the protein byproducts to livestock and poultry, much of the initial soil energy can be returned to the soil. Thus, the manufacture of alcohol from farm crops does not exhaust our most precious resource—the land.

Indeed from the over-all, long-time national viewpoint, it is much more economical to make and use alcohol for power and fuel than to rely exclusively on our limited and diminishing resources of oil. By so doing, we can easily solve that part of our agricultural problem that has to do with surpluses.

The American farmer, with his highly mechanized equipment, is one of the Nation's biggest oil users, and potentially he can be the Nation's biggest ethyl alcohol user. Some years back he produced his own power by growing feed for horses. Just because Old Dobbin has given way to a tractor, is there any reason why the American farmer should not produce his own power supply? In this way the farmer helps to solve his own surplus problem.

Some people still think that dumping surpluses in foreign markets is the way for the future, while others cling to the idea of requiring farmers to reduce their production. Instead of destroying our good-neighbor relationships by dumping surpluses in foreign markets, or by subsidy, paying foreign nations to use our surpluses, or trying to regulate production in our country precisely in line with estimates of our future needs, we should look forward toward full production of agricultural products in line with good soil-management practices. To do this, we should have a national policy calling for full use of agricultural raw materials in our industrial plants. This will aid in achieving maximum employment of labor. It will result in a well-rounded and complete national diet, and a square deal for the tillers of the soil. Thus far, our farmers have not been treated fairly. Now, as we look to postwar farming when the farm boy comes back from the battle fronts to take over Dad's well-worn shoes, we have the knowledge to give the farmers justice and income equality.

We need a national agricultural policy, planned by Congress on a long-range basis. We must plan now so that our farmers, who have done so much in war

and in peace, can look with calmer faith toward a future in a great expanding America. Two billion dollars is a lot of money, and no doubt it is necessary to maintain parity in the postwar years, as we have provided, but it is not a solution of the farm problem. It is merely an expensive stopgap.

We must declare it as a national policy to produce fully, so as to consume properly. We must round out our farm program with positive legislation to assure industrial use of future surplus farm products. In only 3 years out of the past 24 have farm prices been above parity, and those 3 years were 1942, 1943, and 1944, war years, when the farmer could not buy what he needed or wanted, no matter how good his prices or how great his efforts.

I hope and believe that the Senate will soon consider legislation making possible the formation of an adequate national agricultural policy that will be carried out faithfully. I stand ready to join with others of both political parties to sponsor legislation which will emphasize the need for, and point the way to, an expanding use of agricultural raw materials by industry. Such a program, I am sure, will be of tremendous benefit to our entire Nation, and, ultimately, to all the nations of the world. Such a program is closely related to the subject under discussion here today—whether we shall discourage domestic production and domestic industry by a further reduction of tariffs that have been helpful in building here the greatest and best-governed Nation in the world.

Mr. President, immediately following my remarks I should like to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a speech delivered by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal, before the New York Economic Club, on May 23, 1945, dealing with the subject which we have had under discussion.

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

RECIPROCAL TRADE TREATIES

Since the reciprocal trade treaty program was instituted in 1934 the duties on 1,223 items have been reduced. A considerable number of items have been bound on the free list. Not one single item has experienced an increase of duty.

Now demanded is not merely renewal of Executive authority to continue the program, but the right to reduce duties by 50 percent below those reductions which already have been made.

No doubt can exist, therefore, about the intent of the proponents of these treaties. Their purpose is to reduce, to reduce again, and if possible to destroy whatever protection the tariff affords to the markets of American farmers, to the jobs of American workers, and to the ability of American business to serve the American people. On the evidence of their acts, and not merely of their words, their objective is that illusive international dream land, the state of free trade among nations.

In behalf of these treaties more than one naive sophism has been advanced. Once they were earnestly recommended to the American people as a preventive of war. Now, with supreme contempt for the inter-

vening history, they are soberly advocated as a preventive of future wars.

Among the other ills which the treaties promised to moderate was unemployment. Six years after the act was passed, and after a dozen other employment nostrums had been tried, until war made a temporary abundance of jobs, unemployment was as prevalent as before. Their contribution to the creation of new jobs during that period was imperceptible if, indeed, they did not decrease employment.

The framing of the first legislation in authorization of the trade agreements was accompanied by a regrettable note of dishonesty. Although not distinguishable from commercial treaties among nations, they are called agreements. This term was written into the legislation for a single purpose, a purpose which I believe no defender of the treaties will attempt to deny. That purpose was to evade any review of their provisions by the congressional representatives of the people. It was to confine all authority with reference to them at the executive department of the Government. If the treaty procedure, therefore, smells a bit with the odor of totalitarianism, those who established the procedure chose the aroma.

A prodigality of propaganda has sought to blind the American people to any doubts about the immaculate virtue of the treaty program. So overwhelming has been this propaganda, so lovingly has every line and syllable been anointed with the unctious of idealism, that whoever remains unconvinced can expect to be regarded as one reeking with reaction, as the personification of sordid selfishness, unregenerate with isolationism and steeped in original sin.

The public funds of the nation and the powerful propaganda machinery of Government have enlisted to perfume the treaty program with this fragrant atmosphere of idealism. So effective has been the appeal to unselfishness that philanthropic generosity from many sources has surged forward to contribute money to further the propaganda. Among these sources are such pious idealists as the exporters and importers, the export manufacturers, the marine and shipping corporations, and international bankers. Remarkable as the fact may be, even certain of the foreign industrial and agricultural competitors of the United States have been induced to support the abolition of our tariff duties.

This is a timely moment to review a program for which so much factitious fervor has been aroused. The question comes up at an hour when we face a future filled with unknown and unpredictable quantities. For nearly 6 years the violent forces loosed in a devastating, consuming war have altered the economic conditions of the earth. Allusions to whatever effects may be alleged, pro or con, to have resulted from the trade treaties in the 1930's can have little weight in this discussion tonight. The world's face has changed. One could hardly say with accuracy that the world's face has been lifted; rather it has been bashed in.

This is now a world that has spent most of its savings, destroyed large portions of its capital wealth, and which has profoundly distorted the former relationships among nations. This is now a world in which ancient hatreds have been intensified and new hatreds have flamed into evil existence. We shall hereafter be dealing with nations and peoples who will be striving desperately to recoup their damaged fortunes, to restore their former well-being, to assure their future safety from aggression, and to realize whatever they may of the shining hopes that have been held out to them as promises of the postwar era. Here in the United States we shall be obliged to repair the ravages

wrought upon our own economy first by political recklessness and then by war.

Nevertheless we are profoundly and sincerely anxious to help the less fortunate peoples of the earth. Genuine, effective help to others by the United States can be justified on the ground of enlightened selfishness no less than in the cause of humanitarian decency.

As Americans, we crave for every nation the highest possible standard of living that its people can earn. We oppose the exploitation of those who are economically or politically weak. The United States can derive no advantage, either in prosperity or security, because of poverty anywhere else in the world. Prosperity, anywhere in the world is a buttress to prosperity and security everywhere in the world.

According to the precepts taught by the advocates of free trade and parroted by the proponents of the reciprocal trade treaties, mutual international prosperity can be advanced by providing unobstructed access to world markets for those commodities which each nation most readily produces because of natural advantages or developed skills.

If this premise were true, and if it were supported by the evidence of fact, a simple and desirable formula for world welfare would be in our possession. Unfortunately, it is not true; the fundamental error of their own basic theory deludes its advocates.

Building upon the sands of this false premise, the advocates of free trade are certain that the United States can strengthen other countries by constant reduction and eventual abolition of American tariffs and thereby admitting into this, the richest of all national markets, an unrestricted volume of competitive production from the rest of the world.

With no consideration for the moment as to the effect of such policies upon the fortunes of the American people, let us examine their actual effects upon those abroad whom we would like to help to achieve higher standards of living.

Under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, fully 65 percent of the imports of the United States entered on the free list, without payment of duty, and the free list has not been decreased since that time. It stood at about that figure; also, during the previous decade. Thus for a quarter of a century the United States has admitted approximately two-thirds of its imports without duty. This record certainly affords a substantial basis of experience for estimating the effect of free trade upon the people in other lands who have produced those goods which we have bought freely and in abundance.

Among the products which we bought from abroad was rubber. We are the world's largest consumers. How much did free access to the American market improve the standard of living of the rubber producers in the East Indies? Their wages are variously reported at from 10 to 20 cents a day. Have they in return been able to buy automobiles or tires or even raincoats? Have they been able to exchange their labor for radios and refrigerators or even for the small comforts and conveniences which abound in our stores? Has free access to the American market benefited the people of the East Indies, or has it exploited those people to provide Americans with cheap rubber? Has it, in fact, diverted them from developing production of other goods which they need for themselves?

From the same region the United States has imported annually from three to four hundred million pounds of tropical starches, mostly free of duty. Have those transactions enriched the farmers of the East Indies? Or have they rather served to reduce the opportunities of American farmers?

Free of duty from South American countries we have imported large quantities of

coffee. In addition we have imported, from there and other tropical areas, huge quantities of vegetable oils. Is there evidence that we have thereby built up the standards of living for the producers of those commodities? One answer may be found in the recent statement by a Brazilian economist. He speaks of a country vaster in extent than continental United States, older in discovery, and not inferior in natural resources. The average standard of living in Brazil, he declared, is below that of India and China, where the standard is so notoriously low that an increase of eighteenfold would hardly bring it to the American level.

Have the jute farmers of India overcome their poverty by access to world markets? Have the fellahin of Egypt reveled in prosperity from sending their cotton into the international channels of trade? What benefits are enjoyed by the laborers in the tin mines of Bolivia? Did free access to the American market create either prosperity or peace for the silk workers of Japan?

What is the matter with this picture? According to the principles of free-trade advocates the producers of rubber, of tropical starches, of torrid zone vegetable oils, of coffee and tin and jute and silk ought to be prosperous. They ought not to labor for the world's lowest standards of living.

Before answering that question, it is pertinent to ask another. What are the two most constant problem crops in American agriculture? One is cotton, and the other is wheat. Both depend for a large part of their market upon world demand and foreign ability to buy. Farmers of the United States have relatively little difficulty in finding profitable markets for the poultry and dairy products, the meats and fruits and vegetables which they sell within the United States.

The fact is that the advocates of free trade overlook an important economic law to which the textbooks have given all too little attention. This is the law which seems to condemn to a condition of disadvantage nearly every large group of people who labor as original producers of an abundant raw material which must find its markets through world trade. The people who are forced to concentrate upon such production become the ready victim of exploitation by the ruthless forces of world competition. They are never far from the verge of an economic slavery which they can escape only by developing alternative products and new sources of earning power. The more they concentrate upon their specialty, the more narrow becomes their dependence and the more certain their poverty.

It must be emphasized that production has two functions. One is to create goods; the other is to create purchasing power. Production that does not earn buying power does not fulfill its human purpose.

Here in the United States the American people have built their unprecedentedly high standard of living over a century and a half by achieving a remarkable diversity of production. That diversity promoted where desirable by a fairly continuous policy of protection from excessive foreign competition, has, under freedom, enabled Americans to develop an unequalled variety of sources of earning power. Our national prosperity is not dependent upon a few limited species of economic activity. With so great a variety of means to earn, Americans are in consequence able to buy an overwhelming proportion of the goods produced within the United States. The fact that always more than nine-tenths and sometimes as much as 95 percent of our business is done among our own people, and that so little of it is subjected to the vagaries of world trade, has enabled our people to sustain and steadily to increase their high standard of living.

The prosperity which has resulted from the long American protective policy has enabled Americans to become the world's largest consumers of imported materials and therefore the world's best customers for the products of other lands. Domestic prosperity is the most powerful stimulant of foreign trade. In periods of highest prosperity we import the largest volume of the raw materials which we do not produce, and import the largest quantities of the luxury goods which we can then afford to add to our standard of living. That higher volume of international trade is not the cause but the product of prosperity at home.

A correct system of protective tariffs is a fertilizer for international trade and not, as the propagandists would force us to believe, a barrier. Such a system has enabled Americans to build up the production of the enormous variety of things Americans have wanted. That production has earned them the means to buy other commodities from elsewhere. That system has created diversification and abundance of earning power. We have not limited ourselves to a paucity of means to live, nor restricted ourselves to a few limited varieties of economic activity. Our farmers are not confined to the cotton and wheat and corn fields, but have a hundred other profitable activities. Our workers are not confined to the automotive, business machine, and other industries in which our efficiency may be exceptional. They have a tremendous choice of jobs. Does anyone really want to reduce that choice by limiting American production to a few specialties for world markets with less purchasing power than ours?

The American people are quite generally agreed that their best service to the rest of the world may be to help other populations to help themselves.

That service will not be performed merely by opening our markets to the unrestricted delivery of their products. Such a course would only intensify the exploitation of other peoples to augment our supplies of cheap raw materials and cheap luxury goods. It would only narrow the fields of economic opportunity which they might create for themselves.

A far wiser and far more effective way to help less fortunate peoples to help themselves will be to aid them to produce for themselves the things they need for themselves. That course will be far more enlightened than to reduce their opportunities by exploiting their labor to produce for us the things that we have reasons to need to produce for ourselves.

Neither does it follow that a protective system which has yielded high returns for the United States can be exactly suited to the needs of any other country; nor, certainly, should a great nation like ours, with a large natural capacity for self-containment, be influenced to imitate a policy developed for a small have-not nation, such as England. Free trade, with all its accompaniment of exploitation, may be necessary for a country which can produce neither most of its food nor of its raw materials. In the United States we can produce most of both. We do not need to exploit the cheap human labor of distant lands. On the contrary, our most selfish interest, as well as our most generous good will, will be served if we aid such people to produce for themselves the goods they most need for themselves.

If trade treaties are to be reciprocal, and if they are to create this so-called free trade, the United States must demand that other countries reduce their duties in return for reductions by us. Most of the nations of the world depend upon customs duties for a far higher percentage of their national

revenues than does the United States. Whereas the customs provide only about 9 percent of the income of our Government, Brazil, for instance, derives 48 percent of her revenue from customs. Every other Latin-American nation counts upon customs for more than 25 percent of national taxes—ranging up to 88 percent in Guatemala. Sweden and China look to customs for more than half their revenues, and India for nearly 70 percent. The United States may perform a doubtful kindness when it exerts its power of negotiation to upset the already delicate fiscal systems of less secure nations.

Thus far I have indicated that what is called freedom of trade tends to the exploitation of workers and producers in less diversified areas; that it restricts rather than improves the range of their economic opportunities; that it tends to bind them to enterprises of doubtful advantage; that it tends to deprive them of the power to develop diversified sources of earning power; that it puts them at the mercy of conditions beyond their control in world markets and keeps them in the power of their customers.

I do not believe that Americans wish to encourage the exploitation of any foreign people. I refuse to believe that Americans desire to become parties to an ill-conceived program which can only lead to the further pauperization of other nations. I do not believe that the genuine idealists of free trade themselves, if they truly understand the pernicious effects of their doctrine, would continue to be its advocates.

Never yet has it been possible to produce all the goods of all kinds for which human desires exist. There is no limit to the potentials of human consumption except purchasing power. In turn, the only limit upon purchasing power is earning power—the power to produce exchangeable goods.

