

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—RAYMOND D. JOHNSOS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there was reported favorably today from the Committee on Military Affairs the nomination of Raymond D. Johnsos of the State of Illinois to be principal manpower field supervisor of the Chicago regional office. The nomination is not on the calendar, and I am wondering if I can obtain unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond D. Johnsos to be principal manpower field supervisor of the Chicago regional office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received July 7 (legislative day of March 24), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William J. Storen, of Charleston, S. C., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C. (reappointment).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. (temporary) Homer G. Hutchinson, Jr., to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of April 1940, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Maj. (temporary) Ross S. Mickey to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of June 1940, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Hal R. Kolp, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 10th day of February 1941.

Fred E. Haynes, Jr., a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 22d day of August 1942.

William H. McDonough, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943.

Louis C. Vandertill, a citizen of Michigan, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of March 1943.

Kenneth A. Gordon, Jr., a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943.

Platoon Sgt. Joseph D. Baugh, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

Charles A. Irvine, a citizen of Missouri, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 7 (legislative day of May 24), 1943.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark and as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxembourg now established in Canada.

William C. Burdett to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

Loy W. Henderson to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq.

Donal M. McGonigal to be a consul of the United States of America.

John S. Service to be a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William J. Storen, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Ernest L. Marbury, of Alabama, to be deputy regional manpower director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Alabama State office.

George C. Chesney, District of Columbia, to be head industrial consultant in the Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Washington office.

George C. Estill, of Florida, to be regional chief of manpower utilization, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Raymond D. Johnsos, of Illinois, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Chicago regional office.

William O. Weyforth, of Maryland, to be senior labor economist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Maryland State office.

Harold S. Woodley, of Michigan, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Battle Creek area office.

Charles M. Hay, of Missouri, to be general counsel in the office of the executive director, at \$8,000 per annum, in the Washington office.

Richard J. Cullen, of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Elmer K. Delp, of New York, to be assistant regional chief of training, at \$5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Huxley Madeheim, of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Glenn L. Bobbitt, of North Carolina, to be area chief of training, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Raleigh area office.

Leo H. Carney, of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Erie area office.

Frederic S. Martin, of Rhode Island, to be regional personnel officer, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

Henry L. Badoux, of Tennessee, to be assistant regional chief of manpower utilization, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Julian Capers, Jr., of Texas, to be senior information specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

William D. Gallier, of Texas, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Richard B. Johnson, of Texas, to be housing and transportation specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Arthur A. Smith, of Texas, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Everett R. Speer, of Texas, to be assistant regional chief of placement, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

William Edward Raab Covell
Albert Jesse Browning

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Ferguson Hanmer, Salmon.

LOUISIANA

Vada S. Clements, Ida.

NEW YORK

Leonard J. McHugh, Depew.
Aaron Feldherr, Greenfield Park.
Elroy R. Ganey, Jamestown.
Charles F. Schreier, Sag Harbor.
Edward P. Sullivan, Sunmount.
John T. Clark, Tuxedo Park.
Mary P. Carroll, Valley Falls.
Theresa Jaeger, West Nyack.

OREGON

Gwendolyn H. Stemmerman, Powers.
Gerald E. Wright, Wauna.

RHODE ISLAND

Walter B. Kingsley, Allentown.
Raymond L. Battey, Greenville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 7, 1943

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, as we bow at the altar of prayer we thank Thee that a new day shows us the stepping stones to higher and better things. Our hearts are heavy as we realize that war is still darkening the sky and increasing the sorrows of humanity. Oh, show us the way that leads to the ranges of wise attainment which Thou dost reveal in loving and merciful condescension.

Oh, touch every lover of liberty and every dreamer of fine ideals of free institutions. Over all our country, open sightless eyes to a world dazzling in the shade, that they may see it beckoning them to a splendid vision and grand endeavor. Ours is a life's work, a life's task, and a life's mission. Dear Lord, forbid that we should ever cheapen our calling or lower the virtues of democratic procedure. Gladly cooperating with the divine purpose, give us a deepening sense of powers unemployed, of possibilities unachieved, and ideals unfulfilled. Every earnest effort to do our whole duty is nearer the goal of victory and barriers overcome. Do Thou increase the revelation of Thyself and blend our labors into the aspirations of a true democracy; and Thine shall be the praise. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; and

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2076. An act to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; and

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; and

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING MEETING OF HOUSE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House this morning.

The SPEAKER. The House is going to be voting on various conference reports this morning.

Mr. BLOOM. I withdraw the request.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes today at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any other special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

CRISIS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 6,000 babies were listed as born to soldier fathers in the month of May. The Army estimates that 300,000 babies will be born to service fathers during the war period.

There are many inconsistencies emanating from the Office of Price Administration, many problems that still remain unsolved. A tragic call for help appears in the United States News of this week in the form of a letter to the editor from one of the fathers of tomorrow's citizens whose wife is having her second child. He writes that the papers record a record "baby crop" this year. They report that some baby carriages will be made, but no diapers. What do the New Dealers expect us to do with our babies without diapers and pins with which to fasten same?

We can do without a lot of things, but how can a baby do without diapers? Is there anybody in Washington who is interested in baby problems? If so, to whom should I address complaint?

Mr. Speaker, that is a call of desperation; I bring it to your attention as another major problem which still remains unsolved by the W. P. B.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a short editorial.

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

There was no objection.

CRITICAL STRATEGIC MATERIAL—THE B. E. W.-R. F. C. DISPUTE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the problem of obtaining critical strategic materials is a problem of vital importance to the millions of our fellow Americans who will constitute our overseas fighting fronts.

The Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Commerce have both charged that this problem has been handled improperly and, to quote the Vice President, "to the detriment of the war effort."

The situation demands clarification and constructive action. Yet that action was blocked yesterday by a vote of 6 to 5 in the Rules Committee, all six

Democratic members voting against action.

It is difficult to understand how six leading Democratic Members of this House could bring themselves to vote as a unit squarely in opposition to the ascertainment of the facts, squarely in opposition to expediting the war effort.

The situation is not a new one. There has been friction and criticism for well over a year. Secretary Jones has asked that the situation be dealt with now. His own friends in this House deny his request. Sooner or later the situation must be dealt with in fairness to the armed forces. The people of the country will demand it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two particulars: One to include an editorial, and the other to include two speeches.

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

There was no objection.

THE SYNTHETIC DIAPER CRISIS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]—and I do not know what the revision of her remarks will show—always gives the House some constructive thought, but sometimes she overlooks some of the basic facts on which her argument is based. She just asked the House, "What will our babies do without diapers?" The enemy can be defeated, the battle on the home front won, without becoming frightened over a newspaper article telling us there will be a shortage of diapers. The babies of our soldiers, of our civilians, will not be without diapers.

The lady is unduly alarmed. American ingenuity and resourcefulness, the courage and the determination of the American mothers will today, as always, in spite of the New Deal—yes, notwithstanding the most strenuous efforts of Hopkins and WALLACE—solve the problem as it arises and the babies, every little girl and boy, God bless them, will feel the comfort, have the service of a soft, adequate diaper, well secured by a loving mother, grandmother, or grandfather.

Some of us in our earlier days were blessed by the fact that everything desired was not immediately at hand. Let me venture the suggestion that many a distinguished Member of this House, yes, perhaps of the other body, was in her or his infancy cradled in a diaper that first saw service as part of a flour sack, a salt bag, perhaps as a former petticoat or shirt. At the risk of being wrong, let me venture the guess that there are enough old shirts, petticoats, and other used garments soft in texture

but strong and reliable in fabric which, if the worst comes, will serve the purpose.

I am in favor of doing everything possible for the soldiers, for the soldier-fathers, for the mothers of the soldiers' babies—in fact, for all mothers, and I understand that some 6,000 soldiers' babies were born—

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the month of May in 21 States—

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the month of May. But she overlooks the fact that she advocated the inclusion of the service of the WAVES, the WAC's, the SPARS, and perhaps thousands of other women going into foreign service, so there will not be as many babies—or so it would appear—so there will probably not be as great a need for the diapers to which the lady has called attention.

Another thing she forgets and that is this, that before the present generation was born there were millions of babies born throughout the world who never were pricked by a diaper pin. I know something about what it is to wash diapers, to pin them on babies; I have done that and it was a pleasure, one that I would like to have again if age and circumstances did not prohibit.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has perhaps misunderstood me. This is the first time I have ever known him inclined to be reactionary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I am not reactionary. No one who has ever washed diapers is a reactionary; he is a progressive. There is something about the practice that makes you seek progressive methods. The Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is always alert, but on this occasion I do not think she has cause for worry.

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

(Mr. LEMKE and Mr. POWERS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include some tables on agricultural appropriations for 1942, 1943, and 1944, appropriations that are available to the Department of Agri-

culture. These will be good reference material for all the Members.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order; I suggest the absence of a quorum. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the second deficiency bill (H. R. 3030) to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the figure "\$75,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000" and in line 8 strike out "\$3,375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the figure "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 6 of said amendment, after the word "expended" and before the comma, insert the following: "and to be allocated to the Intra-

coastal Waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay to Corpus Christi, Texas"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

No. 1: Appropriates \$20,000 to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out duties imposed by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941, and section 204 of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1944, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, relating to the Government Printing Office: Appropriates \$17,000,000 for working capital and congressional printing and binding, fiscal year 1944; increases the amount available for printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register to \$430,000, fiscal year 1943; and strikes out the proposed payment to messengers on night duty, totaling \$2,400, to be paid from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year 1943.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Nos. 6 and 7: Appropriates \$29,500 for salaries and expenses, National Resources Planning Board, as proposed by the House, instead of \$42,500, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that not more than \$37,000 shall be available for salaries (other than to pay annual leave), as proposed by the House, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

No. 10: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate appropriating \$65,000 for salaries and expenses, Bituminous Coal Consumers' Council, fiscal year 1944.

Nos. 11, 12, 13, and 14: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate providing \$20,000,000 for war-area child-care payments to States, local public authorities, and other agencies, and \$450,000 for salaries and expenses, necessary to carry out the war-area child-care program proposed to be administered by the Federal Security Agency; and eliminates the provision of the Senate making such appropriations dependent upon the enactment of the bill (S. 1130) to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

No. 15: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for war public works (community facilities), instead

of \$75,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; of which \$2,250,000 is made available for administrative expenses, instead of \$3,375,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 16: Appropriates \$12,000,000 for use by the Public Roads Administration in connection with the Inter-American Highway, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Nos. 17, 18, and 19: Appropriates \$100,000,000 for war housing, instead of \$150,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that not exceeding \$7,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation under "Emergency fund for the President, defense housing," contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, shall be continued available until June 30, 1944, as proposed by the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Nos. 20, 21, 22, and 23: Appropriates \$68,000 as an additional amount for support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, fiscal year 1943; provides \$2,916.86 for the payment of final judgments; and provides for the division of expenses in connection with such items; all as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Nos. 28, 29, 30, and 31: Strikes out the proposals of the Senate to appropriate \$1,100,000 for the Bituminous Coal Division, and \$25,000 for the Patrick Henry National Monument, under the National Park Service.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Nos. 32 and 33: Inserts additional funds for the payment of claims for damages by collision with naval vessels, contained in Senate Document 82, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 34 and 35: Provides additional funds under the Coast Guard for the payment of claims for damages, operation of vessels, contained in Senate Document 81, as proposed by the Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

No. 36: Appropriates \$800,000, fiscal year 1944, to the Bureau of Accounts, for salaries and expenses, deposit of withheld taxes, as proposed by the Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Nos. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44: Appropriates \$7,095,000 for rivers and harbors work, as proposed by the Senate, amended to require allocation of the funds to the intra-coastal waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay to Corpus Christi, Tex.; provides \$4,385,000 for the prosecution of a dam and reservoir project on Mosquito Creek, Ohio, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$10,000,000 for flood control, general (emergency fund), as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates \$80,820 for maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home, 1944, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that appropriations for the Military Establishment and for civil functions, fiscal year 1944, shall be available for carrying into effect the act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to, or loss or destruction of property, and so forth, approved July 3, 1943, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—JUDGMENTS AND AUTHORIZED CLAIMS

Nos. 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60: Appropriates funds for the payment of judgments and authorized claims as submitted to the Senate in sundry Senate documents, all as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

No. 61: Provides that all appropriations and authority, with respect to appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, as proposed by the Senate.

LXXXIX—464

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 8, relating to the preparation and distribution to the public of the United States Government Manual under the Office of War Information.

No. 9, relating to the transfer of equipment, tools, and machinery heretofore used by the National Youth Administration to States or State boards for vocational education.

Nos. 24, 25, and 26, relating to aid and the temporary rehabilitation of farmers, in areas flooded in 1943.

No. 27, relating to appropriations for development of airports started by the Work Projects Administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, Department of Commerce.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill went to the Senate carrying about \$36,000,000. The Senate added about \$300,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TABER. It went to the Senate with about \$36,000,000 and they multiplied it by 10.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; the Senate added about \$300,000,000. It is only necessary to discuss a few items.

One item that attracted some attention, a very appealing one, was that for child care in war areas. The Senate inserted \$20,000,000, but the bill authorizing such payments, although it had passed the Senate, has not been considered in the House. Under the circumstances the House could not yield and the item went out of the bill.

A second item which has attracted deserved attention is the item for war housing. In many of the congested centers about our war industry plants the housing condition is bad and in some locations is critical. It is charged, perhaps with some color of accuracy, that in some such centers disturbances which have arisen, notably in the Detroit area, were due to deficiencies in housing available for workmen employed in the war production plants.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which committee has made a very extensive investigation of the housing situation in this country, also an investigation of the use of funds which have been appropriated for this purpose heretofore. I was very strenuously opposed to the authorization of this appropriation. I was assured that that bill was only an authorization not an appropriation, and that I

would be given ample opportunity to express my grievances and give the information I have to the Appropriations Committee of the House and therefore to fight this appropriation in that committee. This appropriation has never been before the Committee on Appropriations of the House, yet my distinguished chairman assured me I would be given a chance to be heard on it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has stated the situation fairly. This appropriation is in response to an authorization for \$300,000,000 just passed both Houses. The Senate inserted an appropriation for half the authorized amount, \$150,000,000. The House conferees after due consideration reduced that to \$100,000,000, one-third of the new authorization.

Mr. WILSON. When the gentleman says "the House," does he mean the House Committee on Appropriations or the conferees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The managers on the part of the House, the conference committee, included the chairmen of all subcommittees. The situation was imperative, it had to be taken care of at once. Notwithstanding the need, we provided only one-third of what the gentleman's committee authorized.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. It will be recalled that the gentleman from Indiana, by an amendment which he offered when the measure was pending here in the House, indicated that in his judgment \$200,000,000 would be necessary for this purpose. I am wondering why he has changed his mind and thinks that even \$100,000,000 will not be necessary now.

Mr. WILSON. If the gentleman from Texas will permit me to give this answer to his question, I would like to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman from Texas said that was only an authorization, that it was customary to ask for authorizations far in excess of the amount to be appropriated. When I asked for an authorization of \$200,000,000 I had no intention whatsoever of asking for an appropriation of \$200,000,000 or not even \$100,000,000. We have more than 45,000 housing units in the country today empty.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say that the Navy Department alone gave the committee the evidence with reference to its need for 175,000 units. Certainly there cannot be any quibbling with reference to one-third of the authorized appropriation now being needed.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

Mr. WILSON. I am going to have to object to this. I will demand a record vote.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has made his position very clear. He

proposed an amendment to appropriate for this purpose \$200,000,000.

Mr. WILSON. That is not correct. I did not propose an amendment to appropriate anything. It was only an authorization.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Whenever a committee authorizes an appropriation it does so for the express purpose of securing appropriations and it is presumed that the committee having charge of the appropriation will proceed to give appropriate consideration to the authorization that the committee recommends. An authorization can have no other purpose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman two questions. In the first place, am I correct in assuming there is not anything in this bill about crop insurance? I was told there was.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The item on crop insurance is brought back in disagreement. It will be taken up later.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is one of the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. It will be taken up for consideration as soon as the conference report is disposed of.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman about this child-care proposition which seems to me to be one of our greatest problems? I can understand why we cannot appropriate money pursuant to an act that has not been passed, but may I ask the gentleman what the outlook is on that problem?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Speaking for myself I may say that our attitude on it would have been at least sympathetic had there been authority for its consideration.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from California that that situation is taken care of under title II of the so-called Lanham Act, which provides for these community facilities, including child care, and so forth, and this bill authorizes an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for these various purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Which can be used for that purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. Part of it; yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. An appropriation for the Guffey Coal Act was precluded when the Committee on Rules declined to favor a resolution to consider a bill to continue the life of the Commission beyond August 24.

We provided for completion of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Florida to Texas. We provided the remaining amount of some \$7,000,000 to complete the project.

We also provided \$4,385,000 for the Youngstown flood project, where in a recent flood the river came within a half inch of putting out of commission three of the largest and most important steel plants in the Nation.

We provided \$10,000,000 for repair of levees under the jurisdiction of the War Department and \$80,000 to readjust salaries in the State Soldiers Home.

Before I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, this appropriation has never been before the Appropriations Committee of the House. We have never had a chance to be heard. There are several Members of the House who are opposed to this appropriation. The National Housing Administration has never shown a committee of the House of Representatives, the Rules Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, where one single dollar is needed.

We have today between 45,000 and 60,000 empty housing units built from the Lanham Act funds. We have today 45,000 or 50,000 units that will never have anyone living in them and if we build 300,000 more we will have at least 100,000 units in which there will never be anyone living. I have made an investigation of this myself, I have the evidence, and I know what I am talking about. If anyone can show me how building empty houses is going to win this war I will support this appropriation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I have not the time to yield.

Mr. Speaker, this housing agency has between \$30,000,000 and \$40,000,000 in funds now with which to build houses. They do not need an additional appropriation at this time. Therefore I think that \$50,000,000 would be adequate. I have always thought that \$50,000,000 would be adequate to carry them over and do the job that is essential to the war effort.

I only had 20 minutes out of the entire time allowed in the consideration of the bill authorizing the pending appropriation. The proponents of the measure had 1 hour and 40 minutes. I had less than half enough time to present my case to the committee. Here I am and here we are today, Members of the House, put in the position of appropriating money for something few know anything about. You have not had a chance to hear anyone on the issue, you have heard only from a few people who have been advocating this appropriation. The opposition have had no chance whatever to present their case.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report will be voted down and that the conferees will be instructed to amend this particular section to \$50,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana that the evidence before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds shows that the family units are 91-percent occupied, and with reference to all the units, both family units and the units for single workers, they are 84-percent occupied. Of course, vacancies arise with reference to these single workers because many of them are taken out of their employment and put

into our military services. These vacancies do occur. They are temporary by reason of the fact that others come along to replace these men when they are taken into the service. But it is a fine record under all the circumstances to have 91 percent of the family units occupied and an over-all picture of 84 percent of them occupied.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement of my distinguished chairman. We have held a number of hearings in our committee on this piece of legislation. The records will show that, as he stated, 84 percent of these buildings are occupied.

I regret exceedingly that my distinguished friend and colleague from Indiana has taken the position he has. You recall that several days ago we debated this matter for 2 hours on the floor of the House, 1 hour assigned to the other side and 1 hour to our side. The gentleman from Indiana had 20 minutes of the 1 hour allotted to our side and the rest of us had 5 and 10 minutes apiece. This House then, by a majority vote, sustained the recommendation of the committee and against the recommendation of the gentleman from Indiana.

It is to be regretted that when we had our committee meeting yesterday our distinguished friend from Indiana, probably because of official business, was unable to attend, because at that committee meeting we ironed out a number of the objections that were brought up on the floor.

I sincerely trust that the House will this morning go along with the recommendation of the conferees and stand by their previous action, notwithstanding the objections of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed for the first time that this appropriation contains a certain amount of money for the completion of a dam known as the Mosquito Creek Dam in the Mahoning River, in the vicinity of Youngstown, Ohio. A good many of the people from Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania have felt that this dam, although it purports to be a flood-control project, is really in aid of a canal which they have been trying for some time to build from Youngstown to the Ohio River.

I, together with some of my colleagues on both sides of the House from Pennsylvania, have taken this matter up with various departments of the Federal Government. They assure us that this is really a bona fide dam. I am taking this time to say that if there is any attempt on the part of the people behind this project to use it in aid of this canal, which we feel to be unfair and uneconomic, we are being deceived at the present time, and will resist any further building which will be in aid of the canal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1938 this House authorized the construction of this dam. Two years ago, in 1941, the heads of a steel plant appeared before a Senate committee and testified that they were losing 4,000 tons of steel a month, 3 plants losing 12,000 tons a month, or 84,000 tons of steel a year. In the summertime this loss is due to low water, and in the wintertime they are losing this steel through high water.

We have a War Production Board down here which requires us to get priorities if we want to get a coffee grinder, but there are 84,000 tons of steel being lost for the want of a dam.

This dam should have been constructed long ago, at a cost of only \$4,000,000. This dam is to keep the steel plants going, to furnish the material and make everything that is necessary in winning the war. Even the railroad has admitted that this dam is no part of a canal. I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania was ever in the town of Youngstown, Ohio, yet he stands here and tells us something about what is going on down there, without knowing what is going on.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a matter of fact, I happen to have visited quite frequently the city which the gentleman has represented so well. The railroad companies are very much opposed to this particular dam, and only because they believe it is physically in aid of this canal. If it were a legitimate flood-control project and necessary to the gentleman's district, I would be the last person to oppose it. The only reason I am making this statement is that I want it to be made sure that we shall resist any attempt to use this dam in aid of this canal, which we feel to be unjust to the western Pennsylvania district.

Mr. KIRWAN. Senator GUFFEY had opposed this project, but when he found out that it was no part of a canal, he withdrew his objection. This is not only for my district, it is of aid to the Nation in the production of steel.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the housing item, together with the item for community facilities, has been reduced to \$150,000,000 in all. That is, \$50,000,000 for facilities and \$100,000,000 for housing.

There were no hearings anywhere indicating just what they wanted to do with the money. We are going a long way letting bureaucrats have \$150,000,000 without any hearings whatever to justify it. The only reason that anyone has for signing the conference report and going along with it is that probably they cannot do a great deal more than they need when they had a budget estimate for \$300,000,000 on one,

item, and, as I remember it, \$150,000,000 on another, making a total of \$450,000,000, and they are only getting \$150,000,000.

I just want to serve notice on this housing outfit that they cannot come in here and get me to sign another conference report without telling us what they are going to do with the money in detail. There is absolutely no justification in the record for the appropriation of a dollar. We are taking it on faith, making a cut on the basis of what they asked for originally by dividing it by 3. I do not like that way of doing business and I want these people to know that they will never get me to go along again without calling attention to it on the floor and fighting it and without giving us the detail and telling us what they want the money for.

There are several things in here that are quite liberal. On the other hand, they are what we had to yield to in connection with getting an agreement out of the Senate. When the Senate makes a business of increasing by tenfold what we send over to them, we always know there is considerable "velvet" in it. Those are the times that we have to watch and cut down just as much as we can. There are a great many amendments in disagreement that will require discussion later on, but for the time being I will not add anything further.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did your committee strike out the proposed item of \$20,000,000 as an appropriation under Senate 1130?

Mr. TABER. We did, because we had no authorization to carry any such thing. If we had wanted to, we could not put it in the conference report without making the conference report subject to a point of order, and we thought that no such thing as that should be considered without our first having legislative authority and hearing in detail as to what should be done.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the \$20,000,000 is dependent upon the passage of S. 1130, then?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I do not know anything about that. It is not in this bill and it is not dependent on anything now except the passage of the bill and future hearings before the Appropriations Committee as to need.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I bring to the attention of the gentleman from New York that the service contemplated by the proposed appropriation is carried out through the appropriation to which the gentleman referred, under the so-called Lanham Act, with reference to community facilities?

Mr. TABER. But it is being carried out in a very extravagant manner under

the direction of a woman by the name of Florence Kerr, who is moving people all around in it at enormously high salaries. I call especial attention to one case in New Orleans where they had a set-up that satisfied the locality and took care of everything for \$130,000. They only had one supervisor at \$350 a month. She moves in and boosts the cost to over \$500,000 and puts in seven or eight supervisors with one at the head at \$500 a month. That kind of business is something that requires considerable brakes.

Mr. LANHAM. They are asking for a great deal more than has been used by the Federal Works Agency for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. That may be.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to ask a question. With reference to this proposal of the Senate for this child-care program, do I not recall that at one time the gentleman from Missouri reported that in another bill provision was being made for the child-care program, for the children of mothers engaged in war industries?

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to answer that, that is provided for under title II of the so-called Lanham Act. Care is being taken of the children of the war mothers.

Mr. CASE. And is the gentleman satisfied that adequate care is being provided under that item?

Mr. LANHAM. I think insofar as it can be done at this time it is being done, and much less money has been spent for that purpose than is contemplated under this Senate proposal.

Mr. CASE. Then the action of the conferees on this bill is satisfactory at this time to the gentleman on this point?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 306; nays 30, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—306

Abernethy	Angell	Bell
Allen, La.	Arends	Bennett, Mo.
Andersen,	Arnold	Bishop
H. Carl	Auchincloss	Blackney
Anderson, Calif.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bloom
Anderson,	Bates, Ky.	Boiton
N. Mex.	Bates, Mass.	Bonner
Andresen,	Beall	Boren
August H.	Beckworth	Bradley, Pa.

Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Peterson, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Hobbs	Peterson, Ga.
Bryson	Hoch	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Hoeven	Philbin
Burchill, N. Y.	Holmes, Mass.	Pittenger
Burdick	Holmes, Wash.	Ploeser
Burgin	Hope	Poulson
Butler	Horan	Powers
Byrne	Howell	Price
Camp	Hull	Priest
Canfield	Jackson	Rabaut
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Ramspeck
Cannon, Mo.	Jeffrey	Randolph
Carson, Ohio	Jenkins	Rankin
Carter	Jennings	Reece, Tenn.
Case	Jensen	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Johnson,	Reed, N. Y.
Chapman	Calvin D.	Rees, Kans.
Chipherfield	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Church	Johnson,	Rivers
Clark	J. Leroy	Robertson
Clason	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Coffee	Luther A.	Robson, Ky.
Cole, Mo.	Johnson,	Rockwell
Cole, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Rogers, Pa.
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Calif.
Cooley	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Cooper	Judd	Rohrbough
Courtney	Kean	Rolph
Cravens	Kearney	Rowan
Creal	Kee	Satterfield
Crosser	Kelley	Sauthoff
Cullen	Kennedy	Scanlon
Cunningham	Keogh	Schiffler
Curtis	Kern	Schuetz
D'Alessandro	Kinzer	Schwabe
Davis	Kirwan	Scott
Day	Kleberg	Shafer
Dewey	Klein	Sheppard
Dickstein	Knutson	Short
Dilweg	Kunkel	Sikes
Dingell	Lambertson	Simpson, Ill.
Dirksen	Landis	Simpson, Pa.
Disney	Lane	Smith, Maine
Dondero	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Eaton	Lea	Smith, Wis.
Eberharter	LeCompte	Snyder
Elliott	LeFevre	Somers, N. Y.
Ellison, Md.	Lemke	Sparkman
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Spence
Elston, Ohio	Luce	Springer
Engel	Ludlow	Stanley
Feighan	Lynch	Starnes, Ala.
Fenton	McGehee	Stegall
Fernandez	McGregor	Stearns, N. H.
Fish	McKenzie	Stefan
Flannagan	McLean	Stewart
Fogarty	McMillan	Stockman
Folger	McMurray	Sullivan
Forand	Maas	Summers, Tex.
Fulbright	Madden	Sundstrom
Furlong	Mahon	Taber
Gale	Manasco	Talbot
Gamble	Mansfield,	Talle
Gathings	Mont.	Taylor
Gavagan	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Gavin	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, Tex.
Gearhart	Martin, Mass.	Thomason
Gerlach	Mason	Tibbott
Gibson	May	Towe
Gillette	Merritt	Voorhis, Calif.
Goodwin	Merrrow	Wadsworth
Gossett	Michener	Walter
Graham	Miller, Conn.	Ward
Granger	Miller, Mo.	Wasielewski
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel, Ohio
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Pa.	Weiss
Gregory	Mills	Welch
Griffiths	Monkiewicz	Wene
Gross	Morrison, La.	West
Gwynne	Mruk	Wheat
Hagen	Mundt	Whelchel, Ga.
Hall	Murdock	White
Leonard W.	Murphy	Whittington
Halleck	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Hancock	Myers	Wigglesworth
Hare	Newsome	Willey
Harless, Ariz.	Norrill	Winstead
Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hartley	O'Neal	Wolverton, N. J.
Hays	O'Toole	Woodruff, Mich.
Heffernan	Outland	Woodrum, Va.
Hendricks	Pace	Worley
Herter	Patman	Wright
Hess	Patton	Zimmerman

NAYS—30

Barrett	Clevenger	Hoffman
Bender	Compton	Johnson,
Brehm	Crawford	Anton J.
Buffett	Dworshak	Jones
Busbey	Ellis	LaFollette
Carlson, Kans.	Fellows	Lewis
Chenoweth	Heidinger	McCowan

McWilliams	Smith, Ohio	Wilson
Ramey	Vincent, Ky.	Winter
Rizly	Vorys, Ohio	
Rowe	Vursell	

NOT VOTING—94

Allen, Ill.	Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews	Gallagher	Mott
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Gilchrist	Norman
Barry	Gillie	Norton
Bennett, Mich.	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Bland	Gore	O'Connor
Boykin	Gorski	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Green	O'Konski
Brooks	Hale	O'Leary
Buckley	Hall,	Phillips
Burch, Va.	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Capozzoli	Harris, Ark.	Poage
Cochran	Harris, Va.	Pracht
Costello	Hébert	Russell
Cox	Hill	Sabath
Culkin	Holfield	Sadowski
Curley	Izac	Sasscer
Dawson	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Delaney	Keefe	Slaghter
Dies	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	Kilburn	Stevenson
Domengeaux	Kilday	Sumner, Ill.
Doughton	King	Tarver
Douglas	Larcade	Tolan
Drewry	McCord	Treadway
Durham	McCormack	Troutman
Elmer	McGranery	Van Zandt
Fay	Magnuson	Vinson, Ga.
Fisher	Maloney	Weaver
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Ford	Monroney	

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Holfield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
 Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Barry with Mr. Hill.
 Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Elmer.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Norman.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Phillips.
 Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gillie.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Hale.
 Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Keefe.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Troutman.
 Mr. Tarver with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Ditter.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Pracht.
 Mr. Curley with Mr. O'Hara.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. Gorski with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
 Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Andrews.
 Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Gilchrist.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8: On page 4, line 13, insert:

"OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

"OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

"The second paragraph under the caption 'Office of War Information,' contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not prevent the preparation and distribution to the public of the United States Government Manual."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Before the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following paragraph:

"OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

"The eighth proviso in the paragraph under the caption Office of Price Administration, contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not take effect until August 16, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are two items contained in this amendment. One relates to the continuation of the United States Government Manual under the Office of War Information, which would have to be discontinued under an amendment inserted in the war agencies appropriation bill.

The second provision relates to the inhibition under the Office of Price Administration which was adopted as a part of the war agencies appropriation bill, prohibiting the employment of employees without business experience. Under that bill the provision becomes effective immediately and obviously allows them no time for adjustment. The pending amendment gives them 45 days in which to make provision.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: Page 4, line 20, insert:

"WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

"National Youth Administration: Upon the application within 60 days of any State or State board of vocational education, or county or county board of education, any building, accessory, equipment, tools or machinery of any type heretofore in use by the National Youth Administration, and located in such State and county, shall be transferred by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department to any such applicant without compensation."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment, insert the following:

"WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

"National Youth Administration: For an additional amount for the National Youth Administration in the performance of its functions from July 1, 1943, to the date of enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, and thereafter for the liquidation of such administration, including not to exceed \$2,000 for printing and binding, not to exceed \$1,500,000 from the

unexpended balance of the appropriations for the National Youth Administration in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943, to be added to and merged with the funds made available for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration by such Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944; and of such merged amount not less than \$1,487,000 shall be allocated and set apart to be used exclusively for payment of accumulated and accrued leave of employees: *Provided*, That all real and personal property of the National Youth Administration is hereby declared surplus, and all equipment, materials, and supplies shall be assembled, inventoried, and turned over to the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, under Executive Order 9235 by the Administrator of the National Youth Administration as expeditiously as possible, and all real property shall be disposed of by the Commissioner of Public Buildings in accordance with the act of August 27, 1935 (40 U. S. C., 304 (a) and 304 (b)): *Provided further*, That under commitment to return such property to the United States at borrower's expense, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration in use on June 30, 1943, by any State or other public vocational education authority may continue to be so used during the period of the present war and for not to exceed 6 months after the termination thereof, without compensation, but in no event beyond the date such property ceases to be used for vocational education purposes: *Provided further*, That during such period the Director of Procurement, in the case of personal property, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings, in the case of real property, upon certificate of the United States Commissioner of Education that such property is to be used for vocational education and training, may loan, without compensation, to any State or other public vocational education authority, if applied for within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal agency or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph, if such borrower agrees, in the case of personal property, to pay all expenses incident to obtaining and returning such property."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be notified when I have consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For what purpose?