The policy in every nation, therefore, ought to be to nurture and nourish, to stimulate and expand the capacity of the people to earn. How to maintain such a policy will shortly become the major concern here in our own country.

Let us suppose, for one moment, that the United States succumbed after the war to the extremists in this passing frenzy of internationalism. Let us suppose that we decided to adopt this porous doctrine of free trade, and accepted the theory that we could prosper best by purchasing everything from wherever it might be obtainable most cheaply. After the war nearly every product Americans use might conceivably be offered somewhere, by nations eager for exports, at a price below the level required for profitable production here. What, then, would be the consequence? What could it be except the rapid destruction of American earning power?

The illustration may be fantastic, but the principle is not. The preservation and increase of American economic strength is a first duty of Americans. The United States cannot hope to be a power for peace and stability in a turbulent world, and cannot expect to exert moral force for human good, and at the same time permit ourselves to abandon any kind of production that will improve our national strength. Only the United States will help the United States.

By 1940 our country had not yet emerged from the long depression. Since then the debt, destruction, and distortions of war have been superimposed upon the effects of the depression. We are in no position blithely to assume the costs of vast new theoretical experiments.

The motorcar industry is admired as a triumph of American efficiency. No other country makes so much car for so little money. The free trade theorist therefore reasons that we should export more automobiles, and should reduce tariffs of some less

efficient industry in order to import something to pay for the exported cars.

It so happens that in 1939 the automobile wage earners and the cotton-textile industry's wage earners were approximately equal in number. The value of the output of the automobile worker was three and one-half times the value of the cotton-mill worker's output. Therefore it might seem logical to trade our efficiently made motor cars for cotton products from abroad, especially since several foreign countries have textiles to offer.

Simple arithmetic reveals what the effect would be. To create one job at making motorcars for export we should have to import enough textiles to displace three and one-half cotton workers. Is that the kind of business that will pay our public debt and maintain America strong?

Incidentally, a British mission this year reported to Lancashire that British spinners produce 18 to 49 percent less per man-hour than Americans, and British weavers 56 to 67 percent less. Our textile industry is not so inefficient.

The production of sugar beets in this country has long been scorned by the free traders as an uneconomic business. In any sugar-beet area of the United States an automobile will normally be found for every 4 or 5 persons. In Cuba there is 1 automobile for every 175 people. Which looks like the better way to build an automobile market, to buy some sugar from American beet farmers or to buy all of it from Cuban plantations where the actual workers buy no automobiles at all?

Moreover, when Detroit sells an automobile to an American citizen someone else sells a garage, a highway, a hot-dog stand, tire replacements, gasoline and oil, hotel rooms, and a whole train of goods and services. When an automobile is sold overseas only an automobile is sold.

Does someone complain that every American consumer has to help buy the sugar-beet farmer's car? That could be. Assuming that the full amount of tariff is reflected in every pound of sugar, the duty adds up to about \$1 per person. That kind of a dollar is job insurance for the automobile employee and for many another American worker. With the kind of employment problem that may roll up in a few years, the needless importation of goods Americans can produce will be recognized for what it is—the export of jobs. How many jobs can we afford to export?

Nor for many years will the United States again dare to permit itself to be unprepared for war, for our preparedness will be assurance of peace. We know now that preparedness includes almost everything. Yet we see rising a new breed of isolationists who are willing to see their country isolated from sources of essential supplies. The short-sighted failure to encourage our synthetic-rubber industry years ago has left us in 1941 isolated from rubber. Thanks to a wise protective tariff enacted in the early twenties, we were not also isolated from the indispensable chemicals from which we were cut off once before. The tariff-protected American chemical industry has performed an immeasurable share in the job of saving civilization.

The national defense demands that there shall be produced, in some quantity and at some cost, somewhere within continental United States, every possible essential item for military needs and for maintenance of the civilian economy during war.

The appeal is raised that unless we are willing to cut another 50 percent from our present tariff rates we shall not be able to keep the friendship of other nations. Is it possible that a great nation like ours is going

to be dependent upon so small an umbrella of appeasement as that?

The most immense of all the oversights of the free traders is their failure to understand the new American philosophy. For centuries men assumed that the world had only so much wealth, and that if one man or one nation were to obtain more he must take it from others. That was the predatory philosophy.

Here under freedom we have developed something so great and so new that most of the statesmen and economists have not yet discovered its existence. Ours is no longer a predatory philosophy, but a philosophy of production. Through science we learn to obey the laws of nature and to create out of the materials of the earth vast arrays of goods such as never existed before. This is new wealth which we take from no one. We make it out of the soil, out of the air and sea, and even out of the waste heaps of a more ignorant past.

In less than three-fourths of a century we have created 15 major new industries which account for a tremendous share of our employment, of our wealth, and of our standard of living. The rest of the world is welcome to take our tools of production to learn our skills, and to do the best it can to equal our standard of living. That is our best contribution to humanity, not our markets nor our jobs.

The reciprocal trade-treaty program is a narrow, old-fashioned, one-way, downgrade alley that can only lead America and the other participating countries direct to the economic slums.

I have tried here to lay before you a concept of the true seeds of prosperity and the soil in which they will grow, whether that soil is in our part of the earth, or far overseas. When we shall have helped the world's less fortunate peoples to produce for themselves the things they need, we shall then have helped them on the way to genuine and durable prosperity. Foreign trade is the fruit, not the seed, of prosperity. As they grow in welfare and well-being, as they build up their real earning powers, trade over the face of the earth will flourish as never before, discord will decline, and the productive ideals of American freedom will everywhere be called blessed.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF GEN. MARK W. CLARK, UNITED STATES ARMY

During the delivery of Mr. BUTLER'S speech,

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that all Members of the Senate would be happy to take advantage of an opportunity to greet one of our great commanders in the European theater of war. The whole American Nation is proud of the accomplishments of the commanding officers of our armed forces, and proud of the team work they have accomplished in the winning of the war on the European side of the Atlantic.

We have with us today one of our outstanding commanders, a man who performed a great preliminary feat before the landing of our troops in north Africa, who has been in command of our troops in that theater, in Sicily, and finally in Italy, who was in command of the American Army in Italy at the time of the surrender of the German forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess for 10 minutes in order that the Members of the Senate

may greet Gen. Mark W. Clark, who is now our guest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for 10 minutes.

During the recess, Gen. Mark W. Clark, United States Army, was escorted by the Secretary of the Senate (Leslie L. Biddle) to a place in the well of the Senate, amid great applause from the floor and the galleries.

Mr. BARKLEY personally presented the Members of the Senate to General Clark, after which he was escorted from the Chamber amid applause.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, and Mr. TAYLOR resumed the Chair.

SALARIES AND WAGES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the House has passed Senate bill 807, the Federal pay bill, with an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 807) 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; to bring about a reduction in Federal personnel and to establish personnel ceilings for Federal departments and agencies; to require a quarterly analysis of Federal employment; and for other purposes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3240) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we shall not be able to vote on the bill today. It had been my hope that we might vote on the pending committee amendment, but probably that is not possible. It is not contemplated that there shall be a session tomorrow. Therefore I desire to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning with the session on Monday, and during the pendency of the committee amendment which is now before the Senate, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the bill or the amendment, or any amend-

ment or substitute therefor. That means that when the pending committee amendment shall be disposed of, there will be no limitation of debate until another one is imposed. The limitation would apply only during the pendency of the pending committee amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this debate has continued for practically a week. I think it has been a very thorough discussion of what is involved. I believe that the request made by the Senator from Kentucky is altogether reasonable under the circumstances, and I hope that the Senate will agree to the arrangement which he suggests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the unanimous-consent request, a Senator, by speaking on both the amendment and the bill, if he should care to do so, would have a maximum of 30 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, while this amendment is pending. Of course, when it is disposed of, future arrangements will have to be made if a further limitation of debate is desired. But during the pendency of this amendment any Senator may speak for a total of 30 minutes on the bill and the amendment, if he so desires.

Mr. HATCH. I do not wish to object to the request; but on Tuesday, if the Senate is in session, as soon as I can obtain recognition from the Chair, I desire to present a matter which I am sure will not require longer than 30 minutes, so that even if the limitation of debate is still in effect, I am sure that 30 minutes will be ample time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I fervently hope that we may dispose of the entire bill by that time. If not, we can accommodate the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that there would not be a vote on the amendment this afternoon?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have had compiled for me a statement regarding some of the benefits which have come to the State of Washington from reciprocal trade agreements. These agreements have been of great significance to my State and to the products raised or manufactured in it. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

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

BENEFITS TO WASHINGTON FROM RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

SIGNIFICANCE OF FOREIGN TRADE TO WASHINGTON

Foreign trade is an important factor in the prosperity of Washington. After the First World War virtually all nations, including the United States, increased their barriers against imports. Excessive tariffs, quotas, and a variety of other devices impeded the flow of international commerce. These measures

contributed to the break-down of international trade following 1929. Total United States exports between 1929 and 1933 declined from \$5,241,000,000 to only \$1,675,000,000 and total imports from \$4,399,000,000 to \$1,323,000,000.

Total exports reported as originating in Washington fell from \$127,000,000 to \$35,000,000 between 1929 and 1932. As the volume of exports from Washington, and from the United States as a whole, dropped, the demand for Washington products declined, thousands of wage earners lost their jobs, prices fell, and purchasing power throughout the State was reduced. The total income of individuals in Washington fell from \$1,103,000,000 in 1929 to \$597,000,000 in 1932, and cash farm income declined from \$208,000,000 to \$88,000,000 between the same 2 years.

Washington's economic development and prosperity are affected, both directly and indirectly, by foreign trade. It needs foreign markets for the products of its mines, its farms, its forests, and its factories. Washington producers also benefit when other sections of the country increase their sales abroad and provide better home markets for Washington products.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

For the purpose of restoring our international trade, Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act which approved by the President on June 12, 1934. The act, originally established for a 3-year period, has been extended twice for additional 3-year periods: from June 12, 1937, and from June 12, 1940, and once for a 2-year period; from June 12, 1943.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Since the Trade Agreements Act was approved, 32 agreements (including supplementary agreements) have been negotiated with 28 countries. The progress made toward restoring international trade under the program before the present war changed the course and character of foreign trade gives evidence of its effectiveness. In the 2-year period 1938-39, when 16 trade agreements were in effect, United States exports to countries covered by these agreements averaged 63 percent greater than in 1934-35, when only 1 agreement was in effect for a year or more; exports to all other countries showed an increase of only 32 percent. While other factors contributed in producing these results, the concessions obtained from other countries in trade agreements on specified American products, and the provisions against discriminatory treatment of United States trade, played an important role. Washington shared in the increased trade.

War conditions so distorted both the character and the volume of our foreign trade that figures subsequent to those for 1939 would not be appropriate.

CONCESSIONS OBTAINED WHICH BENEFIT WASHINGTON

Fruits and vegetables, wheat and wheat flour, fishery products, and lumber and timber are examples of the important products of Washington for which expanded and more stable foreign markets have been obtained in trade agreements.

Washington is one of the leading producers of a variety of fruits and vegetables which enter foreign trade in large volume in either the fresh or processed form. Growers and processors of fruits and vegetables benefit from the concessions obtained in agreements with 26 countries for fruits and preparations and in agreement with 21 countries for vegetables and preparations. Of particular interest to Washington farmers and exporters are the concessions obtained in trade agreements with 21 countries for fresh apples and fresh pears, with 8 countries for dried apples and dried pears and with 18 countries for dried prunes.

Thirteen countries reduced the rates of duty or granted other mitigations in tariff treatment on fresh apples and 8 countries bound existing moderate rates of duty or granted other mitigations in tariff treatment on fresh pears and 7 countries bound existing moderate rates against increase.

Among the important groups of concessions on these products are those obtained in the agreements with Canada and the United Kingdom. Canada lowered its duties and removed the 3-percent excise duty on a long list of fresh, canned, and dried fruits and vegetables, reduced the advanced valuations used in calculating regular and special duties, and reduced its in-season charges on fresh vegetables and fruits. The United Kingdom reduced or bound its duties on a wide range of vegetables and fruit products and provided in the agreement for freer access to British colonial markets.

Washington, ranking within the first 5 leading wheat-raising States and one of the largest flour-milling centers in the country, benefits from the concessions obtained in trade agreements facilitating the restoration and expansion of America's export trade in wheat and wheat flour. Concessions were obtained for wheat in agreements with 7 countries and for wheat flour in agreements with 12 countries. Five countries reduced the rates of duty or granted other mitigations in tariff treatment on wheat and 2 countries bound existing moderate duties against increase. On wheat flour, 4 countries reduced the duty and 8 countries gave assurances that existing duties would not be increased. The agreement with the United Kingdom removed the duty on wheat from the United States, thus removing the Empire tariff preference in favor of wheat from Canada and other British Empire sources. The agreement also provided parity of tariff treatment for American wheat with British Empire wheat in 5 British colonial markets.

Since Seattle is the outfitting and distributing center of the great salmon-canning industry of the Northwest, Washington's commercial fishermen, cannerymen, and exporters of fishery products benefit from concessions obtained in agreements with 21 countries. Thirteen countries reduced the rates of duty or granted other mitigations in customs treatment on canned salmon and 12 countries reduced the duty or granted other improved customs treatment on sardines. A variety of other concessions were obtained on canned pilchards, on fresh, chilled, or frozen salmon, halibut, mackerel, oysters, shelled or in the shell, and on many other kinds of fish.

Washington's lumbermen and exporters and manufacturers of wooden articles benefit from expanded foreign markets resulting from concessions obtained in trade agreements with 17 countries. On boards, planks, and scantlings 11 countries reduced the rates of duty or granted other improved customs treatment and 5 countries bound existing duties against increase. On logs, hewn timber, and pilings, 4 countries reduced the rates of duty and 4 countries bound existing duties against increase. In addition, the agreement with the United Kingdom reduced the margin of Empire preference in 9 colonies and bound the existing moderate Empire preference, which is approximately equal to our import tax on lumber, in 18 colonies. A variety of concessions were also obtained in trade agreements with 5 countries on cooperage and with 10 countries on various manufactures of wood.

In addition to the direct concessions obtained, there is a most-favored-nation provision in each trade agreement which automatically extends to American products reductions or other mitigations of tariff rates granted by the agreement country to countries other than the United States. For example, lower tariff rates on some 600 items

formerly extended by Canada to France but not to the United States now apply also to American commodities. Among these Washington benefits from reductions on wheat and wheat flour, on dried fruits, and canned salmon.

WASHINGTON BENEFITS AS THE UNITED STATES BENEFITS

There is a direct relationship between the prosperity of one section of the country and that of the country as a whole. The concessions obtained in trade agreements on American products not produced in Washington expand foreign markets for such products and thereby increase domestic purchasing power for Washington products. Consumers and industries in other sections of the country buy more fruits and vegetables, grains, fishery products, and lumber and timber, and many other products of Washington.

Enlarging the sale of American products to foreign consumers means railroads, steamships, and trucks have greater tonnage to handle. This, in turn, increases the demand for and provides steadier employment in these lines and in related service industries—banking, brokerage, advertising, insurance, and warehousing. The net result is that Washington farmers, workmen, manufacturers, merchants, and professional people benefit.