Mr. HOBBS. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield to the gentleman to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman has yielded to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri yielded to the gentleman from Alabama, but when the gentleman from Missouri heard for what purpose the gentleman from Alabama desired recognition he refused to yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri asked me for what purpose I desired recognition and I stated for the purpose of offering an amendment to the committee amendment, and he yielded to me after that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if I so stated it was through inadvertence as my purpose in preferring the unusual question as to the purpose for which the gentleman desired recognition was obviously to decline recognition for an amendment. Members in charge of bills are charged with the responsibility of protecting such bills from amendment. I could not yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama to offer an amendment, because I am not authorized to yield, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has voted to liquidate the National Youth Administration. That organization now has under its control \$55,000,000 worth of property in 1,700 different locations throughout the United States. The purpose of this amendment is to provide for the orderly and economical conservation and disposition of that property.

Speaking generally, the plan adopted under the legislation in disagreement between the two Houses and the plan determined upon by the conferees was to loan rather than grant, gratuitously, any of this property at this time to the public institution which were using it on June 30, to remain under their control for a period ending 6 months after the termination of the war or until it ceased to be used for vocational education. In other words, it is turned over to the schools now using it solely and exclusively for the purposes of vocational education and when it ceases to be so used it is to be returned at the expense of the borrowing agency.

Such of the property as is not being used on June 30, by public vocational educational institutions for that purpose is to be available to Government agencies, especially the Army and the Navy, who are to pay for it out of funds at their disposition. Other property which the Government agencies do not want and which is turned back by the educational institutions having it at this time can be loaned for the purpose of public vocational education and training to public vocational education authorities.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the conditions that have been described in this debate, and the pertinent questions that have been asked, show clearly the need of an appropriation of some money to enable the schools to avail themselves of the opportunity the pending amendment seeks to give them.

But also the need of teachers to take the places of those who have gone from their classrooms into the fighting forces or into war industries is perfectly apparent to all who know anything of the teacher shortage. Unless we are indifferent to the sad plight of our schools and colleges we must provide for the continuation of the educational program of the National Youth Administration, both to aid in the solution of the problem

of furnishing qualified teachers and the direct aid to the financially suffering schools and colleges whose enrollments have been cut so drastically by the war.

With these thoughts in mind, I sought to offer the amendment I shall read in concluding these remarks. You know how I was prevented from offering this amendment and was deprived of the chance even to have it read.

In order that you may know what it was, I now read it for your information and consideration.

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: After the Committee or House conferees' amendment, insert:

"Such unexpended balance, after the funds made available hereinabove shall have been deducted, the remainder shall be transferred and credited to the United States Office of Education for the continuation during the fiscal year 1943 of the war training and educational program in schools and colleges by virtue of the cooperation of National Youth Administration, plus such additional amount as may be necessary to increase such remainder to the sum of \$6,000,000, which additional amount is hereby appropriated and made available for such purpose."

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I promised to yield to the gentleman from Michigan to permit him to submit a request.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the other special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee.

Mr. ENGEL. As I understand it, this amendment does not postpone the date of liquidation as set in the bill passed some days ago, January 1, 1944.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. ENGEL. National Youth Administration must be liquidated by January 1, 1944.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes in order to answer the questions of the Members on their feet.

Mr. ENGEL. This million and a half additional is to pay for leaves and meet the pay roll from July 1 to the date of dispersal; is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. There is due in accrued leave and for operation from July 1 up to the date of the enactment of the regular annual bill in round figures about \$2,000,000. To meet these fixed obligations we earmarked a million and

a half of this fund as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Then the personal property which has been loaned to schools remains there for the duration of 6 months and they have the first priority.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Property in use on June 30 last by a public vocational school can continue to be loaned to that school for use for vocational-education purposes during the war and for not more than 6 months afterward. Government agencies have prior consideration for the rest of the property and after them public vocational-education authorities can be loaned this property for vocational education and training.

Mr. ENGEL. Then the war agencies have next priority; is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; they have priority to buy.

Mr. ENGEL. The vocational schools have priority as far as leasing the property is concerned until 6 months after the termination of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Provided it is to be used for vocational education.

Mr. ENGEL. The personal property is to be disposed of by the Procurement Division of the Treasury and the real property by the Public Buildings and Grounds Division; is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], a member of the committee.

Mr. RABAUT. The understanding I had when we were in committee yesterday was that these facilities would remain in the schools in which they are now located if they were used for vocational training. Under the language that has been suggested here, however, these facilities are only permitted to remain in the public schools. There are some private schools that have these facilities; there are some institutions, such as colleges, that have these facilities. I do not think it was the intention to deny such institutions in the language proposed yesterday in the committee.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Replying to the gentleman from Michigan who is interested in some of these schools, I think it was the belief of the committee that under this language the public authorities would designate such schools as needed this equipment and should be operated, even private schools. And they would be entitled to the use of this property provided they carried on the program as it had been carried on prior to this time. In other words, it does not mean that the public agency could not have a designee, a private agency, who could operate it by authority from that public agency. The wisdom of allowing a law to be passed under which Government property would be turned over to some

private individual or group, is doubtful in my opinion. It should go through some governmental agency of the State, county, or the city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 3 additional minutes to reply to the gentleman's questions.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it the chairman's understanding of this bill that this property that is in private institutions now is to be taken out immediately whether they are using it or not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have consulted the clerk to the committee and I am advised that we adopted the provision in the Senate amendment which limits it to public institutions.

Mr. RABAUT. Would private institutions be permitted to use it, or will it be taken away from them? If it is, the bill is discriminatory.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am advised that the Senate language limits it to public institutions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. A part of my question has been answered. I am anxious that this N. Y. A. material be made available to our public schools to the greatest possible extent for war training. Do I understand now that this equipment is loaned to public institutions and no rental charges are made?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no rental charge. The only requirement is that they return it at their own expense at the conclusion of the period for which it is loaned.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman tell me what becomes of the facilities that are not in schools but have been operated wholly by the National Youth Administration? Can they be turned over to the public-school bodies?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It goes to such Government agencies as request it, notably the Army and Navy which must pay for it out of the funds allotted to them. If Government agencies do not want it the public institutions can request a loan of it for vocational education and training and if no one wants it, it can be sold as surplus.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Why should not public schools in a case like that be allowed to take over these facilities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The purpose of this is to leave it in the public schools where it is retained without cost or charge as long as it is used for vocational education up until 6 months after the war when final disposition can be made of it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If I may say to the chairman, I have in my district a very large facility of the National Youth Administration being used to train war workers for a bomber plant. It is going

to be shut down. Why cannot the county schools take it over and operate it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have absolute authority to loan it to carry on that work as long as it is used for vocational education, if not needed by some Federal agency.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Provided the county board of that county asks for the transfer?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In view of the confusion we have had, I think it comes about by a lot of Members asking questions that no one can hear because they are not by the microphone. I suggest if anyone wants to ask a question of someone else that they go to the microphone where they can be heard.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point is well taken, and I concur in the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have the same problem in my district that the gentleman from Georgia who has just interrogated the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The situation is that this N. Y. A. facility has been operated by the N. Y. A. making goods for war purposes for the Army and Navy, doing it in property owned by the school board. The school board has furnished the property. Now, that is closed down. It is not clear to me, and I do not think it is clear to the gentleman from Georgia, that the language of the conference report is clear enough to take care of that situation so the property may be retained there. My suggestion to the chairman is this: Can we not have that language a little bit more specific so there will be no question about it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The language specifically applies to precisely that situation. If there is no requisition from the Army or Navy, it can and will be loaned for that purpose upon request of the school.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman tell us just how it does so, so that there may be no misunderstanding about that? Will he do that in his extension of remarks?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the educational board makes application for it, it will be loaned if it is to be used for vocational education purposes.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire with regard to the dis-

mantling of some of the facilities already in existence. I am informed that some well-regulated and productive institutions have already been taken down and the machinery has been stored. I am also told by the superintendent of schools of the city of Detroit that they are reluctant to have to apply to the State board or to anyone else, and he insists that they should have the right to take over existing facilities and to make their application direct and that they should be protected in this regard.

Mr. TABER. They would be allowed to under this language.

Mr. DINGELL. Well, I will accept that, but I would like to have the Chairman make that specific so there will be no misunderstanding.

May I say with regard to the general use of this machinery, that there are many institutions, not necessarily public schools, but private schools and other schools under N. Y. A. that have been teaching and doing a very creditable piece of work. They should not now be disturbed. All these should have the same privilege until 6 months after the war. I do not think there should be any partiality shown because it is an emergent question and it requires the training of the greatest possible number, particularly in such localities as the city of Detroit. I would like to have some assurance from the Chairman that private and public schools and such institutions as have been training the youth for war work will have the privilege of using this machinery and that meantime the N. Y. A. discontinue dismantling these plants until full and final disposition is made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I understand the gentleman's interest in the dismantling of these plants, but Congress has spoken, Congress has ordered N. Y. A. liquidated, the Congress has determined that these plants, regardless of the work they are doing or how essential or how valuable they are, shall be discontinued, and we have no alternative but to follow the direction of the Congress.

As to this surplus material, some of the machinery and equipment is exceedingly valuable and in great demand. The Army and Navy are crying for it right now. Under the pending amendment, after public educational institutions now using this equipment have been cared for, the remaining surplus material is subject to disposition to Government agencies and the Government agencies, such as the Army and Navy, have priority.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman advise the House whether or not any provision has been made whereby after the Army and the Navy have exercised their priority in the selection of such machinery as they may need, either a private school or a public school has the right to buy this machinery and use it where it now is?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the language of the Senate amendment and under the revision adopted in conference, after the public schools which now have this equipment have been provided for and the agencies of the Government have exercised their priority, then the remaining surplus can be loaned to any public institution provided it uses the equipment for vocational education.

Mr. DONDERO. Could they buy it in order that they would own that machinery, and leave it there?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in order to yield for a question, I shall take 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the chairman of the committee to yield that I might be able to make a brief but, I trust, appropriate observation with reference to the "funeral arrangements" that the committee has made concerning the remains of the late National Youth Administration.

The spectacle that we have witnessed for the past several minutes of many Members standing on the floor of this House demanding to know what is going to happen to their particular N. Y. A. projects is exactly what I anticipated would happen. I predict there is going to be still more confusion and embarrassment when Members return home, especially to Members who voted to kill the N. Y. A. on the theory that it was not contributing anything to the war effort. I am gratified, of course, to learn that some Members who were bitter in their criticism and denunciation of that organization have finally discovered that they have, or had, one or more projects in their own districts that were vitally important to the war effort. Frankly, their complaints now about closing down their projects come mighty late.

It is also interesting and very significant to see that many of the inquiries, complaints, and criticisms against the deficiency committee as to the manner in which the N. Y. A. is to be liquidated, come from those who apparently did not know that they had an N. Y. A. project a few days ago, or else from those who insisted that it was rendering no appreciable benefit in training young people for the vital war industries.

When you return to your districts within a few days there is going to be a sign on the doors of most of those splendid, well-equipped N. Y. A. shops, 1,500 in all, "Closed for the duration." Regardless of the language of this amendment, there is nothing that the committee can now do except to liquidate that organization.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, the RECORD will show that I opposed to the end the closing of these N. Y. A. shops that have carried on such an outstanding, con-

structive, and worth-while training program for the young men and young women of America.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In reading over the language of the proposed amendment, I notice it carries the words "any other Federal agency." It would occur to me that a fair interpretation of that might be that any Federal agency would have priority over any State or county agency. I refer particularly to the language toward the conclusion of the amendment which reads, in part:

Any real or personal property of the National Youth Administration not required by any other Federal agency or otherwise loaned under the authority of this paragraph.

Would that not mean in effect that the United States Office of Education would have a priority over any State educational set-up?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. After the public educational institutions which now have the material have been provided with what they require, the Federal agencies then have priority as the gentleman has indicated, and they can secure this material on application if they pay for it. Upon payment it is theirs and they may use it for their own purposes.

Mr. CASE. The part of the amendment to which I have referred deals with the loaning of this property and the returning of it, if the borrower agrees to pay the expenses.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The loaning is exclusively for vocational educational purposes, but when no longer required for that purpose any Federal agency in the exercise of its right of priority can buy it and use it as it deems best.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, when the committee considered this matter the intention was very clear as to what was to be done. Certainly the language is meant to carry out these ideas. The intention of the conferees was simply this. Since the liquidation of N. Y. A. had been ordered, we did not wish that there be a complete waste and disuse of the material, with which they have worked, consequently we attempted to draft an amendment which would carry that desire into effect. Under the law, the Army, Navy, and Government departments have first call on surplus property. This right remains under this amendment. We did not touch that. But in the event that it is not called for by these Government agencies, the intention of the conferees was to make it possible for those schools to be operated, should any public agency want them to be operated, by making application to the proper authorities. Any material which was needed by the public authorities could be turned over to a public

agency, school district, city district, or any other public agency, and the property would be turned over to it by way of a loan until 6 months after the war ends. That was the intention.

It was further intended that where these schools were being operated by some private group, since this is the Federal Government's property it would be turned over upon application to the State or some subdistricts, and they in turn could designate some private agency to go ahead about as they had before.

The whole proposition meant to be covered by this amendment is the full utilization of the existing N. Y. A. school facilities by application on the part of a public body and also by designation by that body to some private institution where they had been operating that way in the past. That is my understanding of the intent of this amendment and I believe the amendment carries that into effect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, along with many other Members of this House, voted in favor of the continuation of the National Youth Administration because I felt that every single facility we had for use in the war-training program would be necessary and should be used. It seems to me that this discussion today indicates that that is true, and that these facilities are going to be made available to these various school agencies.

I should like to ask the chairman this question, if I may. We have been talking about making these facilities available to the various schools and agencies in order to use them for war training. The question that is bothering me is: Where are these schools going to get the funds necessary to employ the personnel for the operation of these training facilities? Has the committee provided additional funds to take care of that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The proposition here is to dispose of surplus material. We have nothing to do with the operation.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The War Department and the Navy Department have training schools in which they are furnishing instructors for persons in the Army and the Navy. They could use this material. The Office of Education has \$90,000,000

to be used in training men for industry, and they have instructors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the \$90,000,000 is a reduction of the amount budgeted. No one is more anxious than I am to see this amendment adopted making possible the transfer of this equipment to the educational agencies. I think our war effort demands that it be used to the fullest. But I fear that with the reduced appropriations for vocational education we may be doing a futile thing. We are certainly imposing an added responsibility upon our educational agencies in that we are asking them to take over some of the training work formerly done by N. Y. A. The schools will do that job to the best of their ability, but we should have voted increased appropriations to make that possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under the terms of this motion "the property shall be turned over to any other Federal agency," the National Youth Administration having been created by Executive order, could not the President create another agency by Executive order and use the funds he now has on hand and have this property turned over to that agency, under that term "any other Federal agency"?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no provision under which this could be used for that purpose.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman in addition to yielding me 1 minute also yield for the purpose of offering an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman defer that for the present?

Mr. HOBBS. Very well.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record on the question of the bill, S. 35, the silver bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, as I read the latter part of this motion made by the gentleman from Missouri it will not take care of such situations as the one in which I am interested, where the N. Y. A. is operating a training center on property owned by one of the counties in my district, in buildings owned by that county. There is no provision made in this motion to let that county continue to operate that training center.

Right near the city of Atlanta we have a bomber-assembly plant which will employ 29,000 people. It is just getting

ready to go into production. They need to train many workers there. It seems to me it does not make sense to pass a motion of this sort, which will not give that county an opportunity to take its own funds and operate this machinery for the purpose of training people in that community to work in a war plant. Therefore I am not going to support the motion unless it is amended. I hope the House will vote it down so that it can go back to conference and they can write it so that it will be workable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is mistaken in his interpretation of this amendment. I know it is the intention of this committee, and the chief clerk, who has been with the committee many years and who is conceded to be an expert, advises that the language is broad enough to include such a situation as the gentleman describes. Certainly it is the avowed intention of the committee that it shall. I might say that I have a similar situation in my own district, where there is a modern up-to-date N. Y. A. shop that has been training approximately 200 young men and women for work in war industries. I raised this same question at the time the committee was trying to agree on the language and was assured then that the language is sufficiently broad to include a project of this kind.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If I understand the language, the property must be first offered to other agencies of the Government before the county authorities have any chance to take it over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, on the theory that the armed forces, if they need these facilities, must have first call. I believe that is the intention of the membership of this House to use these facilities for the war effort if it is possible to do so. Then if no war agency wants it, let the city, town, or county public-school system take it over and operate it if it can find a way to pay the trained personnel to do so. Of course, such an arrangement may not be satisfactory in many instances, but it seems to be the best arrangement that can be made under the present circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], chairman of the subcommittee which originally had charge of this legislation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I shall direct my remarks primarily to the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], because I am interested in projects or proposals similar to the one he has referred to and have reached a conclusion somewhat different to that expressed by him. The amendment provides that

all property of the National Youth Administration is declared surplus by this act and that all equipment, materials and supplies shall be inventoried and turned over to the Director of Procurement in the Treasury Department to be disposed of according to the act of August 27, 1935; it provides further that, under certain conditions, all such property may be loaned to a State or other vocational educational authority to be used for educational purposes within the State and county where located during the remainder of the war and 6 months thereafter, provided that application is made by a State or other vocational educational authority within 90 days after the passage of this bill, provided such property is not required by any other Federal agency, such as the War Department or the Navy Department, both of which have been and are still engaged in giving young men and women training similar to or corresponding to that formerly given by the National Youth Administration and the United States Office of Education.

My understanding is, therefore, that the Army and Navy shall first be entitled to these properties, as provided under existing law, and after that the United States Office of Education may be entitled to such properties if it can be used in its vocational educational program. Therefore, a State, or State vocational educational board, or a county vocational educational board will have a right, through the United States Office of Education, to make a requisition for these properties and will be entitled to same in case a requisition is not first made by the War Department or the Navy Department.

I am sure the gentleman from Georgia has in his county and his State a vocational educational board, either of which may be classed as "another governmental agency" and would be entitled to this material, equipment, and so forth, for use in their vocational schools. This is my interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The Lanham Act does not provide any money for vocational training, and that is where they get the money from.

Mr. HARE. Oh, no; I think my colleague is mistaken, for we passed a bill only a few days ago carrying an appropriation of \$90,000,000 in the way of grants to the States for use in the vocational-education program of defense workers. Under the proposed amendment the United States Office of Education, a State or county vocational education board may file application for the buildings, equipment, materials, and so forth, of the N. Y. A. and use it during this emergency and 6 months thereafter without compensation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] 4 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can clear this situation up or not, but I intend to try.

The authority given here to turn things over to other Federal agencies has to be construed as limited to those agencies that would have funds available to pay for the stuff. Nothing can be turned over to any agency that does not have the money to pay for the stuff, and they have to get the money by securing an appropriation. The only agencies that would have the money would be the Army and the Navy. That is the situation exactly as it stands.

The committee wants to make available to any State vocational school or any local school in a school district, whatever it might be called, the material and machinery that the N. Y. A. has so that it could be put to use.

Frankly, should the Army and the Navy need it for factories that they are directly or indirectly operating, that is what it ought to be used for. There are a lot of factories that could use this material to very good advantage. Frankly, I am not sure but what we would be better off if the stuff was sold to the factories, but there seems to be a very considerable sentiment that the vocational schools, where they are in need of this machinery, might have the opportunity to use it, and that is what we provided.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In just a moment. It is absolutely impossible to allocate any of the President's funds for such a function as the N. Y. A. under the limitations that have been set up; it is absolutely impossible for the Department of Education to go ahead and do anything of this kind for the funds that have been appropriated to them are for allocation to the State schools and the State commissioner of education could not go ahead with funds that have been allocated to him.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, we all know that if the Army and the Navy really need this material and want it they can get it anyway.

Mr. TABER. They will get it, if they want to make use of it, and they ought to.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the title to the buildings and the equipment that is a part of the buildings generally is in the local community, in many instances, where it has been used for vocational education, where they have used both the buildings and the machinery?

Mr. TABER. Well, that is true to a very large extent.

Of course, the N. Y. A. activities were so far beyond anything that many of us imagined, such as conducting model dairy farms with bureaucratic cattle and all that sort of thing, that it is almost impossible to conceive of the activities and the extent of the activities in which they were engaged. The thing ought to be liquidated and sold immediately.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fair construction that the priorities that the Federal agencies will have is limited to purchases, and that the availability of the property to the States and local communities is limited to borrowing for the duration of the war, and that the property neither sold nor loaned will remain in the custody of Treasury Procurement, if personal property, and of the Public Buildings Commissioner if real property?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, except that the property neither sold to other Government agencies or loaned, will under the rules, be sold to the public.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 147, noes 37.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: On page 13, line 6, insert "Department of Agriculture."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be passed over until after we dispose of No. 26, inasmuch as they relate to the same subject matter.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: Page 13, line 7, insert:

"FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

"Administrative and operating expenses: For an additional amount for operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1933, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501-1518; 55 Stat. 255-256), fiscal year 1944, \$4,318,748, and the proviso contained under this caption in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House adhere to its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 and concur in the same.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not make exactly the same speech that I have

made on at least five occasions with reference to this crop-insurance program, but I do want to advise the House of the position taken by the farm leaders of America: First, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, advises us to "retain the crop-insurance program for wheat and cotton until further trial of this program can be made." He says further, "I think it will succeed."

Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, says this:

Our established crop-insurance program should be retained. We are just really getting started.

Mr. Robert Handschin, regional secretary of the National Farmers Union, says this:

The feed and food supply of our Nation for 1944 can be irreparably damaged if crop insurance is denied on winter wheat to be planted soon and Congress should recess until after Labor Day.

Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange—and I believe everybody will admit that the National Grange is a very conservative farm organization and that Mr. Albert Goss is a very able man and is very familiar with the problems of agriculture. He says this:

The need for a workable plan of crop insurance has long been apparent. We believe the plan should be continued and this program gradually broadened as experience justifies.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And may I add this, that as I understand it today, the Government is helping to carry the crops of those farmers who plant crops essential to the war effort, such as hemp, soybeans, and other oil-yielding crops.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to call attention to the fact that the Senate of the United States has insisted upon continuing this crop-insurance program. The Senate has had several record votes on it and on each occasion has gone on record as favoring a continuance of the program. It seems to me that when all of the farm leaders—and Mr. Edward O'Neal has been championed on many occasions by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Missouri—insist on this program, that in this emergency we should not hesitate to renew the program which was certainly initiated and devised in the interest of the farmers. If we fail to renew the program, how can we return to our districts and look our constituents in the face and explain to them why we wrecked the program which was inaugurated just a year or so ago in their behalf?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Does not the gentleman believe it highly significant that a dole is included in this bill, something against which some of us have been inveighing for a long time?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I think it is very significant.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the crop-insurance program, while it may not have worked as well in the short period of time in which it has been in operation as some people had hoped it would, that it does go a great way in helping solve the agricultural problem.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HARE. We are now considering \$15,000,000 for relief for agriculture. If these farmers had been encouraged and permitted to take insurance, this appropriation would not be necessary. The amount that we are losing on insurance today is not half of \$15,000,000. If we continue the policy of giving relief to farmers whose crops are destroyed by flood, by rain, by hurricane, and so forth, it will cost us not \$15,000,000 but from twenty to fifty millions.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. He is entirely correct. Do the Members of this House whose constituents have entered into these insurance agreements realize what the situation is? What will the gentleman from Missouri say to his farmers? Or gentlemen from the great State of Nebraska have to say to the 67,000 Nebraska wheat farmers who have contracts with this Corporation? Or the gentlemen from the State of Kansas, where 42,000 wheat farmers have made similar contracts? Or gentlemen from the State of Ohio, where 40,000 farmers have insurance contracts?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true, too, that the contracts that are now out were written on a 3-year basis and those farmers took them with the understanding there was protection for 3 years?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct; and although the contract contained an escape clause, everyone knows that the farmers signed those contracts in good faith, believing that the Government would carry out its part of the contract and continue this Corporation for at least 3 years.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us where we will get the money to pay all these losses?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I can tell the gentleman that. In this program the wheat farmers of the country have themselves contributed \$35,000,000 to a total loss of \$55,000,000 which otherwise

would have been provided perhaps in relief funds.

Mr. GAVIN. The American taxpayer has got to get relief somewhere. We should stop some of these losses.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. To the gentleman who just spoke about relief for the taxpayers, will he listen?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We have been paying over a 10-year period \$65,000,000 for relief to agriculture. That has come out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

Mr. GAVIN. A great many of them in my State, 11,000,000 people, too.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If you are concerned with getting away from the problem of public taxation, why do you not let us work out a program here, and give us time, so that the farmers can carry this relief and relieve your taxpayers of that burden? If you want to do that you ought to come and join us.

Mr. GAVIN. Why do you not work out a program where we will break even instead of having these losses?

Mr. COOLEY. It would be absolutely unreasonable to expect any set of administrators to devise an actuarially sound program in the short period of time that this Corporation has operated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for 5 successive years we have tried this experiment and each year the losses to the Government have been astronomical. Every year they have said, "Give us 1 more year and we will make it self-sustaining." Each time we have given them 1 more year and each year the losses mount.

Let me give you a little personal experience. The first year crop insurance was introduced I insured my own wheat because I thought I ought to have some personal acquaintance with all services provided for agriculture. At the end of the season I found I had lost money by insuring. In my district, which is a wheat district, and in which every farmer who cultivates his land includes wheat in his rotation, a large number insured and they all lost money. Here is the distinction. On land on which you are going to make a crop 4 years out of 5 insurance involves a loss but in the marginal areas where you are sure of losing the crop 2 years out of 3, it is a profitable investment because you can go ahead and plant and you know you are going to collect either from the Government or the crop. Usually it is the Government that pays. That means that in the marginal areas the farmers who insure are betting on a sure thing. In my congressional district where many farmers took insurance the first year I have not had a single request for continuance of insurance or a single letter about insurance for 3 years.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I have not had a farmer in 13 counties write me and ask me for this since the agitation has been on.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman's district is partly in the Missouri River Valley. Crops have been utterly destroyed there. The wheat crops are gone. If there ever was a time when crop insurance was justified, it is under the conditions that obtain in your very congressional district, or a part of your district this year, and if we are ever going to help these farmers in times of distress, when we have insect infestation, when we have drought, when we have floods such as we had this year, crop insurance is the program, if you will give it a sufficient time to be worked out. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that no life-insurance company was ever able to get on a paying basis except after a long period of time and the expenditure of a lot of money. Why do you not give the farmers of America a chance to carry their own relief?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Missouri, for whom I have a deep personal affection, seems in this instance to know more about our farmers than they know themselves. In those areas the land is good and where we lose a crop 1 year out of 5 it does not pay to insure. If it paid the farmers to insure they would insure, but whereas a very large number insured when crop insurance was first initiated, the number has steadily declined. That is conclusive proof of the attitude of the farmers themselves.

And there is not a single taxpayer in the State in the gentleman's district or out of it that favors paying these enormous losses every year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman from Missouri has touched the sore spot on all of this insurance. In the areas where it is customary to have crop failures about 4 out of every 5 years, they need the insurance, and there is also where the yield is small when they do have a crop, but the premiums in those areas are so high that it takes about half of the average yield to pay the premium and to cover the cost of the insurance. In the other areas—like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]—where you had a flood this year, you may not have another destruction of crops there in 30 years.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In conclusion, this matter has been before the House repeatedly. Every time it has been before the House it has been voted down. It has been voted down on standing votes, on teller votes, and on yeand-nay votes. It has been voted down because it is an unconscionable charge

against the Treasury. The taxpayers are opposed to it because they object to being saddled with this recurring deficit every year, and because the farmers themselves do not use it, because it does not pay on good land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not yield upon this amendment. The House has taken this position many times. The Senate itself yielded on this item by a very substantial majority when the agriculture appropriation bill was under consideration.

There is a large expense to this program and it is being availed of by fewer and fewer of the wheat farmers where it has been tried year after year. What is the use of going on with something that does not develop into a useful activity for the people?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lack of information and erroneous information which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee made manifest in his statement, and which the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] aided in spreading, I must call your attention to a primary fact upon which the crop-insurance program stands, and has operated from the beginning.

Crop insurance does not insure dollar for dollar. It does not insure crop for crop. It insures 75 percent of the average crop over a period of years, actuarially established. Many farmers cannot get crop insurance because they do not have sufficiently adequate records to show over a period of 5 years what the crops have been. Therefore it is utterly impossible for any farmer who has had a crop failure "2 out of 3 years" to get any insurance at all. He could not afford to pay the premium for so little insurance—75 percent of his average annual crop on a 5-year basis. No such insurance policy has been written. The crop-insurance program is for the purpose of aiding those who wish to establish at their own expense, without cost to the Government over a 10-year period and beyond, a stable economy for agriculture by guaranteeing up to 75 percent of their average annual crops for 5 years, when and if they should have one crop failure.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to yield for a question.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman had a business that was losing \$44,000,000 a year, would he continue it?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly would if I could afford it, and was sure it would pan out within a reasonable time. You may laugh if you please, but that shows to my mind the temper of this House. They are running a steam roller over everybody who is in disagreement with the Committee on Appropriations. Every time the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] laughs—and he is one of the finest Members of this House—he

wants everybody else to duck and hide and not come out of their storm cellars until he has worked his will.

I say that a business like crop insurance if it had sustained a loss of \$44,000,000 a year, and that supposition is according to your estimate which is not true, ought to be continued at least during the 10-year test period to show that it will come out of its doldrums just as life insurance and every other kind of insurance did. But the \$44,000,000 the gentleman from Pennsylvania talks about is not the loss per year, but for the first 4 years. That shows how little the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] knows about the business record of crop insurance.

I call your attention to the fact that what I prophesied the other day in my argument for crop-insurance continuation is happening right under our noses. The very next amendment following this one, on page 13, is a provision to give free gratis and for nothing to the flood sufferers out yonder on the Mississippi and Missouri and other rivers \$15,000,000. In other words, we will not allow the constituents of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to insure themselves against loss—we give them this money, a \$15,000,000 dole. When such gratuities are thus advocated, and this one has been approved by the Senate, why should farmers buy insurance against crop failure or destruction? Why should farmers pay premiums for that which Congress may give them for nothing? There is this dole handed out here in the very next amendment, and the gentleman from Missouri says the farmers of Missouri do not want crop insurance. Do they expect a dole? They, and all others, may well do so if we kill crop insurance.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I want to correct one erroneous impression. We have not lost \$44,000,000 a year.

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly not. That has been the total cost of both losses and operations for the whole 4 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise amendment reducing the amount from \$7,000,000 to \$4,000,000.

Perhaps I can consume my time best by explaining this matter to some of you who seem to misunderstand completely the insurance program. The gentleman from Missouri said the insurance is now being used only on the marginal farms which have never produced a crop. That cannot possibly be true because no marginal farmer can pay the premiums.

This insurance on crops is issued exactly like the insurance on your life, on experience. Two farms in the same neighborhood have different rates. They get your production for the last 10 to 20 years as the figures are available, and your premium is fixed on the basis of the experience of that farm. No marginal farm which has suffered repeated crop failures can afford to pay the premiums. If you have made good crops in

the years past, you have a low premium. If you have had poor crops you have a high premium. The program itself denies the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

If you are in a few moments, under the next amendment, going to give to the constituency of the gentleman from Missouri \$15,000,000, as a pure hand-out, after the Farm Security Administration has already been there and given millions to the farmers in the form of grants, after you last week voted \$10,000,000 for the same group to rebuild their roads and their dikes—if we can spend that much money for those unfortunate farmers—what is wrong with appropriating approximately 25 percent of that amount in order that the other farmers of this Nation may have the opportunity to insure themselves against these hazards? Shall the Congress adopt a policy today, "No, we are not going to permit the farmers to pay premiums to insure themselves, but we are going to wait until a disaster comes and then appropriate millions and millions as a gift"? I beg you not to put yourselves and not to put this Congress in the position of adopting any such policy at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there ought to be a time somewhere down the line when we finally settle an issue.

Now, let us trace the history of this thing for a few minutes. This House has deliberately debated and considered and voted against crop insurance, not once, not twice, but a number of times—five times, I am told. The matter was considered by the Agriculture Committee. It was brought into the House by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TAVER]. It was voted out of the bill after debate, after heated debate; it was reinserted by the Senate; it was brought back here any number of times and considered by this House, and those gentlemen who have spoken about it today have stated their case, and time after time this House has voted overwhelmingly against it. The last vote taken on it in the agricultural bill, a very unusual procedure, was to adhere to our disagreement to it, which meant that if the Senate did not recede the bill would be killed; and the Senate receded. Notwithstanding that fact, and notwithstanding the repeated disapproval expressed by this House, they reinsert it in this deficiency bill, and here it is back again today.

Now, I do not know too much about crop insurance. I do know that the evidence has shown us everytime we have had it under consideration that it has been a colossal loss, and that it threatens to be even a larger loss to the Public Treasury; that it has not demonstrated it is any real help to the farmers, but many, many leaders of farm organizations have spoken against it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield to correct a misstatement?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will say the losses have increased in the wheat program every year it has been tried, and that was the evidence before your committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The losses have increased?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No. The cost of this program has increased from year to year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think last year the loss was about \$45,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no. The loss over the entire program has only been \$44,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I base my appeal to this House on this fact: We have passed on this time and time again, and the House has settled the issue, and I do not believe we should reopen it now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let us break this problem down a little bit and see what it is like. There will be no controversy about the figures, because here is a 1,800-page record before me, which is the record of the Crop Insurance Corporation itself.

In 1939 on wheat alone the farmers paid in three and four-tenths million in premiums. The Government paid in four and one-half million, in the form of expenses, making a total of just a little short of eight million. That is the contribution of the farmer and the Government—\$8,000,000. And how much did the farmer get? He got five and six-tenths million out of eight million that was contributed.

In 1940 the farmer paid in a little over nine million in premiums. The Government paid in five and three-fourths million in expenses, making a total of \$14,800,000. How much did the farmer get? It cost us \$14,800,000 to give the farmer about \$13,800,000.

In 1941 the farmer paid in in premiums \$7,000,000. The Government put in five and one-fifth million in expenses, making a total of twelve and two-tenths million dollars. How much did the farmer get? He got \$14,000,000 in indemnities, but it cost us twelve and two-tenths million to give it to him.

In 1942 the farmer paid in eight and four-tenths million in premiums. The Government paid seven and nine-tenths million in expenses, making a total of \$16,300,000 that the farmer and the Government made in premiums, contributions, and administrative expenses. How much did the farmer get? A little over \$12,000,000. It cost us \$16,300,000 to give the farmers only \$12,000,000.

Now, here is about the way it works out: There is no controversy about the figures. These are the record figures. Let us assume that you are going to give every farmer \$2.12. Then you say, "Now, Mr. Farmer, before we do so we are going to take a premium from you and then we are going to add some expenses, so that in order to give you \$1.12 of the \$2.12 it is going to cost us \$1 to give it

to you." It cost \$1.12 either from the farmer or out of the Federal Treasury for every dollar that the farmer got. Is there any rhyme or reason or sense to that? For every dollar returned to the farmer, we collected 62 cents in premiums from him and added 50 cents in administrative expenses. Thus, it cost \$1.12 in premiums or expenses for each \$1 received by the farmer.

It is now stated that in another section of this bill provision is made for a dole. Let me ask those gentlemen who have raised that question, When there are only 970,000 cotton-insurance contracts, what are you going to do with the other eight and one-half million cotton farmers who did not take out any insurance?

What about them? Does that dispose of this dole question? It does not. When you talk about wheat, when you talk about the wheat farmer, about 450,000 or 500,000 of those who were disposed to take out crop insurance, do you think they are going to escape the dole if this is going to be put on a dole basis? What of the other thousands of wheat farmers who have not participated in the program?

When we are talking about this flood matter, we are dealing with a wholly emergent situation that arises once in a long time, and yet they want to hold that up by way of an emergency as against a permanent program that has resulted in a loss of \$41,000,000 in four years on one commodity alone and a loss of \$1,550,000 on cotton for the first year it was insured.

The gentleman from North Carolina referred to Mr. Handschin, the legislative representative of the Farmers' Union, and who appeared for more than an hour before our committee. He is for crop insurance; he is for extending the plan; he favors extending it to corn; he is for extending it to a great many other commodities, so that the losses might be infinitely greater to the taxpayers of this country every year on the basis of present operations. He is the same Mr. Handschin who, when he testified before the committee, said that he believed in an unchallenged Federal control of all agriculture. Yes; he is for crop insurance; he is for something more; he is for complete domination of every farmer in the land by the Federal Government and for extension of the whole control program. So, when they cite this gentleman as a witness, let us take him as a witness in his full capacity, his full record on every phase of the agricultural program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman also advise the House, in his discussion, concerning the viewpoint of Albert S. Goss, who said that he was in favor of crop insurance and of extending this program as experience justifies?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. And also Mr. Edward O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Mr. Goss has never spoken to me about the crop insurance. I have seen Mr. O'Neal on some occasions, and he has never stated to me personally or over the telephone, or in any other manner that I modify my position on crop insurance, and yet he knows that I have been rather active in the liquidation of this agency that has lost money ever since it started operating.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House has voted this down repeatedly, and the Senate finally receded, and it was taken out of the agricultural appropriation bill. It is back now, because Members of the other body who are interested in this matter have hooked it onto the deficiency appropriation bill. Since the Senate has already receded on this item, why should it not recede again if it expects to pursue a logical and consistent course?

The House should vote down the preferential motion of the gentleman from North Carolina and should stand by the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to adhere to our position and not recede from the position we have consistently taken by an overwhelming majority at least four times in this body.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 52, noes 123.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: Page 13, line 15, insert "That in order to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities of any existing agency or bureau to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations, and for that purpose there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$15,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, is amendment 25 or 26 up now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the House is now considering amendment 26.

Mr. TABER. And the motion before the House is that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is that the House adhere to its disagreement to amendment No. 26.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, no man in this body has rendered more effective service in behalf of flood damages and flood sufferers than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is the gentleman in favor of the motion or opposed to the motion?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am in favor of the motion, but I want to make a statement with the gentleman's permission in support of the motion he has made. I should like to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I know of the profound interest of my devoted friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in behalf of flood damage and flood sufferers of his and other districts. He is to be commended upon the motion he has made. I trust that neither the Senate amendment or any similar substitute will be brought back to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the Senate is wholly unnecessary and would establish an unwise precedent. It would provide for doles for the first time for flood or other similar sufferers. Heretofore Congress has provided in cases of flood or drought loans, but Congress has provided for security on crops or livestock or equipment, and now in the war as in peace the Farm Security Administration under the supervision of the War Food Administration is authorized to make loans to flood sufferers to buy livestock and is authorized to make grants. The Senate amendment was certainly not carefully considered. The language is unusual in an appropriation bill. It concludes as follows, and I quote from the Senate amendment:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$15,000,000.

Congress has heretofore made provision for earthquake sufferers. They provided, however, that the loans should be secured. In 1933 Congress passed a bill for the relief of earthquake sufferers in California.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be glad to yield, as soon as I finish my statement.

In 1934 Congress made provision for disaster loans for flood and other sufferers, but security was required. Disaster loans were authorized and provided for flood damages and rehabilitation in 1935 and in 1936, but security was required. There are now loans available to flood sufferers, but they require security. All disaster loans, all feed and seed loans, all livestock loans provide for security. The Senate amendment requires no security. The Disaster Loan Corporation

is now authorized to make loans for damages or destruction by earthquake, cyclones, tornado, or floods, but security is required. The Farm Security Administration is authorized to make grants and to make loans to farmers whose property has been destroyed or damaged and to aid farmers to obtain livestock and equipment. The floods came late. The Farm Security Administration is authorized to make grants. It was urged in behalf of the continuance of the Farm Security Administration that during the war it was essential to make loans to farmers suffering from floods or droughts. The Farm Credit Administration also makes feed and seed loans, but the crop is given as security. The Senate amendment does not provide for either loans or security. I quote, "To provide relief." Relief is a dole. Loans and, in proper cases, grants are now authorized by the Farm Security Administration. There is no occasion for the Senate amendment. No such provision has ever been made for flood or drought sufferers. The amendment is unnecessary and unsound.

Secondly, it would establish a precedent that would destroy the principle of disaster loans for flood sufferers and cyclone sufferers and drought sufferers that have heretofore been made, and are now authorized. It would discriminate against those who suffered from the floods in 1942, 1937, and other years. This amendment is restricted to the flood sufferers of 1943. Unless we mean to provide for a direct dole, which Congress has never provided for any sufferer, we should not agree to the Senate amendment. Congress has provided money to the Army to feed flood sufferers in years past, but doles or direct-relief appropriations without security have never been made.

We have provided money for the W. P. A. to create employment; we have made seed loans, we have authorized disaster relief loans for people in cities and towns and for people in the country, but security has always been required. We have authorized earthquake loans, but security was required. This is the first time that a straight loan without requiring security has been proposed.

The American Red Cross has provided food and shelter. It provides relief. The Red Cross has spent \$96,000 in Indiana to date to buy seed to aid flood sufferers; they have spent \$205,000 in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas; and in Missouri and Illinois the Red Cross has spent \$219,000 to date in the 1943 floods. Heretofore the relief program has been carried on by the Red Cross as they have done in the floods of 1943. They go in and feed people where they are hungry and have no food, to give them clothes where they have lost their clothes, but so far the Federal Government has always declined to provide direct relief or doles to flood sufferers.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I agree with what the gentleman said; I am opposed to the dole.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The question is: What are the Indiana farmers going to do along the Wabash River where year after year the river has been overflowing and destroying thousands of acres of crops?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Those farmers have probably, if they can qualify, already gone to the Farm Security Administration; they have got their loans, they have given security on their property, their horses, their cattle, or their tractors. Under the provisions of this Senate amendment the farmer who now comes along without security and asks for a loan or grant will get it and there will be a discrimination among the flood farmers of 1943 and, also, among the farmers of the 1943 flood and previous flood sufferers. There is a discrimination against people who live in the country and in the towns, because disaster loans are applicable to town and country alike.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Flood Control by the very nature of the studies his committee has made is familiar with the situation along the Wabash River. What we want to do is to get at the source and stop the floods that cause this damage.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then the thing to do is to support the bill I propose to bring before the Congress, later in the session.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman have any such flood-control work in that area in that bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I stated in response to the gentleman's question, when the matter was up for consideration before, that we put \$10,000,000 in the pending bill for rescue and repair work on the Wabash and other rivers of the United States, which I call emergency legislation. I stand for comprehensive flood-control works along all rivers, including the Wabash, where the cost of the improvements is less than the benefits. I propose to submit a comprehensive flood bill for works along all rivers during the present Congress.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But when are we going to get real and effective assistance? I recall, when the question was up before in connection with the sum the gentleman mentions, that it was made clear at that time that those particular funds would be available only on existing projects. As the gentleman states it, the funds would apply only to rescue and repair work.

Our problem, however, is to undertake comprehensive new projects which will afford real and lasting protection within the Wabash Valley. How soon, therefore, may we expect to authorize this new work which very recent unfortunate experience has proved to be essential?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I trust before the session is over, but certainly during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman should be commended on his position, and I would like to ask this question: If the entire \$15,000,000 is appropriated and spent it would not provide any protection against future flood damage, would it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all and there would be a discrimination among the flood sufferers themselves and the Senate amendment would make no provision for the people who live in towns. Let us treat them all alike. Let us treat all flood sufferers of all years alike. We can do that under existing legislation.

I extend my remarks to reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and to say that Congress has just appropriated \$80,000,000 for rehabilitation loans and grants for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, to the Farm Security Administration. Provision is made for loans to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, to enable such farmers to obtain seed, livestock, and equipment, but security is required. The livestock, the crops, and the equipment are given as security. One of the reasons urged for a continuance of rehabilitation loans to the Farm Security Administration now under the supervision of the War Food Administration was to provide for sufferers from floods, cyclones, and droughts. Grants are authorized. I am advised that grants to the amount of \$2,000,000 were extended to flood sufferers in 1942. I am advised that grants to the amount of \$13,000,000 were extended to flood sufferers in 1941. The \$80,000,000 for rehabilitation loans, including grants, was available on July 1, 1943. Loans have already been offered to farmers out of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943. There is substantially \$80,000,000 available for loans and grants. Just 7 days of the fiscal year have passed. If it should develop that additional funds are required for either rehabilitation loans or grants by the Farm Security Administration, there will be other deficiency bills and there will be ample time for supplemental appropriations.

For floods, droughts, and cyclones, under the American system, the Red Cross provides direct relief. They move in as soon as the disaster occurs. They feed those who are hungry. They provide clothes and shelter. They provide seed. The Farm Credit Administration makes feed and seed loans, but they take the security of the crops. The Farm Security Administration makes grants when the floods come late and the winter crops are destroyed so that farm sufferers can be tided over and they can make the crop the next year. That crop will be security for the loans with which to make the crop.

No man could be more sympathetic with flood sufferers than I. No showing has been made that existing appropriations are not sufficient for the flood sufferers of 1943. The fiscal year has just begun.

As I have pointed out, the Senate amendment is for \$15,000,000 and I quote the language of the amendment: "To provide for relief." It applies to rehabilitating the buildings, the crops, the livestock, the machinery, and the equipment damaged or destroyed in 1943. As I have stated, disaster loans require security. The acts providing for the loans stipulate security. The Senate amendment eliminates the word "loan." It contains only the word "relief." Relief and doles are synonymous. During the balmy days of the Work Projects Administration, Congress never provided for direct relief. It never provided for doles. It provided for work for the unemployed. If the floods destroyed the crops the W. P. A. provided for employment for farmers, but the Senate amendment is a departure from any and all legislation in any and all floods, droughts, or other disasters prior to the year 1943.

Any substitute for the Senate amendment that provides for loans, or in exceptional cases grants, in such manner and terms and conduct as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe would be just as objectionable. By eliminating the provisions that have obtained in all previous legislation for disaster loans or for rehabilitation that require security the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make the loans without security. The fact that the provision that obtains in all other legislation requiring security is eliminated in any amendment that may be offered as a substitute for the Senate amendment would show that it was the purpose of Congress to provide direct relief or the dole. Such is contrary to the American system and to the policy of the United States.

If it be said that the \$15,000,000 proposed is to be administered by the Farm Security Administration, I answer that it will not be administered as other rehabilitation funds are administered. Security is not provided for, but the amendment is careful to provide that not to exceed a million and a half dollars may be spent for administrative expenses.

If additional funds for the flood sufferers, either as loans or grants, are required, the proper way would be to increase the appropriation available for rehabilitation loans to the Farm Security Administration under the supervision of the War Food Administration so that adequate loans and grants would be made to the flood sufferers of 1943. If an amendment for either grants or loans without security is offered as a substitute for the Senate amendment, it would undermine the Farm Security Administration and its rehabilitation program. If we are to have special legislation for every flood, there is no occasion for the continuance of the rehabilitation loans of the Farm Security Administration or for feed and seed loans by the Farm

Credit Administration. It is the duty of the citizens to support the Government and not the duty of the Government to support the citizens. It is the responsibility of the Government to provide work or loans for those who suffer from flood and other disasters to enable such sufferers to help themselves.

I should like to say that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is to be commended for including in the pending bill \$10,000,000 authorized by the House and the Senate to provide for emergency repair and restoration of all flood-control works damaged or destroyed by floods in 1943. The provision is applicable to all flood-control works damaged or destroyed in any State in the Union by floods in 1943, whether such works were constructed by the Government or by the local interests.

I know of no more satisfactory public works than flood-control improvements where the benefits exceed the costs of the works. For the next fiscal year no appropriations are being made for national flood-control works. They have been suspended for the duration. If floods continue, emergencies must be provided for. Works are being constructed to protect munitions plants. It may be necessary to construct works to protect the farms and the bread baskets of the Nation. Food is as essential as guns to win the war.

It may be said that there is no occasion for my argument inasmuch as I am in accord with the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 26. I am not speaking against a windmill. I am speaking against amendment No. 26. I am familiar with it. It is a combination of disaster, feed and seed, and Farm Security rehabilitation relief. Its purpose, and I quote from the amendment, is—

to aid in the temporary rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged.

Disaster loans have to do with the repair of buildings, rehabilitation loans with seed, livestock, and equipment. If it be argued that the Senate amendment is nothing more nor less than a Farm Security authorization or increase in the Farm Security appropriation, I reply that any such statement is without foundation. Farm Security does not make loans for the repair and rehabilitation of buildings. I agree that the Senate amendment gives no definite yardstick. That is the trouble. I recall that the amendment was first presented in the Senate to the emergency flood-control authorization for 1943 when the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the minority leader [Mr. McNARY], protested that it went beyond any previous legislation. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] withdrew the amendment.

I am speaking because the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has made the motion to further insist. I want to strengthen and support his position. I want to prevent a motion to re-

cede and concur with an amendment such as the gentleman from Missouri evidently has in mind when he says that his amendment is intended to provide additional funds for the Farm Security Administration. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee cannot expect more for the flood sufferers in 1943 than Congress has accorded to the flood sufferers in other years. If an amendment is offered in lieu of the Senate amendment to provide relief by loans, or in exceptional cases by grants, without requiring security, even though the purpose is to enable farmers whose property was damaged or destroyed by floods in 1943 to obtain seed, livestock, or equipment, such a substitute or amendment should not be adopted for it is not in accordance with existing law for rehabilitation loans or grants by the Farm Security Administration, and hence is not an increase in the authorizations.

The fiscal year has just begun. Heretofore I know that the Farm Security Administration has said, when appeals have been made for help for flood sufferers, that there should be an additional appropriation. I know that it is said that \$20,000,000 is available for administration and grants as against \$50,000,000 in 1941, but \$13,000,000, or approximately one-fourth, was used for grants in 1941. On the same basis at least \$5,000,000 of the \$20,000,000 should be available for grants in the next fiscal year. But, fortunately, as I have stated, the fiscal year has just begun and there is a total of \$80,000,000 available for rehabilitation loans, grants, and administration.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] evidently is not familiar with the Senate amendment because he speaks of language that is not in the Senate amendment. He speaks of additional loans for the Farm Security Administration. There is no occasion for any new language or any new authority. If it be shown that the appropriations for Farm Security Administration are inadequate for loans and grants, that appropriation should be increased and the fund should be handled just as other rehabilitation loans and grants have been handled in other floods during the present administration.

Any loans without a definite requirement of security, as is the case with disaster and rehabilitation loans, is nothing more or less than a dole. It is straight relief. The Senate amendment No. 26 is utterly untenable and unsound. The substitute that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as indicated by his argument, has in mind is equally unsound. It is a departure. It is the first time that straight relief or straight dole has been proposed by any chairman of any Appropriations Committee in the history of the House of Representatives.

The Committee on Flood Control, in the acts of 1936, 1938, and 1941, has authorized flood-control projects in the principal river basins of the United States. I recall that in the act of 1936 some 18 or 20 projects were authorized along the Wabash River in Indiana. I do not know why they have not all been

constructed. The local interests are required to furnish the rights-of-way for the levees. The projects were recommended, before Congress approved them, by the Chief of Engineers. I believe that I am warranted in saying that the Committee on Flood Control has heretofore approved all projects along the Wabash River, including local protective works and reservoirs along the tributaries on which favorable recommendations have been made by the Chief of Engineers. If any projects have been favorably reported since the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, they will be included in the next flood-control bill, which I trust the committee will be able to report during the present session, certainly during the present Congress.

I should like to say in this connection that Congress has authorized for general flood control about \$930,000,000. Five hundred and twenty-six million dollars have been appropriated. For the duration, flood-control appropriations are not being made. The appropriations to date, plus those required to complete projects already under construction, aggregate \$770,000,000. We have an apparent backlog of \$160,000,000 in authorized flood-control projects for construction following the war. This backlog is insufficient. I can assure the gentleman from Indiana, as well as other Members of the House, that the Committee on Flood Control is planning an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects, including levees, flood walls, and reservoirs, where favorable recommendations have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers. These projects will be available for construction following the war. No appropriations have been made for flood control for the next fiscal year, as I have stated. If floods continue, emergency appropriations may be necessary to provide for the production of food, just as emergency appropriations have been necessary to protect munitions plants. I advocate public works to provide for unemployment. The need following the war will be great. I know of no more satisfactory public works than sound flood-control improvements.

I trust that the House conferees will continue to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 26, and that no motion will be submitted to recede from the disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with a substitute unless that substitute is in accordance with existing law and unless that substitute provides the same relief for the flood sufferers of 1943 that has been provided for the flood sufferers of previous years during the present administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Mississippi who is fostering some of the most beneficial legislation that has been submitted to the Congress is in this instance charging a windmill.

In the first place the committee has moved to adhere to the last motion that can be made, and any criticism of the amendment is superfluous and beside the

point. In the second place, he does not seem to have read the amendment very carefully because the amendment provides not for relief, not for a dole; it provides for none of the things he condemns so enthusiastically.

It provides only for bringing back this devastated area into production. Some of these areas on the Wabash River, on the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers, and their tributaries, including the richest land in the Nation, the breadbasket of America, have been covered with water, preventing the planting of crops, or crops already planted have been destroyed. There is still time for emergency crops this year, but these farmers, with everything swept away—buildings, machinery, stock, and fences—cannot get into production this season without some cooperation.

The second error into which the gentleman falls is that he attempts to differentiate between this and Farm Security. He says Farm Security provides for this. Why, certainly, and that is the purpose of this amendment. The amendment provides for administration by the Secretary of Agriculture through an existing agency and that agency is Farm Security. But while Farm Security has for the current year about \$136,000,000, it has for the coming year—the year for which this money is provided, the year for which we are now appropriating—only \$80,000,000. With much reduced funds and heavily increased needs this \$15,000,000 is necessary to take care of the situation in the manner to which the gentleman refers. The purpose of this amendment is to supplement the amount which Farm Security might spend for this purpose. The gentleman says Farm Security serves the need, but how can Farm Security serve the need with half the amount it had last year and with triple the need of last year?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Would not the proper way be to increase the appropriation to the Farm Security Administration? I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, and I speak advisedly, the word "loan" is not mentioned in Senate amendment 26. There is nothing but relief mentioned in the Senate amendment from which I quote: "To provide relief." I knew whereof I spoke.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This provides for the very purpose the gentleman urges. The word "loan" is carried in the committee amendment which I was precluded from offering by the gentleman's opposition. The gentleman says this work ought to be done by Farm Security, but how can Farm Security do it without funds? He says we have the right agency, but he does not want to let them have money to operate. The only purpose of this amendment is to give the Farm Security Administration funds to encourage production of food in these flood-devastated areas.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say that I am very much interested in this provision in the bill. I do not think we are doing anything new or unusual. We are appropriating millions of dollars for other things.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is right. We are merely providing funds for continuing the program. The gentleman from Mississippi used 5 minutes in heated argument against the very thing he urges.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman brings in a supplemental appropriation for the Farm Security Administration under the War Production Board, I shall not have a word to say if it be shown that the \$80,000,000 appropriated, as the gentleman says, is insufficient, although the fiscal year has just begun.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are in the last day of the session. We are trying to adjourn tonight, if possible, and, if not, we expect to recess tomorrow night. If the money is to be provided it must be provided here and now. This is the last opportunity. Here the gentleman is quibbling about the method. At this late hour there is no other method. Floods do not wait. Here is a chance to give the Farm Security Administration \$15,000,000 when they ought to have \$45,000,000, and resume the production of desperately needed food both this year and next.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk recur to Senate amendment numbered 24 which we passed over. We would like to dispose of that at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report Senate amendment numbered 24.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 13, line 6, insert "Department of Agriculture."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 24.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 14, line 3, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS
"Development of civil landing areas: For completion of landing area construction previously undertaken by the Work Projects Administration at public airports, including all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field, \$8,832,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this

appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of \$8,832,000 may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 27.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. STEFAN: Mr. STEFAN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 27.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the preferential motion which I offer at this time is for the purpose of saving airports which are 50 to 90 percent completed and which may represent a tremendous loss to our taxpayers if they are not completed. I find myself in a very unusual situation in offering this motion. I had originally intended to offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment. However, I learned that if I had offered such a motion I would not be allowed to speak on the subject, and the motion would have been voted upon without the possibility of explaining the motion or the amendment. Had I offered such a motion it probably would have precluded anyone else favoring the completion of these airports from talking. The opposition would probably have all of the time to speak because the opposition has control of the time. So the motion before the House now is to recede and concur with the Senate amendment No. 27, which has as its purpose the appropriation of \$332,000,000 for the completion of certain airports. I believe that approximately \$8,000,000 would be needed to complete the original 28 or more airports in the original C. A. A. list. But members of the committee indicate to me that the other body has put in some items which the C. A. A. did not originally contemplate, and it has been suggested to me that perhaps we would be more successful in completing these meritorious projects if the amount was reduced. Therefore, I had planned to offer a preferential motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment, but, fearing that we would be cut off from debating the amendment and precluded from speaking on the subject, I merely offer a motion to recede and concur, with the hope that we can offer amendments later in order to save a situation which is so important to national defense and for the continuance of our aviation program.

The membership of this House knows of my interest in economy. I am sure I have demonstrated time and again my opposition to waste and extravagance. I am sure that the membership knows of my continued efforts to eliminate non-

essential expenditures. But here is an item where appropriations will save a gigantic investment of money in which the States, municipalities, and the Federal Government are interested.

I hope the membership of the House will pardon some repetitions regarding airports. I have spoken on the subject here so often that I fear that I may not get the undivided attention of the membership. However, there may be a number of Members here who have not heard my previous explanations, so I again tell you briefly what is involved in this bill.

When the W. P. A. started building airports, that Agency went into every State in the Union and urged communities to become interested in these projects. Many were started and many were completed. Many are now being used by the armed forces and have become a valuable part of our defense program. About 267 of these W. P. A. airport projects were in the so-called approved or completed and partially completed stage when W. P. A. liquidated. I believe about 103 of them were completed and are being operated. The Army and Navy took over about 71 of them and are operating them and it is assumed will complete them where necessary with Army or Navy funds. Only recently the Congress voted unanimously the reappropriation of \$99,000,000 to complete about 65 of them. This left about 28 of the original 267 airports without designation. These are the 28 airports involved in the bill under debate. Most of these 28 airports, including 1 in my congressional district—Fremont, Nebr.—are 50 to 90 percent completed. Others are scattered over many other States. I shall include a breakdown of them in the extension of my remarks for the information of the membership. These 28 airports represent a huge municipal, State, and Federal investment. I want to save that investment with this motion. It is from the basis of economy that I ask your support. Here are about 28 of those original 267 airports in which the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government have many millions of dollars invested. In many cases as in the case of Fremont, Nebr., the work is almost 90 percent completed and it will require but \$225,000 to complete. Many of you here today have airports in your districts in a similar condition. In many cases the runways have been graded; material is on the ground and if they are not completed now they will really represent waste. The municipalities in many cases have depended upon the agreements of the W. P. A. which made promises of funds to complete these projects. In many cases the W. P. A. had already allocated funds to complete them. But when W. P. A. liquidated, these funds, which had been earmarked especially to complete these airports, went back into the Federal Treasury and the airports were left high and dry with wind and erosion daily damaging the investments the taxpayers have in these projects.

LXXXIX—465

I ask the membership of this House to consider the citizens and officials of these municipalities. The Federal officials in many cases went from community to community urging these officials to build airports on the basis that they were badly needed for national defense. Our patriotic city officials and our patriotic citizens answered the call. They held bond elections and went into debt to buy land. The State aeronautic commissions helped with State funds and the W. P. A. expended millions of Federal funds and airports were actually started and, as in this case, practically completed. I hope you will realize that this motion is in no way a pork-barrel proposition, but an effort to save a gigantic investment made by our taxpayers.

The C. A. A. recognized this fact. It recognized it because it made many surveys and recommended to the Bureau of the Budget that it be allowed a little over \$8,000,000 to complete these 28 airports. So the request here is not only my own request but it comes directly to you from the C. A. A. It also comes to you with a unanimous vote of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. But the House committee asks you to eliminate the entire item, which would leave these airports deserted and a great investment lost to our taxpayers. Because the C. A. A. deems it important that these airports be completed immediately, I feel that we should complete them. It will be argued that the Army has not designated these airports as of military necessity and that the W. P. A. contract gives the responsibility to the localities to complete them. My argument is that the C. A. A. says they are needed and should be completed. The W. P. A. had allocated the money for them, but the money is in our Treasury because the W. P. A., when liquidating, returned the money to the Treasury. There is no record that the Army and Navy say these airports are not needed. I predict that while we are talking on the subject some of them may be taken up by our armed forces, and certainly, if the war continues, they will be needed.

My colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has one of these airports in his district. He has been working on that project diligently for a long time. He has done everything that could be done. I hope the chairman will give him a few moments to tell the story of that airport. I hope other Members who have these unfinished airports in their districts will ask for some time so that the House can have the full picture. I plead with the House to go along with us on this very important aviation program.

Twenty-eight airports under old W. P. A. program, which are 50 to 90 percent completed. C. A. A. has asked the Budget for \$8,000,000 to complete these airports. Budget will hold hearings on this request shortly.

California: Merced.

Colorado: Pueblo.

Connecticut: Danbury.
Georgia: Atlanta, municipal.
Idaho: Idaho Falls.
Indiana: Bloomington.
Iowa: Des Moines, Iowa City.
Kansas: Pittsburg.
Maine: Dexter, Eastport.
Michigan: Menominee.
Minnesota: Eveleth, Hibbing, International Falls.
Nebraska: Beatrice, Fremont.
New Mexico: Raton.
North Carolina: Burlington, Rockingham, Wilson.
North Dakota: Valley City.
South Dakota: Spearfish.
Texas: Henderson, Rusk County.
West Virginia: Clarksburg, Wheeling.
Wisconsin: Eau Claire, Oshkosh, Siren—Burnett County.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASE. I notice the Senate amendment provides \$8,832,000. The gentleman has suggested that had it been possible he would have offered an amendment. Would he have changed that amount and placed any restriction on the amendment?

Mr. STEFAN. I would have cut it down to around \$4,000,000 to save at least some of these airports and some of this investment.

Mr. CASE. Under the \$4,000,000 fund or whatever it was the gentleman had in mind—

Mr. STEFAN. The amount that some Members suggested was \$3,990,000. But that would not complete the projects under discussion.

Mr. CASE. If the amount were changed to that \$4,000,000 figure, would it permit the completion of the airports on which W. P. A. contracts had been entered into?

Mr. STEFAN. I believe that \$4,000,000 would at least save most of them and make them usable.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If \$4,000,000 is all that is necessary, what is going to happen to the other almost \$5,000,000 that is carried in the bill?

Mr. STEFAN. In my opinion, that amount could have been used for concreting and cementing runways. With the \$4,000,000 we could barely hold the investment together and at least put these airports to some use.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What does the gentleman mean by saying "complete"? Does it include the paving of runways and the grading of space for administration buildings?

Mr. STEFAN. By "complete" I would mean paved runways and D. L. A. as contained on C. A. A. specifications.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the House will agree to this

proposed appropriation and complete most of these 28 airports in which we have invested many millions of local funds. It is not right to these communities which have given locations and some of which have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to build these airports, for the Government to abandon these airports and not complete them. As was said by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, to leave these projects uncompleted would mean the loss of many more millions of dollars than it is estimated it would take to complete them. That ought not to be done. It is indefensible.

In my own district at Wilson, N. C., I noticed a report of the W. P. A. And it appears that only \$7,000 has been spent by the Federal Government, and \$326 by the local sponsors. As a matter of fact, the town of Wilson issued bonds in the amount of \$100,000 and has spent \$58,000 of that sum. The Federal Government has spent over \$100,000. There is \$158,000 that is practically sure to be lost unless \$50,000 or \$100,000 more can be spent in order to complete this project. That is the story on almost all the 28 projects here that have been left out of the completion program. The communities where the airports are located were induced to put up hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars to acquire valuable property and start construction of these projects, and it is an outrage for the Government now to abandon them. They will ultimately be needed, if not now, and will be of inestimable value for 100 years to come.