IMPORTANCE OF TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM DURING THE WAR AND AFTER THE WAR

Although considerations related to the war effort now dominate the nature and extent of our foreign trade, the trade-agreements program exerts a beneficial influence on that part of our trade which continues to be in-

fluenced by economic considerations. It also directly contributes to advancement of our trade relations with friendly countries and of the war effort.

The agreements provide valuable insurance, now, against a repetition of the tidal wave of trade barriers and discriminations that swept over the world after the last war. They provide, now, a solid foundation for resumption of mutually beneficial trade after the war, when so many of our agricultural and industrial producers will need foreign markets if they are to avoid curtailment of production and ruinously low prices, and when American industry and consumers will need imported raw materials and semimanufactured and finished products.

Trade agreements concluded before the outbreak of war in Europe, as well as those concluded since then, help to bring about close economic cooperation between this country and the other United Nations in the joint effort to achieve complete victory. These agreements stand today for economic cooperation in war and in peace—for a world in which men everywhere can produce in accordance with their ability and exchange their goods on a fair and reasonable basis. They inspire confidence that the United States will do its share in creating conditions favorable to prosperity and security after victory.

The trade-agreements program is in line with the economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter, now the United Nations Charter, and article VII of the mutual-aid agreements with our allies.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Maine

[Mr. BREWSTER] has called my attention to a statement he made yesterday that may be misconstrued without some further clarification. He has asked me to make the necessary clarification.

The Tariff Commission study to which he referred covered only the products the imports of which amounted to \$100,000 or more in 1939. Thus, a large number of products were not included in the study, many of which are large export items.

The figures cited, showing the value of domestic production and the estimated decline in United States production due to reductions in duty, thus apply only to a part of United States industry, and do not include the value of our principal export industries, such as automobiles.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let me say that my colleague the junior Senator from Maine asked unanimous consent to have a table inserted in the RECORD, and it was inserted on page 6121. But the footnotes were not printed in the RECORD with the table, and the Senator feels that they are necessary if the table is to be fully understood. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the table may be reinserted and that the footnotes appearing at the bottom of the sheet also be included in the extension.

There being no objection, the table, together with the footnotes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of 1939 statistics and postwar estimates for all commodities, dutiable and free, covered by the report¹

	1939	Estimates for postwar long term					
		Per capita income as in 1939			Per capita income 75 percent above 1939		
		Duties as in 1939	Duties reduced by 50 percent	Duties increased by 50 percent	Duties as in 1939	Duties reduced by 50 percent	Duties increased by 50 percent
Production for the domestic market (millions of dollars): ²							
(a) Gross.....	41,568	49,949	49,084	50,366	76,531	75,344	77,185
(b) Net (estimated as 75 percent of gross).....	31,176	37,462	36,813	37,777	57,398	56,508	57,899
Imports:							
(c) Foreign value (millions of dollars).....	2,064	2,186	2,657	1,950	3,628	4,407	3,156
Estimated ratio of landed value to foreign value (percent).....	126.4	126.4	119.2	133.6	126.4	119.2	133.6
(d) Landed value, estimated (millions of dollars).....	2,609	2,763	3,167	2,605	4,586	5,253	4,216
Ratio of imports to production for domestic market (percent):							
1. Based on (a) and (c).....	5.0	4.4	5.4	3.9	4.7	5.8	4.1
2. Based on (b) and (c).....	6.6	5.8	7.2	5.2	6.3	7.8	5.5
3. Based on (b) and (d).....	8.4	7.4	8.8	6.9	8.0	9.6	7.3
Ratio to 1939 (percent):							
Production for domestic market.....	100	120	118	121	184	181	186
Imports (foreign value).....	100	106	129	94	176	214	153
Ratio to estimates at lower income level (percent):							
Production for domestic market.....		100	100	100	153	154	153
Imports (foreign value).....		100	100	100	166	160	162
Ratio to estimates at unchanged duty level (percent):							
Production for domestic market.....		100	98	101	100	98	101
Imports (foreign value).....		100	122	89	100	121	87

¹ In totaling the figures for the numerous commodities for which, on account of the many uncertainties involved, estimates were expressed in the form of a range, the middle point of the range has been taken in each case.

² Does not include production for export; see text discussion.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am very happy that the correction of the RECORD has been made by the Senator from Maine. In concluding his remarks yesterday, based—as I understood—on the premise which is now disclosed to have been unwarranted, the junior Senator from Maine stated:

We read repeatedly in the newspapers about a foreign trade of \$5,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000, and 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 jobs which would be created. If anyone is cherishing such an illusion, which has been held before the people of the United States by the words of so many spokesmen in high places, he may see his dreams dissipated by the cold-blooded testimony of the United

States Tariff Commission, whose integrity, I believe, will not be challenged.

It is now apparent from the statement of correction which has been made by the senior Senator from Maine for the junior Senator from Maine that the conclusion which seemingly was to be drawn from the figures which the junior Senator from Maine cited was totally unwarranted, because, as the correction indicates, the statement totally disregarded the matter of exports. Let me point out that when the Senate adopted the resolution calling upon the Tariff Commission for a report, it called only for a study of imports in volume over \$100,000

a year. It did not call for any estimate from the Tariff Commission of any corresponding figures for exports, and in its report in accordance with the resolution the Tariff Commission stated very specifically that it was complying with the limitations of the resolution, and was not in any respect estimating the increase in exports; which, of course, would certainly result from the action of our efficient industries in exporting automobiles and other commodities in great volume.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not undertake to reply in any respect to what the Senator from Connecticut has said,

for I am neither familiar with the statistical table, nor do I have clearly in mind precisely what my colleague said about it. I leave the matter as it will be when the extensions or corrections which I have requested are made, and I leave the Senator from Connecticut to deal with my colleague when he returns to the Chamber.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, on page 5972 of the RECORD of June 12 there was inserted a table in reference to the do-

mestic production and imports of various selected commodities. I have received a telegram from the Elgin National Watch Co., of Elgin, Ill., which protests this table and says it is grossly misleading, and cites why it is. I ask unanimous consent to have the table reinserted in today's RECORD, and to have the telegram explaining the protest printed immediately following it.

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

Domestic production and imports of selected commodities, showing percentages imports are of domestic production, 1933-39

Product and agreement in which principal concession was made	1933	1935	1937	1939
Woolen manufactures (United Kingdom, effective Jan. 1, 1939):				
Domestic production.....	\$306,281,000	(¹)	\$540,919,000	\$476,787,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.4	(¹)	1.9	2.0
Cotton manufactures (Switzerland, effective Feb. 15, 1936, and France, effective June 15, 1936):				
Domestic production.....	\$834,207,000	(¹)	\$1,228,909,000	\$1,012,147,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.4	(¹)	2.3	1.8
Cattle and beef (Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936, on cattle):				
Argentina (effective Nov. 15, 1941, on canned beef):				
Domestic production (pounds).....	7,331,000,000	7,565,000,000	7,906,000,000	8,002,000,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.6	4.1	4.8	5.5
Cash farm income from cattle and calves, beef and veal.....	\$599,485,000	\$1,062,426,000	\$1,237,924,000	\$1,289,658,000
Leather footwear (Czechoslovakia, effective Apr. 16, 1938, to Apr. 22, 1939):				
Domestic production (pairs).....	350,400,000	383,800,000	412,000,000	424,100,000
Imports as percent of production.....	0.6	0.4	1.1	0.6
Elastic fabrics (France, effective June 15, 1936):				
Domestic production.....	\$16,130,000	\$15,237,000	\$14,924,000	\$16,065,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.3	1.1	1.7	1.2
Pottery (United Kingdom, effective Jan. 1, 1939):				
Domestic production.....	\$44,024,000	(¹)	\$97,365,000	\$97,861,000
Imports as percent of production.....	12.4	(¹)	10.2	6.9
Watches and clocks and movements (Switzerland, effective Feb. 15, 1936):				
Domestic production.....	\$29,201,000	\$62,549,000	\$104,446,000	\$89,513,000
Imports as percent of production.....	6.7	8.8	10.3	11.3
Cheddar cheese (Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936):				
Domestic production (pounds).....	415,649,000	475,788,000	497,007,000	541,781,000
Imports as percent of production.....	0.2	0.2	1.0	1.2
Income of domestic Cheddar cheese producers.....	\$42,396,000	\$68,038,000	\$79,024,000	\$69,348,000

¹Not available.

JUNE 15, 1945.

Telegram from Elgin National Watch Co., Elgin, Ill.:

"Re H. R. 3240, refer table page 5972, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 12, showing watch imports as percentage American production. This information utterly misleading. Imports consist almost exclusively all kinds jeweled watch movements, and nonjeweled wrist watches. Few clocks and nonjeweled pocket watches imported.

"Dollar values cited in table way high for American watch production. Cited values include American production of clocks, nonjeweled pocket watches, and apparently value added by casers in this country.

"Furthermore cited values of American production based on sales value of finished product. Imports largely from prices of movements only. Although requested we have not been given information by governmental sources as to what cited values actually include. Unit figures only fair method of comparison. Comparison on unit bases reveals Swiss has had 50 to 60 percent of jeweled watch market in this country up to 1942, when American industry was converted to war production.

"Please make this information known in Senate debate."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois to what table he refers.

Mr. BROOKS. I am referring to the table which was inserted in the RECORD by the majority leader on the 12th of June. Would the Senator like to have me read the telegram?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I heard the Senator state the contents of the telegram. I did not understand the identity of the table.

Mr. BROOKS. It was the table which was inserted on June 12.

Mr. BARKLEY. The table which I had inserted in the RECORD, and which I obtained from the State Department, contained figures from various governmental departments dealing with the statistics which were set forth in the table.

Mr. BROOKS. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose that the table in which the Elgin Watch Co. is interested is the watch table.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was a category of watches which related to our trade agreement with Switzerland?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. The suggestion was made that we may increase exports. The whole argument for the pending bill, as I understand it, is that we must have more imports in order to have more exports; that we cannot have exports unless we have imports. So the entire argument involved in this debate is not one of exports, but one of whether or not we can increase our imports. The omission which was made does not directly affect the point made by the Sen-

ator with regard to this matter, as I understood it.

Mr. GEORGE. The distinguished Senator from Ohio seems to be laboring under a very grave misapprehension that the whole purpose of the proposed legislation is to increase imports. The expressly declared purpose is to increase foreign trade, which includes both imports and exports. The purpose of the measure is not limited to an increase in imports.

Mr. TAFT. Obviously the only effect of lowering the tariff would be to increase imports, and it has been argued that if imports can be increased exports can also be increased. I think there are other limitations on exports, but the whole argument with reference to a possible danger to our American industries is to increase our imports in order that we may increase our exports. There are other means by which we may increase exports. For example, we may loan billions of dollars abroad. However, I think that method is much less desirable. I am willing that our imports be increased to the extent that they do not interfere with employment. But certainly, the philosophy back of this bill is that we must increase our imports in order thereby to give to foreign nations dollars with which to buy goods which we manufacture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio if it is not true that during the past years since 1921 and 1922 we have also had an excess of exports over imports.

Mr. TAFT. To some extent the figures which have been used are misleading because they do not include such items as traveling abroad, payment of insurance to Great Britain, and other items which are equivalent to imports into this country for the purpose of balancing imports and exports. The excess of exports over imports during the years preceding the war is due to the fact we were lending money abroad. If we are willing to lend money abroad we can increase our exports. In fact, we must balance the situation either by loans or otherwise.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said that he believed it was less desirable to do it by loans than by imports.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I think it is a mistake to build up an export trade which cannot be based on a fair exchange of goods. If we are bound to have a very large amount of duty-free imports—during the postwar period, in the neighborhood of \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000—we may have imports over our duties. The duties ought not to be so high as to exclude foreign goods, and they should not be so low as to put the American industry out of business.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the Senator from Ohio says that the primary purpose of this bill is to enable us to have a greater volume of imports, I think he is putting the cart before the horse. I understand that the primary purpose of the bill is to put into the hands of the State Department an instrument which they may use in securing a reduction of the tariff barriers which most of the other nations of the world have built up against American exports.

During the last 10 years the State Department has succeeded in lowering barriers against our fruit growers, both fresh and dried fruits, machine tools, cereals, and other products of various industries. I think the primary purpose of the bill is to give the State Department the means with which to secure a lowering of the barriers which foreign countries are maintaining against us.

Mr. TAFT. Obviously, the weapon which we would give to the State Department to do what the Senator from Vermont has stated is the ability to increase imports into this country. The only reason they govern the exports is that we give them the power to say, for example, "We will lower our tariffs so that you can ship more goods into the United States." I am surprised to find the advocates of this bill disputing it. It is the very basis of their philosophy. We must agree, as the Senator has said, to increase imports into the United States in order that other nations may take from us our exports. Personally, I believe that in such a deal we would be giving a great many more concessions to other nations by reason of the most-favored-nation clause than we would ever get from them. However, that is a matter of opinion as to which there may be some dispute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio seems to think that the advocates of this bill rely solely on the possibility of increasing imports in order to increase exports. That situation could take place only insofar as it might become necessary to pay for exports from this country by imports into this country. What we are seeking to do is to bring about a situation by which we can obtain some concessions from other countries which will permit more of our exports, regardless of the number of imports.

The two things, of course, go together, but without a bargaining power, and without the possibility of obtaining concessions from other countries, we cannot expect to increase our imports sufficiently to pay for all the goods we may want to export on the basis of the present tariff barriers. By negotiation we would not only bring about a larger field for the payment of exports by imports, but we would make it easier for ourselves to get our goods into other countries by lowering the barriers which those countries have erected against us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my present remarks there be inserted in the body of the Record several tables which I have before me showing the concessions obtained in reciprocal trade agreements among the 26 nations with which they were negotiated, with respect to the various articles of American production, including agricultural products, fruits, vegetables, canned and raw; meats, meat products, beef and veal; pork and pork products, fresh, frozen, or cured; ham, bacon, sausage, mutton, animal oils, dairy products, raw hides and skins, unmanufactured leaf tobacco, raw cotton, textile manufacturing products such as rayon and synthetic fibers, and so forth; wood and paper products, naval stores, petroleum and petroleum products, glass and glass products, and a miscellaneous

assortment of American manufacturing products which have been involved in trade agreements. The information shows the number of nations which have made concessions to us, and the number of products on which concessions have been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, August 1, 1944.