I hope the House will agree to the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. He knows more about these airports and about civil aeronautics and has the matter closer to his heart than any other Member of the House, and we should listen to his splendid information and follow his sound sensible advice. It would be a great injustice to these communities not to continue these projects and complete them. It would be unwise from every point of view.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I can understand the interest of those who have airports in their districts, in wanting this motion not to prevail. It so happens that W. P. A. did many things beside build airports. They constructed many other things. I doubt if there is a man in this Chamber who has not some project that needs more work done by W. P. A. or by someone in order to complete it. I know that I have and I know that others have. It is human nature to want those things to be done, but I fail to see why you pick out a few projects, such as airports, and say, "We want those finished because of their importance," because there are many, many other projects which W. P. A. was undertaking that were also worth while.

Now, let us go back to what W. P. A. was organized for. It was said on this floor many many times in years gone by that W. P. A. was not doing this work

just to furnish something nice to the communities. W. P. A. went to work to furnish employment to unemployed people. That was the whole purpose of W. P. A., to give people jobs; not to give cities and communities and States nice presents from the Federal Government. They have received millions of dollars worth of benefits while they were giving employment. But now that that is over, there is no W. P. A. to provide this employment and it is hardly compatible with the idea of W. P. A. to come back and say, "Now, you gave us so much you must go ahead and give us the rest of it."

Now, on these projects, the only possible excuse in my opinion, for going ahead would be that they would be of some importance to the war effort. The Army has taken the projects that W. P. A. was working on and has designated those that were of military importance, and those are being finished. Those that are before us today have not been so designated, so they stand as work done by the W. P. A. or others that may be worth while to the communities but are not of military value. I think the amounts mentioned here are so small that any State or city which has an airport partly finished, if it has the ingenuity and if it has the interest, can go out and raise that money and not expect the Federal Government to do it. I think it is time for the people in the States and in the cities not to look to the Federal Government for everything. The Federal Government, in the interest of relieving unemployment, has furnished tremendous value in property and in improvements to the States and the cities. This airport program is a great asset to those communities and they should undertake the completion of them themselves.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, these were not designed as a gift to the States. They are not needed for military purposes because they have not been so designated, and it is unfair on the part of the cities and the States to come in here and say, "Now, because you spent millions in my district you must go ahead and spend millions more."

I trust that the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be agreed to, and I also hope that those communities will be a little more enterprising and do the job themselves, and not call on Uncle Sam to take over the burden.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must disagree with my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], whose good judgment in most instances I would rely on to the nth degree.

I know that if this country is wise, as it has been partially wise in the past, it will arrange for a great airport expansion program in all of the States of the Union. We should have, perhaps, 20,000 airports of varying sizes in this Nation.

It is sound thinking and acting for Congress to develop its airport program. Each step we take in that direction is desirable.

I draw your attention to the fact that Florida had the foresight, prior to the declaration of war, to build a system of airports over a period of several years, and Florida today is outstanding as a State which was able to take care of the impact of war from the standpoint of aviation facilities for the Army and Navy. A visit to Florida airports, teeming with activity, will prove the strength of that statement. Civil Aeronautics Administration officials will tell you that Florida was in a preferable condition because of the work done under W. P. A. funds in the construction of airports. Of course local political subdivisions carried their full share of costs in the items of lands, and so forth.

I know airports that fall in the category of those mentioned today during debate. I have none of these projects in my own congressional district, but Clarksburg and Wheeling, W. Va., are in the list to be finished if the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska carries and we agree to the Senate view. A splendid airport at Morgantown, W. Va., in my district, builded with W. P. A. funds and local cooperation and supervised by the C. A. A. has been the means within the last month of saving in equipment to the Army Air Forces an amount of some several hundred thousand dollars. In what way? Three planes of the Army Air Forces, flying with small gasoline loads, under bad weather conditions, found it possible to come in and land. When further desirable development to this airport takes place it will mean that aircraft will find even more adequate facilities for safety and operation.

Of course, the Airport Approval Board, composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce, has not had occasion to say that these uncompleted airport projects, which we consider today, must be finished and are necessary in order to win the war; but the Civil Aeronautics Administration, through the Director of Airports, Mr. C. B. Donaldson, and the chief airport engineer, Mr. Phillips Moore, will explain to you that these projects, of which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] speaks, are vital to a continuance of a good civil-aviation program in this country and that these projects will be valuable in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is not that the reason that C. A. A. asked for the completion of them, because they are needed, and there are 28 of them that are needed to round out the program which the C. A. A. went to the municipalities and urged the communities to bond themselves to build?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is absolutely right. Military planes are flying in the vicinity of these airports and they are needed now. I can tell you that in the territory of one of these uncompleted airports today military

craft are flying over at the rate of about 200 every 24 hours; before the war military planes were perhaps operating 18 or 20 craft in the same period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this House to act wisely and agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Nebraska. Each airport completed or further developed is a link in the vital chain of sound national planning for peace and for the purposes of defense if war occurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTINGER].

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope this preferential motion of the gentleman from Nebraska prevails. It is one of the most important motions that has been before this body at this session. I am for the development of the airports of this country. We are far behind with the type of program that ought to be carried on. I will not here repeat the statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from West Virginia, but those statements are fully true and correct.

In the district I represent, to be concrete with you, there is an uncompleted airport at Hibbing, Minn., and an uncompleted airport at Eveleth, Minn. Both of these airports are in the heart of the iron-ore industry. They ought to be finished. We do not know the day nor the month when the planes, for military purposes, may find it necessary to safeguard this section where now 80 percent of the iron ore in the United States comes from to be used in the manufacture of iron products.

At International Falls there is a third airport in my district that is uncompleted. It is on the Canadian border and if the enemy ever comes over that northern route, International Falls is on the line of travel.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you in the interest of national defense, in the interest of the Army, in the interest of the American people, that these airports ought to be finished so they can be utilized if the hour of emergency comes. These are just three instances.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RABAUT. Of course, the gentleman knows that if the Army or the Navy wants to complete any airport they have a right to do so.

Mr. PITTINGER. Yes, I realize that. They have already recommended the completion of some airports. I do not think they have had time to give consideration to what the development of airports in this country means, not only to the Army and the Navy, but to the American people in connection with the program of air transportation.

Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion this afternoon indicating that some Members have felt that the different communities should complete these airports. The short and practical answer to that is that these communities do not have the funds sufficient to do so. There have also been some remarks indicating that these were W. P. A. projects, and, if we complete them, it will set a precedent to complete numerous other W. P. A. projects that have nothing to do with the airport development. I do not approach this question from that standpoint.

It is my contention that we are way behind with airport development in the United States, and as I understand it, the major portion of this \$8,000,000 Senate item is to be used to complete the uncompleted W. P. A. airports. Every one of those airports were started because of their value to the country in the field of civil aeronautics, and, as I have indicated, airports in my territory have a value in our war effort.

It strikes me as nonessential to vote \$71,000,000,000, as we recently did, for the War Department, and then to quibble over an \$8,000,000 item in one of the most vital factors that affects America, namely, the development of aviation in this country.

It is true that the War Department has authorized to develop airports where it considers there is an emergency, and where it considers such development immediately necessary. I have had no control whatever over that program, and I know that the War Department has agreed to proceed with the completion of certain uncompleted W. P. A. airports. I feel satisfied that when they start to investigate they will come to the conclusion that the airports to which I have referred in this speech should be included in the War Department program.

But I want to approach this item of \$8,000,000 from another standpoint.

I have said on many occasions that while we are spending billions of dollars in a war for destruction of our enemy, we should not overlook our domestic problems, and that this includes the problem of transportation and other factors.

I think we can well afford to spend \$8,000,000 on airports, every one of which is now, or will shortly be, of vital importance in solving the transportation problems of America.

As I view it, the possibilities in the future of civil aeronautics is unlimited, and we do not realize the great field of the future in this line of transportation. Not only will the airplane industry furnish passenger transportation, but it will make possible the transportation of freight, and I predict that the greatest development of the future will come with the development of this mode of transportation.

Compared with the program for civil aeronautics, and the development of air fields in the future, this item of \$8,000,000 for completion and development of a few air fields located in various parts of the United States becomes rather insignificant.

I think it a mistake for Congress to adjourn at this time without making this appropriation. So far as I am concerned I feel that we have neglected this great development of the airplane, and that Congress should have a special committee on civil aeronautics, or it should assign to one of its existing committees, the job of planning now for the development of airfields in every State in this country, so that the transportation, which is sure to be developed along these lines, will have this adequate equipment at its service when the post-war development period begins.

I urge the adoption of this motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

As the aviation industry makes progress they are going to need emergency landing fields. The remarks of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are timely and proper, and set forth in a most commanding way the need for this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, it must be remembered that there are W. P. A. projects and W. P. A. projects. It is true that in the beginning the W. P. A. work was mainly for the purpose of providing employment to those who needed work, but toward the last a lot of that work was being done with an eye on the war effort, and the people of the various communities were appealed to on that score; their patriotism was appealed to with an eye toward the war effort, and with that in mind embarked on the construction of these airports, and expended large sums of money moved by patriotism.

I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, an excerpt from a letter I have received from J. A. Kastler, of Raton, N. Mex., former mayor of that municipality, concerning an airport in my own State, which I understand is 91 percent completed. Mr. Kastler states:

The city of Raton backed this venture in actual cash, having purchased 1,300 acres of land for \$13,000, and having contributed some \$15,000 additional in other improvements, and, besides, have had expenses regularly in maintaining the port as a designated landing field.

Though not completed, it is being utilized today in the war program. I quote also from a letter I have received from Arthur Johnson, vice president and cashier of the Raton First National Bank. He states:

As you, of course, know, the airport is being used quite extensively for training in conjunction with Peterson Field at Colorado Springs. With some additional work I feel sure that this airport will measure up with the majority of airports in the country.

Mr. Speaker, what I have had to say with reference to the airport at Raton, which, as I say, is 91 percent completed, no doubt applies to other similar airports, and I think that the Congress at

this time ought to do something to evidence its good faith to the people who have loyally supported this program and who have worked and expended funds to provide sites for the construction of these airports to aid the war program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. I feel that these airports should be completed at the earliest possible date.

One of these airports is located at Pueblo, Colo., which is in my district. This is the municipal airport and is now being used. However, certain work remains to be done before all of the improvements contemplated are completed.

To date the Government has spent \$317,819 on this airport. The city of Pueblo has contributed \$57,654, making a total expenditure of \$375,473. Under the C. A. A. estimate the sum of \$70,000 has been allocated to complete the project that was under construction when work stopped. If this amendment is adopted this amount will be available to install contact lights and pave taxi ways and aprons, in addition to other improvements.

Pueblo is rapidly becoming one of the air centers of the West. The Army has an air base located at this point. An instrument training program for pilots is being conducted under the supervision of the Pueblo Junior College. The Continental Air Lines have Pueblo as a stop on their Denver to El Paso route, and also on the Denver to Wichita route.

I mention these facts to indicate the importance of this airport. The flying weather in Colorado is considered most favorable by the Army. Very few days are lost because of bad weather. Large air bases are located at Lowry and Buckley Fields in Denver, another at Peterson Field in Colorado Springs and one at La Junta. I submit that it is highly desirable to complete this municipal airport at Pueblo so that it may be available for the use of the Army flyers in case of emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment will be adopted. I consider the completion of these airports at this time as most essential to our war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of sound business and economy we should support the motion of my Nebraska colleague. I will illustrate what is involved by telling the House about the airport in which I am interested.

The city of Beatrice, Nebr., had an airport of 160 acres where they were training about 50 flyers for the Army and Navy through C. A. A. program.

They have several plants there doing important war work. That airport was constantly used in our war program. Airplane parts and other war products

were being shipped in and out of that port. Then the Federal Government through the W. P. A. came along and sold that community on the idea of voting bonds and enlarging their airport. They voted bonds and spent about \$80,000 of the city's money. The airport was enlarged and it enveloped the existing airport they had so it could not be used any more; it is gone. The Federal Government promised them in effect that they would finish it. The Federal Government sent its agents into that community and urged a bond issue to build a larger airport for the benefit of the aviation program of the entire United States. The W. P. A. spent over \$73,000

in addition to the sponsor's funds on that airport. A statement of the work and expenditures already made by the W. P. A. alone on the airport is as follows:

BEATRICE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, BEATRICE, NEBR.

First stage of development: Grading, drainage, pavement, and incidentals for the construction of two runways, taxiway, and apron in accordance with plans approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration to meet requirement for a class 3 airport.

WORK ACCOMPLISHED

Items of work performed or to be performed as of February 1, 1943, by Work Projects Administration and sponsor, the city of Beatrice, Nebr.

Item No.	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit price	Amount	Percent complete
1	Clearing and grubbing.....	260	Acre.....	\$3.10	\$806.00	72
2	Removal of old fence.....	160	Rod.....	.35	56.00	50
3	Grading runways landing strips.....	4,800	Cubic yard.....	.39	1,872.00	3
4	Grading apron, taxiway.....	43,890	Cubic yard.....	.39	17,117.10	80
5	Field grading.....	8,000	Cubic yard.....	.39	3,120.00	6
6	12-inch subbase treatment.....		Cubic yard.....	.75		0
7	Fine sand for subbase.....		Cubic yard.....	.55		0
8	3-inch underground ducts.....		Linear foot.....	1.00		100
9	Furnishing seed.....	1,238	Pound.....	.33	408.54	100
10	Preparation and seeding field.....		Acre.....	3.25		0
11	Fencing field.....		Rod.....	1.57		0
12	Storm-sewer excavation.....	9,436	Cubic yard.....	1.00	9,436.00	100
13	Storm-sewer backfill, rolled.....	4,664	Cubic yard.....	.185	862.84	100
14	Storm-sewer backfill, tamped.....	2,614	Cubic yards.....	.395	2,339.53	100
15	18-inch concrete pipe in place.....	1,806	Linear feet.....	1.80	3,250.80	100
16	24-inch concrete pipe in place.....	2,056	Linear feet.....	2.75	5,654.00	100
17	30-inch concrete pipe in place.....	608	Linear feet.....	3.70	2,249.60	100
18	36-inch concrete pipe in place.....	1,228	Linear feet.....	4.60	5,651.20	100
19	42-inch concrete pipe in place.....	656	Linear feet.....	6.35	4,165.60	100
20	48-inch concrete pipe in place.....	980	Linear feet.....	7.85	7,693.00	100
21	Storm-sewer inlets.....	11	Each.....	63.00	693.00	100
22	Pipe headwalls.....	3	Each.....	32.60	97.80	100
23	6½-inch concrete pavement, runways.....		Square yards.....	2.12		0
24	6½-inch concrete pavement, apron, taxiway.....		Square yards.....	2.12		0
25	60- by 80-foot frame hangar, utilities.....	1	Each.....	7,500.00	7,500.00	100
	Grand total of work accomplished.....				73,172.91	

Mr. Speaker, unless we reject the report of the conferees, this great investment, at least a great part of it, is forever lost. Is there any economy in that? It means that the Federal Government has broken faith with this community; it means that this community that had an airport, no longer has one at all. My colleague [Mr. STEFAN] has worked long and hard on this program. His airport at Fremont, Nebr., ought to be completed. His motion should be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a table of expenditures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I favor the preferential motion of the gentleman from Nebraska. The total appropriation to complete 28 important airports is \$8,830,000. One of these airports is in my district, known as the Wheeling-Ohio County Airport. It will require less than \$100,000 to finish this project and to put this airport in first-class shape for all civil and military pur-

poses. The city of Wheeling and Ohio County have each spent a very considerable sum of money. In addition the W. P. A. has done quite a lot of work. Supplementing all of that, the public-spirited citizens of the city of Wheeling and Ohio County have devoted their time, efforts, and money to completing this important work. Several planes in distress have landed on this airport. It was with difficulty that they were again able to take off. Bethany College, within a few miles of this airport, has a large class of naval air trainees. I cannot conceive of any airport in or near our section of the country that is of greater civil and military importance. It is in direct line of east and west transportation. Its value to the community, as well as to the country, will be permanent. It is well located above the fog, easily accessible to the city of Wheeling and to nearby territory in the States of West Virginia, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

For 15 years the people of Ohio County have been air conscious. They have been attempting to develop an airport. In fact, they are among the pioneers. Many of our citizens use air transportation constantly. We are in an energetic defense plant area.

I strongly urge that this appropriation be given support by the membership of the House and that we be permitted to finish this airport, with the small sum that will be made available by this ap-

propriation, at the earliest possible date. It is sound, practical, and worthy of the support of the entire House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to go further into the discussion of whether these airports should be completed insofar as the Federal Government is concerned. I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky at all.

In my district the Federal Government through W. P. A. came to the city of Pittsburg, Kans., and interested them in expanding the municipal airport. The city undertook an obligation of \$600,000. Today they have expended about half of that. The port is about 52 percent completed. They are training Army pilots at that port right this minute and yet the Army has not designated that port as one necessary for military purposes and it cannot be completed by the city of Pittsburg without Federal assistance. The city of Pittsburg has voted a \$150,000 bond issue. The runways at this airport have been graded and developed, and if they are not finished the money that has been expended in partially completing the airport will be at least a 50-percent loss, because the city of Pittsburg is not financially able to undertake an obligation of that amount without Federal assistance. This airport is also being used by Army bombers training at various ports in this area, using it as an emergency field, and for this purpose it certainly is necessary as a war-training project.

I hope that by some manner or means we can prevail upon the conferees to go back to conference and agree on an amount which will permit the completion of these vitally needed airports, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska will prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I favor the preferential motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. Speaker, included in this list of airports is one port with which I am particularly familiar—the one at Iowa City, Iowa. A few years ago it was designated as a bomber landing field by the War Department. The War Department thereby induced that community to expand and put in hard-surfaced runways. They got the job 80 percent completed. They have a very extensive pilot-training program in existence at that port now, yet in spite of the fact that the project is 80 percent completed, they find themselves there now unable to use the airport to its fullest possibilities and to its real need.

We need \$120,000, approximately, to complete this project. I disagree with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to the effect that this city could easily raise the money, for it is a city of only 17,000 people. They have pioneered airport develop-

ment all through the years. I lived there through the entire program of airport development by the Chamber of Commerce, and the city government, and I know that the city of Iowa City cannot raise \$120,000 as easily as the gentleman from Kentucky indicates. I know the history of the project thoroughly, and I know it is important. It is designated as a bomber landing field by the War Department, and they need these Midwest airports to supplement the entire network of airports. My prediction is they will need them more and more as the years go by.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion made by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has repeatedly gone on record and demonstrated oftentimes its willingness to support a well-rounded program of civil aeronautics and the proper development of airways throughout the country. As you all know, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has now under consideration amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act.

That bill provides for subsidies, and it provides for the expenditure of vast sums of money for the development of aviation. It seems to me that we cannot at this time afford to curtail our program of development of airports. The war has shown us definitely that if it had not been for our civilian aeronautics program in the past, why we would have been stymied, we could not have moved, and it would be just criminal if we at this time curtailed the program of development of our airports in connection with civilian aeronautics. I think this very definitely ties in with our war program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Michigan is correct in his observation. I desire to add also that these W. P. A. airports became the backlog of the training program for civilian pilots, and out of which came the fliers who were the backbone of the Army air forces as we began this war. We need more and more airports. It is too bad we did not possess several thousand in addition to what we did have on December 7, 1941.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] when he spoke of economy. I am in favor of the House at this time reaching some compromise in order to make funds available for the completion of the airports

involved in this amendment. I take that position primarily because I believe economy is the main objective in seeking completion of these ports so that the sums already invested will not be lost.

A great deal of money has been spent on these projects. The one in which I am interested in my State, Idaho Falls, was not started as a W. P. A. project. At the present time \$355,000 has been expended upon the development of this airport. The C. A. A. in the first emergency landing field program allocated about \$50,000 to improve that airport, which is strategically located in the intermountain area embracing Ogden and Salt Lake City, Utah, Boise, Pocatello, and Mountain Home, Idaho, where there is extensive aviation development.

I received a letter recently from Mr. E. W. Fanning, mayor of Idaho Falls, in which he refers to this airport, as follows:

I might say that I have just returned from a trip to Seattle, Wash., where I conferred with Mr. Paul Morris, and Mr. Lane Wilcox, director of airports, for the Civil Aeronautics Administration in regard to the completion of our airport. While there I found that these gentlemen had at various times recommended the completion to Washington, D. C., but they had been informed that it would be impossible for Civil Aeronautics Administration to do anything unless requested to do so by either the Army or the Navy. They did state, however, that they had included the amount necessary to complete this airport in their budget request. * * *

We have a very definite commitment from the United States Government that if we would purchase the land, the Government would do the necessary construction work, and we feel that there is a moral obligation which should be taken into consideration, inasmuch as the city of Idaho Falls spent \$70,000 for land alone for this project.

I submit that that is not a boondoggling project or that it merely involves the completion of a W. P. A. project. This airport requires only a moderate sum to develop it into a class 4 field so that it may be used to the fullest extent by the 4-motored bombers which are constantly flying throughout that intermountain area. I believe the war program will be beneficially affected by making available a few millions to complete this group of 28 airports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. The State of Wisconsin has three of these uncompleted airports started under Government encouragement and to some extent with Government funds. One of these is at Oshkosh, in the district of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who recently dwelt at considerable length upon the completion of these projects before the House. Another one is located at Siren, and the third is located at Eau Claire.

The city of Eau Claire has gone to large expense in securing land in order that this project might be started. In

proceeding to do so it had the support and assurances of the Federal Government. The airport has not been completed. The city has other responsibilities incident to the location of a large munitions plant there which require all the funds it can raise for its own purposes at this time. Unless this amendment shall be adopted and the preferential motion agreed to, there is no possibility of early completion of that airport.

I hope the preferential motion will be adopted by a large majority and that this bill may be approved and the 28 airports completed. That should be done, in justice to the communities in which they are situated. Furthermore, their completion will serve to improve the airport facilities of the entire Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in this program, but I think the work essential at this time can be done with half the money proposed, leaving the paving to be done at a later date. Furthermore, no project should be prosecuted at this time which is not important to the war effort. I hope we can vote an amendment along that line.

My experience is similar to that which has been recounted by the other Members. I refer particularly to the Lawrence County airport where the county spent a great deal of money with the understanding that runways would be extended by the Federal Government. In fact, the Civil Aeronautics Authority made an allotment at one time of \$100,000 and the W. P. A. an allotment of \$130,000 to complete the extension of the runways and pave them. The county went ahead and purchased the land but the project has been held up. The county in this instance has put a great deal of money in hangars, repair shops, and so forth, and has one of the largest investments of any local community in an airport that I know anything about. The county has done more than it was asked to do. It is commonly believed that extension of the runways would be very valuable to the war effort.

A large class, several hundred cadets, use the field for training purposes now, but the runways should be lengthened to make an emergency landing possible for the flying fortresses that are based at a field 50 miles away and a glider base even nearer. I should want this project considered solely on its value to the war effort if money is made available to replace the lost W. P. A. labor.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to ask for a division of the question and then to offer a further preferential motion which will reduce the amount from the \$8,300,000 in the Senate amendment to \$4,000,000, which will take care of all of these airports for the work necessary to conserve what has been done. This preferential motion which I shall offer is in line with the suggestion or the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], when he made his remarks, that he would have offered that

motion could he have offered it at that time.

It seems to me that is the real intent and that is the meritorious thing to do and that such a motion should be offered. So I shall ask for a division of the question and then offer a further preferential motion.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am advised by the C. A. A. that if the amount is cut down what they propose to do is to preserve and protect the investment and the work that has already been done and perhaps not attempt at this time to proceed with certain of the concrete paving, and so forth, if they can put these ports in usable condition without that. That is the reason they can get along with the lesser amount.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and the \$4,000,000 will be spread over all the airports and they can do the work that is essential for the time being.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion because I think, in time of war, regardless of other considerations, the airport program should be tied into the war effort. I am just as much interested in developing airports in my district as is any other Member of the House, but I think the whole consideration should be, Is it necessary to win the war? If the Army does not approve of the projects carried in this amendment, then I am certainly opposed to the preferential motion which would make possible this expenditure.

May I ask the chairman whether the airports that would be continued if the preferential motion were sustained are in the comprehensive plan of the Army?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; they are not. They have not been approved by the board in charge of the program.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. I therefore oppose this preferential motion.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTINGER. I think the correct statement is that the Army board picked out certain airports on which it considered emergency work to be necessary. It has not disapproved these other airports; it simply has not reached them yet.

Mr. JONES. Turning it the other way around, it has not approved these airports. As to whatever is needed in the Army's program, there is money available from other appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Funds are already provided for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if I were not convinced that the completion

and placing in a usable condition of the airports we have under consideration were not tied into the war effort, I would be opposed to the preferential motion, but having in mind one of these airports—one, so I am informed, similar to the others on the approved list—I know just how necessary it is right at this moment in the war work we are endeavoring to carry on in California to immediately resume and to complete as quickly as we can this construction responsibility.

All over the State I represent are to be found in great numbers Government training fields, Government combat fields, and civilian fields galore. The civilian fields and the Government fields now available are crowded to the point where it is dangerous to use them. Additional facilities must be developed at the earliest possible moment. No legislation offers greater promise of early relief from air congestion than the measure under consideration. By the pursuit of this method we can bring into use in the winning of the war 26 half-completed airports, scattered, as they are, all over the various parts of the United States. I hope that the preferential motion is agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall consume 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, however desirable these other airports may be following the war, they are not needed now for the prosecution of the war, and that is the only consideration on which they could be included in this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that there are three airports in this amendment that have never been approved by the War Department, and that no work has ever been done on any one of the three by the W. P. A.?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. There are airports here which have not been adopted by the W. P. A. For example, we have a request here for an appropriation of \$832,000 for an airport, and on which the Work Projects Administration has never spent a penny.

Mr. TABER. There is practically \$2,000,000 in this bill for those three airports.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With which neither the War or Navy Departments nor the W. P. A. have ever had any connection or in which they have expressed any interest or for which they have indicated there was any need.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think we remember that this House year after year believed in the feasibility of a highway to Alaska, yet the War Department repeatedly until September 1941 said such a road would have no military value; so we cannot always point to the War Department as a criterion of just what is best in these matters, can we?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. At the time to which my friend the gentleman from West Virginia refers the road was without military value. It was not until and under circumstances which could not at that time be foreseen, and which have materially changed the entire situation, that the project or the road assumed any military value.

In this case, insofar as these airports are concerned, we have an accurate and available method of determining military value. The Board, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce, not only has authority to order construction at any time, but it has the funds, amounting to about \$90,000,000 at this time, from which it may draw at will for construction of airports deemed essential to military operations. It has both the authority and the funds to build or to complete or supplement any needed airport. If there were the slightest need, if there were at any time the slightest evidence of any military value to be served by the completion of any of these airports, all that would be necessary would be for this Board to approve them and they could be completed promptly without notice or application to Congress or to any other authority, out of funds already at their command.

Granted that W. P. A. has had something to do with initiating some of these airports, may I call attention to a stipulation in the contract entered into by the sponsors of these airports at the time they were started.

I shall read just two excerpts from the signed agreement which the sponsors of each of these airports signed when they first filed their applications for construction of these facilities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 3 additional minutes.

Here is the first provision of the contract:

It is agreed that the Work Projects Administration is under no obligation to initiate operations under the project authorization, if approved, nor to complete the project, or any portion thereof, if placed in operation.

The first thing the sponsors agreed to and to which they affixed their respective signatures was this specific, definite, unequivocal agreement.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In spite of that very fine writing in W. P. A. 301, the W. P. A. allocated funds to those municipalities with an agreement that that money would be spent there. The municipalities had no idea W. P. A. was going to liquidate. They went to work and started buying land because W. P. A. allocated the money to build the airport there. They not only obligated themselves and went into debt, they put a tremendous amount of other money—municipal money and State money which was given them by the State aeronautics commissions—into these airports. Then W. P. A. liquidated and left these airports high and dry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Did the gentleman approve that liquidation?

Mr. STEFAN. I did, with the exception of carrying out the obligations it had made with the municipalities. I am interested in saving the investment we have made, the investment of Federal funds, of State funds, and of municipal funds. I am interested in economy. If you wipe this out you are going to wipe out this investment. I have visited many of these airports myself. They are 50 to 90 percent complete. The State aeronautics commissions have approved them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman approves liquidating W. P. A. Every one of these projects in which W. P. A. was interested or which it initiated were stopped by the liquidation. They approved liquidation with a full realization on these contracts, because it was stressed at the time the President stopped W. P. A. operations.

First, there was this agreement and understanding, this contract, that in event of discontinuance, no obligation devolved upon W. P. A. to complete the airports. Second, there was the further agreement, and may I especially call attention to this last proviso in the contract which all applicants signed at the time W. P. A. undertook construction.

Further, in consideration of the expenditure of Federal funds on the project—

I would like to have the attention of the Members, because Members should hear this provision which is in every contract under which these projects were constructed:

Further, in consideration of the expenditure of Federal funds on the project, it is agreed if the proposed work is undertaken and operations are discontinued—

That is the situation here—

by the Work Projects Administration, the sponsor will take such steps as may be necessary to complete a useful economic unit of the work.

All sponsors, when they made this application and when they entered into this contract, agreed that if anything interfered with completion by the Federal Government—interfered with W. P. A. completing it—the sponsor should then complete a useful, economic unit of the work.

Now, in the face of that agreement and in violation of that contract, sponsors of these projects are asking for the expenditure of these substantial sums of money on projects for which there is no military need, which have no military value, but with all of which they have agreed, under the circumstances, to complete themselves.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That condition has existed in every contract ever since the E. R. A. days of 1933. Communities and municipalities are obligated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take one additional half minute in which to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All of the communities are obligated under that agreement to complete those projects where there is economic value in so doing. If there is no military value in completing these projects they should not be completed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There were thousands of projects, highways, schools, roads, water systems, and so forth, that were discontinued at the same time. There is no distinction or difference. The sponsor whom the gentleman represents agreed if the W. P. A. did not finish the project they would finish it. It now devolves upon them to carry out their contract.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All of which would be good for post-war planning.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has touched on one of the important considerations. After the war we will need projects of this character to take care of unemployment and all projects which are without military value should be deferred until the demobilization of the war industries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota demands a division of the question.

The question is, Will the House recede? The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE) there were ayes 48 and noes 77.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will not insist on a roll call at this time. We are very greatly pressed for time. There is no question about the feeling of the House. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would withdraw his point of order.