Concessions obtained in reciprocal trade agreements—number of countries¹ granting concessions on important products and groups of products exported from the United States (not including numerous concessions obtained on a wide variety of other products)

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

(Maximum possible: 26 countries)

Major products or groups of products	Number of countries granting—	
	Reduced duties, larger quotas, etc.	Concessions of any kind, including bindings of existing treatment
Fruits, vegetables, and preparations.	23	26
Fruits and preparations.	23	26
Fresh fruits.	17	24
Apples.	13	21
Pears.	14	21
Oranges.	2	2
Grapefruit.	6	7
Grapes.	7	11
Other fresh fruits.	4	9
Canned or prepared fruits.	21	24
Applesauce.	2	2
Peaches.	7	8
Pears.	6	7
Grapefruit.	3	3
Pineapples.	5	5
Fruits for salad.	7	7
Fruit juices and sauces.	7	8
Jams and preserves.	3	3
Other canned fruits.	4	4
Dried and evaporated fruits.	21	25
Apricots.	7	10
Apples.	4	8
Plums.	13	18
Peaches.	6	9
Raisins.	11	14
Pears.	4	8
Other dried fruits.	6	11
Nuts.	5	9
Vegetables and preparations.	19	21
Fresh vegetables.	5	5
Potatoes.	4	4
Other fresh vegetables.	4	4
Canned vegetables and preparations.	18	20
Beans.	4	5
Asparagus.	12	14
Tomatoes.	3	4
Soups.	5	6
Vegetable juices, including tomato juice and catsup.	5	7
Other canned vegetables and preparations.	11	13
Dried vegetables.	2	2
Grains and preparations.	18	21
Wheat.	5	7
Corn.	2	4
Oats.	2	3
Rye.	1	1
Barley.	2	2
Wheat flour.	4	12
Cornmeal.	3	5
Cornstarch.	3	8
Oatmeal and rolled oats.	10	16
Rice and rice flour.	4	10
Prepared breakfast foods and cereals.	6	8

¹The 26 trade-agreement countries covered by this study, in order of signatures of the agreements, are: Cuba, Brazil, Belgium and Luxembourg, Haiti, Sweden, Colombia, Canada, Honduras, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Guatemala, France, Finland, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ecuador, the United Kingdom, Mexico, Iran, Venezuela, Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, and so forth; wood and paper products, naval stores, petroleum and petroleum products, glass and glass products, and a miscellaneous

Concessions obtained in reciprocal trade agreements—Continued

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—continued

Major products or groups of products	Number of countries granting—	
	Reduced duties, larger quotas, etc.	Concessions of any kind, including bindings of existing treatment
Fodders and feeds:		
Oil cake and oil cake meal.	1	7
Other fodders and feeds.	2	2
Meats and meat products.	16	18
Beef and veal.	4	5
Pork and pork products.	15	18
Fresh, frozen, or cured.	8	13
Ham.	5	9
Bacon.	4	7
Lard.	10	15
Sausage casings.	1	5
Mutton.	3	3
Animal oils other than lard.	1	4
Other meat and meat products.	6	12
Dairy products.	8	11
Milk and cream, including dried milk, et cetera.	7	9
Malted milk and processed milk preparations.	2	4
Cheese.	1	3
Butter.	3	5
Eggs.	1	2
Raw hides and skins, except furs.	2	4
Cattle.	1	1
Other.	1	1
Unmanufactured leaf tobacco.	4	11
Raw cotton.	0	7

NONAGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Fish.	19	21
Fresh or frozen fish.	2	4
Salmon.	1	2
Oysters.	2	3
Canned fish.	18	20
Salmon.	13	15
Sardines, including pilchards.	12	16
Shrimp.	3	4
Other canned shellfish.	7	7
Smoked, salted, or pickled fish.	5	5
Leather and leather products.	10	22
Leather.	9	20
Cattle upper leather.	2	6
Patent upper leather.	5	14
Other leather.	7	13
Leather footwear.	4	7
Leather products other than footwear.	4	6
Tobacco manufactures.	5	11
Cigarettes.	5	11
Other tobacco manufactures.	1	1
Rubber and rubber products.	16	23
Tires and tubes.	9	16
Rubberized piece goods.	2	4
Belting, hose, and tubing.	7	13
Surgical rubber goods.	1	2
Other rubber products, including rubber footwear.	6	11
Textile manufactures.	11	17
Cotton manufactures.	8	13
Yarns.	2	5
Piece goods.	4	7
Shirts.	3	5
Other cotton manufactures.	6	10
Silk manufactures.	9	14
Hosiery.	8	13
Rayon and synthetic fibers.	4	7
Hosiery.	4	7
Wool manufactures.	3	4
Wood and paper products.	15	18
Paper and paper products.	12	14
Wood and wood products.	13	18
Lumber and timber.	12	17
Logs, including hewn timber, pilings, etc.	4	8
Boards, planks, and scantlings.	11	17
Pine (pitch, white, sugar, Ponderosa).	5	7
Douglas fir and western hemlock.	4	6
Spruce.	2	3
Oak.	2	4
Redwood.	1	3
Other.	5	6
Box shooks.	0	2
Wood manufactures.	5	11
Cooperage.	2	5
Furniture.	1	3
Other wood manufactures.	4	10
Naval stores.	3	9
Turpentine.	2	6
Rosin.	2	7
Petroleum and petroleum products.	5	14
Lubricating oils and greases.	3	9
Other petroleum products, including petroleum jelly.	3	9

Concessions obtained in reciprocal trade agreements—Continued

NONAGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—continued

Major products or groups of products	Number of countries granting—	
	Reduced duties, larger quotas, etc.	Concessions of any kind, including bindings of existing treatment
Glass and glass products.....	3	5
Cement.....		5
Iron and steel products except machinery and vehicles.....	13	20
Iron and steel plates, sheets, bars, and rods (all iron and steel semifinished products).....	4	5
Structural iron and steel.....	2	3
Steel furniture.....	10	12
Iron and manufactures.....	4	7
Nuts, bolts, nails, et cetera.....	4	6
Pipes and fittings.....	2	4
Tools and hardware.....	6	11
Copper and manufactures.....	4	8
Lead and manufactures (including solder).....	2	2
Zinc and manufactures.....	4	4
Silver and manufactures.....	2	2
Aluminum and aluminum products.....	3	3
Vehicles, parts, and accessories.....	15	23
Automobiles (including chassis), accessories, and parts.....	14	23
Passenger automobiles.....	12	23
Parts.....	12	16
Accessories.....	3	9
Trucks and busses (including chassis), accessories and parts.....	11	20
Trucks and busses.....	11	19
Parts and accessories.....	4	8
Other vehicles.....	3	5
Machinery and parts.....	19	24
Agricultural machinery and parts.....	6	16
Cultivating machinery.....	2	9
Plows.....	1	6
Other.....	2	7
Harvesting machinery.....	3	8
Milking machinery.....	0	1
Windmills.....	1	3
Tractors.....	4	11
Industrial machinery.....	15	24
Mining machinery.....	1	3
Metal-working machinery.....	0	2
Textile, sewing, and shoe machinery.....	7	13
Printer's machinery and equipment.....	3	7
Office appliances.....	13	22
Typewriters.....	12	22
Calculating machines.....	9	19
Cash registers.....	9	15
Other office appliances.....	9	16
Other industrial machinery.....	6	14
Electrical machinery and apparatus.....	16	22
Batteries, storage and dry cell.....	5	9
Radio and parts.....	11	15
Radio tubes.....	10	13
Washing machines.....	2	2
Vacuum cleaners.....	1	1
Electric refrigerators and parts and other household appliances.....	8	17
Electric-light bulbs.....	3	5
Telephone and telegraph apparatus.....	6	8
Generators, dynamos, and motors.....	4	9
Chemicals and related products.....	19	22
Coal-tar products.....	0	5
Other industrial chemicals.....	4	10
Paints, varnishes, and pigments.....	14	17
Ready-mixed paints.....	4	7
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.....	6	12
Soaps and toilet preparations.....	14	14
Other chemicals and related products.....	6	10
Films and other photographic equipment.....	5	14
Surgical implements and appliances.....	1	3
Musical instruments and parts.....	5	6

Source: Compiled from Concessions Obtained for United States Exports, by Commodity Groups, in the Trade Agreements (revised), Department of Commerce; and from Concessions Obtained and Granted, by Commodity Groups, in the Trade Agreements With the United Kingdom and Canada; Trade Agreement With Mexico (Publication 1861); Trade Agreement With Iran (Publication 1925); and Trade Agreement With Iceland (Publication 1984), Department of State.

APRIL 1, 1945. CONCESSIONS OBTAINED BY THE UNITED STATES IN TRADE AGREEMENTS

The United States has obtained from foreign countries with which trade agreements had been concluded prior to April 1, 1945, concessions—including duty reductions, quota increases, and bindings of existing customs treatments—on articles which accounted for 54.4 percent of the total imports of those countries from the United States on the basis of 1937 figures. Concessions have been obtained on 73.5 percent of their imports of agricultural products from the United States and on 47.8 percent of their nonagricultural imports from this country. Further details are given in the following table:

Agreement countries' imports from the United States of concession products as percent of total imports from the United States; on basis of 1937 data

	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products	All products
Reductions in duty and other mitigations of trade barriers.....	20.8	26.9	25.3
Bindings at existing levels.....	52.7	20.9	29.1
Total concessions.....	73.5	47.8	54.4

¹ Not including Czechoslovakia and Nicaragua for which the reciprocal concessions were terminated on Apr. 22, 1939, and Mar. 10, 1938, respectively. No data are included for trade with the colonies of France and of the Netherlands and for Newfoundland, British non-self-governing colonies and other British territories which are also included in the agreements.

Value of trade-agreement countries' agricultural imports from the United States, classified by types of concessions granted to the United States; on basis of 1937 data

[Thousands of dollars ¹]

Trade-agreement country	Total agricultural imports from the United States	Imports from United States of agricultural products subject to reductions and other mitigations	Imports from United States of agricultural products subject to bindings at existing levels	Percent of total imports from the United States		
				Reductions and mitigations	Bindings	Total concessions
Argentina ²	\$2,576	\$447	\$826	17.3	32.1	39.4
Belgium.....	27,843	6,684	2,085	24.0	7.5	41.5
Brazil ³	2,369	212	868	9.0	36.6	45.6
Canada.....	68,015	22,707	27,981	33.5	41.1	74.7
Colombia.....	3,056	565	198	19.4	6.5	25.9
Costa Rica ²	918	95	666	10.3	72.6	82.9
Cuba.....	22,028	12,237	7,293	55.6	33.1	88.7
Ecuador ²	759	617	16	81.3	2.1	83.4
El Salvador ²	530	82	209	15.5	39.4	54.9
Finland.....	6,917	1,048	4,487	15.2	64.8	80.0
France.....	61,454	7,295	1,787	11.9	2.9	14.8
Guatemala.....	1,149	647	3	3.9	56.3	60.2
Haiti ³	1,069	150	26	14.1	2.4	16.5
Honduras ²	536	148	122	27.6	22.8	50.4
Iceland.....	7	7	7	100.0	100.0	100.0
Iran.....	3	1	1	26.2	17.5	43.7
Mexico ³	6,141	2,179	1,535	35.5	25.0	60.5
Netherlands.....	20,382	11,888	11,328	39.1	37.3	76.4
Peru.....	1,549	135	110	8.7	7.1	15.8
Sweden.....	16,819	1,985	10,571	11.8	62.9	74.7
Switzerland.....	7,901	2,219	3,789	28.1	47.9	76.0
Turkey.....	1,274	1,025	None	80.5	—	80.5
United Kingdom.....	254,114	34,265	198,865	13.5	78.3	91.8
Uruguay ²	304	131	91	43.0	30.0	73.0
Venezuela ²	3,831	2,127	1,159	55.5	30.3	85.8
Total, 25 countries.....	521,544	108,407	274,667	20.8	52.7	73.5

¹ Converted from foreign countries' currencies into United States dollars at annual average rates of exchange.

² Based on United States export data.

³ Imports of agricultural products from the United States estimated as being of the same proportion to total imports from the United States as agricultural exports to that country are to total United States exports to that country.

Source: Compilations from foreign countries' trade statistics, and, where necessary, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, U. S. Department of Commerce.

If all the concessions obtained from foreign countries up to April 1, 1945 had been in effect in 1937, 33.5 percent of our total exports, 48 percent of our exports of agricultural products, and 28.9 percent of our exports of nonagricultural products would have been affected in that year. As some of our largest agricultural exports, such as cotton and grains, are subject to little or no duty in several of the agreement countries, the bindings of low-duty or duty-free treatment which we have obtained from such countries on agricultural products constitute a larger share of the total concessions obtained than the duty reductions we have obtained. The reverse is true for nonagricultural products on which concessions were obtained. This is shown by the following table:

Percent of United States exports on which concessions have been obtained; on basis of 1937 data

	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products	All products
Reductions in duty and other mitigations of trade barriers.....	13.6	16.3	15.6
Bindings at existing levels.....	34.4	12.6	17.9
Total concessions.....	48.0	28.9	33.5

Value of trade-agreement countries' nonagricultural imports from the United States, classified by types of concessions granted to the United States; on basis of 1937 data

[Thousands of dollars ¹]

Trade-agreement country	Total non-agricultural imports from the United States	Imports from United States of nonagricultural products subject to reductions and other mitigations	Imports from United States of nonagricultural products subject to bindings at existing levels	Percent of total imports from the United States		
				Reductions and mitigations	Bindings	Total concessions
Argentina ²	\$91,255	\$22,256	\$29,873	24.4	32.7	57.1
Belgium	51,320	14,684	1,780	28.6	3.5	32.1
Brazil ³	74,041	21,016	5,791	28.4	7.8	36.2
Canada	422,507	217,492	89,248	51.5	21.1	72.6
Colombia	41,605	10,846	18,299	26.1	44.0	70.1
Costa Rica ²	3,515	379	297	10.8	8.4	19.2
Cuba	66,819	28,843	24,370	43.2	36.5	79.7
Ecuador ²	4,244	492	1,282	11.6	30.2	41.8
El Salvador ²	3,063	109	115	3.6	3.7	7.3
Finland	11,902	230	5,297	1.9	44.5	46.4
France	100,460	16,240	2,716	16.2	2.6	18.8
Guatemala	6,439	303	928	7.8	14.4	22.2
Haiti ²	3,767	99	539	2.6	14.3	16.9
Honduras	4,956	55	854	1.1	17.2	18.3
Iceland	151	9	23	6.0	15.5	21.5
Iran	4,973		4,809		86.6	86.6
Mexico ²	99,620	12,173	17,833	12.2	17.9	30.1
Netherlands	44,670	1,418	8,811	3.2	19.7	22.9
Peru	19,300	5,697	1,821	29.5	9.5	39.0
Sweden	58,112	687	24,929	1.2	42.9	44.1
Switzerland	21,043	9,592	1,589	45.6	7.5	53.1
Turkey	12,384	4,708	None	37.4		37.4
United Kingdom	310,023	32,379	61,450	10.4	19.8	30.2
Uruguay ²	12,801	4,549	1,408	35.5	11.0	46.5
Venezuela	42,398	2,454	12,652	5.8	29.8	35.6
Total, 25 countries	1,511,568	406,910	316,214	26.9	20.9	47.8

¹ Converted from foreign countries' currencies into United States dollars at annual average rates of exchange.

² Based on United States export data.

³ Imports of nonagricultural products from the United States estimated as being of the same proportion to total imports from the United States as nonagricultural exports to that country are to total United States exports to that country.

Source: Compilations from foreign countries' trade statistics, and, where necessary, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Value of trade-agreement countries' total imports from the United States, classified by types of concessions granted to the United States; on basis of 1937 data

[Thousands of dollars ¹]

Trade-agreement country	Total imports from the United States	Imports from United States of products subject to reductions and other mitigations	Imports from United States of products subject to bindings at existing levels	Percent of total imports from the United States		
				Reductions and mitigations	Bindings	Total concessions
Argentina ²	\$93,831	\$22,703	\$30,699	24.2	32.7	56.9
Belgium	79,163	21,368	3,865	27.0	4.9	31.9
Brazil	76,410	21,228	6,659	27.8	8.7	36.5
Canada	490,522	240,289	117,229	49.0	23.9	72.9
Colombia	44,661	11,441	18,497	25.6	41.4	67.0
Costa Rica ²	4,433	474	963	10.7	21.7	32.4
Cuba	88,847	41,080	31,663	46.2	35.6	81.8
Ecuador ²	5,063	1,169	1,298	22.2	25.9	48.1
El Salvador ²	3,593	191	324	5.3	9.0	14.3
Finland	13,819	1,278	9,784	6.8	52.0	58.8
France	161,614	23,335	4,663	14.5	2.8	17.3
Guatemala	7,588	548	1,575	7.2	20.8	28.0
Haiti	4,836	249	565	5.1	11.7	16.8
Honduras ²	5,492	203	976	3.7	17.6	21.5
Iceland	158	9	31	5.8	19.4	25.2
Iran	4,976	1	4,310	0	86.6	86.6
Mexico	105,761	14,352	19,368	13.6	18.3	31.9
Netherlands	75,052	13,306	20,189	17.7	26.9	44.6
Peru	20,849	5,832	1,931	28.0	9.2	37.2
Sweden	74,931	2,672	35,600	3.5	47.4	50.9
Switzerland	28,944	11,811	5,378	40.8	18.6	59.4
Turkey	13,858	5,733	None	41.4		41.4
United Kingdom	564,137	66,644	260,315	11.8	46.2	58.0
Uruguay ²	13,105	4,680	1,499	35.7	11.4	47.1
Venezuela ²	46,229	4,681	13,811	9.9	29.9	39.8
Total, 25 countries	2,033,112	515,317	590,882	25.3	29.1	54.4

¹ Converted from foreign countries' currencies into United States dollars at annual average rates of exchange.

² Based on United States export data.

³ Less than 0.1 percent.

Source: Compilations from foreign countries' trade statistics, and, where necessary, Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to agree with what the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said. Undoubtedly the head of the Farm Bureau, Edward O'Neal; Mr. Patton, of the Farmers' Union; Dan Tobin, of the Teamsters'

Union; and the representatives of the CIO—all of whom testified before our committee—were not testifying on the basis of imports. They were testifying on the basis of exports to other countries. I assert here and now that unless

the American farmer, whose business—agriculture—is the basic industry of all, can make disposition of surplus products which he produces, such as wheat, cotton, tobacco, and certain kinds of fruit, the entire American economy is bound to suffer. That is one of the bases for the bargaining power the State Department ought to have in order to make disposition of the surplus cotton, the surplus wheat, and the surplus tobacco which this great Nation of ours produces. Unless the surpluses shall be disposed of, there will not be prosperity in America. I care not what kind of a tariff may be in effect; unless there is prosperity at the grass roots of this Nation, or, in other words, in agriculture, there will be none any place.

UNIFORMS OF NAVY AND COAST GUARD ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on June 1, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 1032, "To provide for changing the design of the uniform of enlisted personnel of the Navy and Coast Guard" and to have it conform in basic design to the uniform worn by commissioned and warrant officers of the Navy and Coast Guard.

The response to this bill from the enlisted personnel of the Navy, as well as from their loved ones, has been tremendous. I have received communications from the far corners of the world—wherever our boys are stationed.

It is obvious that the men in the ranks of the Navy desire a more appropriate uniform. I am positive from the replies I have received that our gallant servicemen would be much more satisfied and happier in carrying out the tremendous task assigned to them in helping to bring democracy back to its rightful place on this earth if the Navy Department would consent to give its personnel a uniform on par with that furnished to the men in the Army and in the Marine Corps.

Everyone will agree that the present uniform for the Navy enlisted personnel has been the source of almost continuous complaint and criticism. The rank and file of the enlisted men feel that a uniform based upon British design, commemorating principally British tradition, is completely out of place in our great and powerful American Navy.

Unfortunately, I have noticed a feeling among the enlisted men of our Navy to the effect that the present uniform has been kept intact principally to draw a line of demarcation or to emphasize a subordinate position between the different ranks of the service.

Some of my correspondents—and I shall quote some of their letters later—have explicitly shown a feeling of shame, disgust, and even resentment because of the prevailing uniform.

This resentment is almost universal, and it comes from the enlisted personnel of the Navy—veterans of Pearl Harbor, of Midway Island, of Coral Sea, of Guadalcanal, of Saipan, and of Iwo Jima.

Mr. President, continuing the statement I was making, at this time I desire to call attention of the Congress to the reasons behind the present design of the Navy uniform.

How many Senators know the origin of the black neckerchief which our sailors

wear? Well, Mr. President, the black neckerchief draped about the necks of the enlisted personnel of the Navy men represents, believe it or not, continuous mourning for Lord Nelson the hero of the British Navy.

The 13 trouser buttons—and some suits have 14—commemorate the Thirteen Original Colonies.

The three white collar stripes commemorate the three sea victories of Admiral Nelson, of England.

Mr. President, tradition is important and useful, and it is very well to follow it in the proper place, if it is not overdone. In the present instance the enlisted personnel of the Navy are crying for relief from the tradition of the Navy uniform and from its obnoxious design. They want in its place a uniform of a manly style, and above everything else they want it to be modern and more in harmony with the contours of the human body. [Laughter.]

I submit, and I believe my colleagues will agree with me, that the burden of preserving horse-and-buggy traditions, especially in honor of foreign heroes, should no longer rest solely upon the shoulders of the enlisted men of our Navy. If the brass hats are so determined to retain this apparently ridiculous ensemble, then I believe, in good sportsmanship they themselves should lead and show the way in which a uniform based on the tradition referred to could be worn gracefully, with dignity, and good taste. However, upon close observation of a Navy officer's uniform we find the tradition of bygone days strangely absent.

One sailor wrote me that the worst thing about being in the Navy is wearing a uniform that went out of style when the sail boat was converted to steam. Surely the admirals who are in control of the destiny of our great Navy owe it to the men under them to provide them with a uniform which in summer would make them feel less like a street cleaner and in the winter less like a little boy in a Lord Fauntleroy outfit. [Laughter.]

We are all aware of the fact that the Army modernized its uniform 25 years ago, but that the Navy is still wearing a uniform that was designed—believe it or not—Mr. President, not 25 years ago, not 50 years ago, not 100 years ago, but 170 years ago, and has come down the years with very few changes.

Next to the agony of appearing in public, our sailors undergo other unnecessary indignities inflicted upon them by a set of rules or a code that is as out of date as the uniform itself. Many of the rules or regulations forced upon our enlisted men have been handed down from the British Navy, where for years the officers were lords or aristocrats, while the seamen sprung from the lower classes.

Surely, we in America have outgrown such antiquated ideas. We have taught these men who are now in uniform—who are out there fighting to save our form of government—that the United States is a free country, where everyone is equal so far as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are concerned. It is with deep regret that I read that many of our en-

listed Navy personnel are beginning to look upon these high ideals with contempt.

Mr. President, many Army men have told me that they would have preferred to have served in the Navy had it not been for the Navy's uniform. The resentment against the present style of the uniform extends beyond the Navy personnel, and can be found among their families and loved ones.

Even within the naval service itself, I have been informed that the advance to a rating as chief petty officer is a momentous day for a sailor simply because it means the end of what these men term their "monkey suits."

The little blue hat, the one which has been dubbed in Navy publications as the Donald Duck or Little Lord Fauntleroy cap, is dismissed with the comment that whoever designed this headpiece for a man to wear must have had a deep hatred for all mankind. [Laughter.]

Navy men say—and they speak from experience—that their open-neck blouses obviously were not designed to give the best protection against the cold weather. Protection against cold weather should be an important factor in any type of uniform. A scarf would offset some of the disadvantages caused by the open-neck blouse, but due to current regulations, our sailors are not permitted this form of protection. It is of interest to note that our enlisted Navy personnel are the only military personnel in the American armed forces who are not allowed the privilege of wearing a scarf. Chief petty officers and commissioned officers, who do not need this weather protection, are permitted to wear a scarf. Enlisted men, however, may wear a turtle-neck sweater underneath their blouse, but this combination results in a poor appearance and in an overheated condition. Because of these factors few of the men take advantage of wearing the sweater.

We know that the blouse, the white hat, the neckerchief, the blue flat hat are all becoming to a woman, so much so that they have continuously demanded these styles for the personal wear. When this Government inducted women into our armed forces one would have presumed that their style of uniform would have been patterned from the same type of clothes they wore in private life. Instead we see the servicewomen wearing apparel made out of suit coats, shirts, ties, and garrison caps—a man's dress accepted the world over.

Let me call attention to the fact that Navy personnel are taught that their white hat has "life saving qualities," because when held in an inverted position it has a certain degree of buoyancy. Mr. President, in the name of logic, what chance does a seaman have of saving his life with a little white hat?

The white uniforms have been another source of much complaint and criticism. Navy publications have referred to this dress uniform as the Good Humor men, the barbers, or the painters. Aside from the fact that the men claim that they find it extremely difficult to keep clean, and for that reason it is quite a laundry problem in itself, it also has none of the

qualities of camouflage, thus making it unsuitable for use during wartime.

I have examined this uniform from every possible angle, and, frankly, I cannot find anything to report that might favor the continuance of this existing costume of the Navy personnel.

We have a great and wonderful Navy. We have constructed the most powerful Navy on earth. This record of accomplishment is a mighty tribute to the foresight and capacity of the American people. Yes, Mr. President, with every reason for pride, the American people have not only designed and built, but they have also manned this mighty fleet of ships. With this background, our Navy has every reason to be in every sense of the word truly representative of the ideals for which our new and modern America stand.

Since we entered this war the Navy has undergone many changes. Yet, in spite of many streamlined changes, the Navy adheres to a style of uniform no longer useful and no longer held in the highest regard by the men in the ranks.

I am positive that this feeling does exist, and I shall now read for the information of my colleagues, a few of the letters which have come from Navy men in all sections of this world. Of course, for obvious reasons, Mr. President, I shall not identify the writers of these letters, but I have received thousands of them, and I have picked out some which I have here upon my desk, and I shall be glad to show the originals, with the signatures, to any Senator who desires to see them.

I have here a letter from the great city of Chicago, dated June 12. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed find a newspaper clipping that may be interesting to you. I have written the Secretary of the Navy about decreasing the size of the collar on a sailor's uniform. The goods from 20 sailors' collars would make a full suit for him. So far no answer. The present uniform is a hand-me-down by tradition from the British Navy. The three stripes on the collar stand for three British naval battles.

Mind you, Mr. President, not American naval battles, but British naval battles.

Why are we so steeped in British tradition? Here is hoping that you can do something about this, too.

Below that the writer says:

Tradition must be worth more than saving money, especially in wartime.

Here is another letter from an enlisted man:

It was with a great deal of appreciation and gratitude that I read your remarks on the uniform for enlisted men in the Navy. It is archaic in every way (13 buttons have to be contended with on the flap of the blue uniform) and is decidedly uncomfortable. Another point, why do we have to wear a uniform that was taken after the British Navy more than 200 years ago, when today even the conservative British have made changes. The idea that men have to roll up their trouser legs to swab decks is the most ridiculous argument ever advanced. Men swab decks dressed in dungarees.

Petty officers, many of them in their thirties and forties, look extremely ludicrous in the tight breeches of the Navy. They have to be tight because they have to be kept up without a belt. There are so many faults

with the uniform that I could go on and on, for example, the absurd flowing silk neckerchief, that excuse of a hat that goes on the head. It is all so ridiculous that it would seem unnecessary to have to point them out. However, naval officers can't bear the thought of seamen and petty officers dressing in suits somewhat similar to their own, although the petty officers in the Coast Guard do wear the jacket and trousers similar to the chief petty officer in the Navy.

Furthermore, the uniform of the Navy makes a man feel inferior to other men who wear regular trousers, shirt, and jacket. The Navy suit, with its huge collar, neckerchief, and funny pants, gives all men the appearance of being dressed in the clothes of a small boy. But the brass hats like this; they have changed their own uniforms again and again, and the Waves have had many changes in their uniform, but the enlisted man in the Navy still gets no regard in any way except to be knocked about. It is time somebody thought of the enlisted man in the Navy.

I now read a letter from San Diego, Calif., from a young man who is serving there:

According to the press you have introduced a bill to change the enlisted man's uniform of the Navy. I want to commend you for your action in this regard and you will certainly be counted as a friend by the enlisted men of the Navy if you can get the uniform changed.

The chief gripe of the enlisted men is the uniform. It seems that the Navy clings too much to tradition, especially regarding the uniform. The present design of the uniform dates back 200 years after the British uniform.

Why not give the enlisted men of the Navy a break by giving them a uniform that is at least practical. The Army uniform has been changed quite a bit since the first World War, but not so with the Navy. Just what's the purpose of the big collar, the neckerchief, and the bell-bottom pants? In the present uniform, a fellow looks like little Lord Fauntleroy, but he's supposed to be a man. I'm not only voicing my sentiments but also the sentiments of thousands of others like myself.

Here is a letter from Seattle:

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Like thousands of other Americans, I am delighted to learn through the newspapers of your efforts to modernize the uniform of the United States Navy sailor by removing the "monkeylike" features of the garb so as to give the man wearing it a feeling of dignity and bearing properly befitting the American sailor. As an ex-Navy man of World War I, I well know how the great majority of the men then felt about their absurd appearance, and the widespread comments at the present time about the outlandish appearance of our sailors, in contrast with that of the United States soldier and marine, indicates very strongly that millions of Americans are disgusted with the stupid type of thinking that clings to a tradition in our Navy uniform that is not American but British, and the Good Lord would not ever expect from them anything in the field of thinking that by any possible chance might lead to progress in the art of modernizing anything.

So, good luck to you in your efforts and I am confident that every ex-Navy man, as well as the millions of future United States sailors, as yet unborn, will be wholeheartedly cheering for you now and mentioning your name in gratitude through the centuries to come.

I read a letter from the District of Columbia:

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your recent movement on foot, to reform naval serv-

ice enrollee's uniforms, I am 100 percent for it, and for you, your honor. As an ex-seaman of 5 years naval service, 4 years at Great Lakes, and a year with the Naval Coast Patrol, Atlantic Division, I am glad to support and I do support your suggestions on this proposition. My letter may be held for the attention and the consideration of the committee membership at such time as hearings are scheduled.

Your honor, all complaints are fully justified in this uniform issue and the Navy blue-jackets are quite right.

First. There are no pockets in the present OD uniform. If one carries a comb in the only naval middy or jumper pocket, the commanding personnel may give him a pep talk for looking unmilitary.

Second. The average billfold is too large for trousers. By the way, British sailors are issued a money belt for this purpose.