Mr. BURDICK. Time is no more valuable than the 2 minutes you said you did not have when you had it, when the debate was on.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 198, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—149

Abernethy	Buckley	Cullen
Andersen,	Burch, Va.	Cunningham
H. Carl	Burchill, N. Y.	Curtis
Anderson,	Burdick	Dickstein
N. Mex.	Burgin	Dilweg
Andresen,	Byrne	Durham
August H.	Cannon, Fla.	Dworshak
Angell	Carlson, Kans.	Eberharter
Barrett	Carson, Ohio	Ellis
Beall	Case	Ellison, Md.
Beckworth	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mo.	Clark	Fellows
Bonner	Cole, Mo.	Fernandez
Bradley, Pa.	Cooley	Flannagan
Brooks	Cravens	Folger

Gale	Lesinski	Richards
Gathings	Luce	Rizley
Gavagan	Lynch	Rohrbough
Gearhart	McGehee	Rolph
Gossett	McGregor	Rowan
Grant, Ind.	McKenzie	Sadowski
Gwynne	McMurray	Sauthoff
Hagen	Maas	Scanlon
Hare	Madden	Schiffier
Harless, Ariz.	Manasco	Schuetz
Harness, Ind.	Mansfield,	Short
Harris, Va.	Mont.	Sikes
Hart	Marcantonio	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Va.
Hendricks	Miller, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.	Sparkman
Hoeven	Miller, Pa.	Stanley
Holmes, Wash.	Monkiewicz	Stefan
Hope	Morrison, La.	Stockman
Horan	Mruk	Sullivan
Howell	Mundt	Talle
Hull	Murdoch	Tibbott
Jensen	Myers	Vincent, Ky.
Johnson, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.	Voys, Ohio
Judd	O'Toole	Vursell
Kerr	Patton	Wasielewski
Kleberg	Peterson, Fla.	Weichel, Ohio
Klein	Pittenger	Weiss
Kunkel	Ploeser	Welch
LaFollette	Poulson	Wene
Lambertson	Price	White
Landis	Ramspeck	Winstead
Lanham	Randolph	Winter
Lea	Rankin	Wolcott
LeCompte	Reed, Ill.	Wright
Lemke	Rees, Kans.	Zimmerman

NAYS—198

Allen, Ill.	Gibson	Newsome
Allen, La.	Gillette	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Graham	O'Neal
Arnold	Granger	Outland
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gregory	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Griffiths	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Philbin
Bell	Hall	Powers
Bender	Leonard W.	Pracht
Bishop	Halleck	Priest
Blackney	Hancock	Rabaut
Bloom	Harris, Ark.	Ramey
Bolton	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Boren	Hays	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Heidinger	Robertson
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Robinson, Utah
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Robison, Ky.
Bryson	Hobbs	Rockwell
Buffett	Hoch	Rodgers, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Hoffman	Rogers, Calif.
Busbey	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Mass.
Butler	Jackson	Rowe
Camp	Jarman	Sabath
Cannfield	Jeffrey	Sasser
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Satterfield
Celler	Jennings	Schwabe
Chapman	Johnson,	Scott
Chipherfield	Anton J.	Shafer
Church	Johnson,	Sheppard
Clason	Calvin D.	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Johnson,	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	J. Leroy	Slaughter
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Smith, Ohio
Colmer	Luther A.	Snyder
Compton	Johnson,	Somers, N. Y.
Cooper	Lyndon B.	Spence
Costello	Jones	Springer
Courtney	Jonkman	Starnes, Ala.
Cox	Kean	Steagall
Crawford	Kearney	Stearns, N. H.
Creal	Kee	Sumner, Ill.
Crosser	Kelley	Summers, Tex.
D'Alessandro	Kennedy	Sundstrom
Davis	Kinzer	Taber
Day	Kirwan	Talbot
Dewey	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Lane	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	LeFevre	Thomason
Disney	Lewis	Towe
Domengeaux	McCowan	Voorhis, Calif.
Dondero	McGranery	Wadsworth
Doughton	McLean	Walter
Elliott	McMillan	Ward
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Wheat
Engel	Mahon	Welchel, Ga.
Feighan	Martin, Mass.	Whitten
Fenton	Mason	Whittington
Fish	May	Wickersham
Fisher	Merritt	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Merrow	Willey
Forand	Michener	Wilson
Fulbright	Miller, Conn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Furlong	Mills	Wolverton, N. J.
Gamble	Monrone	Woodruff, Mich.
Gavin	Murphy	Woodrum, Va.
Gerlach	Murray, Tenn.	Worley

NOT VOTING—83

Andrews	Gillie	Mott
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Gore	Norman
Barry	Gorski	Norton
Bennett, Mich.	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Bland	Hale	O'Connor
Boykin	Hall,	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Capozzoli	Hébert	O'Leary
Carter	Hill	Pfeifer
Cochran	Holfield	Phillips
Culkin	Izac	Plumley
Curley	Johnson, Okla.	Poage
Dawson	Johnson, Ward	Rivers
Delaney	Keefe	Russell
Dies	Kefauver	Sheridan
Ditter	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Douglas	Kilburn	Stevenson
Drewry	Kilday	Stewart
Eaton	King	Tarver
Elmer	Larcade	Taylor
Fay	Ludlow	Tolan
Fitzpatrick	McCord	Treadway
Ford	McCormack	Troutman
Fulmer	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Maloney	Vinson, Ga.
Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Gilchrist	Morrison, N. C.	West

So the motion to recede was rejected. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Norman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Troutman.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. King with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Tolman with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to further insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the various votes will be reconsidered and that motion laid on the table.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. REVERCOMB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON.

Managers on the part of the House

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 43, line 13, insert: "SEC. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of \$4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33.

Mr. EBERHARTER and Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. TABER. To offer a preferential motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will have both motions read and see which is more preferential.

The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EBERHARTER moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 33 to H. R. 2968.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of \$5,500 per annum or more, appointed after June 30, 1943, unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That those appointed between June 30, 1943, and November 1, 1943, may hold office till the latter date unless sooner than that the Senate shall have refused to give its advice and consent as to any such appointee."

The SPEAKER. The Chair is compelled to hold that the motion to recede and concur, at this stage, takes precedence over a motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] demands a division of the question.

The question is: Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate?

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 98, noes 73.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be quite a bit of confusion as to what this vote will decide. I ask the Chair to please state what the parliamentary situation is at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The only question involved is whether or not the House will recede from the disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a further fact that if the House accepts the motion to recede then the motion of the gentleman from New York to concur with an amendment will take precedence over the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Tellers were ordered.

The House again divided; and on the vote by tellers, there were—ayes 120, noes 79.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 176, answering "present" none, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—170

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Mundt
Allen, La.	Gillette	Murray, Tenn.
Andersen,	Goodwin	Norrell
H. Carl	Graham	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Andersen,	Griffiths	Peterson, Ga.
August H.	Gross	Philbin
Angell	Hagen	Ploeser
Arends	Hall	Poulsen
Arnold	Leonard W.	Powers
Auchincloss	Halleck	Pracht
Barrett	Hancock	Ramey
Beall	Harness, Ind.	Rankin
Bell	Harris, Va.	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Heidinger	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Bolton	Hinshaw	Rizley
Boren	Hoeven	Robson, Ky.
Brehm	Holmes, Mass.	Rockwell
Brooks	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Rohrbough
Buffett	Horan	Rolph
Busbey	Howell	Rowe
Butler	Jenkins	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Jennings	Schiffer
Carson, Ohio	Jensen	Schwabe
Carter	Johnson,	Scott
Chenoweth	Anton J.	Short
Chipfield	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Johnson,	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	J. Leroy	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Springer
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Stanley
Compton	Kinzer	Stearns, N. H.
Courtney	Knutson	Stewart
Cox	Lambertson	Stockman
Crawford	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Cunningham	LeCompte	Taber
Curtis	LeFevre	Talbot
Davis	Lemke	Talle
Day	Lewis	Tibbott
Dewey	McCowen	Vincent, Ky.
Dirksen	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Dirks	McGregor	Vursell
Dondero	McKenzie	Welchel, Ohio
Dworshak	McLean	Wheat
Ellis	McWilliams	Maas
Ellsworth	Manasco	Wigglesworth
Elston, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Engel	Merrow	Winter
Fellows	Michener	Wolfcott
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fish	Miller, Pa.	Wolverton, N. J.
Fisher	Monkiewicz	Woodruff, Mich.
Gamble	Morrison, La.	Worley
Gathings	Gavin	
Gavin		

NAYS—176

Abernethy	Cullen	Hobbs
Anderson,	D'Alesandro	Hoch
N. Mex.	Dickstein	Hoffman
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dilweg	Hull
Bates, Ky.	Dingell	Jackson
Bates, Mass.	Domengueaux	Jarman
Beckworth	Doughton	Jeffrey
Bennett, Mo	Durham	Johnson,
Bloom	Eaton	Calvin D.
Bonner	Eberharter	Johnson,
Bradley, Pa.	Elliott	Luther A.
Brown, Ga.	Ellison, Md.	Johnson,
Bryson	Feighan	Lyndon B.
Buckley	Fernandez	Johnson, Okla.
Bulwinkle	Fiannagan	Judd
Burchill, N. Y.	Fogarty	Kean
Burdick	Folger	Kee
Burgin	Forand	Kelley
Byrne	Fulbright	Kennedy
Camp	Furlong	Kerr
Canfield	Gale	Kirwan
Cannon, Fla.	Gavagan	Kleberg
Cannon, Mo.	Gerlach	Klein
Case	Gibson	Kunkel
Celler	Grant, Ala.	LaFollette
Chapman	Gregory	Lane
Clark	Gwynne	Lanham
Coffee	Hare	Lesinski
Colmer	Hariess, Ariz.	Luce
Cooley	Harris, Ark.	Ludlow
Cooper	Hart	Lynch
Costello	Hartley	McGranery
Cravens	Hays	McMillan
Creal	Heffernan	McMurray
Crosser	Hendricks	Madden

Mahon	Ramspeck	Sumners, Tex.
Mansfield,	Randolph	Sundstrom
Mont.	Richards	Thomas, N. J.
Marcantonio	Robertson	Thomas, Tex.
Mason	Robinson, Utah	Thomason
May	Rogers, Calif.	Towe
Merritt	Rowan	Voorhis, Calif.
Miller, Conn.	Sabath	Wadsworth
Miller, Mo.	Sadowski	Walter
Mills	Sasscer	Ward
Monroney	Sauthoff	Wasielewski
Murdock	Scanlon	Weiss
Murphy	Schuetz	Welch
Myers	Shafer	Wene
Newsome	Sheppard	West
O'Brien, Mich	Sikes	Whelchel, Ga.
O'Neal	Slaughter	Whitten
O'Toole	Smith, Maine	Whittington
Outland	Smith, Va.	Wickersham
Patman	Snyder	Willey
Patton	Somers, N. Y.	Winstead
Peterson, Fla.	Sparkman	Woodrum, Va.
Pittenger	Spence	Wright
Price	Starnes, Ala.	Zimmerman
Priest	Steagall	
Rabaut	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—84

Andrews	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Baldwin, Md.	Gorski	Norman
Barden	Cossett	Norton
Barry	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Green	O'Connor
Bland	Hale	O'Hara
Boykin	Hall,	O'Konski
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Burch, Va.	Hébert	Pfeifer
Capozzoli	Hill	Phillips
Cochran	Hoilfield	Plumley
Culkin	Izac	Poage
Curlley	Johnson, Ward	Rivers
Dawson	Keefe	Rodgers, Pa.
Delaney	Kefauver	Russell
Dies	Keogh	Sheridan
Ditter	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Douglas	Kilday	Stevenson
Drewry	King	Tarver
Elmer	Larcade	Taylor
Fay	Lea	Tolan
Fitzpatrick	McCord	Treadway
Ford	McCormack	Troutman
Fulmer	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Gallagher	Maloney	Vinson, Ga.
Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Gilchrist	Martin, Iowa	White
Gillie	Morrison, N. C.	
Gordon	Mott	

So the motion to recede was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Hale.
 Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Hoilfield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Norman.
 Mr. Barry with Mr. Hill.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Keefe.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Phillips.
 Mr. Tarver with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Troutman.
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Ditter.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. O'Hara.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. Gorski with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
 Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
 Mr. Curlley with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Andrews.
 Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Ford with Mr. Elmer.
 Mr. Izac with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Murray.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gilchrist.
 Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gillie.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Taylor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand the situation, the motion made by me contained two parts, the motion to recede and concur; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked for a division of that question and the House just declared itself not to recede. The question, as I understand it, now before the House is whether it desires to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The House cannot concur until it has receded, which it has just refused to do.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I beg the Speaker's pardon. I thought the vote was that the House should recede.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 43, line 18, strike out "203" and insert "204."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to amendment No. 34.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the various amendments were disposed of was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— AMERICAN RED CROSS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 7, 1943.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a report, prepared by the American Red Cross, of obligations under the appropriations for foreign war relief, consolidated and extended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.

This cumulative report, reflecting all refugee and foreign war relief operations from July 1, 1940, through April 30, 1943, supplements reports submitted as of April 30, 1941, and April 30, 1942. It is of necessity an interim report, since the foreign war relief program is still in progress and H. R. 2714 will have the effect of extending the availability of this appropriation until June 30, 1944. A final report must await the conclusion of the foreign war relief program.

There are also transmitted herewith reports from the Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department, which are serving as

purchasing agencies under the program of foreign war relief. It will be noted that the reports of these Departments are prepared on the basis of orders placed with vendors as distinguished from the report of the American Red Cross, which is prepared on the basis of requisitions submitted to those Departments.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a communication from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], chairman of the Special Committee Investigating Employees of Alleged Subversive Activities.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a newspaper item from a newspaper in Worcester, Mass.

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

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$27,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 8 of said amendment, after the word "highways", strike out "on the system of Federal highways, and secondary or feeder roads", and insert the following words: "of States or their subdivisions".

On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 24, strike out the figures, "\$20,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof the figures, "\$10,000,000".

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 3, after the word, "section.", add the following: "Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall apply only during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period of one year thereafter."

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 12, after the word, "bridges" insert a "comma" and the following words: "including interstate toll bridges."

On page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in line 16, after the word "official", strike out all of the remainder of line 16 and all of line 17, and insert a "comma", and add the following: "unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. ROBINSON,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
JAMES W. MOTT,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
CLYDE M. REED,
WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) amending the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: In the bill, as passed by the House, \$25,000,000 was set as a limitation on the expenditure of access road funds for access roads to raw materials. The Senate amended the bill to provide for a limitation of \$35,000,000. The conferees on the part of the House deemed this amount excessive in proportion to the unexpended balance of the general access road fund and compromised on a limitation of \$27,500,000, since \$233,000,000 of the \$260,000,000 access road fund has already been allocated to certified projects. Senate amendment No. 1 also provided for the express inclusion within the meaning of "raw materials" in section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941, as amended, of petroleum, by inserting, after the words "raw materials", wherever they occur in section 6 of the Defense Highway Act, the words "including petroleum". The managers on the part of the House regarded this amendment as redundant, taking the position that "pe-

troleum" is clearly within the meaning of "raw materials".

No. 2: The managers on the part of the House recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2, with the following changes agreed to by the managers on the part of the House and the Senate:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendments, amendment No. 2, after the words "repair of roads and highways", strike out "on the system of Federal highways, and secondary or feeder roads", and insert in lieu thereof "of States or their subdivisions". This amendment, with the change recommended by the Conferees, would allow the Commissioner of Public Roads to reimburse the several States for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of roads and highways within the various States which were substantially damaged not only by the Army or the Navy, as provided in existing law, but also by other agencies, persons, or contractors in performance of a contract or work in connection with the prosecution of the war. Since most of the damage to roads occurring as a result of excessive and abusive use in connection with the prosecution of the war is not done by the "Army or Navy or both" but is nonetheless essential in the prosecution of the war, your managers regard this amendment as important and as one that should be adopted.

The change in this section of Senate amendment No. 2 was recommended by your managers to make certain that where such damage occurred it would be reimbursable in all justifiable cases without possible controversy as to whether the damaged road was within the meaning of "secondary" or "feeder" road definitions.

The managers on the part of the House recommend that the House recede from its disagreement on that part of Senate engrossed amendment No. 2, entitled "sec. 7" and agree to the same with amendments striking the figure "\$20,000,000" and inserting "\$10,000,000" and inserting an additional proviso at the end of said section 7, reading as follows: "Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall apply only during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period of one year thereafter." In view of the extensive damage done to the road systems of those States in the area affected by the recent floods, it is regarded by your managers to be necessary to the expeditious repair of this damage that this section be included in the bill and agreed to by the House. Since authorization for taking care of flood damage has been recommended by the House Committee on Flood Control, it was deemed advisable to limit the amount authorized to be expended in this section to \$10,000,000, and to limit the time for its expenditure to coincide with the period of the present emergency.

The managers on the part of the House recommend that the House agree to section 8 of Senate amendment No. 2, beginning on page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, with the amendment agreed to by the conferees which would insert, after the words "toll bridges", on line 12 of page 4, the words "including interstate toll bridges." This section would extend the time limits in the act entitled "An act to aid the several States in making, or for having made, certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1937, as amended, to allow the Federal Government to participate in the acquisition of toll bridges by the States at any time prior to January 1, 1945, and would make certain other changes in the present provisions for such acquisitions. The proposed amendment would strike out the act of August 14 as amended and insert an

entirely new provision, which is self-explanatory.

Section 9 of Senate engrossed amendment No. 2, found on page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendments, was found to be wholly objectionable by all the managers on the part of the House. In order to resolve the differences between the House and Senate conferees, your managers have agreed to recommend the adoption of said section 9 amended to read as follows: "No part of any appropriation authorized in this Act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war."

J. W. ROBINSON,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
JAMES W. MOTT,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report on the bill (H. R. 2798) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the conferees have inserted a section 9 in this report which provides that no part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by anyone unless the War Production Board shall certify the use of critical materials for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war, and I ask the gentleman from Utah if that was included within the provisions of the House and Senate bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That was agreed to by the conferees on both sides.

Mr. TABER. That it was not in either bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; it was not in either bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman's request to be simply to call up the conference report now?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the conference re-

port is not within the range of the conference in that section 9 of the bill as proposed in the conference report is not an item that was in the bill as it passed the House or the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Utah desire to be heard?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, section 9 was not in the House bill but was an amendment placed in the Senate bill, and it was before the conference committee for consideration as amended by the Senate, and in conference the conferees changed section 9 to read as it now appears in the conference report.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman read the provision the Senate inserted in the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. As the bill passed the Senate, section 9 read as follows:

No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

In the conference report we amended section 9 to read as follows:

No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of the critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war.

It is clearly an amendment of the Senate provision.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to supplement the statement of the gentleman from Utah on the point of order. I believe the agreement between the Senate and the House conferees is simply an enlargement or an extension of the language in the prohibition adopted by the Senate at the time of the final passage of the bill in that body.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The amendment was in the Senate bill and that is section 9. The language the conferees bring back to you is simply an amendment of section 9 by the conferees and was unanimously agreed upon by the conferees.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if I might suggest, it is an enlargement of the language and goes beyond the range of the differences.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is clearly a limitation of the language of the Senate amendment and was intended to be a limitation. We say so frankly. The House conferees refused to agree to the language of the Senate. The language substituted by the conferees is intended in my opinion as a limitation of the language used in the bill and does not go so far as the language that was in the bill as amended by the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call attention to the fact that the language of the Senate very broadly provided:

No appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The language agreed upon by the conferees is merely restrictive of that and is purely within the purview of the language which was before the conference and is a limitation upon the action agreed upon by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Section 9 of the Senate amendment reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation authorized in this act shall be impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official other than the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Section 9 is purely a limitation and it is a limitation on everyone except the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The language agreed upon in conference is more restrictive than the language of the original section 9 in the opinion of the Chair because it strikes out the words "other than the Commissioner of Public Roads" and inserts "unless the War Production Board shall certify that the use of critical material for additional highway construction would impede the conduct of the war."

It seems to the Chair, section 9 dealing with limitations, that this is simply a further restriction and limitation and the Chair would be compelled to overrule the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER), there were—ayes 147, noes 10.

So the conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS PERTAINING TO COMPENSATION, PENSION, AND RETIREMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2703) to provide for adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 8, after "person", insert "not a citizen of the United States."

Page 7, line 13, strike out "That for" and insert "For."

Page 7, line 15, strike out "for 90 days or more."

Page 7, line 18, after "enrollment", insert "or where clear and unmistakable evidence

demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not expect to object, but I know the House would like to have a description of the amendments. There has been no objection to some of the amendments, but one is not what it should be. As it is indicated that the House may recess shortly, we feel it is best to accept what we can secure from the other body. Will the gentleman explain the amendments to the House? I should like to state to the House how harmoniously the entire membership of the committee have worked to secure legislation this year for the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment on page 4 inserts the words "not a citizen of the United States" in line 8, which, in my opinion, should have been included in the House bill. I have no objection to that provision at all because it throws around the measure a protection that I rather think is essential.

The next amendment is on page 7, line 13, where the words "that for" are stricken and the word "for" inserted. That is in line 13.

The amendment in line 15 on page 7 strikes out the words "for 90 days or more." That is, every person employed in the active military and naval service for 90 days or more, and so forth. The "90 days" were stricken out.

The only amendment about which there is very much controversy in the minds of members of the committee is the last one on page 7, beginning in line 18, after the word "enrollment" insert the words "or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service."

With that amendment the provision reads as follows:

For the purposes of paragraph 1 (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active or military or naval service.

Up to the present time a great many men have been turned out of the service after they had served for a long period of time, some of them probably as much as 2 or 3 years, on the theory that they were disabled before they were ever taken into the service. We provided this 90 days' limit in the House bill in order that a man should not be kept in service more than 90 days and then be discharged for an alleged disability presumed to have existed before he was taken into the service without giving

him proper hospitalization and compensation where it is deserved.

This amendment strikes out the 90 days' provision and adds the provision which takes the burden from the veteran and places it on the Administration to prove by clear and unmistakable evidence that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service. The only question with some of the members of the committee was they feared that this provision is not strong enough because every time we have been called upon to change veterans' legislation, or almost every time, it has been because of a refusal on the part of the Veterans' Administration to carry out the will of the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the distinguished chairman of the committee feel that the very fact these men have been accepted into the armed forces should be prima facie evidence that the veteran was in good health?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. This amendment puts the burden of proof on the Administration to show the contrary. We want to serve notice now that we are going to expect the Veterans' Administration to carry out the will of Congress in that respect and not to as they did in the early 20's, construe everything so strongly against the veteran that it will force us to come back here and amend the law in order to make them do what we are trying to direct them to do here.

Mr. SHORT. The poor disabled veteran should not be made the goat.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that he is not going to be made the goat. If the Veterans' Administration does not carry out the will of Congress by proper administration of this law as it applies to these disabled veterans, we are going to see that they do it or so strengthen the law that they cannot get around it.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who has always been one of the very best friends the servicemen of this country have had.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I can say the same thing for him.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are many veterans in the present World War that are having great difficulty in establishing service connection. The House unanimously passed the House provision which we felt was airtight. The entire membership of the World War No. 1 veterans' committee has worked hard to secure this provision. If the Veterans' Administration does not live up to what we feel is right, I hope the House will immediately take steps to change it. I hope the Members will report to the veterans' committee any and all cases they feel to be unfairly rated.

It is only because the House is likely to recess very quickly that this change is accepted. Is that not true?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, but I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Senate provision has one advantage over the House provision in that it does not require a veteran to serve 90 days. In other words, it eliminates that 90-day limitation, which might have been a two-edged sword.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I wonder if this bill has the retroactive feature in it that we discussed when it was originally on the floor, when the gentleman opposed it. If the bill is passed now, will it be retroactive to affect those men who have been taken from the service on the basis that they have preservice disability?

Mr. RANKIN. That is my understanding and that is the understanding of the committee, that it will apply to all the men who have been discharged from the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps during this war.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman feel that the legislation as it is now presented will take care of overcoming the allegations in the discharges which the War Department and the Navy Department give these men in which it is stated that the discharge is for physical disability existing prior to service?

Mr. RANKIN. This places on the Veterans' Administration the duty to go into the proposition and to prove that it was a preservice disability. It places the burden of proof on the Veterans' Administration to show by unmistakable evidence that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service.

Mr. CASE. What I am afraid of is that the Veterans' Administration will say that, where the discharge on the face of it states that it is for physical disability existing prior to service, that is proof.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but they cannot say that is proof in the face of this bill. It is a question of fact, and they cannot substitute that statement for proof in the face of this law.

Mr. CASE. The reason I am raising the question is that General Magee, in his testimony before the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee, went into this question at some length. We discussed it pro and con for some time. He contended that it was incumbent upon them under their regulations to state that this disability existed prior to service. It was the contention of many members of the committee that that statement on the discharge would be used as prima facie evidence by the Veterans' Administration to show that the disability existed prior to service.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly what we are serving notice about now. It

not only is not conclusive proof but it is not prima facie proof. We expect every one of these cases to be examined and to stand each one on its own bottom.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad to have the chairman make that very definite and clear. I think it should be recognized as part of the legislative interpretation of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have heard the statement of the chairman of this committee who, I think, understands this legislation as well as, if not better, than any other Member of this House. I am sure we all appreciate the fine, unselfish service the gentleman has rendered the veterans of the World War. I am wondering, however, if the gentleman feels that the legislation as now proposed with the Senate amendments is preferable to the bill as originally passed by the House. I think I state the position of every Member here that we do not want to be a party to anything that might do an injustice to any member of the armed forces. This is a very serious and important matter of legislation that will affect these boys for years to come.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that we prefer the House bill, but the Senate made these changes. Some of them, as I have said, are improvements. This last amendment may have more salutary effect than some Members at first thought it would, but we are likely not to get any legislation at all at this time unless we agree to these amendments here today. For that reason, we have agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I would rather not have any legislation at all at this time and wait until later to get the law exactly as Members want it than have a measure that is unsatisfactory.

Mr. RANKIN. We have had this matter up with the veterans' organizations today. We have all agreed that with these statements as to the attitude of Congress and as to the intention of Congress it is best to let this bill go through as amended in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. With that statement I am willing to go along with the bill as it is now.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it the gentleman's intention to pursue this matter in the next session to try to get all the House provisions into law?

Mr. RANKIN. If the administration carries out the intention of the law as the Senate Members think it will, and if the law works as it should, it will not be necessary to change the law; but we are going to keep an eye on it and unless the intention of Congress is carried out we will of course move to strengthen the law.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to congratulate the gentleman for being so diligent. I know that the best interests of the veterans are protected in the gentleman's hands.

Mr. RANKIN. And I would say the same thing about the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. The veterans never had a better friend than he has been at all times, and they know it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think this bill will serve notice to the doctors examining and taking men into service, that they must make sure that the men are physically sound and will be much fairer to the men going into the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and when a man breaks down and becomes mentally infirm, the signing of a waiver is not going to have any effect. In other words, we are going to have the man examined, have his case gone into thoroughly and see that he is given justice.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. That is the point I wanted to bring up. When we had this bill up before I placed in the RECORD some correspondence between myself and the Secretary of War in which it appeared that there is a regulation in the Department at the present time which requires veterans being discharged for disability to sign a waiver that they had suffered these disabilities before they were inducted into the service. I wanted to ask the gentleman if it is his opinion that with this legislation that practice in the War Department will be done away with?

Mr. RANKIN. Those waivers will not have any effect if this legislation is passed, except that it may be used as evidence, but not conclusive evidence.

Mr. ANGELL. Those veterans being discharged frequently are not mentally competent.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. ANGELL. They are suffering great disability and they are under the strain from service in foreign lands and it is unjust to require them to sign such a statement that they suffered the disabilities before they were inducted into service. I am willing to go along with the gentleman if it is his opinion and that of his very efficient committee that this will be satisfactory to the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. I think this measure will take care of cases of that kind.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. We all appreciate the fine service that the gentleman gives to the veterans of the United States. Does this bill apply to the veterans of all wars?

Mr. RANKIN. This provision applies to the veterans of this war.

Mr. JENSEN. Just the veterans of this war?

Mr. RANKIN. Just the veterans of this war.

Mr. JENSEN. There are many veterans of past wars.

Mr. RANKIN. They are already taken care of.

Mr. JENSEN. Are the veterans of World War No. 1 taken care of in about the same manner?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It seems we are having a great deal of trouble trying to get the benefit of that legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, you may have considerable trouble proving service connection after 24 years.

Mr. JENSEN. Did the Senate take out that 90-day clause?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. They do not have to serve 90 days, but with this other provision some think it is an improvement.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I feel sure that the removal of that fixed 90-day clause is a good thing, because you cannot expect a doctor always to be able, when he examines a patient, to be sure whether or not he has any disease. For example, there are some allergic diseases that are not present for many months of the year. Even though a man has had it every year during a certain season, there are other times when it will not be present and cannot be detected. There are other conditions, like duodenal ulcer, which may recur periodically in the spring or the fall. A man may have a spell every spring, or he may go 5 years without one under normal living. Then if it comes on when he is in the service and he does not admit that he has had it before, it is impossible for the doctor to tell. I have had patients come to me and say, "I am going into the service. You treated me for duodenal ulcer. Don't you tell the Army doctors about it if they call up and ask." I cannot tell them because it is a privileged communication. There are many fellows who would take advantage of the 90-day clause; they would deliberately get into the Army, sometime after 90 days reveal their symptoms, and then they will be discharged on account of physical disability and will be able to get a pension.

The bill as amended is much better than it was, but there is still one word in the bill that makes it almost impossible to administer from a medical standpoint.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman gets away from that 90-day clause, let me say that with that provision in the bill some felt there might be a tendency on the part of the medical authorities not to be in a hurry to examine a man until he had been in there for 75, 80, or even 89 days. So with that provision eliminated it will probably facilitate the examination of these men and the passing upon their cases.

Mr. JUDD. I think it is much better as it is except for one word, and I admit I do not know how to correct it. That word "aggravate" is administratively impossible. How can a doctor prove that a thing has not been aggravated by the man's service, or how many veterans will ever admit that it was not aggravated?

"Aggravate" is a matter of degree, and usually impossible to measure.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. JUDD. I do not know how any doctor is going to be able to prove one way or the other.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that that word "aggravate" is now sanctified by time and usage. It has been in the veterans' law ever since the last World War. If a man went into the service in the last war with a disability and that disability was aggravated by his service his disability was held to be service-connected. For instance, we will take a case in the present war. A man comes in with a nervous tendency that is not pronounced enough to cause the Army to reject him, or the Navy to reject him, but he goes through Pearl Harbor or he is on a vessel that is bombed and men are killed all around him and the ship is blown to pieces, it might aggravate that disability without touching him. It might aggravate his condition to such an extent that he would be a total nervous wreck. Then he should be entitled to hospital care and such other benefits as are provided for service-connected disabilities.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman is right in agreeing to make this bill provide the burden of proof shall be upon the Government to show that the condition did exist previous to entry into service, rather than having the burden of proof on the veteran to show that it did not exist before he entered the service. That is the fair thing to do, just like in baseball where a tie is decided in favor of the runner. There ought to be a presumption in favor of the veteran in this case as well.

But, with the word aggravated in there it is going to be almost impossible ever to keep some from getting pensions that ought not to get them.

Mr. RANKIN. So far as the word aggravated is concerned, as a practicable proposition, it is not subject to a doctor's technical diagnosis or doctor's medical terminology, as used by an experienced physician such as the gentleman from Minnesota would give it in writing up his report on a special case involving a technical diagnosis.

Mr. JUDD. I understand.

Mr. RANKIN. It is to be taken in connection with all the facts and circumstances of the case and has had a practical application in its use.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. As the gentleman from Mississippi has indicated, the word aggravated has a well-defined meaning in law.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. Not only with respect to veterans, but in cases involving negligence, such as inactions where because of negligence there has been an aggravation of a preexisting condition, and the injured party is entitled to recover. That has been the law for a long time; it is not new in veterans legislation; it is not new to the law.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who is a real friend to the veterans, make the analysis of the bill which is applicable to quite a number of cases that I have had arise in my district. I have had many persons file claims who have had a very hard time, but with the burden of proof shifted to the Government, it will eliminate many such cases. I am therefore very grateful to the chairman of the committee for making provision that the burden of proof is shifted to the administration.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman from Ohio. We found some men who were suffering from service aggravated disabilities and who had been discharged and sent home, and in some instances sent to the county jail or who had been turned back to their parents and families without the benefit of hospitalization. That is wrong. I called to the attention of the House here to a case arising in Idaho of a young man who had been returned home, who had been in the service several years and was at Pearl Harbor during the attack. A year later, when he failed to recover from the shock he suffered at Pearl Harbor he was discharged on the theory that his disability had existed prior to his entry into the service and they said nothing about it being aggravated.

I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio, however, when I called that case to the attention of the Congress and to the administration on the floor of the House, they went back and reopened the case and he was given the proper rating and relief.

Mr. MCGREGOR. May I say on behalf of the veterans of the Seventeenth District of Ohio that we thank him for his interest.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman upon the fine statement made and for this proposed legislation, which should be passed without a dissenting vote.

I want to add that to the statement made that there are many boys who have returned from the service who have been placed in county jails because there was no other place to care for them. I have known of a number of instances where boys have also been placed in poorhouses. Our jails and almshouses are no place in which to place our veterans. We must properly care for them.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. In some cases these veterans have been confined in our jails and poorhouses for long periods of time—not because they have violated our laws—but simply because there was no other place in which they could be cared for. We owe a signal duty to these disabled veterans, and in this we must not fail.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. We must provide for the proper care of our veterans. A grateful Nation must care for her veterans. I know the great service my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has rendered for our veterans. I wish to compliment him upon that outstanding service for our veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] and to the Congress, and to the country, that so far as I am concerned, so long as I am chairman of this committee, no veteran who has honorably served his country in this war, and been disabled, or had a disability aggravated as a result, is going to be turned out and forced to beg his bread from door to door or to sell pencils or seek the shelter of a jail or a poorhouse or sent back home without proper treatment, if I can help it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the amendment appearing on page 4 of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. That is a limitation.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain the meaning of the provision contained on page 4 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. That amendment was placed in the bill by Senator CLARK of Missouri. It states:

When any person not a citizen of the United States, entitled to compensation, pension, or other gratuity under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, is located in the territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or of any of its allies, any award of such benefits in favor of such person shall be terminated forthwith and such person shall not be entitled to any such benefits except upon the filing of a new claim accompanied by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing that the claimant was not guilty of any of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act.

Mr. SABATH. May I ask this question? We have many aliens in our service who volunteered. Some have been captured and are now held by our enemies, some have been killed. Would those who are held by our enemies be precluded from the benefits of this act?

Mr. RANKIN. They would be precluded during the time they were held in enemy territory. The language reads:

Provided, That no compensation, pension, or other gratuity shall be paid for any period prior to the date of such new claim: *Provided further*, That while such person is located in a territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or any of its allies any part of the benefits to which such person would otherwise be entitled may, in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be apportioned and paid to the dependents of such persons who are in the United States or in a place not occupied or controlled by such enemy, except that the amount so apportioned and paid

shall not exceed the amount to which each dependent is entitled if such person were dead.

The Senate added an amendment which adds after the word "person" the words "not a citizen of the United States." If they are citizens of the United States, no matter if they are naturalized citizens, then this amendment would not apply.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Does this mean that we are to have two classes of servicemen, those who are citizens and those who are not citizens? That one group of our citizens will have the advantage of certain benefits and the other group be denied certain benefits?

Mr. RANKIN. It means that the man who is not a citizen who falls in the hands of the enemy in enemy country is treated differently; they draw a distinction between him and the man who is a citizen of the United States.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It seems to me that is grossly unfair. I shall oppose that.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so. It only applies to the ones who have committed some of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It seems to me that a man who fights for the United States, whether he has citizenship or does not have citizenship, if he fights for the country, is entitled to the same benefits as the man who has citizenship. I would be in opposition to that Senate amendment.

Mr. SABATH. May I make this observation: Many of these men who have enrolled or who have been drafted into our service are still citizens of countries with whom we are at war, and whenever they are apprehended they are treated as traitors, not merely as American soldiers but as traitors to their own country; consequently, they are dealt with more harshly and frequently they are subjected to the death penalty. Why should we discriminate against them when they assume the responsibility they do in the interest of helping our country where they have resided for a few years, helping her win the war?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that both these gentlemen voted for this bill when it passed the House with that provision in it, and this limitation narrowing it down to men who are not citizens of the United States who fall in the hands of the enemy was placed in the bill by the Senate. So far as I can see, that is not a very serious discrimination against anyone.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Why discriminate willfully against people who volunteer their services?

Mr. RANKIN. This applies only to the ones who are guilty of some one of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act, which reads as follows:

Sec. 4. Any person shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans'

Affairs to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies shall forfeit all accrued or future benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to gratuities for veterans and their dependents: *Provided, however*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his discretion, may apportion and pay any part of such benefits to the dependents of such person not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that answers the question.

I ask for the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENCE B. HUTCHINSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$116" insert "\$416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAFFER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report.

The bill as passed the House appropriated to Florence B. Hutchinson the sum of \$1,000, for personal injuries, medical and other expenses sustained by her when she fell getting out of an elevator on March 1, 1941, in the Champlain Apartment Building, Washington, D. C., leased by the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, the space therein having been assigned to and being occupied by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Senate reduced the amount appropriated from \$1,000 to \$116 and, at the conference, a compromise of \$416 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the action of the conferees?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes. The bill passed the House carrying \$1,000 for the relief of this claimant. The Senate cut it down to \$116 and actual medical expenses. The conferees agreed to \$300 for damages for personal injuries and suffering.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all that is involved?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUARDIAN OF LEONARD L. GAY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated to the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay the sum of \$3,500 for personal injuries sustained by an exploding cartridge during United States Army maneuvers in Louisiana on January 16, 1942.

The Senate reduced the amount appropriated from \$3,500 to \$2,500, and at the conference it was agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate, and that the amendment of the Senate be concurred in by the House.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST W. DICKEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same, with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$5,000" insert "\$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report.

The bill as passed the House appropriated to Forrest W. Dickey the sum of \$7,500, for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, sustained when shot without provocation by an armed soldier of the United States Army at Barstow, Calif., on January 27, 1942.

The Senate reduced the amount appropriated from \$7,500 to \$5,000 and, at the conference, a compromise of \$6,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
NAT PATTON,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Frank Waldrop appearing in the Times-Herald of July 7, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS TO COUNTRIES ALLIED WITH THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States, with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out all after "exile", down to and including "territory" in line 13 and insert "then, to a country or any political or territorial subdivision thereof which is proximate to the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, or, with the consent of the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, to any other country."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this Senate amendment simply permits these Chinese sailors to land in some other country besides England, is that right?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct. This bill was passed by the House unanimously on March 23; it passed the Senate but it was recalled by Senator LA FOLLETTE because of an objection made by the Chinese Government. The Chinese and British Governments have agreed upon the amendment and the text of the amendment and an agreement has been entered into between these two countries with reference to the treatment of these Chinese. They will be treated better. These Chinese who are now held in detention may go back to the Allied Nations, some of them to England, most of them to India, where they will join the armed forces of the Allies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is a complete agreement on this?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, there is a complete agreement between the Chinese Government and the English Government, and so forth.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] who is interested in this matter is in the hospital and he has asked me to say that he thinks the Senate amendment is all right and agreeable and that it ought to be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An

act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," the national-defense housing bill, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "\$500,000,000", insert "": *Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used for loans, grants, or contributions for the operation of day care or extended school services for children of mothers employed in war areas if and when the War-Area Child-Care Act of 1943 (S. 1130, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) becomes law: *Provided further*, That no grant, loan, or contribution for the maintenance or operation of public schools in any State shall be made without prior consultation with the State department of education and the United States Office of Education."

Page 1, line 7, after "\$500,000,000" insert "": *Provided further*, (a) That none of the funds authorized herein shall be used to acquire public works already operated by public or private agencies, except where funds are allotted for substantial additions or improvements to such public works and with the consent of the owners thereof; and

"(b) The total amount allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, shall not exceed \$40,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, these are amendments which the Senate placed upon a bill passed by the House with reference to the so-called community facilities in these congested housing areas where we have been building access roads to plants and carrying on certain hospitalization, sewerage, and water extensions, and aid to schools.

The Senate in one of the amendments placed a restriction that any such necessary construction as there may be in additions to existing schools to take care of the children of these war workers who have been brought into the communities, and any other matters which affect the schools under the act, shall require consultation not only with the local school people but with the State superintendents of education and with the Office of Education in Washington.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It does not require that consent shall be given, merely that they will be consulted?

Mr. LANHAM. Merely that there shall be consultation with them. We think it is reasonable to assume, in view of the fact that what is done under this act is by reason of the burden that is placed upon these communities by the war workers who have been brought in and who have children going to these schools, that these consulted authorities would naturally approve the applications because there will be need for such services shown by them.

Another amendment is to the effect that none of the money can be used to

buy an existing facility unless there is to be some necessary addition to it, and also with the consent of the owner. For instance, there might be a little hospital in one of these congested areas which could be purchased and added to more economically than by constructing an altogether new one.

Then there is a proposal that not more than one-fifth of the money authorized to be appropriated may be used for services, the remainder to be used for construction of the various kinds enumerated in the act.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask if there is in this bill real protection against Federal control of schools?

Mr. LANHAM. Absolutely. As a matter of fact, this law itself by terms very specifically provides already that no Federal agency can have anything to do with the operation or the curriculum or the administration of any of these schools.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wanted that to be very clear.

Mr. LANHAM. That is in the law.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Most of these schools that are being constructed in the war areas are temporary in nature?

Mr. LANHAM. They are.

Mr. DONDERO. They will not become part of the State school system when this war is over unless they have been built as additions to existing structures?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct, and unless the State authorities desire to keep them.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Under this law, the Federal Government does not thrust itself into the school systems of our States?

Mr. LANHAM. It does not. As a matter of fact, we on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were so adamant in our views in that regard that we wrote into the law the most stringent provision for which we had words to give expression to our sentiments in the English language.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understood the gentleman to say that these buildings shall not be acquired by public bodies within the State unless certain additions are to be made.

Mr. LANHAM. No; that, of course, was an erroneous understanding. The gentleman from Michigan inquired whether or not if an addition had been made to a school the State authorities or the school authorities could acquire it afterward. If an entire school building of a temporary nature were constructed, or a building of any other nature, it could be acquired by the local authorities.

Mr. HINSHAW. Acquired by the local authorities, not by the Federal Government?

Mr. LANHAM. This is a law that pertains only to the duration of the war. It is our purpose with reference to the housing and also these facilities to dispose of them when the war is over. The law so provides. For instance, if a city has had an addition made to its water service or to its sewerage system for the accommodation of these projects, the most reasonable disposition of such properties would be to the city concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. The reason I ask the question is that under some previous law—whether the gentleman's committee was the fountainhead of that law or not I do not recall—in the construction of additional school facilities in the city of Burbank, Calif., it became necessary for the Federal Government to take a lease upon public land—that is, the school land—in order to make the construction. The Federal Government would not do the construction without also having control over the ground. I want to know whether this money can be spent on public ground without taking that ground over, or whether the Government has to take over control of the ground for some period, such as 99 years.

Mr. LANHAM. No; sometimes it is more advantageous for the Government, naturally, to lease land than it is to purchase the land, and it is more economical, but it is the intention for all of this property to be disposed of when the war is over. We have no purpose in the world of invading the jurisdiction of the States or the operation of their various State facilities.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman does not quite understand my question, I think. I mean, if this money is to be spent, we will say on an addition to a local school, does that require that the school board or the school district make a lease of the public land to the Government, which the Government can then use for the construction of the building?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know just what all the administrative minutiae may be in getting a necessary addition made to a school, but there is certainly no effort on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with or to take over State property.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is a very important matter.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think I understand the purport of the question of the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been out to California and knows the situation.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Where there are at the present time school facilities and where there is an influx of war workers, there is nothing in the law to prevent the Federal Works Administration from placing an addition on the present school facilities without acquiring land, as far as I know, and I think I am correct, because the municipality or the county already owns that land. It is simply a question of building

an addition to accommodate the other children.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman from California means that that addition becomes a part of their school system, it does.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then do they have to undertake any obligation to repay money on a loan?

Mr. LANHAM. Not necessarily, because the law provides for grants or loans or both.

Mr. HINSHAW. The reason I asked that question is, as the gentleman doubtless knows, that it would take a vote of the people in a particular school district to authorize a school board to accept a loan or to make a loan.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman all the details of the administrative action in each particular place in the country. I would not know that. States have different provisions. However, unless this bill is passed, the work will be stopped on schools, on care for children of war workers, on hospitalization, on extension of water and sewerage systems, and on access roads to these plants which are vitally necessary for the operation of the plants.

I cannot tell just what the situation may be at Burbank, Calif., but if the gentleman from California will inquire of the administrative authorities what that situation is, they can give it to him in detail.

Mr. DONDERO. Further reserving the right to object, I think it ought to be said to the House that when this bill left the House and went to the Senate it did not include the amendment which provided that the Federal Works Agency's representatives were compelled even to consult with the State authority. That amendment has been placed in the bill by the Senate. I think it strengthens the bill and safeguards to the States some voice in the question of whether or not a school shall or shall not be built.

Mr. LANHAM. That is the amendment that was offered in the Senate by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. How much is the total amount of money involved in this conference report?

Mr. LANHAM. This is not a conference report. This is simply the conclusion of legislation upon this bill from the standpoint of the authorization. In the deficiency bill today an appropriation of \$50,000,000 was made, contingent upon the enactment of this measure.

Mr. BOREN. This \$50,000,000 is to be used to build sewer systems or any other facilities that might be necessary?

Mr. LANHAM. That is right—all of those mentioned in title II of the act.

Mr. BOREN. No such system was ever used until the defense efforts came into the country. When an oil field was opened up and thousands of people went into the area and school children were congregated without schools and sewer systems and so forth, for 150 years historically we have got along without this sort of a Government subsidy. Now the

Government is assuming in this bill to pay for those necessary facilities which in a normal time would be left as a burden on the locality.

Mr. LANHAM. I fear the gentleman from Oklahoma does not understand the purposes of this act and the purpose of this part of it. No subsidy is involved. We have gone into these various congested areas of defense where these war plants of different kinds are situated and in-migrant workers have been taken in to serve those plants. To the extent that housing is not available and to the extent that private capital cannot build the necessary housing, then we have constructed, publicly, these housing projects. The people who are going to live in them have to be serviced. The only purpose of this is that when these families come in, with the mothers working in war plants, they have these children that must go to school and it places a burden upon the community which we are trying to take care of simply from the standpoint of the war effort.

Mr. BOREN. How much of the \$50,000,000 will go to education?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot tell the gentleman exactly how much of it will go to education, because the \$50,000,000 appropriated today is but a part of the authorization and not the full amount. In the last year, I do not have the figures before me, but I think it was approximately \$11,000,000.

Mr. BOREN. The authorization is for \$500,000,000?

Mr. LANHAM. No; it is for \$200,000,000.

Mr. BOREN. How much of the authorization is designed for educational purposes?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not have the figures with me and I cannot tell the gentleman definitely, but I think it will be perhaps fifteen or sixteen million dollars.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. WILSON. I believe it would help to clear up the situation to state that in most cases the Federal Works Agency has merely matched money that the local corporations put up, and paid that part of the cost of building these necessary additions in proportion to the amount that their situation has been aggravated by the influx of war workers. That has been my experience in getting funds for this purpose.

To answer further the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], if it is an addition to a school and the project is to be built on existing school grounds, the local corporation furnishes that ground as a part of their contribution in taking care of this influx and will also match this Federal Works Agency grant to a certain extent, especially if the construction has future need and is of a permanent type. If it is temporary and the influx is purely temporary, then it is likely that they will stand the whole cost. They will select their own site and therefore it will be disposed of in some way or other after the emergency.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague.

May I say further in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], that I now have the figures for last year. Last year there was \$11,506,269 that went for the schools.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman of course knows of my very keen interest in the housing situation in Detroit. That, to a great extent, affects the entire school system there because of this great influx of workers from all over the country. I should like the assurance of the gentleman, as I understand some of his committee are about to make a reasonable tour of the country, that if and when they are in Detroit they will make a careful analysis of our emergency needs, that they may consult with the local housing authority and with the good mayor of my city in order that we may work out some reasonable plan under which the necessary facilities may be furnished.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that it is contemplated that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will make a visit to that area and will be very glad to have the consultation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that aside from all considerations, these facilities are absolutely vital to the war effort, and without them we cannot expect these people to work?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, absolutely. Without these facilities you could not get these in-migrant workers to go to work in these plants.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact, as the gentleman from New York said, that these facilities are absolutely necessary?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. And that the small communities will be tremendously benefited; those communities where these great plants have been built; far removed from the large centers, and that all of this will be of tremendous benefit to all sections where those plants have been erected at great cost? But it requires that they are necessary, and I presume that it will have to be done.

Mr. LANHAM. It would be an unjustifiable burden upon the communities not to help them out with reference to these necessary expenditures for the war effort.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. Is it not a fact that communities are seeking these projects and asking that they be located, that they were looking for these projects because they considered they were not going to be a burden, but considered they would be an asset if the projects were located

in their community. Is it not a further fact that the projects are looked upon as a financial benefit to the communities where they are located; and is it not a further fact that there are plenty of communities throughout the entire Nation that would be glad to have such projects located within their own communities?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in one community in Indiana with a population of about 450 people, they put up a large powder plant and there have been built something like 2,000 houses for the use of people working for the Government. These people were brought there when there was nothing but temporary shelter in that community; the school population has increased three or four times what it was previous to the location of this project, and this little rural village had absolutely no capacity to bond itself to build a school building, to build sewer systems or water facilities, and these people were left almost stranded; the local community could not house them, and it was necessary to have housing, and, therefore, they had to build these facilities to give them any kind of shelter. The local community could not build them; it could not do so if it wanted to, because it did not have the bonding capacity.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I happen to live in an area not far from Detroit where the Government built a Navy ordnance plant and a tank plant. The tank plant was built in the middle of a corn field where there was a little community of 200 or 300 people, which was faced with the problem of taking care of several thousand workers plus their children.

Mr. BOREN. Did Detroit not want this plant?

Mr. DONDERO. This was outside of Detroit in a rural community, where they could not possibly take care of these workers.

Mr. BOREN. Did the local community not want it?

Mr. DONDERO. The plant was put up there without taking it up with them; they had nothing to say about it; it was located there by the Federal Government, and it was necessary to provide facilities for the workers in the plant.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, it is an amazing thing to me that the Government, with all of the facilities that are available throughout the length and breadth of this land, with all the places that could be utilized, has to pick out some of these places to locate its plants where they are a burden on the people where they are located.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, that is something about which the Com-

mittee on Public Buildings and Grounds would have no jurisdiction whatever, but there is no doubt in the least about the need for these facilities.

Mr. BOREN. But the Congress can decide whether or not we are going to subsidize the building of these facilities; at least, it can lay down a yardstick that will cause them to hesitate to follow such a course in the future.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to my good friend from Oklahoma that I am in sympathy with the viewpoint taken by him, in general, and the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] knows that I have exerted every effort to safeguard the rights of the States and the local communities against any such subsidies.

Mr. LANHAM. I can assure my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that he and I are in accord in that respect.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REED of New York. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that it does not make any difference whether these small communities wanted these projects located there or not. Some of them may think a benefit would result, but if they will look back to the last World War, they can see the ghost towns that were left when the war closed.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right; there will be no ghost towns under this legislation because we provide for the disposition of the property when the war is over.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. This fund, as I understand it, is to be used to provide water works and sewerage for the additional housing in those centers of great war industry activity where it is so badly needed because of the emergency conditions.

Mr. LANHAM. And it is not done for their own citizens; it is done because the Federal Government puts the burden on them.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to Senate amendments numbered 1 and 2 to the bill H. R. 2936, to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the Senate amendments?

The question was taken and in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds having voted in the affirmative the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2614. An act to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims; and

H. R. 2794. An act to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3030) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 9 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 8, 9, 24, 25, 26, and 27, requests a further conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) entitled "An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate still further insists on its amendments numbered 33 and 34 to said bill; asks a still further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for

other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes."

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 281.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, or subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a study of the problems in connection with the public lands of the United States; including, but not limited to, (1) an investigation of the tax problems connected with the acquisition of such lands and burden upon local units by reason of use of large tracts of public lands for public use, the effect upon grazing areas and other incidental problems; the study of a home-stead program and a study of the use of such program to assist in the rehabilitation of men discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and will later yield time to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Is there an amendment to be offered to the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. That is important. What will the amendment contain?

Mr. SABATH. The amendment provides that the hearings and investigation shall be limited to the District of Columbia. I intend to offer that amendment at the proper time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was unanimously asked for by the Committee on the Public Lands. During the last 2 years the Government has been obliged to take over a large acreage of land throughout the country. In many instances it was necessary. It is believed by some and by that committee that many counties and sections have suffered because that land has been taken off the tax rolls of the county or State. The committee believes they should investigate and ascertain whether the Government should reimburse the various counties or States

covering the losses they have sustained because of the taking of this land by the Federal Government. I presume a majority of the Members from those sections are in favor of this resolution, but even others feel that no injustice should be done to anyone under this administration. In view of that the Committee on Rules authorized me to report the resolution and offer an amendment which would restrict the committee to making investigations and holding hearings in the District of Columbia. I am informed by the proponents of this resolution, however, that it will be impossible for them to proceed and make the investigation that should be made if they are so restricted; consequently I shall leave it to the House and I hope the Membership will use good judgment in voting on that amendment as to whether they shall say by adopting it that this committee shall be the first to be so restricted.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the House have an opportunity to vote down such an amendment?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman should know by this time that I never deprive the Membership of the House of an opportunity to express itself in voting on any proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. That is true; notwithstanding the shortcomings of some of the Members I still have confidence in the vast majority of the Members of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I wanted the matter to be clear to the Members.

Mr. SABATH. With this short explanation, realizing the desire of the Members to take a little recess shortly I conclude my remarks and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York. I hope it will not be used.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of our military operations in the Far East and the large number of young Americans deployed in that area, suppression of the opium traffic has become a matter of vital importance to us, and if you will bear with me a short time, I shall give you a brief history of opium smoking there, its present status, and what should be done about it as a post-war problem.

A great Chinese leader who was being prevailed upon to legalize opium smoking in China said, "Nothing can induce me to obtain a revenue from the vice of my people." Ever since then the Chinese policy has been to suppress opium abuse. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek inaugurated a 6-year plan to throw off the bonds of opium. This plan was going forward with such success that the Chinese strength frightened the Japanese. They saw the Chinese giant throwing off the opium shackles and attacked before China was completely cured. The specter of a strong opium-free China had as much to do with the

Japanese attack on that country as any one factor. Today in unoccupied China opium smoking has been reduced to an extent which has astonished international opium experts who have observed that country for many years. China regards opium suppression as more important than it regarded extraterritorial privileges which were abolished by the United States and the British a short time ago.

After having taken the initiative of calling the Shanghai Commission in 1909, our Government exercised its influence to convene the Conference of 1912 at The Hague. This resulted in the adoption of an international instrument embodying certain principles on opium smoking. This convention, which was incorporated in the Versailles Treaty, came into force after the First World War and carried with it a provision that the contracting powers should gradually and effectively suppress the smoking of opium. However, the situation in the Far East grew worse.

The conference called in 1924 at Geneva on smoking opium accomplished nothing. Even the most enthusiastic defenders of this instrument could not deny that it was nothing more than an outline of principles which might lead at some time in the future to an improvement in the situation.

Conditions grew steadily worse, and in 1931 an opium-smoking conference met at Bangkok which did not fulfill even a fraction of the hopes and expectations we had nourished in this respect. No definite time limit was set within which opium smoking should be suppressed in the Far East, and the agreement of 1931 can only be considered as an attempt to improve some administrative arrangements of the smoking opium monopolies then maintained by the British, Dutch, French, Portuguese, Siamese, Iranian, and Japanese Governments, these arrangements being merely of a secondary character. Conference on the manufacture of drugs have given satisfaction to all governments concerned, and the problem of smoking opium should reach the same level of development which the control of dangerous drugs has already reached.

Article 6 of the International Opium Convention of 1912, signed at The Hague, provides that the "Contracting powers shall take measures for the gradual and efficacious suppression of the manufacture, the internal traffic in, and the use of prepared opium insofar as the different conditions peculiar to each nation shall allow of this, unless existing measures have already regulated the matter."

The United States fulfilled its obligations. It would not allow smoking opium in the Philippine Islands, although a plan was proposed to this Congress to allow a smoking opium monopoly to sell opium to the Filipinos for a period of 3 years. Think of what would have happened to our prestige had Congress not turned down this proposal. How much might this have affected the course of war in the Pacific? How much sooner would the Japanese have been able to conquer territories, and would Australia and New Zealand have been saved had we adopted

the same opium policy as some of the other powers?

While these government smoking opium monopolies which sell opium to all comers are supposed to control, the situation has become decidedly worse, and it is not to be wondered at that the natives of Burma and Java were not enthusiastic in their assistance to defend their territories from Japanese aggression. These people always resented the fact that opium was being sold to them. Opium smoking is legal in British Malaya, the Netherlands Indies, the unfederated Malay States, Sarawak, Brunei, Burma, Ceylon, India, British North Borneo, Hong Kong, Thailand, French Indochina, Iran, and in all territories under Japanese domination. These countries have maintained that they have fulfilled their obligations under the 1912 convention, and that they cannot abolish monopolies unless smuggling of opium into their territories ceases, and as long as opium production continues in China on a large scale they believe that the system of selling prepared opium is preferable to suppression. If you can follow that line of reasoning why not set up infection centers when you get a smallpox epidemic? By the same illogical reasoning all prostitutes should be licensed by the government. The legal sale of poison to a population is morally indefensible. The true reason for maintaining these monopolies is revenue.

At the Bangkok Conference in 1931 our representative stated that "while we are prepared to lend all practical aid to measures directed toward suppression of this destructive vice, the Government of the United States is not prepared to follow a line similar and concurrent with that followed by other governments so long as those other governments elect to retain the monopoly system and are not willing to attempt complete suppression."

Canada has always agreed with us on this policy. Our neighbor along with ourselves has always been on the receiving end of smuggled smoking opium manufactured in those Far Eastern government monopolies. The opium is purchased by the smuggler across the counter in the Far East and then is smuggled into the United States and Canada.

At the Bangkok Conference our representative also said, "The Government of the United States most strongly urges frank recognition of the fact that there is but one real method by which to suppress the evil of opium smoking in the Far East or anywhere else and that this method is complete statutory prohibition of the importation, manufacture, sale, possession or use of prepared opium, coupled with active enforcement." The Chinese Government has always supported the United States Government in this policy, and has bitterly complained about the sale of opium to its citizens by foreign governments.

The Netherlands Government has always maintained that it could better control the situation by selling prepared opium under strict rules. However, the

smuggler got the upper hand in the Netherlands Indies before the Japanese moved in. Now the Japanese operate these monopolies. The scorched-earth policy in the Far East did not apply to the opium smoking monopolies. The Japanese took over these going concerns without 1 day's loss of business. The Japanese are now maintaining these monopolies and are deriving enormous revenue therefrom, although broadcasting that from now on this terrible vice will not be the curse of the Far East. Of course, we know that this is Japanese propaganda to offset our facts about the diabolical methods used by the Japanese in poisoning and weakening the Chinese with opium and softening them up for conquest. The two-faced Japanese state that they had already suppressed smoking opium in certain territories. Like the two-faced god Janus they say that the tax on smoking opium in Burma had been considerably reduced so that the coolie would not have to spend all of his money for smoking opium.

At conferences and meetings of the Opium Advisory Committee of the League of Nations, the British Government has maintained the position that if effective measures are taken by China to suppress the growth of the opium poppy and have reached such a stage as to remove the danger of opium smuggling from China into British territories, such as Hong Kong and Burma, they would initiate the necessary measures to enable the complete prohibition of opium.

The French Government has also stated that it would undertake to abolish completely the use of prepared opium following the British Government's proposal.

The Government of Thailand also stated that it could not abolish the sale of smoking opium from government shops as long as an uncontrollable illicit traffic originating from neighboring states existed.

A commission of inquiry into the control of smoking opium by the League of Nations stated that the opium going into the illicit traffic in the Far Eastern territories was not solely of Chinese origin but consisted mainly of opium produced in Persia, Turkey, the Shan States and India. Therefore, China was not alone responsible. The Six-Year Plan which China inaugurated in 1935 for gradual suppression made such successful progress that by the end of 1940 it can be said that the goal of suppression had almost been reached.

To give you an idea of the number of smokers in some of these territories, the Netherlands Indies had in 1940 77,000 registered smokers, half of whom were Chinese and the other half Javanese; Burma had 45,000 smokers, only 13,000 of whom were Chinese; and the rest were Burmese.

Some time in 1940 the Chinese government issued instructions to Chinese foreign representatives to endeavor to stamp out opium smoking among overseas Chinese in their respective jurisdictions, but they got little help.

Some of the worst smoking opium conditions are found in the Portuguese Government monopoly at Macao, an island near Hong Kong, where about a million transient smokers annually purchase opium from the Portuguese Government monopoly.

The opium situation in India should not be overlooked. There are some 6,000 government shops in India which sell opium. The revenue yielded is great. As much as 500 tons of smoking opium, or twice the medical needs of the world, are eaten or smoked in India. An Indian scientist points out that these opium smokers are not healthy; they have nothing to look forward to in life but to work hard and buy opium with the fruits of their toils. I could go on for hours elaborating on this sort of picture but shall reserve this for further discussion.

I just want to point out that the defense given by all these countries that as long as smuggling continues they could not abolish government monopolies is utterly destroyed by the situation which existed in Hong Kong before the Japanese conquered that territory. Rationed government smokers numbered 5,557 in 1939 whereas according to the Hong Kong police authorities illicit smokers numbered 90,000. Is not this eloquent evidence that the smoking opium monopoly can be closed? The solution there should have been not to sell government opium but to proceed against the smuggler. When the government sells opium to 5,000 and the smuggler sells to 90,000, the defense for maintaining government monopolies has collapsed.

In French Indo-China a few years ago the Government increased the price of smoking opium to the inhabitants because smuggling, it stated, had been reduced to such an extent that the government was no longer in competition with the smuggler. Formerly, the French Government had stated that it would close government shops when smuggling ceased. Instead of doing so it raised the price of opium.

Iran is one of the large opium-producing countries. It formerly produced much of the smoking opium used by Japan in territories under her control. Iran is also the source of much medicinal opium. Iran has unfortunately legalized the sale of opium. However, in issuing a license to its subjects to purchase opium, the government permits contain the following 12 admonitions:

1. Don't be fooled by this home-wrecking drug.
2. Escape from the claws of this ghoul.
3. Addiction to opium leads to ruin.
4. Why set fire to your own possessions?
5. Opium brings misfortune.
6. It is easier than you think to give up opium.
7. Opium is your enemy and your family's enemy.
8. You can easily give up opium.
9. You have learned how harmful opium is. Make an effort to give it up.
10. Gradual lessening of the amount consumed is the easiest way to give up opium.
11. Have pity on your wife and children.
12. Save yourself from ruin and your family from misfortune.

The Iranian Government also gives the following warning to the licensed users:

You know that by using opium daily you are turning in to your government's treasury an appreciable amount of your income. However, since your government, which is your well-wisher, is ready for your own good and for the sake of society to forego this revenue, it behooves you to further this purpose of your government by giving up the use of opium, thus doing your share to save yourself and serve the public good.

As a result of using opium you make yourself miserably, your family financially insecure, your country weak. Make an effort and give it up.

If you are not interested in your own good, at least try to serve humanity and your country by making an effort to discontinue its use.

If you will reduce your daily ration of opium gradually, by imperceptible degrees, you will succeed in giving it up without even feeling it.

Never use opium in the presence of others, and thus avoid setting fire and bringing ruin to other people's homes and lives.

Then why legalize its sale? The Iranian Government cannot rely on the defense that as long as the smuggler operates, they must sell to control its use.

Organized labor throughout the world declared itself with respect to this problem by the following resolution adopted by the International Labor Conference at its session in June 1936:

The twentieth session of the International Labor Conference:

Taking note of the report entitled "Opium and Labor," submitted by the International Labor Office;

Considering that it cannot remain indifferent to the conclusions of this report, in which it is stated that opium smoking is injurious to the workers, impedes their social and economic development, impairs their health and decreases their efficiency and, when it is practiced continuously, shatters the health and increases the death rate of the smokers, and tends to reduce the rate of economic and social progress in the districts affected;

Believing that these effects are due both to unsatisfactory conditions of labor and to the official authorization of the sale of opium to workers:

Requests the governing body to recommend the governments in whose territory the sale of opium for smoking is authorized to improve conditions of labor by the following methods:

1. Reduction of hours of work in occupations where long hours are worked;
2. Guaranty of an adequate living wage and improvements of conditions of labor in arduous occupations, which are generally the worst paid;
3. Establishment of facilities for medical treatment;
4. Establishment and organization of collective spare time activities;

Also requests the governing body to bring to the notice of the competent bodies and of the governments the following suggestions, with a view to drawing up rules which would complete the measures mentioned above in countries in which the sale of opium for smoking is authorized;

1. The limitation of the sale of opium, either raw or the prepared form, to registered smokers;
2. The registration of all workers addicted to opium smoking;

(a) The establishment of registers for the registration of workers who smoke opium, such registers to remain open for a period of

12 months, after which they should be closed and no further smokers registered;

(b) The granting of licenses for registered workers authorized to smoke opium, so as to allow of the identification of the license holder and the purchase by him of the quantity of opium mentioned in the license;

(c) Notification to all registered smokers that the sale of opium will be discontinued at the end of 5 years;

3. Reduction of the quantity of opium sold to licensed smokers by one-fifth each year;

4. Establishment by the government of curative centers where workers accustomed to smoke opium may obtain treatment to cure them of the habit;

5. Drawing up and application of such laws and regulations, and adoption of such measures as are considered necessary to prevent licensed smokers from substituting for the use of opium that of opium derivatives, cocaine or any other drug covered by the existing conventions;

6. Drawing up and application of such additional laws and regulations as governments may consider necessary to bring about the cessation of the licensed use of opium for smoking within 5 years;

7. Application of measures to prevent workers who smoke opium from obtaining and smoking smuggled opium.

This interest by organized labor should have a powerful influence in having smoking opium completely abolished when we and our allies reconquer far eastern territories.