Third. There is little or no available space for your identification card. Loss of your identification card means at least 30 days restriction to the ship. Someone said, When they take your liberty away it really hurts. When they restrict your freedom of movement, your freedom of action, you feel like a man without a country, or else an orphan.

Fourth. Without pockets, a naval man must carry his handkerchief in his neck like a female.

Fifth. The middy or jumper is only a tradition and a man must be a good valet mechanic to put on his pea coat over his middy.

Sixth. Coast Guard enlisted men, naval steward enlisted personnel, naval marines, both WAVES and SPARS, all have the officer's cut coat, so why the discrimination?

Probably a compromise could be reached so sailors on land duty, fully one-third are in shore establishments; could wear the new uniform. The sea-going sailor could have both uniforms, that is, traditional uniform and also the new service uniform for liberty leaves. Your Honor is aware and all gentlemen are aware that the naval marines have two uniforms, as you know the cadet type tailor made uniform, for dress parade and liberty leaves, and the military field uniform. So why not the naval sailors. After all the naval marines, Coast Guard and naval sailors are under one departmental administration.

Mr. President, I have just been informed by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [MR. BARKLEY] that he is going to make it his own personal business to see that the Navy uniform is changed. I personally thank him for that statement. I know very well that when the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky takes the lead in such a battle as this the issue of the battle becomes more favorable to us. When Senators read the letters on the subject, and find what the men themselves have to say, I know they will do what they can to see that the enlisted men in the Navy receive the uniforms to which they are entitled.

In view of what the distinguished majority leader has just told me, I shall read only three or four more letters instead of reading all of them, as I had previously intended.

I read a card from Ventura, Calif., as follows:

Just read about your bill to dress sailors in men's clothes. This is to tell you that I for one am 100 percent for it. It might interest you to know that in a poll conducted by the "Camp Parks, Calif., Log" the Seabees voted 100 percent for a uniform modeled on that of the Navy chief petty officers' uniform.

Here is one from Texas:

Thanks very much for the introduction of the bill regarding sailors' (enlisted) uniforms. This has been needed for well over a century and I can truthfully say that this bill, if passed now, would take away more than 75 percent of the sailors' complaints.

Speaking for myself and the undersigned names also—

Mr. President, there is a list of names attached to the letter, and the signers all come from Cuddihy Field, Corpus Christi, Tex. I continue to read:

I can say that I, or we, would be glad to donate our uniforms that we have now gratis at the time of purchase of a sensible uniform, and probably this would ease the material shortage that the bill's opponents speak of. Also, one of the most strengthening arguments that could be presented for our cause would be to let the opponents of this very intelligent bill try to dress or undress in one of these uniforms before the Senate. At the very least—and this shouldn't be too much—is to give us a dress uniform that has four pockets in the pants and a shirt with two pockets. All we ask is a dress uniform that looks as good as civilians' work clothes. Is this too much? Let the opposing Senators answer this question for publication where the boys from his district will know how sane and sound his argument is. At any rate, if it can be made optional, the 1 percent that likes this "superman ensemble" can retain it, while the others can at least not feel too out of place anywhere except at a 10-cent beer parlor.

This stupid uniform, no doubt you know, has to be turned wrong side out to be pressed and then the creases are opposite from any we've worn in civil life. This present uniform has done more to lower the morale of the men in the Navy than any other one thing, especially of the older men.

I am writing this directly to you knowing that it is absolutely against military procedure to write directly without getting this passed on and O. K'd by the CO of each department head above this department.

You may use any part or all of this letter, also my name, as I don't care what the consequences are as long as it will further the cause of some much-needed and intelligent legislation along this line.

In other words, "get me out of this uniform or get me out of the Navy."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a number of letters and telegrams, approximately 47 in all, without the names of the enlisted men or of the persons who sent the letters to me. Some letters come from business concerns, and in the case of those letters I ask that the name of the concern printed at the top of the letter be printed in the RECORD, but not the signature.

I may say, Mr. President, that among them are letters from bankers, from lawyers, and from doctors who have served in the Navy. I have letters here from the mothers of some of the boys and from some of the sweethearts of the boys. I wish I had time to read some of the letters from the sweethearts of these boys. I have a petition also signed by 16 men, who attached their names to it in spite of all the rules and regulations of the service.

I suggest that every Senator read these letters when they are printed in the RECORD, because they make very interesting reading.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed find a newspaper clipping that may be interesting to you. I have written the Secretary of the Navy about decreasing the size of the collar on a sailors uniform. The goods from 20 sailors collars would make a full suit for him. So far no answer. The present uniform is a hand-me-down by tradition from the British Navy. The three stripes on the collar stand for three British naval battles—the Nile, Trafalgar, and Spanish Armada. Why are we so steeped in tradition anyway?

Here is hoping you can do something about this too. Thanks.

I for one am very much in favor of it. The present uniform, as far as I'm concerned, is entirely impractical, it's hard to keep clean, and it's not in the least comfortable. The collar is useless, and only serves to make the uniform more clumsy, and besides it's a waste of material.

I believe we are entitled to wear a decent modern uniform and not be hamstrung by one that has been out-moded for years.

A change from the "monkey suits" to a more suitable uniform will increase the morale of the men. Enclosed a clipping.

DEAR SIR: The writer is a sailor who is wholeheartedly in favor of your bill to change the design of Navy uniforms for enlisted personnel.

No person more than 8 years old should be required to wear such clothes.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: Permit me to extend my thanks and sincere congratulations for your fine efforts to liberate the men of the Navy from the hells of the antiquated British uniform. It is a noble effort. Your bill will have the heartfelt sanction of over 3,000,000 men.

It is contrary to Navy Regulation for me to write a letter of this kind. Its context may appear to be of a solicitous nature. I will appreciate your considering it as confidential. I will appreciate much more your consideration of my thought regarding a definite policy toward the discharge of over-age men who are cluttering up the desks both on these shores and at advanced bases of the Navy.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER: Just returning from 18 months overseas' duty; the thing that gripes the fellows most is the Navy's enlisted man's uniform. All the boys want a change.

Giving one example at an important information desk in the Hawaiian Islands where a marine, Army, and Navy enlisted men were on duty the Navy man was in charge but everyone by-passed him because he looked like a child in the silly white uniform, while the marine and Army man in khaki with black ties looked important.

Dungarees and whites and blues jumpers are out of place in office work where one meets the public.

Give us some pocket space.

Thanking you for your interest in the changing of the Navy uniform.

THE UNION NATIONAL BANK,
Houston, Tex., June 6, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I note what you are doing with reference to changing the uniform of the sailors.

Why in God's name anybody would ever punish somebody by dressing him up like that I don't know.

If the Navy had been as backward in everything else as they have been about the uniform, we wouldn't have had any Navy.

THE CITY NATIONAL BANK,
Guymon, Okla., June 7, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: We want to thank you for introducing legislation which would change the uniform of the United States Navy men. With an organization of such good record as a fighting unit, forced to wear a playboy's uniform, it is a damn shame. If there ever was any justification for such a uniform, it has long since been out. There are no pockets, it looks like the devil on a he-man, and is entirely out of date.

If the officers were forced to wear the same uniform as the gobs, the change would have been made long ago. And if there is any justification for the gobs to wear the present clothes, the same reasons would apply to the officers. I served in the Navy during World War I, so I have some knowledge, first hand, on the matter.

Here's luck to you in your endeavor.

DEAR SIR: If you are successful in swinging the deal described in the enclosed, you will not only endear yourself to several million of my blue-clad colleagues but will also serve to add years of prestige and self-respect to those of us unfortunates bridled with these wholly outdated, outmoded, and thoroughly unsatisfactory drappings.

Yes, your very appropriate gesture should be cause for me to change my residence to North Dakota just so that I can cast a vote for you.

Many thanks for your effort in our behalf.

DEAR SIR: A million thanks for the above. I have many relatives in the service, and every enlisted man objects to the kiddish and outmoded pants.

Best wishes.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I read with interest an Associated Press release in which you pointed out "The sailors just don't like 'em" (speaking of Navy enlisted men's uniforms). Being an enlisted man myself, I can say I don't like the present uniform and think drastic changes should be made now.

I would like to refer you to the June 4, 1945, issue of Life magazine, an article entitled "No More Monkey Suits?" This article was written by the Navy editor of Yank magazine, and letters from Navy personnel indicated that over 90 percent wanted a better uniform. It seems, with this great a percentage wanting another uniform, something should be done.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Florida Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, since he is one of my Senators.

I certainly hope you get action.

OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR LANGER

Bravo! At long last maybe something will be done for the Navy GI. We agree that sailors don't like the flared-skirt trouser, and neither do thousands of civilians. The entire design is not of American origin, so why not change it? All other branches of our armed services have had various changes and additions, so give our sailor boy a break. Pop-eye belongs only in the funny paper. After all, we have served our apprenticeship at mourning for Lord Nelson; we don't think he would mind and haunt the seven seas.

So keep up the good work, Senator, because we are for it 100 percent. Since we are just Washingtonians, we never have much voice in national matters but enjoy putting our stamp of approval on another's good deeds.

Carry on! Quien sabe?

MY DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed appeared in a copy of Yank. We sailors think that it expresses very well the opinion the majority of us have in regard to our uniform.

We appreciate your efforts in changing our uniform, and, for our own sake, hope you succeed.

DEAR YANK: My bitch is about that outrageous beribboned, becollared, bebuttoned insult to a full-grown man, the Navy uniform.

The pockets aren't big enough, the collar gets in the way, the pants buttons are funny for just so long, the white stripes won't stay clean, the blue dress is too heavy for summer, and the whites are a mess after 20 minutes. The neckerchief is useless as the laces in the back of the pants, and that silly, stupid cry of "tradition, tradition" is ridiculous; not even authorities agree on the origin of the alleged customs. We're like Chinese women who bind their feet because their mothers and grandmothers bound their feet.

I've been in the Navy for 3 years and I'm now on a shore-duty survey, so I'm not a new guy shooting off my mouth. I'm mildly proud of my branch of the service, but I'm intensely angered by the pajamas I have to wear to work.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your timely bill on the Navy uniform. I know the boys deeply resent the "monkey suit." Your bill would give them a uniform of dignified appearance.

DEAR SIR: Speaking for myself and every man that I've talked to, we are for you 100 percent on your bill to change the Navy uniform. We in the Navy think we have the most unhandy and the least liked uniform of all the services. If the Negro messmen can wear a nice uniform why not we?

DEAR SIR: In the Sunday edition of the San Diego Union appeared a news article stating you had introduced a bill to make the Navy get rid of its bell-bottomed trousers. I wish to express a heartfelt thanks for your attention to this matter. I feel, and the feeling is shared by a good many of my friends, that it would boost morale tremendously if we could get rid of a very silly looking outfit. The present sailor outfit is completely out of date and not at all in harmony with our great streamlined Navy.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Thanks a million for introducing a bill to make the Navy get rid of its bell-bottom trousers, and, please, how about the jumper? It's too hot in the summertime, yet you can't take it off or you'll be in your underwear. Lots of us fellows have written to the Yank magazine asking for a new uniform, and they have a few new models that would be very practical for us men in the United States Navy. We really appreciate your work for us, Senator, and please keep it up.

SENATOR LANGER: The bill you've introduced to change the Navy uniform is the smartest thing to come out of this conflict. Please push this bill and get it passed. They are the most old-fashioned, ridiculous outfits a country could dream up. It is outrageous that grown men, heroes, fighting for our country are forced to wear a Lord Fauntleroy suit. I really pity them.

Not only do they look ridiculous but they are so impractical and hard to get in and out of. Senator Brooks said that over 2 years ago; the President and Admiral King agreed to change the outfit, but nothing ever came of it.

The enlisted man in the Army wears a shirt and pants; his low rank isn't marked by a "monkey suit." It's a disgrace to force a grown man from civvies into a middy and so-called pants.

More power to the bill; let's let all Navy men wear chief petty officer uniforms and look like men again. The gals don't like them, either.

DEAR SENATOR: We hope your bill passes. All Americans would like to see our sailors neatly attired.

The tight-drawn trousers around the hips and big flaring bottoms are about as ungainly as human ingenuity can make them.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I hope that the bill introduced by you in redesigning the present enlisted man's naval uniform meets with success. I, as well as other fellows wearing the present uniform, feel that it is lacking in many respects and far from being practical.

There are many older fellows in the naval service who feel very much out of place in a pair of tight-fitting pants.

Again wishing you success and letting you know that we appreciate your efforts.

DEAR SIR: I have wondered so much how long it would be before someone in Washington would come to realize the discomfort and unbecomingness of the sailor's uniform.

It is a cute little suit for a 4-year-old, but an insult to a man's intelligence, besides the inconvenience and discomfort. Many a boy or man has lost his savings, railroad tickets, and other possessions out of his keyhole pockets.

Endless money has been spent on all other uniforms for both men and women; let's spend some on the sailors. Give them a coat and shirt that is in keeping with his age and a little comfort, both from a wearing and a dressing standpoint.

Congratulations on your stand, Senator LANGER, and may you win.

DEAR SENATOR: I see from press reports that a special Navy board is considering a change in the uniform of Navy enlisted men, but that they want to put it off until VJ-day. The report also states that you are in favor of doing something about it now.

I trust you will insist on doing something about it now. I am glad that someone is taking the part of the enlisted men. The officers have seen to it that they have an attractive uniform.

Of course, the enlisted men don't like their uniform. I wore it in World War I, so know what I am talking about.

Some months ago I was talking with the mother of a boy who had just enlisted in the Marine Corps. This boy had been working in a navy yard as a machinist. Knowing that the Navy needed machinists, I asked the mother why her son didn't enlist in the Navy. She replied that he preferred the Marine Corps uniform. I imagine this must have been true in hundreds of cases.

With appreciation for your efforts, I am,

DUBOISE, PA., June 2, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I read in the Courier Express, of which my husband is publisher, that you had introduced a bill to change the design of Navy uniforms. It is most certainly time that someone has shown some interest in the men who form our first line of defense.

Of all the uncomfortable, impractical, ill-fitting, miserable looking garbs, I think the Navy has the worst. I have discussed them with many sailors and they all thoroughly detest them. Those skin-tight bell-bottom trousers with all the buttons, as well as the equally tight blouse look mores like a masquerade costume than a uniform.

My son is six-foot-three and weighs 190 pounds. His studies at the University of Virginia were interrupted by the war. He, at that time, was enjoying the privilege of wearing comfortable, good-looking clothes in which he took great pride. To change to the "monkey suit" of the Navy was certainly not to his liking, as has been the case of thousands of other fellows just like him.

I think the greatest fault to be found in them is that they are so impractical. For

instance, several times when my son was home on a short leave he would be in whites, which as you know, provides no coat of any description. By the time he was ready to start back to the South it would have turned very cold. There he was in those sleazy white things with no protection whatever.

In the case of the Army it is so entirely different. They from the lowliest private are well dressed. They are provided with splendid well-fitting uniforms, jackets, splendid raincoat, and always present a fine appearance. The only coat a sailor has is a heavy pea-jacket which is never to be worn with white. So there you have it.

MY DEAR MR. LANGER: I read an account in our paper with regard to your introducing a bill advocating the change of the enlisted men's uniform for the Navy.