Just before the outbreak of the war the League of Nations had three preliminary conferences to determine the best method of limiting the production of opium to world medical needs. One of the greatest stumbling blocks encountered was the difficulty of obtaining a total opium production figure because of this so-called legitimate sale of opium by governments having territories in the Far East. For instance, some years government smoking opium needs would total 50 units, and might go up as high as 80 units in another year. Therefore, it would not be possible to arrive at a world consumption figure for both medicinal opium and government monopoly opium for smoking and eating when the consumption for smoking and eating might vary as much as 50 percent because of the sale by government monopolies, which is not a fixed item like the world consumption for medical needs.

It would be impossible to arrive at proper limitation of opium production in the post-war world unless this problem of government sale of smoking opium is settled now.

We have often heard humorists say that we have never lost a war nor won a conference. That was exploded in 1931 at the League of Nations in Geneva when the United States won the greatest and most far-reaching victory in the history of the narcotic problem when it obtained nearly all of its proposals to limit the manufacture of narcotic drugs to the medical needs of the world. The result of this convention has been an enormous drop in addiction throughout the world. No small part of this credit belongs to our United States Commissioner of Narcotics, Hon. Harry J. Anslinger, who, with the aid of Canada, China, and several of our South American neighbors, resolutely battled the European narcotic manufacturing cartel for

3 months to obtain concessions in an international treaty never before accomplished in any of our treaties. I have examined the records of this history-making conference and find that our American delegates set up machinery which is still in operation despite the war. One result of this convention is that cocaine addiction has practically disappeared throughout the world. That is why I am appealing for a settlement of the smoking opium problem now.

Commissioner Anslinger for at least 10 years attended the League of Nations meetings having to do with the opium problem, and each year he appealed to the several nations to put an end to their sale of smoking opium, not only to free opium slaves but to arrive at limitation of production.

I have no desire nor intention to criticize any of our allies and I do not want anything I have said here construed in that light. I am looking at the problem objectively only. It would be a far-reaching step if we obtained a declaration from our allies now instead of waiting for the post-war world when the smoking opium problem as in the past, might be difficult, if not impossible of solution. Governments should abandon the principle of the sale of poison opium to their people. This problem has highly political, social, and economic ramifications.

The legalized sale of opium must be abolished under the "four freedoms." There must be freedom from exploitation by governments. Can a man have freedom from want if his government takes the fruits of labor in exchange for opium? Government sale of opium to its nationals is in effect a license to cut off one-third of a man's life. This was proved by Mr. Lyall, president of the opium board of the League of Nations. The poor coolie laborer works all day, gets about 50 cents, and gives 45 cents to the government for opium. His family is impoverished. He goes into a government-licensed den and either buys opium or smokes a government pipe which has been used a hundred times that day. We can be thankful we never sold opium to the Filipinos. That is one reason they rallied around our flag.

We have a problem to face right at this moment, that is the danger of contamination of our American troops who reconquer these territories. These boys must be guarded against the danger of becoming opium-smoking addicts in any of these territories which they reconquer where opium-smoking monopolies exist; otherwise we shall have many of them returning as opium users. There is only one thing to do when we reconquer these territories, and that is to close immediately these government opium shops and not allow them to reopen—certainly not during the time we are in occupation. I hope that our Army and Navy authorities will bear this in mind and will take drastic measures to close these shops because the danger of addiction always follows where opium is accessible.

This is one of the problems for post-war settlement which could be settled now by these few simple words on the part of the United Nations, "When terri-

tories belonging to any member of the United Nations are reconquered, government opium shops will be closed and will remain permanently closed." Let us have an agreement now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects: First, the supply of natural gas; and, second, the opinion of a citizen of Florida on the Florida Barge Canal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include some extracts from a publication of the Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted at a mass meeting in San Francisco on June 17, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two places in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address, and that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a speech

made by him before a Republican rally in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which the President addressed to the Rivers and Harbors committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was granted permission by the House to extend my own remarks and to include an address of the Librarian of Congress. I am informed that the address exceeds the usual amount and will cost \$108. I ask unanimous consent that this address may be printed, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JULY 7, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES WOLFENDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BREHM, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a highly important bill or it would not have been brought in here at the eleventh hour. The Committee on Public Lands has been working on this bill for a very long while. I rather suspect there are 40 or 50 Members of the House who would be interested in their districts by the passage of legislation of this kind. In my district, like other districts, the Government has acquired vast tracts of land to build Army camps. Camp Shanks, within 25 miles of New York City, is located in Rockland County, in my new district, and is equipped to handle 40,000 soldiers. The Government has taken over almost a whole township; it has taken it out of taxation. Interest is required to be paid on the bonds issued by the town and school district. These townships have no money to pay the interest with if the Government does not contribute its share. This raises a very serious question in reference to establishing a definite policy. What should be the right and fair policy for the Government? Should the Government pay these taxes in the school districts and townships where it has acquired a large quantity of valuable land and taken it out of taxation? I want a committee to be formed to study the entire problem and to report back a definite policy. That is why I am supporting this bill. I do not propose to say to the committee what it shall do or what it shall not do. It has the interest of the Government at heart, and it has the interest of the people and taxpayers at heart. The Government should do the right thing, and the Congress, I am sure, will support any policy that is just and fair to the Government and to the people in the districts affected. It certainly is not fair to destroy a whole township or a whole county, which has been done in many States of the Union.

I am not pleading for my own district alone; I am pleading for a square deal for the American people whose property has been taken away from them because of the war, or on account of some emergency or necessity, and that property has been withdrawn from taxation. Therefore, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I insisted that this resolution be reported and a committee be empowered to study this serious and complicated problem. Of course, we have confidence in the committee and know that it will study the problem intelligently.

There are members on the Rules Committee, like my distinguished chairman, who for one reason or other—I do not want to say, of course, that he is wrong, but he is going to offer an amendment to restrict this committee in their labor, in their work, and keep them right here in Washington in the warm weather during August and make them stay here all the time during the recess to study the problem, whereas they, of course, ought to be going out throughout the country and into the different States of the Union, not alone in New York but even in the State of Illinois and possibly in Chicago, finding out the facts, and upon those facts recommending a definite policy to the House of Representatives.

I have confidence in any committee of the House that already exists, both Democrats and Republicans, and believe that the Committee on the Public Lands is composed of able, conscientious, and intelligent members.

I take this opportunity to say that if the Republicans had been in power instead of the New Deal and a controversy had arisen between a Cabinet officer and the Vice President, and they had started calling each other names and had entered into charges and countercharges and criminations and recriminations, denouncing each other as squandering the people's money, and being thoroughly incompetent and dishonest, and impeding the war effort, there would be an investigation. There would be an investigation not only by the Congress but by the Department of Justice, and the Republicans would not have tried to prevent it. But here we are about to adjourn, and the Rules Committee that reported out the pending resolution yesterday refused by a vote of 6 to 5 to permit an investigation of that controversy on the home front, although the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones, came before the committee and asked for such an investigation. This same Committee on Rules, a very distinguished committee, by the way, refused by a strict party vote to permit an investigation of these charges and countercharges of gross squandering of the people's money and of utter inefficiency and incompetency that seriously hampered our war efforts. There were a few words passed between these two distinguished gentlemen that I prefer not to use in a public assembly of this kind, because I would not want to be called to order by the Speaker of the House or have my words taken down by some Member. From what each of these two eminent statesmen said of each other I infer there was a slight misunderstanding over each other's veracity.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has heard a great deal in the last few years about the good-neighbor policy and about unity and tolerance. Would the gentleman give us his idea as to how much this good-neighbor policy here at home is promoted when the Vice President comes back and hits his nearest neighbor, Jesse Jones, and calls him this, that, and the other?

Mr. FISH. There is only one thing left to do and that is to engage in a good old-fashioned battle royal. We might stage it in the House of Representatives. If they had been Republicans, there would have been investigations and impeachment proceedings in the House against both of them until we found out the facts and the truth of the charges and countercharges in the interest of the American public, who are entitled to the facts. But the Wigglesworth resolution was voted down in spite of the fact that Mr. Jesse Jones asked for it, by a strict party vote, by the same distinguished committee that reported this resolution. I do not un-

derstand how the fair-minded Democratic members of the Rules Committee could be a party to putting the snuffer on such an investigation.

At the same time they refused an investigation of the Elk Hills oil situation out in California, which was included in one of the bills from the Committee on the Public Lands. If the Republicans were in power, that situation would have been investigated by half a dozen committees and all the facts presented to the public. I do not know; possibly the Republicans are to blame for not getting on their hind feet and insisting upon these investigations for the good of the country. It may be we are too easy and too good-natured not to insist on them. The responsibility rests squarely with the Democratic majority for voting down any investigation of these serious charges.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Might it not be that we have become accustomed to that way of doing to which the gentleman just referred, there has been so much waste, so much extravagance, so much corruption, so much quarreling among them?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman means we have possibly become immune to these charges of squandering the people's money and of incompetency among the New Deal bureaucrats.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Possibly that is the answer.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK. The gentleman has told us what his party would do if it were in power under present conditions. I presume he speaks in part from the experience his party has heretofore had in dealing with some subjects of that kind in its last administration.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and we investigated them and sent some of them away. We did not cover them up. We did not seek to hush up any scandals. We voted for an investigation and to bring the facts out into the open. That is all we are asking for now, a fair and impartial investigation, which the Democrats on the Rules Committee voted down.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REED of New York. Just to get back to the original proposition of the Government's taking over large tracts of land and taking them from the tax rolls, that is a very serious question, particularly in the Northwest, because there are counties up there where the Government has gone in and bought forest land until there is not enough taxable property left even to support the sheriffs and the judiciary systems of those counties.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and the school districts and the schools, to keep the children in the schools. There is no money left, they are virtually bankrupt. This is a serious resolution. It involves a great national policy. I hope the amendment to be offered by my distinguished chairman will not prevail.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Following up a little further the suggestion made by my colleague from New York [Mr. REED], in some of these Northwestern States, particularly in my own, more than 50 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government and other public agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

This bill is not confined to the State of Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. That is true.

Mr. FISH. It takes in almost every State in the Union. It is not offered along partisan lines. It involves many of the Southern States as well. I hope when the amendment is offered to confine the committee to remain in Washington; if you want a real investigation, if you want the facts, then vote down the amendment and give this committee a chance to go out and get the facts.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman mentioned Elk Hills. I am sorry the Rules Committee did not see fit to go along on this investigation of the Elk Hills oil deposit. That happens to be in my district. The present bill involves increasing the size of that area. It involves million of dollars worth of highly developed oil lands. It takes many, many millions off the tax rolls.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Navy has already admitted his mistake; it was just another raw new deal?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman that the contract that exists is altogether different than the bill pending before the Public Lands Committee, creating additional size of the field.

Mr. FISH. Why were we not permitted an investigation, then, when we asked for it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I asked for an investigation because I thought it went back to the Teapot Dome scandal.

Mr. FISH. Well, we did not cover up anything at that time and why should we attempt to do so now? Why not bring those facts out and let the public know about it? That is what we are complaining about.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is no one who wants to bring it out any more than I do.

Mr. FISH. All right. Go after your Democratic members on the Rules Committee and let us get some action as soon as we convene after the recess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution, but since the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has announced that he pro-

poses to submit an amendment that the hearings be held only in Washington, I am opposed to that amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I stated that I had been instructed by the committee to offer such an amendment, and it was the only way I could obtain favorable action from the committee, by agreeing to offer an amendment, and I stated that I was going to carry out the wishes of the committee and offer the amendment. Do I make myself plain?

Mr. BARRETT. I understand the gentleman is merely carrying out the instructions of the Rules Committee.

Now, I am particularly interested in one phase of the investigation proposed under this resolution. That is the creation of the Jackson Hole National Monument and the hearings pursuant to my bill to abolish that monument. It is located in my State. It comprise 221,610 acres. It takes in nearly half of the taxable property in Teton County, Wyo. Now, briefly this is the history of this matter. About 10 years ago the Park Service proposed legislation in Congress to add this 221,000 acres to Teton National Park. The bill was submitted but failed to pass. It has been submitted to Congress on different occasions. The Congress each time has failed to pass it. On March 15 last the President, by Executive Order, created the Jackson Hole National Monument, and thereby added this 221,000 acres to Teton National Park. Accordingly he accomplished by indirection the very thing that Congress refused to do directly.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. What authority of law was there for creating this national monument.

Mr. BARRETT. The action was taken under what is known as the Antiquities Act. It was an act of Congress of 1906 and authorized the President by Executive order to create monuments to preserve historic objects or objects of scientific interest. It provided by its terms that only the smallest amount of acreage necessary should be set over in order to protect the object to be preserved.

Mr. CURTIS. Has that ever been construed to include over 200,000 acres of land?

Mr. BARRETT. No. I will say it has not been construed by the courts either way, but any reasonable person reading the act will be able to ascertain that certainly the Congress did not intend to include 221,000 acres in a monument.

I might say further that at the time it was considered in Congress, the debates disclosed that they intended they would take in only a matter of a few hundred acres in each case.

Mr. CURTIS. To preserve spots of specific historical interest and value?

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Are there any such objects of scientific interest in the Jackson Hole district?

Mr. BARRETT. I may say that we have had extended hearings in Washington on this matter. Several witnesses came down from Wyoming at considerable expense to testify at the hearings on my bill to abolish this monument. They testified that there were no such objects in the entire 221,000 acres. But now the Public Lands Committee wants to send a subcommittee out there and investigate and look over the land to see for themselves just exactly as to that fact.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am curious to know why the committee wants to go into the question of investigation of the problem of rehabilitation of men discharged from the armed forces. That seems rather farfetched from the main purpose of the resolution. I think that might better be left to the committee handling veterans' legislation.

Mr. BARRETT. The chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] can answer that question better than I, but what they propose is that they will investigate the feasibility of permitting the returning soldiers to file on some of these vast bodies of land purchased by the Government during the past few years and establish homes on it and farm it and get it back on to the tax rolls. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the distinguished chairman of my committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The purpose of the committee was to study the over-all problem with reference to public lands. There is no one agency in the Federal Government today that knows exactly how much land the Government owns. That is one thing. There has been testimony before the committee, but no single agency has that information. The nearest to it was the Federal Real Estate Board.

Almost 20,000,000 acres of land has been taken off the tax books within the last 2 years. We hope to make a complete study, to have more complete information for the Congress showing exactly how much park land, how much forest land, and how much other lands are owned by the Government. We ought to find out how many acres would be available to be used for rehabilitation or could be put up for homesteads.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say further that in this area involved in the Jackson Hole National Monument there are ranchers running about 14,000 head of cattle. Unless this monument is abolished those men will have to go out of business. Teton County will not be able to carry on because nearly half of the tax money comes from people living in this particular area. There are about six schools in that area, and they

will not be able to carry on. The people of Wyoming and Teton County in particular are opposed to this monument. They feel that this is a matter that should have been left to the Congress where they would have had an opportunity to be heard. They feel that this Congress ought to assert itself and to show, in no uncertain terms, its disapproval of the action of the Executive in overriding the will of the Congress and attempting to do by a directive the very thing that Congress has refused to sanction by legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I raise this question because I am not sure that the gentleman has stated exactly what the bill intends to do. As I understood the gentleman, he said that some of the lands would become available for homesteads. They cannot be homesteaded because they are not on an ordinary homestead basis; this refers to the public lands.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is correct but no doubt considerable lands could be opened in all the public land States.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. There are great areas in his State and in my own State where they would not be proper for homestead.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

I might say to the gentleman that the purpose of the bill is to authorize an investigation to be made to determine the particular areas that might be homesteaded.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time because I realize everybody is very anxious to get through. I think this resolution should be passed but that the amendment that may be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee ought to be voted down, and I think the Public Lands Committee ought to have an opportunity to go out and look over the area themselves and determine the true character of the lands set aside by this monument.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution. There is a real problem in connection with the lands that the Government has taken over. In fact, the Government has taken over millions upon millions of acres for which it has no use. These millions of acres have been taken from the counties' tax rolls. In some cases the Government owns practically the entire county, but it refuses to pay taxes.

Therefore an investigation to have the Government pay taxes is proper and urgent. I feel that when the Government is compelled to pay taxes the bureaucracy will not be so greedy in grabbing lands that they cannot use and do not need. I am sure in some cases they will be willing to return some of the lands to the

people to whom it belongs, and from whom it was taken.

There seems to have been a craze on the part of every governmental department to grab some land or something and call it the public domain. Mr. Speaker, this has not been the policy under which this Nation has grown and become the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

In my State under the submarginal land-purchase program the Government took over about one-half of a county and thus removed these lands from the tax rolls of the county. This has made it virtually impossible for the county government to continue. I am sure if these lands are taxed properly that then there will be no more grabbing.

I am very sorry, however, that the Rules Committee excluded an investigation of the Elk Hills Reservation. From the evidence we have been listening to in the Public Lands Committee I am sure we all are satisfied that there is something wrong. We feel that the Navy Department and other departments were not as alert as they should have been. While there has been no positive evidence of fraud or scandal, nevertheless, the contract entered into by the Navy Department giving to one oil company a monopoly for virtually nothing must be viewed with suspicion.

I am not one who will make accusations without a foundation but I will state that the whole transaction does not look good. I think the Department of Justice is to be congratulated for having protected the public interest by pointing out that the contract, to say the least, is illegal. There is further suspicion because about the time this contract was signed we were asked to add another mile all around the Elk Hills Reservation to the reservation. This in order to cancel out other oil companies all in favor of one oil company.

It is clear to everybody that the Government that has so readily grabbed millions of acres of farm lands could have taken these oil lands and gotten immediate possession and there was no need of entering into the kind of contract it entered into.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any special orders heretofore entered and at the close of the business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House today for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], one-time candidate for President on the national ticket, criticizes the minority because we have not investigated this Elk Hills oil deal. I wish he would explain to the House how we can get the votes to do so. That matter was up to the Committee on Rules as I understand it, and I understand that the Republican Members of the committee voted in favor of the investigation.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not time.

Mr. Speaker, before we go home—if we do go home—and it seems to me we should not go home until we find out and are able to tell the people whether Mr. WALLACE, the Vice President, and Chairman of the B. E. W., is right when he says in substance that Mr. Jones has been holding back war production and when he says in answer to Mr. Jones' statement that his is not true, that Jones is a liar and then Jones says that WALLACE is a liar—well, now, maybe the people are not interested in knowing which one or whether both of them are liars, or each is telling the truth, but surely, certainly, the people are interested in knowing whether the Vice President of the United States is holding up war production, whether the Chairman of the R. F. C. and the Secretary of Commerce is holding up war production. Perhaps neither is at fault. The people of this country are interested in knowing whether Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has been holding up war production.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, I cannot. If either one of these gentlemen is doing half of what the other says he is doing he should be kicked out of his official job.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman think it will be a good plan for the Congress to go home and allow the war agencies to quarrel among themselves?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Listen! Listen to what the gentleman says! That when the Vice President of the United States calls the Secretary of Commerce a liar and the charge is hurled back and when each charges the other with holding up the war program, does the gentleman mean that we go home and let them fight? My God! Have we not war enough across the seas without letting these two—one the Vice President, the other a member of the President's Cabinet—carry on a war here at home? The war they have started leads to disunity, decreased production, lack of confidence. It is up to the President to keep order in his official family. When mother's spankings did not bring me to time, father's did; and if the President cannot or will not end the fuss Congress can and should. It certainly must discourage the boys and men fighting overseas.

Read what I put into the Record yesterday from a soldier down in New Guinea who said he was grateful because he was in New Guinea where he only had to fight the Japs. Waste piled on waste and the administration's spokesman of unity and good-neighbor policy for all the world, returning from his trip to South America where he preached unity as an example of his philosophy of good will, turning to swat his chief's Cabinet member.

No, we should stay right here and straighten out at least some of our domestic troubles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY].

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter from Capt. John Schmidt to Clarence Streit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under previous unanimous-consent request I was granted leave to extend my remarks on the subject of aviation. I now have a letter from the Public Printer stating that it will take three and two-fifths pages and cost \$153. I ask unanimous consent that it may be placed in the Record notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered this afternoon by Rev. Father O'Toole in regard to the Chinese situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a news release by the Department of the Interior, commenting on the resignation of John C. Page as Commissioner of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes today after the

other special orders have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement he made over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

THE IMPENDING FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, early in the year I called the attention of the House to the probability of a food shortage. Farm leaders as well as individual farmers at that time were beginning to realize that food production for 1943 would likely be much less than production of 1942 regardless of what certain department heads claimed.

The man on the farm knew that with his boy going or gone to the armed forces and his hired help diverted to war industries by high wages, and regardless of his own patriotism, and his own desire to feed the Nation and the world, that it would be physically impossible for him to supply the food requirements.

Planting time came along and he found himself handicapped in many ways. Many farmers resorted to putting lights on their tractors and operating them as much as 18 hours a day. Oftentimes it was the wife or daughters who operated the tractor while the farmer took his meals. A desperate effort was made to plant sufficient acreage. Then along came about 6 weeks of wet weather over a great portion of the country, and on June 1, the Secretary of Agriculture issued a statement to the effect that 15,000,000 acres of corn remained to be planted. Floods covered millions of acres of fertile soil in our Middle West. It then became apparent to and was admitted by those in governmental authority that there was going to be a very decided decline in production.

It was then that those in authority began admitting what farmers and farm leaders had claimed several months before. The planting season ended about the middle of June and then the country began to realize that we would have to depend on what we were going to get from the acreage planted. It was then that Chester Davis, who knew the situation better than any other man in the Government, declared that it was necessary that we save every scrap of food possible. Several months before I had declared "war on waste" and tried to get the country to become waste conscious. I took this stand after observing terrific waste in restaurants and having a great

many complaints coming to my office dealing with waste in Army camps.

I suggested the phrase of "lick your platter clean" which was given wide publicity and to my complete amazement swept the country. Immediately, I received a flood of letters from every section of the country, even from far-away Alaska and ships at sea, commending me for my action, calling attention to waste, and promising cooperation. Thereupon, I had several thousand stickers made bearing my slogan, "Save food; lick your platter clean, it's the patriotic thing to do."

Immediately there was a great demand for them and today they are appearing in about 24 States.

From the letters I am receiving from restaurant operators in various parts of the country I have reason to believe that millions of dollars worth of food is being saved. It was only when our staple commodities, such as potatoes and beef, began to disappear from the table that I realized to what extent the people of the country were beginning to take seriously the things that I had been saying.

While the public is now cooperating splendidly and while we have had assurances from the War Department that they would cooperate, complaints continue to come concerning waste in Army camps. Just this morning I received a letter calling my attention to waste in an Army camp where the writer said he knew of a whole side of beef being wasted. He called my attention to a medical center where food waste was equally as bad and to a southern Army camp where the waste was termed as being "sinful."

Now, I understand very well that there is a certain amount of waste where a great many men are being served, but certainly no one can justify such wholesale waste as this.

Certain Congressmen who have visited Army camps recently and have eaten in the officers' mess halls have been shocked by the waste they observed, they have told me.

I believe that with the effort the farmers of the country are putting forth we are going to have sufficient food produced this year, if we have sense enough to use it intelligently, but these kind of things are most discouraging to the producers, who have never had sufficient themselves to waste. As a matter of fact, the farmers of this country have never had a break.

True it is, some have gotten along right well, having accumulated acres and sufficient of this world's goods to finally retire and spend their remaining years in a home in town, but we must remember that generally it was made possible by an increase in land values or due to the fact that he raised a large family and that he and his wife and family worked hard for long hours for many years and got where they did by pooling their interests.

The farmer has never had preferential treatment at the hands of the Government. He has never refused to produce or to market his products, regardless of recent headlines saying that the farmers

were on a strike and because of the strike there was a shortage of beef. The shortage of beef I will discuss later, but these things are antagonizing the farmer and sooner or later, and probably sooner than most of us think, he is going to assert himself in no uncertain terms. After all, I believe that we are very close to a time when he is going to get recognition, and it is going to be brought about by a hungry people who will not lay the blame on him but on the few responsible men in governmental authority.

Because he has gone ahead for centuries and produced without complaining and without striking, it cannot be said that the man with the hoe will continue to take it on the chin.

Let me read you a few lines from the pen of Edwin Markham, under the title of "The Man With the Hoe":

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?

Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?

O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
How will the Future reckon with this Man?
How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world?

How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—

With those who shaped him to the thing he is—

When this dumb Terror shall reply to God,
After the silence of the centuries.

The farmer must gamble with the risks of destruction or impairment of his crops by floods, drought, insects and pests of all kinds, blight, and possible lack of sufficient labor for harvesting, plus rising costs of labor, machinery, repairs, feeds, and fertilizer.

Possibly because of the mistaken notion that our food supply was inexhaustible, agriculture was seriously crippled by the drafting of experienced and expert farm help. Instead of new and additional machinery being made available to farmers to compensate in some measure for the reduction in farm help, the supply of new farm machines, and of repairs for old machines, was cut off. Also, the available supplies of fertilizer were drastically reduced because of impractical restrictions. And then, when farm labor had been made scarce and its cost was steadily rising due to that scarcity and to high industrial wages, when cost of production of food was being increased by worn-out and inefficient machinery, when normal production was being retarded by the lack of fertilizer; after all of this, a bungling bureaucracy, either wholly ignorant of the trend of affairs or else without regard for results, placed maximum prices or price ceilings upon farm products. And recently, climaxing all of its previous blunders, this bureaucracy has now further reduced income to farmers by lowering prices upon some foods, accompanying the roll-back

in prices by assurances of subsidies, which are unsound, uneconomic, and impractical, and which may or may not be made available.

The result is that a great shortage of food for next winter and subsequent months is now inevitable and it is too late to do much about it for this year. If there is to be improvement for 1944 there must be drastic changes in policy so that agriculture can be unfettered.

Ignorance cannot be pleaded as an excuse. Farm organizations and others for over a year and a half have urged policies which, if they had been adopted, would have prevented the imminent crisis. But the advice of experienced men was rejected.

When the supply of goods is limited and purchasing power is available, prices of articles will ultimately be fixed by the law of supply and demand. The ineffectiveness of price ceilings, which is being demonstrated in this country now, is but a repetition of what has happened in other countries throughout the centuries. More drastic laws, increased severity of penalties, even deaths, have not prevented black markets.

But generally it is not the farmer who, under black markets, receives the benefit of the higher prices.

If adequate food production is to be assured, price ceilings on farm products must be removed permanently to encourage farmers to assume the risks and work the exorbitantly long hours which will be required.

For war production the manufacturer is assured of his cost of production, plus a profit. Likewise, labor has been receiving repeated increases in pay with time and a half or more for overtime. The proposed system of roll-backs is equivalent to another increase of wages to labor.

It is high time that agriculture be given economic justice and a free hand to do what can be done to produce food so much needed by our city consumers, armed forces, and allies.

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as I can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and, finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

We have the serious problem of an excess income of some \$20,000,000,000, all seeking something to buy. It is impossible to dam this rapidly increasing surplus income by price ceilings. It is increasing at the rate of a billion and a half to two billion dollars per month, and history proves that it cannot be dammed.

Whenever rising production costs bump into price ceilings, production is strangled. These production costs vary greatly in different sections of the country, and local markets have normally adjusted themselves to these different costs. With inflexible ceilings, the high production cost areas are put out of business.

To overcome this difficulty we began the use of subsidies. Nevertheless, no system of subsidies has ever been devised

which is effective enough to reach only these high cost areas. Any subsidy system which is effective in maintaining production must be flexible enough to keep the high cost producer in the field. Under such a plan the low cost producer would receive an unwarranted profit.

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are the direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

If this Nation is unwilling to pay the cost of its food bill during these years of record income largely based on Government outgo, how can we ever expect our price structure to become balanced? In launching upon a subsidy program in our efforts to hold down the cost of living, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is only one basis upon which any government can endure, and that is that the people must support the Government. Any attempt to reverse this principle, asking the Government to support the people, cannot fail to have disastrous results.

Why should we cut the price of coffee 3 cents per pound, butter 5 cents per pound, and meat 2 cents per pound to everybody, including the wealthy and those whose incomes have increased more than the cost of living, in order to aid the few with fixed or low incomes? If subsidies are necessary for the relief of, say, 10 percent of our population, it is an enormous waste to subsidize the other 90 percent who do not need it. A far better scheme would be to use the stamp plan which was employed during the late 30's. Thus the subsidy would go to only those who need it, and it would not be necessary to place ceilings which fast curtail our already diminishing food supply.

England has been cited as an example for us to follow in the matter of price ceilings and subsidies. However, the English economy is almost the reverse of our own. England is an industrial nation, with only 7 percent of her population engaged in agriculture. Her interest lies in maintaining a low level of food prices and the 93 percent of her people can well afford to subsidize the other 7 percent to keep food prices at the desired level.

In England the consumer pays 60 percent of his income for food, as contrasted with 22 percent in America, believed to be the lowest in the world.

England pays a subsidy, but in effect the United States pays it for her. During the 2 years ending March 1, we exported to England under lend-lease \$1,449,064,000 in foodstuffs. She sold this food to her people and out of the proceeds paid subsidies estimated at approximately \$730,000,000, with a tidy balance left over. Thus, England did not increase her inflationary gap by borrowing the subsidy money from banks.

The English figures do not tell the whole story. In her food index she uses only 14 items, largely those received from

America, which are under complete control. She does not include such home-grown products as fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, or any canned goods. The prices on these items have risen sharply. They have had to go up in order to maintain production, but this increase does not show in the food index which England exhibits as proof that food prices have not been allowed to advance.

It should be noted that England is having a serious time with "black markets." She has had to increase the penalty for the sale of food above ceiling prices to 14 years in prison plus \$20,000 fine, yet with these severe penalties prosecutions have increased 320 percent in the last 2 years and the Ministry of Food has recently reported that "black markets" are endangering the successful prosecution of the war.

I therefore feel that it is not wise to try to follow in England's footsteps.

For months, beginning even before Pearl Harbor, a chain of events has brought discouragement, distrust, discontent, and resentment to farmers.

Beginning with so-called daylight saving and continuing through the drafting of essential and experienced farm boys and hired men; the restriction on farm machinery and supplies; the rationing of gasoline and footwear; the requiring of multitudinous forms, reports, and applications; the repeated trips, and accompanying annoyances, to offices of O. D. T. and O. P. A. and other agencies; the charges of profiteering; the criticisms of the press, which though not unfriendly has used misleading information supplied by Government bureaus.

For instance, the recent headlines saying that the meat shortage was created by farmers who were "striking" and refusing to sell their fat cattle. The fact is, fat cattle are burdensome back in the country but cannot be moved to market because of O. P. A. regulations. The same applies to millions of bushels of corn tied up in elevators and granaries throughout the country when it is sorely needed in channels of trade and for feed purposes.

Other things bothersome to the farmer included the shortage of feeds due to unwise price ceilings; the deprivation of markets and loss of income due to unwarranted price fixing; the interference in normal methods of transportation to markets; the steadily rising costs of everything farmers buy, due to high wages to industrial workers; the roll-back of food prices to meet the demands of organized labor; and the hostility shown by government and organized labor to agriculture, through all of these there has been a procedure which has baffled and discouraged farmers.

For, after all, greatly increased production of farm commodities would be our best guaranty against inflation.

In closing it should be stated that there is one outstanding fact that speaks volumes for both the intelligence and loyalty of the American farmer, which is that notwithstanding the widespread resentment of farmers resulting from price ceilings and other Federal domestic policies, the vast majority of farmers

are loyally supporting the President's war policies. This is as it should be, for with this war lost, everything worth living for is lost.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope those in authority will change their program and accept advice from those who understand the farm problem and are interested in our food supply, lest we go hungry.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the present military trends of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE RUDOLPH FORSTER

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, last night there died in the city of Washington one of the great servants of the Federal Government, one of the men who faithfully served this Nation. I am speaking of Mr. Rudolph Forster, executive clerk at the White House.

Mr. Forster was in the State Department, but on the 7th day of March 1897 he was called to the White House. Under President McKinley, under President Theodore Roosevelt, under President Taft, under President Woodrow Wilson, under President Harding, President Coolidge, President Hoover, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt he served.