I believe that the present uniform is obsolete and that many of the men, especially those inclined toward obesity, look childish aside from the fact that they are uncomfortable.

I am sure that the enlisted men in the Navy would more than welcome such a change. A blue uniform very much like the Army has and an overseas cap would answer the purpose and improve the appearance of the men.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I note in today's Washington Times-Herald an article to the effect that you have introduced a bill to reform sailors' trousers. I wish to say that I am heartily in favor of such a reform but hope that, while you are at it, you will do a complete job and reform the whole uniform.

I have a son in the Navy who enlisted on the very day he was 17 and, while I don't know his personal views on the subject, I am sure that he would hardly appreciate anyone referring to him as "Little Lord Fauntleroy" or call it a monkey suit. And neither would I like it.

It seems to me that the whole uniform of the United States sailor is a hangover from a lot of obsolete uses and traditions. For example, I understand that the three stripes on the collar represent the three victories of Lord Nelson. Now, I'd like to ask any red-blooded American, "Why in heaven's name does a Yankee sailor have to go around advertising anything so British as that?"

MY DEAR MR. LANGER: I want to congratulate you on sponsoring a bill to change the Navy enlisted men's uniforms and hope that you may be able to have such legislation passed at an early date.

I don't believe there is any legislation that would directly affect as many of our citizens as I am sure it would bring joy to every enlisted man in the United States Navy. It would also gladden the hearts of all the parents who have sons in the Navy, as every person I have ever heard express themselves detest these uniforms.

I hope you can get this uniform changed to regular trousers and if I may suggest, I hope the blouses can be changed to a sport style which could be worn with or without tie. The blues could have white stars in the collar and the whites blue stars, which would make them easily distinguishable.

Again thanking you for your efforts in this behalf and speaking for all the Navy boys along with their parents, I hope you can get this changed immediately.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is being written to express the appreciation of the writer and millions of others of the enlisted personnel of the United States Navy for the interest you have shown in securing a decent and suitable uniform for them—for the enlisted personnel below the rating of chief petty officer. The writer feels justified in saying "millions of others," for he feels sure

that there are approximately 2,000,000 enlisted men that feel as he does about the present uniform—that it is a reflection on the intelligence of those who are responsible for it and a downright nuisance and source of embarrassment for those that are compelled to wear it.

If there be any among your colleagues who do not agree with you, persuade them to wear one of these uniforms for at least 2 days; everyone that objects to changing the uniform for the enlisted men (below chief) should be compelled to wear one for a week; no stronger argument would be necessary to convince them of the wisdom of changing the same for a better one.

Incidentally, the writer suggests that Congress use its power and influence to have that manufacturer of these uniforms who deliberately cut down the amount of material that should have gone in them so that he could use the excess profitably in the black market, tried for torturing the enlisted men of the Navy. These uniforms are tight enough and uncomfortable enough without being made more so by the lack of the usual amount of material.

DEAR SENATOR: The article in the June 4 issue of Life magazine written by Donald Nugent, Navy editor of Yank, is very much to the point. I am one who passed the armed forces physical examination, but have not been inducted as yet because men over 30 years of age have indefinite deferments for the time being. At the time of passing the physical, my chief dread was that I might be chosen by the Navy and have to wear one of those silly get-ups. Everything else pertaining to Navy life appealed to me more than did Army service. I suppose it is sacrilege to label a uniform of the United States armed forces "silly," but it also is sacrilege to ask a fighting son of the United States of America to wear one of those "silly" outfits. One glance at a WAVE uniform is enough to tell anyone that it is more masculine than the men's uniform. If the naval officers who decree the wearing of those uniforms had to wear them, they would knock down the doors in their haste to resign their commissions.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Under the date line June 1, I find published in the Sun, Baltimore, Md., a news item indicating the introduction, by you, of a bill to modernize the uniform worn by enlisted men in the United States Navy.

May I express to you my thanks for this action and my sincere hope that it will receive the favorable attention of our national legislative bodies. This matter lies very close to my heart, because of three boys who enlisted into the armed forces of the United States. Two of them achieved commissions, one in the Army of the United States and the other in the United States Naval Reserve. One boy was not so fortunate and achieved an aviation machinist's mate, second-class, Navy rating. While nothing has ever been said by the last-named boy of this condition, I know that he feels keenly the great difference in his personal appearance from that of his younger brother. The enlisted men's uniform makes no sense whatever either in appearance, design, convenience, or comfort.

It is a weapon in the hands of those fledgling autocrats of our military forces, who make their evil influence felt far in excess of their numbers or intellectual capabilities. I believe that the persons responsible for this condition are of the same mental stature as those who would plow under edible grains and convert livestock into garbage.

This letter is probably too extensive, but I cannot resist expressing the hope that after correcting this injustice you will devote some

attention to the discrimination in messes, latrines, and quarters as distinguished between enlisted and commissioned personnel of the United States armed forces.

DEAR SIR: We believe this streamline Navy needs streamline uniforms.

We, too, believe it's time for a change, and congratulate you on your effort.
More power to you.

DEAR SENATOR: It is about time the Navy dress its men in as much of men's clothes as it does its Waves. We wear blouses with puckering strings and they have two-piece mannish styled coats and we have the bloomer pants.

In behalf of thousands of men like myself, I thank you. I am just a Seabee, and, as you know, most of us are older fellows.

There are lots of men who do not go out on liberty because they feel so foolish and out of place in the well-named "monkey suit."

Sir, why can't we have something like the Coast Guard's land-based outfit, or the steward branch. A blue serge suit most of us would be willing to buy, and a peaked cap with our own insignia on it, and of course, our rating on our sleeve.

I am sure we all would make a much nicer appearance, plus the fact that we would have pockets and feel human again.

Beside all that, many of us will return home to suits that do not fit and are outmoded as to style. If the uniform was up to date we could remove the stripes and markings and have one suit to wear when we go out looking for a job.

Here's wishing you loads of luck, and thanks a million for your time.

DEAR SIR: In the Navy news we read today of your recent bill regarding a change in the enlisted men's uniform, and it was received with such unanimous approval that I know you will be interested in our reaction.

I know that I express the sentiments of thousands of men in the Navy when I voice my appreciation for your efforts in our behalf. The Navy is largely composed of Reservists who are proud to fight for their country, proud to fight in the world's best navy, but sad to say haven't pride in a "monkey suit" that is uncomfortable, impractical, and antiquated.

I sincerely hope that your efforts meet with immediate success and that you won't be staved off until after the war when those of us who care would be unaffected.

I know that men feel so strongly about this that all but a fraction of 1 percent would be more than willing to provide himself with a new uniform at his own expense. So—

"Here's to the man who does what he can to better the state of his fellow man."

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: May I wish you all the success in the world on your bill changing the design of those "monkey suits" the Navy calls a uniform.

No, I'm not a sailor, but I'm a sailor's wife, and though my husband is one of the few who look good in such a uniform we would both welcome a change. I don't think they are at all becoming, and I know there are thousands of Navy wives who agree with me that all summer is nothing but a constant round of washing and ironing whites. There are laundries, sure, but who has enough uniforms to wait for a laundry to return your things?

My husband is in the South Pacific now, and that is one thing I hope to have changed by the time he gets back—decent uniforms. Why can't the men have uniforms like a Navy chief. They are regular suits, but instead of gold buttons like the officers have, let them

have plastic buttons, and wear their rating just like a chief. I married my husband after he was in the service, and I sometimes wonder just how he would look in a regular suit.

Senator, stick to your guns. There are thousands of gobs and gobs' wives in Washington alone who will back you to the limit.

Lots of luck, and remember, we're all behind you.

It's good to know that the Navy has a 4.0 man pulling for their side, and if your bill goes through I don't think that you will ever be forgotten.

Once again, I wish you all the success in the world.

The argument has been advanced that a complete change at present might be costly. Then why not authorize the new uniform as optional for dress, that is, let those who desire to wear them buy them from their personal expense account, as some do their tailor-mades.

I am expressing the sentiment of the majority in saying that an immediate change of uniform would do much to morale, as it is only 17- and 18-year-old boys who like the Buster Brown suits.

Today the naval service includes men who, as adults, feel foolish to wear this out-dated kid's regalia.

DEAR SENATOR: Millions of sailors, including myself, are especially interested in your recent bill to provide the Navy enlisted men with some decent, comfortable, and honest-to-goodness American clothes. The present garb may be considered as comfortable to the English Limies but to us they just plain stink.

There is entirely too much distinction shown between the officers and enlisted men in our Navy without making such a marked and inferior distinction in our clothing.

I'd probably be court-martialed if I signed my name to this, so will just say thanks.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Your bill introduced in Congress a day or so ago to change the naval uniform of enlisted men was read with deep interest by a host of sailors. We all hope now that you really do something about it and not let the brass hats talk you out of it. That suit has never been received with great joy. I myself am 36, college graduate, businessman before I went into the service, and I can say I am embarrassed when the wise-cracks start coming my way about how "cute" I look in my uniform.

Thanking you in advance for taking an interest in us poor "Buster Browns." I know your bill will be read with joy by all Navy enlisted men all over the world.

DEAR SIR: We here at the naval base in Hueneme are with you a 100 percent in hopes your bill to change our uniforms goes through.

But why wait until the end of the war?

We would like a few pockets and decent clothes to wear at present though we're proud to be members of the United States naval forces, and wear whatever uniform they designate us to. We would like the change now if ever.

My thanks and best wishes for your efforts in our behalf.

DEAR SIR: I read about your bill to get rid of the current Navy enlisted man's uniform.

I am very glad someone with authority is finally doing something about the awful thing. I don't have so much against the pants, that are the same as in George Washington's time, but you almost smother removing the jumper, and it's impossible to remove in water. The hat is the most awful, it is said, not to have a visor, as a sailor is always looking up; it takes one hand to hold

it on, if you look up, and two hands to put it on at all.

The CO seems to delight in making you wear the white hat with a blue uniform. It doesn't match.

Why should colored stewards be allowed to wear the officer's type uniform and the enlisted man doesn't, especially when they make less money?

My idea is to have all the armed forces uniforms alike in design, such as the regular marine uniform, except have khaki for land forces and navy blue for sea forces. As it is now, I can't tell one serviceman from another, as there are so many different types of uniforms.

You have my best wishes that the bill goes through.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have just read (with much satisfaction) about the present bill you have just introduced to the Congress pertaining to the uniform of naval enlisted men.

All we have to say is, "More power to you."

DEAR SIR: I just read an article in the Stars and Stripes, "our paper," where you had introduced a bill to change our uniforms and I want you to know that every man in our outfit is praising you for this effort. When we put this uniform on we feel more like Junior with his first pair of long pants. We are grown men and like everything but the way the uniform is made, so see if you can't get it changed to coat and pants that don't have 13 buttons on the front. Thanks a lot for trying.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you profusely for taking the initiative on the bill for a change in the sailors' uniform. It certainly is the source of continuous complaint and does not give the sailor the dignity which he is entitled.

I would like to suggest that, if possible, you wear the sailors' uniform when you present this bill to the Senate so that they will get a good picture of what this uniform does for a man.

Your bill to change Navy uniform considered a great achievement. All naval enlisted personnel would welcome a change to something that feels and looks like something.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Associated Press of June 2 carried an account of your bill to standardize enlisted men's military uniforms. This bill, I want to assure you, is long overdue and will receive the support of the large majority of enlisted Navy men, especially those who have been drafted into the Navy since the war.

For the past 2 years my job has been to interview hundreds of men in the Navy, and I have found reactions pretty much the same. Consequently I'm writing you to present some ammunition which you may be able to use.

1. The Navy enlisted man's uniform contributes much toward the preservation of a traditional caste system, which exists between officers and men on a far greater scale in the Navy than in the Army.

2. The Navy uniform is not conducive to good military bearing. Observation of Army and Navy men will demonstrate this. "Sloppy" habits and posture go along with the uniform. Dignified men (business and professional) who enter the Navy are made to feel like youngsters because of the uniform; it's reaction is the same as that produced by colleges and fraternities who seek to put freshmen in their place by making them wear childlike caps and other clothing. Navy men are constantly embarrassed by their families and friends who comment on their appearance, comparing them to little

boys on their way to Sunday School, etc. The clothes definitely do not flatter other than well-developed figures. (My wife, for instance is always uncomfortable in public because my uniform accentuates features of my anatomy which causes unnecessary comments from others.) The Navy man today has a reputation to live down—a reputation of roughness, devil-may-care attitude, casanova-ism, and strong language. The uniform does not help him much, when its tightness and cut produces a swagger and appearance which tends to support popular concepts about sailors. (Men who have been taken from civilian life and placed in the Navy through arbitrary assignment are particularly aware of this condition; it may not apply so much to the type of man who joins the Navy to "see the world and have a girl in every port.")

3. The Navy uniform is not practical wearing apparel. The tight trousers with buttons and laces are difficult to get in and out of. Contrary to the Navy's traditional view, a single zipper would make the clothes easier to remove in water. Suspenders or belts are more practical (and certainly better for appearance) for keeping pants up than skin-tight fitting. If these clothes are so good for water rescue why is it that most men on duty at sea wear blue denim shirts and pants cut along civilian style? Uniforms are usually worn only on shore liberty. The jumper (middy) is difficult to manage in dressing and undressing. It's shortness invariably creates a division between itself and the pants when one bends over. Its low cut neck exposes more chest than is commonly considered in good taste for dress. The tie is certainly not masculine attire.

Neither the summer or winter hats are particularly practical. The winter hat is not warm and is extremely difficult to keep on the head in windy weather. The white hat does not protect the head from summer sun, and it lends itself too readily to all kinds of shapes which are anything but military. (Men spend hours twisting the hat into unique shapes for distinctive wearing.)

The pocket situation is especially bad. There is not a good pocket in the entire uniform for wallet, handkerchief, pen, or pencil. What pockets there are are extremely shallow. Necessity has caused sailors to adopt the extremely "masculine" practice of tucking the handkerchief under the jumper at the shoulder.

The overcoat provisions are not practical. There are only two winter or summer styles of dress—with or without overcoat. The soldier has a long, warm overcoat for cold weather; in cool weather he can wear his shirt and blouse; in warm weather he can shed the blouse for just the shirt. The sailor has a waist-length coat which is not adequate for cold weather; this is the only coat he has to wear in cold or cool weather; when he takes it off he has only a jumper.

Summer clothes are impractical. The white uniform is not cool. The material is so closely woven (supposed to be more water-tight) that air does not penetrate it. Winter light-weight blue woolen uniforms are frequently cooler to wear. Whites are less neat looking than even the blues; furthermore, they are hard to keep clean, if they are worn all day, a sailor has to wear two on warm days to be clean. This greatly increases his laundry bill or personal washing. Furthermore, the original issue consists of only three suits of whites—insufficient to keep clean; so every enlisted man finds it necessary to buy several more pairs immediately.

Incidentally, would it not be a savings for all military clothes to be cut on the same pattern and material, but over different colored cloth for each branch?

4. While we are discussing uniforms, it might be well to look into the issue of clothing given to Navy men.

Every Navy man is issued a hammock of high-grade canvas. While there are no doubt exceptions, I have never known a sailor to use a hammock in the last year or two. Almost without exception, ship and shore stations have bunks. Latest style ships have been built with bunks. This hammock is relatively expensive and is deducted from the man's clothing allowance. It is argued that the hammock is handy in packing belongings for shipment. It is, if we are to continue to pack our "gear" in the traditional but outmoded fashion. (Drop in a railroad freight depot and look at Navy gear en route, packed seagoing or "cradle" style.) The Army's barracks bag is much more practical and is easier to store. Instead, we are charged for both a sea bag and a hammock as well as a "ditty" bag.

Most Navy men are not issued a raincoat. Army men are. The price of a regulation raincoat is \$12, which we may or may not buy—if we can afford it. A raincoat would be preferable to a hammock.

All Navy men are issued mattresses which they carry with them. Yet, aside from recruit training, men seldom use their small, thin, issued mattresses. Most ships and shore stations provide standard single mattresses for the bunks. I used my mattress for 5 weeks in recruit training (a permanent barracks mattress could have been provided instead). For the past 2 years it has been stored, for I have slept on standard-size mattresses supplied wherever I have been billeted. Would it not be more practical to issue hammocks and mattresses on board ships, where they are needed, rather than waste a man's clothing allowance at the time he comes into the Navy?

5. The Army system of replacement of used clothing is far more practical than the Navy's. An Army man turns in his worn-out clothing for new. The Navy man receives quarterly a small cash clothing allowance (added onto his pay), from which he is supposed to buy replacements. Frequently he doesn't use the money for clothes, and hence his appearance suffers. Sometimes the amount does not cover the clothing needed at the time, so he doesn't buy the clothing and can't save the money until the next quarterly allotment. The sailor pays out of his own pocket for all clothes bought between quarter allotments as well.

6. While not exactly classified as clothing, personal items should be considered here. Every recruit in the Navy receives a "flying five" when he enters his second or third week of training. This is his first pay of \$5, which he receives in his hand and immediately turns over to a canteen clerk, who gives him a paper bag. In the bag are the following items: Toothbrush, tooth paste, razor blades, shaving cream, soap, comb, sewing kit, thread, scissors, shoe polish, writing paper, and envelopes, 75-cent fountain pen, etc. Most of these items a man will have already—purchased or given to him prior to arriving at the training center. Many of the items are not his brand or do not suit his needs, yet he has to buy them. (In my case, I had my own toothbrush and paste—different from type I received; the blades did not fit my razor; shaving cream was not my preference; I had a sewing kit and thread—so did most of my friends; the fountain pen wouldn't work, besides I had a good one of my own, etc.) It would have been better for the Navy to issue a "must" list to every man and have him buy the kinds of things he needed to complete his list. There would have been less waste, although the canteen would have sold less (after all, it was from the man's pay).

Also from the \$5 was subtracted an amount for half-soleing of shoes. This would be reasonable except the half-sole is not really needed. In the second week of training every man's shoes are picked up and sent to the cobbler shop (employing civilians). Onto the bottom of the new shoes is tacked a new

rubber sole (over the leather) and a new heel. These shoes are used for drilling, and every man pays for this extra sole. It would be cheaper all around if every man were issued one pair of drill shoes made with the sole put on at the factory. The shoe would probably cost no more; the recruit would not have to pay for the sole; and a civilian shoemaker would not have to be paid.

This letter, Senator LANGER, could go on and on, but I believe I have shown how traditionalism has gone rampant in the Navy, how the Navy treats its recruits as though they had sixth-grade mentalities, and dresses them accordingly. It doesn't seem possible that there could be so many divergencies between the branches of the armed services. It doesn't seem fair to take men of intelligence and arbitrarily divide them into two branches of service in which he will be treated so differently. Not only do these differences apply to clothing, but they go all the way down the line (the Navy has only 15 days leave given each man a year; the Navy has not adopted the \$10 war bond which the Treasury made available to men in the armed services—adopted by the Army a year ago, etc.).

I wish you luck with your bill. I know you'll have lots of support from men who can't speak up. (Incidentally, I would appreciate your keeping my name in confidence, as the Navy does not approve of this type of correspondence between enlisted men and Congressmen.)

Re bill to change Navy uniforms enlisted men.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Twice a veteran of the Navy—1906 and 1918—I heartily support your bill. It will improve appearance, raise self-respect, and conducive to good conduct and efficiency. I know. Ask your opposition, if any, to put on a sailor suit and see how they feel.

Now, I know all the arguments, historical and utilitarian. They are the bunk, with the possible exception of stowage. It is likely the British put this "monkey suit" on their tough tars originally to make them too funny to mutiny or make trouble. If naval officers argue for the present uniform, then propose that all personnel wear the same uniform, and see if they choose the enlisted or officer type of today for themselves. If these comedy suits are so hot, let's put them on the admirals, too, and be democratic and utilitarian all the way. This is important. A man can change his whole feeling and outlook by just turning his hat brim up all around and wearing the hat at a funny angle. What happens, then, to his personality when he puts on all that funny outfit our enlisted men below chief petty officer have to wear? At that our boys look the best of any sailors in the world. But the others look so bad; that isn't enough. Our American boys are the world's best by far. Let's give them a dignified, decent, good-looking uniform worthy of them.

As you know, Senator LANGER, there are no sailors nowadays. The men are technicians, including navigators. Whatever may have done for the salty sailing-ship days and the crews of square-riggers, the specialists on our modern mechanized craft have nothing in common with the story-book swashbucklers and should not be made ridiculous by funny clothes or light-opera stuff of any kind.

Congratulations, Senator, and warmest good wishes, and sincere thanks, too, from myself and so many other old-timers I've talked to on this subject. My classmates at Harvard, BREWSTER, of Maine, and TAFT, of Ohio, will, I hope, help you on this, and you may tell them that I said so and sent them my best.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the article which appeared in the June 4, 1945, issue

of the magazine *Life*, entitled "No More Monkey Suits?—Sailors Say They Feel Silly in Present Uniform," by Donald Nugent. I ask that the article be printed in its entirety, with the exception of the cuts of suggested uniforms, which, under the rules, may not be placed in the RECORD.

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

NO MORE MONKEY SUITS?—SAILORS SAY THEY FEEL SILLY IN PRESENT UNIFORM

(By Donald Nugent)

Ninety percent of the 6,000 letters I have received about Navy uniforms plead that something—anything—be done to free sailors of the discomfort and indignity of having to wear a little boy's suit. The letters come from sailors aboard ships in the Atlantic, from stations all over the United States, and from ships and island bases scattered over the Pacific. They all claim a deep satisfaction and pride in serving in the Navy. But they also say they are self-conscious and ill at ease on the street or in mixed company, particularly when their friends refer to their "Fauntleroy's," "Buster Browns," or "monkey suits."

The men say there is not enough pocket space in the uniform. They have to carry cigarettes in the socks, a wallet hung over the pants top, and a handkerchief on the shoulder. These things are always getting lost. The jumper, so difficult to put on and take off that it is necessary to brush one's hair after every operation, is another source of inconvenience, while the 13 buttons on the pants cause more consternation than respect for the fact that they are supposed to commemorate the Thirteen Original American Colonies.

It is bad for a man's morale to be so embarrassed by wearing the uniform of his service. Let us take the hypothetical case of Mac, a sailor on shore leave.

Mac's sister says he's cute and his mother is very proud of him. But as he strolls down Main Street his tight suit gives him a feeling of nudity. There is no shore patrol around so he turns up his tight cuffs for relief from the heat and to protect his stripes from dirt and pulls his flowing neckerchief high over his open neck in an attempt to cover the hair on his chest. The wind blows his long collar over his head and it takes two hands to put it back, but that lifts his jumper up over his pants top and exposes his skivvies over his midriff, so he just leaves the collar there, lazily flapping over the little white hat which in itself is the last word in heh-heh.

Now Mac meets an old friend who says, "Hello there, haw-haw, where d'ja get the monkey suit? No foolin', though, you guys are doing a swell job."

Mac grins sheepishly but he's on the defensive now. He sticks out his chin and affects the grim countenance and swagger of a tough old salt. He passes up the hotel dining room with its austere waiters and white linen and joins several other sailors and soldiers in the tavern down back of the tracks.

The stage is now all set. Mac has had a few beers. The immaculate little white hat has popped off onto the floor and is a disreputable sight. The black tie has been floating idly in a puddle of beer on the bar. A well-fried soldier is becoming unpleasantly eloquent about the 13 buttons. The rest is on the police records all over the country.

An explanation of each of the present uniform's eccentricities can be found in some phase of old-time shipboard activity. But these activities have ceased while the uniform designed for them remains. A tight-fitting "monkey suit" was necessary for constant climbing in the ship's rigging. Such things as coat sleeves, belts, big pockets,

and pants' flies could get fouled in the lines. But modern sailors don't climb the rigging of sailing ships.

The long collar was a removable affair designed to catch the tar that sailors used on their pigtailed. The neckerchief is a perversion of an old black "sweat rag" once used to wipe tar and grease from the hands.

The white hat was designed to use as a bucket to bail out a boat. Today's sailors complain that it only adds to the glare of a tropical sun. The flat hat is just one of those things.

But so strong is the influence of tradition that the Navy Uniform Board in Washington has made only two minor changes in the enlisted man's blues since 1927. The jumper has been shortened and the trousers now have straight legs instead of bell bottoms.

About 10 percent of the sailors who wrote to Yank say they like their uniform. They present two stock arguments for the "monkey suit": (1) A sailor must be distinctive and, above all things, should not be confused with a soldier or marine. (To these diehards the fact that a sailor is dressed in blue and a soldier in brown is not sufficient.) (2) A sailor's outfit must be small and compact so that it can be rolled and stowed in the limited space aboard ship. (A jacket without a flapping collar and a pair of trousers without the 13 buttons and a trap door could conceivably be as easily stowed away in lockers without upsetting life aboard ship.)

But the greatest reason that life aboard ship would not be upset by a change in uniform is that the present uniform is not often worn aboard ship. Usually it's dungarees from the time the ship leaves the United States until it returns.

Strictly speaking, many sailors don't even wear the regulation uniform ashore. They buy out of their own pockets at least one snappy, tailor-made, lightweight, suit of blue serge for shore leave. Most officers are sympathetic and will appear not to notice this violation of regulations. But occasionally the sailor will hit a "hot" ship and his well-fitting new uniform will be forbidden. That gives him the feeling that he is the victim of a calculated plot on the part of the officers to keep him as dowdy as possible, while the officers' own uniforms are constantly revised and kept up to date.

What, then, is the answer to the Navy's uniform problem? The answer comes from the men themselves—they like the battle jacket already authorized in other branches of the armed service. This jacket, with matching, conventional fly-front trousers, could be made up in any material for all uniforms—winter, summer, and work. Great economy and regularity of a sailor's appearance would immediately be attained. The sailor could wear gray shirts for dress and blue chambray shirts for work and a half dozen of these would suffice, eliminating the wasteful practice of wearing out jumpers by daily washing.

The sailor also needs a garrison cap for dress instead of the flat hat which is always in the way. And he needs a billed cap aboard ship in the sun—something like the baseball cap that Admiral Mitscher and Admiral Halsey have found to be just the thing.

The Navy is over 3,000,000 strong today. It will never again shrink to its prewar size. Many reservists say they would like to stay in the Navy if it weren't for the uniform and even Army men say they would transfer to the Navy if it weren't for those "Buster Brown" suits a sailor has to wear.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may add that some of these letters state that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft], and other Senators have already given assurances, possibly even before I introduced my bill, that they will do all in their power to have the uniform changed.

I may say, in conclusion, that last night a committee of enlisted men of the Navy waited upon me and told me they would be eternally grateful for anything I could possibly do in presenting the bill, arguing in its favor and doing what I could to have Congress finally enact the measure into law.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to address the Senate on the pending measure this afternoon, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Harry N. Child, of Washington, to be register of the land office at Spokane, Wash. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several persons to be surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude R. Wickard to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, by agreement the nomination of Claude R. Wickard to be Rural Electrification Administrator will go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul M. Herzog to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul M. Herzog to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day. That concludes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. GEORGE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 4), 1945:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Harry Leafier, December 2, 1944.
Roland K. Iverson, December 18, 1944.
Harry J. Schweigert, June 5, 1944.
Paul V. Joliet, April 13, 1945.

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE APRIL 15, 1945

William L. Smith

SURGEON TO BE SENIOR SURGEON EFFECTIVE APRIL 10, 1945

Raymond A. Vonderlehr

SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Donald J. Hunt, March 1, 1945.
Harry Eagle, April 1, 1945.
Richard C. Arnold, April 1, 1945.
John W. Oliphant, April 1, 1945.
Norman H. Topping, April 1, 1945.
Mason V. Hargett, April 1, 1945.

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTORS EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1945

Ralph D. Lillie
Milton V. Veldee
Paul A. Neal

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEON EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 13, 1945

Will H. Aufranc

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Harold S. Barrett, February 13, 1945.
James L. Hart, February 13, 1945.
John C. Sheehan, February 24, 1945.
C. Merle Bundy, March 1, 1945.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., March 14, 1945.
Vernon G. Guenther, March 5, 1945.

TEMPORARY DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1945

John W. Knutson

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY DENTAL DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1945

H. Trendley Dean

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEER DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 1945

Mark D. Hollis

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 4), 1945:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Paul M. Herzog to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1940.

Paul M. Herzog to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1945.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Hulon McGraw, Anderson.
Charles W. Jordan, Roanoke.

NEW YORK

Florence R. Danowski, East Setauket.
James M. Shay, Kings Park.
William D. Gallagher, Willard.

TENNESSEE

Richard M. Morelock, Persia.
Emma Anderson, Unicoi.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 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, we give Thee thanks that, in spite of the blindness and blundering of Thy wayward children, in every crisis Thou dost raise up leaders to match hours of destiny. Our exultant hearts acclaim the great captain of the hosts of freedom who this day comes in humble triumph to receive the plaudits of the land which gave him to the common cause. We raise our jubilate that by Thy favor the valorous legions which his harmonizing genius helped weld into one irresistible phalanx have battered down the fortress of evil designs and of loathsome brutalities, and that he returns today in glorious victory, leaving behind a refuge of lies in dust and ashes and the arrow of freemen piercing the dragon's heart. It is Thy divine might which has made the glory of humanity's foe to cease and cast his throne down to the ground. May we learn the lesson that our sons and brothers who will never come back fain would teach us, lest we win the fight in the field and lose the peace in the forum. In the 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 Friday, June 15, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT
APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON INVESTIGATION OF FOOD SHORTAGES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 63, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee of the House of Representatives Designated to Investigate Food Shortages be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before said committee during the current session.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Arizona tell us what this concurrent resolution provides?

Mr. HAYDEN. The concurrent resolution provides for printing 5,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before the Special Committee of the House of Representatives Designated to Investigate Food Shortages. The House wants 5,000 additional copies, and adoption of the concurrent resolution will be a courtesy to the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

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	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hoyer	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Eastland	Mitchell	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Wiley
Fulbright	Murdock	Wilson
George	Murray	Young
Gerry	Myers	
Green	O'Daniel	