He was a fine man. Those of us who knew him loved him for his simplicity, his character, his honor. I say that the service he rendered to the Government of the United States has been worth while.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to join with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] in paying tribute to one of the sweetest and gentlest souls I have ever known. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and myself, as well as other Members of this body, had the pleasure of associating with Mr. Forster and of knowing him intimately. We all loved him, we all recognized him as being a man of great wisdom, a man of great patriotism, a man who loved his fellow men. When he left us, one of the gentlest souls that I have ever known departed.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Forster served 48 years in the White House under eight Presidents. He had the confidence of all eight of those Presidents. He loved every one of them and he expressed his great admiration for every one of them. At all times he was loyal to the man he served.

That is a record of achievement that has seldom been equaled and probably

never surpassed in the history of this Republic. Mr. Forster was one of the most lovable characters I have ever known.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Forster was the personification of honor and loyalty and patriotism. He gave his all to whatever task he undertook. Everybody loved him, as has been stated before. I know that the Members who used to telephone to the White House regarding information about the signing of bills never ceased and never will cease to be grateful for the information that he gave every Member the minute that it was honorable for him to do so. You cannot replace Mr. Rudolph Forster.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Georgia, and others in the statement that Mr. Forster was one of the finest, noblest characters I have ever had the pleasure of meeting. I have known him for nearly 37 years, and I never had the pleasure of meeting a finer man than he.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the president of the Indiana Bar Association. I have an estimate from the Public Printer on this, and he states that it will cost \$135. I ask unanimous consent that this may be printed notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. In the event that amendments are offered to the resolution, will there be an opportunity to discuss the amendment?

Mr. SABATH. It will not be necessary.

The SPEAKER. If anyone offers an amendment, he may speak an hour, if he so desires.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, had it not been that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] stated that the resolutions to which he referred, namely, the Wigglesworth resolution to investigate the Wal-

lace-Jones controversy and the Peterson public lands, Elk Hills oil investigating resolution, were defeated by a strictly party majority vote, I would not take the floor at this time. I feel that the two resolutions were defeated because it was believed to be for the best interest of the country that they should not be acted upon at this time. It was not only my opinion but that of a majority of the members of the Committee on Rules that these two outstanding gentlemen—the Vice President, Mr. WALLACE, who is also serving as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and Mr. JONES, Secretary of Commerce, who is also serving as Administrator of several other agencies—their duties calling for the discharge of tremendous responsibilities, will find time to themselves adjust their differences.

I do not know what evidence or basis the Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare had in making the charges that Mr. Jones has delayed war activities. Only a few days ago Mr. Jones appeared before the Committee on Rules to testify in connection with the resolution of Representative COFFEE providing for the investigation of the conditions and circumstances surrounding the \$85,000,000 loan by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Shipshaw aluminum plant project in Canada. Mr. Jones stated that the loans were made to increase the output of much-needed aluminum and in the negotiation the interest of our country were safeguarded. In view of his testimony, not only the majority, but the minority members of the committee, felt that further investigations should be held in abeyance, and this influenced, as the gentleman from New York should know and does know, the action on the two resolutions of which he complains. Frequently, charges are made, exaggerated by the press, and, invariably, when all the facts are brought to light, it is found that the charges are far-fetched.

I have read the statement issued by the Vice President that Mr. Jones has delayed the acquisition and supplying of extremely needed critical materials; but being familiar with the extended investigations invariably made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation before loans are approved, I feel that the same practice was followed in the matter of which the Vice President complains. Up to now, I have not had the time or opportunity to read Mr. Jones' press release; but I am sure it does not contain any accusation that warranted the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in using the word "liar." I hope the dispute is largely a question of jurisdiction, and no doubt in due time any differences will be amicably explained and adjusted. Of course, as I have stated, the gentlemen from Michigan and New York are given to exaggeration, to using unwarranted language, and, in this instance, have sought to create a mountain out of a molehill. That is nothing new—it is their continuing policy to say things to create discord and obtain publicity. If I am satisfied after giving this matter

further study, that it requires action on the part of the Committee on Rules, it shall be forthcoming. However, I feel confident that it will not be necessary for our committee to act.

Reverting to the charges against the administration in acquiring unnecessarily large tracts of land, all I wish to say is, if that has been done, it was done under the Republican Secretary of War and the Republican Secretary of the Navy, and the President should not be criticized for their action, it being humanly impossible for him to watch all that is being done. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the owners whose properties have been taken over for war purposes will be treated fairly and justly. However, it has been my observation that most of the property owners do not desire just and fair terms but seek to obtain the highest possible prices from the Government, far in excess of actual values.

Mr. Speaker, the complaint that we have not given authority to the Committee on Public Lands to investigate the oil lease negotiated by the Secretary of the Navy is due to the fact that the Secretary has admitted a mistake has been made by awarding an illegal contract, which will be canceled. However, as I have stated heretofore, I am informed that the Standard Oil Co. is still in possession, and, if that is so, I am satisfied that the Department of Justice will take proper steps to nullify the lease. In the event such action is not taken, I shall grant the gentlemen urging the investigation a right to be heard on their request for a congressional investigation.

The proposed resolution before us authorizes a study and investigation to determine what, if any, losses have been sustained by counties in being deprived of revenue on taxes paid on these lands; and I hope the Committee on Public Lands will make a thorough study of the question. However, in this connection permit me to call attention to the fact that not only certain counties have suffered and are being deprived of taxes on lands taken over by the Government, but many cities have suffered to a still greater degree. I know in my own city of Chicago many large pieces of property have been taken over by the Government and out of the taxing power of the city, resulting in the loss of taxes. But I have not asked that that situation be also studied, feeling that some principle or arrangement will be worked out and adopted that will apply to the cities.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my opening remarks, I have been instructed by the Committee on Rules to offer an amendment to the resolution that would restrain the Committee on Public Lands from holding hearings outside of Washington, D. C. However, it has been stated that such restriction would be discrimination and deprive the committee of the right accorded to other committees. I move to strike out on page 2, line 9, after the word "times" the following words, "and places within the United States" and insert in lieu thereof, the words "in the District of Columbia." This amendment, as I have stated, would preclude and restrain the committee

from visiting and examining many properties. It is my opinion they have a right and it is necessary for them to visit scenes affected in their study of the question.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: On page 2, line 10, after the word "times", strike out "and places within the United States" and insert in lieu thereof "in the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAAS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 243.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Roads, as a whole or by subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the Government or any agency thereof exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto whether private or governmental which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges.

The committee shall report from time to time to the House the results of its investigations and studies, and in its reports the committee may recommend such legislation as may be deemed pertinent.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpoena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House for more than a minute or two. This resolution was requested by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Roads and was reported by a unanimous vote by the Committee on Rules. It provides that the Committee on Roads shall have jurisdiction to investigate and examine into road construction and the roads program in the United States. I know that nearly all of you gentlemen from the West and

the South as well as from the East are interested in roads. I believe this investigation will be helpful and beneficial to the country, and consequently should receive the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour and the good nature of the House, I do not believe we should delay any longer in the consideration of this resolution. I join with my distinguished chairman in urging the passage of the resolution, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A PROPOSAL FOR A CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF SACRIFICE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein the text of a brief bill I propose to introduce.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, today I shall introduce a bill to provide for a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice. A veteran of the First World War, Capt. W. A. Ross, United States Army, retired, has called my attention to the fact that while we have various medals of honor and various awards for members of our armed forces, provision has never been made for a suitable recognition to the Gold Star Mothers. My bill proposes to award them a medal of appropriate design, including a gold star.

There is a provision for an annual Gold Star Mothers' Day and after World War No. 1, a pilgrimage to the battlefields of Europe was provided at Government expense. Provision has been made for monetary awards to dependent relatives, including mothers. I have not been able to find, however, any provision to award to the Gold Star Mothers an official emblem recognizing the great sacrifice they have made on the altar of the country.

How greatly such a medal would be treasured by the Gold Star Mothers came to me sometime ago, as I read this poignant paragraph in the column of Henry McLemore in the Washington Evening Star. I quote:

Mothers write: "Word of my boy's death came today. In the paper I read of decorations being given those who are alive. My boy gets nothing. Is there nothing that goes to those who die for their country, unseen and unsung?"

And at this point, I think it is appropriate to insert the letter from Abraham Lincoln to Mrs. Bixby, which will probably remain forever, as the finest statement of a nation's gratitude and inability adequately to express it. I quote:

LETTER TO MRS. BIXBY, OF BOSTON, MASS.

EXECUTIVE MANSION.

November 21, 1864.

DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of

the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Yours very sincerely and respectfully,
ABRAHAM LINCOLN.
(John G. Nicolay and John Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln.)

The bill which I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, is brief, and I insert it at this point. As will be seen, provision is made for congressional representation in the selection of a suitable design, for certification of persons entitled to receive the awards and for presentation by the President in the name of the Congress. The text follows:

A bill to provide for a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice

1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present in the name of the Congress, a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice, to the mother of any person who, while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or in the American Merchant Marine in hostile waters, loses his life in line of duty during time of war, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. A design for the Congressional Medal of Sacrifice shall be selected by a committee of seven persons, two of whom shall be named by the President of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one each by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the War Shipping Administration. The design shall include a gold star, and may include an appropriate ribbon or other device for additional gold stars if more than one of a mother's children die in line of duty as provided in section 1.

SEC. 3. The administrative heads of the respective services concerned shall provide for certification to the President of the names of persons entitled to receive the Congressional Medal of Sacrifice; and thereupon the President shall present the medals at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on Gold Star Mothers.

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

There was no objection.

LESLIE M. RAPP

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 288) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective July 1, 1943, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund

of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to Leslie M. Rapp, minority clerk of the Ways and Means Committee, at the rate of \$900 per annum so long as the position is held by him.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 295) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise provided by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation at the rate of \$2,000 per annum for the employment of a clerk in charge of printing for the majority caucus room and compensation at the rate of \$2,000 per annum for the employment of a clerk in charge of printing for the minority caucus room, such appointments to be designated by the majority leader and minority leader, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 296) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Public Lands, not to exceed \$10,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ACTIVITIES OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 290) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the committee of investigation authorized by House Resolution 119, not exceeding \$10,000, in addition to amounts heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to inquire if the Speaker can inform the House as to what we may expect for the balance of the day and perhaps tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it will be impossible for us to close up all the business today. There will be no request to meet early tomorrow because when we adjourn today we will come in at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The Chair will state there will be no further business transacted in the House this evening except to agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the two appropriation bills. We will await that.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Nation's Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a reported program of the United Labor Committee Executive Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE APPROACHING POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the approaching political contest in the United States is destined to be the most momentous within the memory of living man, probably more deeply and lastingly affecting the lives of our citizens, our system of economy and the structure of the Republic itself, than any election held in the history of the Nation.

Thoughtful citizens are convinced that the approaching political contest will determine whether this Nation shall endure as a free and sovereign nation; whether a republican form of government will be maintained; whether the Congress and the judiciary will operate as equal and separate branches of our Government, and whether free enterprise and individual liberty are to be reestablished and perpetuated.

The war in which this Nation finds itself engaged throughout the world cannot be an issue in the ensuing campaign. The American people as a

whole are performing every military task and meeting every call upon them that conceivably could be made in behalf of victory. On that there is no division.

But the American people will not be diverted from the issues in the next campaign; they are crystal clear. Already, though the election is many months removed, people everywhere in the United States who love their country's traditions and institutions, are united in studying the life record and the character of men of sound faith and high repute, seeking to find the man best fitted to serve our people in the Presidency.

Having known him intimately for many years, I have come to believe that Earl Warren abundantly possess every attribute of purpose and courage, mind and heart, industry, character and old fashioned Americanism that our next President must possess if the United States is to endure as we have known it.

Earl Warren is not a candidate for President. He is quoted by Gould Lincoln, in the Washington Star of June 22, 1943, as stating: "I am not a candidate for any other office than I already have." Regardless, the men and women of America are discussing his availability with increasing enthusiasm.

Governor Warren served in the United States Army during World War No. 1. It is strange no member of our armed forces during the First World War has attained the Presidency. It would seem that by thus belatedly, fittingly honoring the veterans of World War No. 1 we can give evidence of the sincerity of our promises to the veterans of this war. And who could doubt that a soldier prefers to have a soldier for his Commander in Chief?

While Earl Warren was a soldier during the last World War, he is a lawyer and not a professional military man, but he had opportunity to learn enough about the military art during his service in the Army to know that the strategy of land, sea, and air warfare must be determined by competent military leaders of those arms who have made the exacting business of war their life work.

Earl Warren was born at Los Angeles, Calif., March 19, 1891. He graduated from the University of California, bachelor of laws, 1912, and from the School of Jurisprudence, University of California, doctor of laws, 1914, in which year he was admitted to the California State Bar. He married Nina E. Meyers October 14, 1925, and the union has been blessed with a large family—James C., Virginia, Earl, Dorothy, Nina Elizabeth, and Robert. Mrs. Warren, a charming lady, graces their home and has helped her husband's career by centering her activities in properly raising her family and maintaining a happy home. She is everything that a mother and a wife should be and has made the Governor's mansion at Sacramento a place of culture and charm.

Governor Warren has occupied the Governor's chair at Sacramento but a short time, but he has had vast experience in the affairs of his State. He had previously been district attorney of Alameda County and more recently attorney

general of California. He has had a distinguished career as a member of the State bar of California, engaging in the practice of law in Oakland.

Governor Warren long has been active in the affairs of the Republican Party in California and in the Nation, being chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of California, 1934 to 1936, and Republican national committeeman for California.

Perhaps the principal reason for this unprecedented victory as Governor was that in a long public career, since 1919, the people of California have become acquainted with the character of Earl Warren; they know that he does not make promises that he cannot fulfill; and they know that when he makes a public pledge it will be fulfilled precisely as stated by him.

He has kept his pledges to the people of California. He has brought order out of chaos, has reestablished sound government and a sound fiscal policy. In the forefront of the war effort, California is ready and alert and delivering for the Nation under the leadership of a sound American Governor.

After meeting the leaders of Governor Warren's administration, Raymond Moley wrote of them:

They are a personable bunch—clean, vigorous, free of the musty aroma of long years in politics and fortunately free, also, of the saccharin intensity of professional reform. They are just good men who want to do a good job in a State which has never been particularly party-bound.

In the days before us, American men and women of sound faith of both major parties might well study the personal and public record of Earl Warren, and particularly consider the amazing alacrity with which he has brought order out of chaos in the vital State of California.

No one who knows Governor Warren doubts his capacity to render a similar service in like precise and expeditious manner for the Nation.

CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of some Member of the House, perhaps of the Speaker, what disposition has been made of the bill that has just come over from the Senate, increasing the price of corn to \$1.40, placing a ceiling of \$1.40 on corn?

The SPEAKER. It has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FISH. The Speaker has answered that it has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Members of the Committee on Agriculture are present in the House, and I would like to inquire whether that committee proposes to meet before midnight tonight or tomorrow morning and report back that bill or some amendment to it. Time is of the essence. I would much prefer a ceiling of \$1.25 than \$1.40 on corn, because I believe if we pass a bill with a ceiling of \$1.25 at Chicago that corn will begin

moving to the Eastern States before our farmers, our poultrymen, our dairymen, and our industries are liquidated. I hope the Committee on Agriculture will not dodge this issue but will meet it squarely and report a bill for action by the House before we recess.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for the war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, still further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 33 and 34, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3030), the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1943, insist on House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 8 and 9; that the House recede from its adherence to its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 24, 25, and 26, and still further insist on its disagreement to such Senate amendments; that the House still further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 27.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I witnessed on last Saturday afternoon the most pitiful spectacle of my entire life. I saw the last round of the first real test of bureaucracy against democracy. I saw the Congress fold up and accept without a struggle a knock-out punch from one of our many bureaus.

I refer to the retreat taken in the Watson, Dodd, and Lovett amendment. I want to review very briefly the progress of this subject: Dealing first with Robert Morss Lovett, secretary of the Virgin Islands, who draws from the taxpayers of America the sum of \$5,800 per

annum. This body recalls that on February 1, 1943, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MARTIN DIES, chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, cited before this body the said Lovett for his long record of Communist affiliations. On April 16, 1943, the said Lovett was given a hearing before a subcommittee of the said special committee, during which hearing the said Lovett defended the Communist Party while still drawing the said sum of \$5,800 from the labor of loyal American citizens. On April 21, 1943, the Kerr committee, which had been created by the House as a trial committee on the pretext that these parties should not be convicted without trial, filed a report based upon hearings given Mr. Lovett and evidence submitted by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in which report he was held and declared to be unfit for Government employment. His fitness was defended by the Honorable Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, which, frankly, is not at all surprising to me or any other well-informed person. On May 14, 1943, the Kerr committee cited Lovett as unfit for Government employment.

William E. Dodd, Jr., was on December 1, 1941, employed as editorial assistant at \$2,600 per annum by the Federal Communications Commission, and on November 19, 1942, the Federal Communications Commission requested Mr. Dodd's local draft board's permission to send him to London to organize news intelligence service in north Africa. An increase of \$600 was requested by the Federal Communications Commission for Mr. Dodd. It is inconceivable that the Federal Communications Commission, with its knowledge of Dodd's political philosophy, would think of putting him in such an important position when the very lives of our fighting forces were at stake, but fortunately the State Department refused Mr. Dodd a visa, which refusal was based on information furnished by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and in the face of these facts the brass of the Federal Communications Commission was strong enough that the said Dodd was retained with the Commission at a salary of \$3,200 per annum.

On February 1, 1943, the said Dodd was cited in a speech by Hon. MARTIN DIES before the House of Representatives for his many activities on behalf of Communist front organizations. On April 5, 1943, the said Dodd was given a hearing before a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, during which he admitted affiliation with a long line of Communist front organizations, and that he had entertained the outstanding foe of American Democracy, Harry Bridges, at a cocktail party while the said Bridges was in the city of Washington, D. C. On April 21, 1943, the Kerr committee aforesaid reported to the House, based upon hearings with Mr. Dodd and evidence submitted by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, that

the said Dodd was unfit to hold a Government position. In the face of these many unanswerable facts definitely establishing the unfriendliness of the said Dodd to our form of Government and of his unquestioned relations to the Communist Party, the said Federal Communications Commission voted, 4 to 3, to retain the said Dodd in the service of the said Commission, and while the youth of this Nation are fighting for the very life of the Democracy the said Dodd is given opportunity to destroy. On May 14, 1943, the Kerr committee cited Dodd as unfit for Government employment.

Goodwin B. Watson has been employed as chief broadcast analyst at \$6,500 per annum since November 18, 1941, having before said time been on a salary of \$5,600. On November 18, 1941, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MARTIN DIES wrote to Mr. James Lawrence Fly, who is Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, calling his attention to Watson's long record of communistic views and his numerous affiliations with Communist front organizations. It would seem, though, that to Chairman Fly his many communistic activities made the said Watson worth more to the Commission, as he raised his salary \$900 that day, and on November 19 the said Fly wrote the said DIES defending the said Watson as fully qualified for his position—this with a full knowledge of his communistic philosophy. In January 1942 the House of Representatives approved a proposal to allow no portion of the appropriations of the Federal Communications Commission to be used to pay the salary of Goodwin Watson, removing the said stipulation on June 22, 1942. On February 1, 1943, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MARTIN DIES, again cites the Communist views and affiliations of Watson, and on April 1, 1943, Watson is given a hearing before a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. On April 21, 1943, report of the Kerr committee, based upon hearings with Mr. Watson and evidence submitted by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, held the said Watson to be unfit for Government employment; and, on April 29, 1943, with a full knowledge of all of these facts, the Federal Communications Commission voted 4 to 3 to retain the said Watson in the service of said Commission. On May 14, 1943, the Kerr committee cited the said Watson as unfit for Government employment in its report to the House.

On May 18, 1943, on a record vote an amendment which, in effect, dropped these 3 parties from the Federal pay rolls carried in the House by 318 to 62. The Senate failed to concur with the House on this amendment and many conferences were held between the conferees of the House and Senate on this subject, and finally on the 30th day of June 1943 the matter came back to the House and a motion was made that the House recede and concur in the Senate action rejecting said amendment, at which time a record vote showed 301 in

favor of standing by our original provision denying salary payment to these 3 parties and 71 voted to recede and concur with the Senate. On Saturday, July 3, 1943, the same week, the matter came back to the House from the conferees and a conference report was offered wherein the conferees from the Senate and the House had agreed to a compromise which at its best could not offer more than to relieve the Federal Government of these 3 individuals who have been found to be subversive and who have practically plead guilty to said charge by November 15, 1943.

Here is where the shame falls on this House. A measure of the vast importance and far-reaching effect of this measure which had been debated back and forth so many times was placed for a vote before this body and actually became law, in effect, cramming these 3 individuals down the throats of millions of loyal taxpayers by a vote of possibly 8 or 10 individuals. In other words, the question was put and those in favor of agreeing to the conference report were asked to signify by saying "aye," and those opposed "no." Probably a half dozen, or possible 10, answered in the affirmative, and possibly 2 or 3 in the negative. Then the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] asked for the yeas and nays, and the Speaker asked all to stand that were in favor of taking the vote on this all-important measure by yeas and nays, or on a record vote, or speaking in plain language, in a manner whereby the American people could see how each Member voted, and 28 rose to their feet, which, of course, was not a sufficient number to demand the yeas and nays. At this point the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] objected to the vote on the ground that there was no quorum present, and, after counting, the Speaker answered there were 284 Members present, which, of course, constituted a quorum. In other words, there were 256 on the floor drawing salaries from the American taxpayers who did not rise to their feet, when by so doing their constituents and the boys who are fighting on foreign battlefields today could have seen how they voted.

You Republican brethren who have been trying to tell the American people how you are going to rid this country of the many things that you say the New Deal has produced, including subversives, certainly were a bewildered looking bunch. We boys on our side who were determined that those three individuals should cease drawing the taxpayers money while they practiced their communistic ideas had hoped for some help from you, and as I stood among the few who rose on our side, I gazed across to my right assuming that I would see the personnel of the Republican side instead of a mere handful, standing shoulder to shoulder pushing forward for the preservation of democracy. You were all squatted so low in your seats until I started to look under them for you. I was told by some of your number that you were going to throw it in Roosevelt's

lap, and to this I want to say that you did not throw it in Roosevelt's lap, but into the very heart and vitals of American democracy.

This body committed a mammoth sin against the American people on Saturday afternoon, or either an unpardonable sin on the Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett in their other votes. We voted them subversive, and leaving off the fact that they virtually pleaded guilty to these charges, they stood convicted of such charges by the ballot of the membership of this House. In other words we have fallen into the pitiful and defenseless position of finding 3 men subversive to our Government in the midst of a bloody, desperate, and undetermined war, after we have taken the sons of mothers, the husbands of wives, the fathers of children and the love of sweethearts and sent them forth to battle fronts throughout the world to die the horrible deaths that the combat of war bring, and yet on the afternoon of July 3, 1943, this body voted, refusing to make a record vote, to maintain these parties who by their own verdict are subversive to our form of government in active service in as important positions as they are now serving. The nature of their employment enables them to know diplomatic, political, and military secrets of enormous importance; this especially applies to Watson and Dodd. I hope that every Member of this body will bear in mind that the word "subvert" means to overturn, overthrow, ruin utterly, to undermine the morals, allegiance, or faith of, to corrupt. In the face of a verdict rendered twice by this House by a more than 3 to 1 vote have we found these parties guilty, but yet we left them on, and to my sorrow and humiliation there were only 28 Members of the body that signified their willingness for their people to know how they voted on this question. I am happy that I was one of the 28 and I am asking the American people to inquire of their Congressman whether or not he was one of the 28.

I love the membership of this House, and this institution has received much criticism that it did not deserve, but on this question the American people should bitterly condemn this House for its weakness in dealing with a question so vital to the life and future of our democracy. I hope that every American citizen reads these remarks, but I am especially calling on the families of the armed forces, the membership of the American Legion, and the soldiers when they return home to read every word of what I have said on the floor of the House today.

I want the American public to bear in mind that this same House has voted hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Dies committee, which money came from the sweat and toil of the American taxpayer, and the same parties who voted these funds deliberately refused to preserve the benefits derived from its expenditure for the safety of American democracy. I do not want to be misunderstood, I am not critical of the Dies committee, I think that the American public owes a debt of gratitude and commendation to this committee, its chairman, the gentleman from Texas the Honorable MARTIN DIES, and the services

it has rendered that they will never be able to pay. I am critical, however, of the membership of this House who vote the funds and refuse to accept the fruits its expenditures produce.

I want to remind the Members of this House and the American public that the greatest danger that this democracy faces today is the filthy hand of communism that is active in our midst today. Our boys are fighting with their lives, giving their blood to win against our visible enemies, and they are going to win, but unless this Congress changes its attitude and goes to acting with courage we are going to lose the battle at home while they are winning the one abroad. My colleagues, you know what was in your bosom on Saturday afternoon, I do not have to tell you, and I do not want you to answer to me, but answer to your own conscience what you think the result of this war would be if the soldiers whom you sent to the battle fronts met the enemy with no more courage than you met your duty on Saturday afternoon.

It might be well for you to consider the matter in this light. You very often find yourself pitying the soldiers who are being taken prisoners, but let me ask you if it ever occurred to you that when you sat passively and refused to fight like you did on last Saturday, that you are being taken prisoner day by day by the filthy forces of communism, and worse than this, are permitting the thousands of people who pay your salaries to likewise be taken prisoner. As your friend, comrade, and colleague, let me ask you to not pass judgment on this statement, but if you are living 10 years from today, I ask you to read this statement and then answer whether or not you think that I have told you the truth.

I do not believe there is a Member of this House who is not aware of the fact that the Communist organizations of this country have for many years been gradually boring into the bone and sinew of our democracy, and especially that their activities have been doubled many times since the emergency of war has built a shadow for them to work under. You know as well as I that the mischief that these labor racketeers have committed in sabotaging our war effort, has been fomented and sponsored by the Communist organizations, and you further know that these same organizations are responsible for the race riots that have been prevalent throughout the country. These are facts that anyone unprejudicial in seeking truth realistically will have to admit. Nothing could be more cruel than for these un-American slickers to go around and prey on the poor American Negro, who in the past has, and in the future will, if let alone by this foreign element sponsoring communism, be much better citizens than the ones of whom I speak. They care nothing for the welfare of the Negro; they have one purpose, one thought, and one aim, and that is to destroy the peace, tranquility, and unity of the God-fearing law-abiding, patriotic American citizens until they can create enough chaos and confusion to strike a death blow and take over this country. Let me tell you

that when my children and your children have to take on the damnable yoke of communism, the records of this Congress will disclose when you and I are gone that their progress toward control of this Government was fought every step of the way by me. You may surrender and accept in the future like you have in the past their progress in silence, and you may now condemn me for my stand, but the day will come when you will thank me for every word I have spoken here today.

On Saturday it was amazing to me to listen to the few remarks that preceded what I would call "the grunt vote" that was taken. Not a man offered a reason for the House's retreat to cover. Instead, excuses were offered, as a naughty schoolboy always does when he knows that he is fixing to commit a wrong. Some made the statement that in legislating, compromise was a necessary element. In policy making I concede this is right. But, pray, tell me, in the light of the righteousness of a just God, where you justify a compromise with a person who is subversive, and whom you have determined to be subversive by your own vote, when the boys that you have wrung from their mothers' breasts and sent to foreign battle fronts are dying to save the democracy that the subject matter of your compromise is destroying from the inside. Could you close your eyes and visualize your son, any American mother's son, in the throes of death on a foreign battlefield or sinking for his last time in the briny deep thousands of miles from a waiting mother and you in the Halls of Congress compromising with an enemy who is here to destroy what that precious life was forfeited for? Could you meet that mother who bore that son in pain and brush the tears from her wrinkled face and tell her that you had silently compromised with the enemy her son died to defeat? I sometimes wonder how deep the horrors of war rest on some people's bosom, what price they put on blood, or where they find the glory in death.

Some said the Senate stated they could not concur because they had not had time to investigate the matter. To this I inquire since when has one body of the Congress got to where it cannot take the word of the other body on matters of this nature. Furthermore, over this period of near 2 months that we have been pitching this matter back and forth, would it not have been much easier and less expensive to the American taxpayer for the Senate to have sent a committee over to look at the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation if they were not willing to accept at face value the report of the two investigating committees of the House. Some few people may swallow this explanation, but the great masses of the American people are too enlightened and will never accept it. There is not, nor can there be, an excuse for maintaining on the Federal pay rolls subversives in a time of war. If it is right for them to stay there 5 months, if they cannot do any harm to our war effort in 5 months, then they can never do any harm. These three men should be put off the pay rolls and put off now, or

should have been vindicated instead of convicted by this body, and it is high time that the American people demand that the membership of this House display some courage in the performance of the duties they are sworn to perform.

It is quite interesting to note that Chairman Fly, since the gentle retreat of the House last Saturday, is seeking new fields to conquer. I notice from the press that he is now attacking the Army and Navy. This shows you to what extent a bureaucrat will go when he gets you on the run. If this House had stood up and let Fly know that we would not tolerate the use of communistic idealists in that service, with probably some more Pearl Harbors to result, it would probably have clipped his wings to where he would at least respect the Army and Navy that are fighting to protect his home today. I have said in the past and will say again that every public official who fails to act with decision, determination, and courage, will see the fruit of his sins quickly. This Congress has got to put the Communists of this country on notice that their activities will not be tolerated further. It was amusing to me recently when the announcement came out of the dissolution of the Third International. I remarked immediately that this announcement was made for the sole purpose of throwing the American people off guard, which has been well proven.

I want to ask in sincerity, unprompted by prejudice or an exaggerated mental state brought about by interest or excitement, why it is that no Communist ever suffers defeat when drawing an issue with this Government. Earl Browder won, Harry Bridges has won through the years, and I hope that someone can give me a real answer to this question.

No wonder our people have suffered from the many injustices that have been imposed upon them by the strictest regimentation by the Office of Price Administration. Just to mention a few instances, one Carl Borden was head of the rent section of the Office of Price Administration whose record as far as public life is concerned shows that he was secretary of a certain League of Industrial Democracy in Chicago, an organization working for "a social order based on production for use and not for profit." He worked in Soviet Russia for several years and this same party is today head of the Office of Price Administration in Hawaii at \$8,000 per year of the taxpayers' money of the United States of America.

I want to remind the people of the United States further that another Office of Price Administration employee by the name of Doxey Alfonso Wilkerson, a Negro Communist, has had much to do with the hardships and inconsistencies visited on them by the O. P. A. Why does this Government persist in having its policies set up by Communists while we tell the mothers and fathers and taxpayers of America that we are taking their sons and their money to preserve democracy. The records will disclose that the said Wilkerson came from the Federal Security Agency and that J. Ed-

gar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has on more than one occasion advised the departments for whom this Negro was working of his communistic activities and of his membership in the Communist Party of the State of New York. Yet, in the face of this, on December 9, 1942, the Assistant Administrator ruled that they found nothing to show the said Wilkerson engaged in activities which might probably be characterized as subversive or disloyal to our Government in which the said Administrator stated: "Therefore, he has been exonerated, and we are filing the report without further action," referring to the report of J. Edgar Hoover. Only recently Wilkerson has been defended by others as being clear of any communistic activities or affiliations and, in the face of this Wilkerson resigned from the Office of Price Administration to accept employment with the Communist Party to devote his full time to lecturing for said party and organizing for the said Communist Party.

I call on the American people to use their status as citizens and the final governing body of this great Commonwealth to stamp out every taint of communism from the portals of this great Government. This country was established as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and I ask that God in all His wisdom may provide that again we return to these sacred principles.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think the House generally approves the views the gentleman is expressing in connection with these three men. However, I think it might be well for the gentleman to have as a part of his presentation the fact that many of these individuals continue to tell the Government that they are not members of the Communist Party, but the facts later prove that they are. A leading example is that of Dr. Wilkerson, who claimed that he was not a member of the Communist Party, who nevertheless when he resigned his Government position went into the Communist Party as an organizer.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, and a little later I will discuss that very question.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with the remarks of the gentleman in connection with the individuals he has mentioned. But does he not feel that there is also a responsibility on the part of the agencies or those who are responsible for them, for allowing them to remain in these positions after this matter has been called to their attention?

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman is clearly right, and it is a shame on our democracy that these agencies have made

it necessary for this Congress to have to take the action it has taken and to make it necessary for me to make the remarks that I am making at this time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In connection with the observations of the gentleman from Illinois, it is true that in connection with Dr. Wilkerson he was on two occasions given a clean bill of health after the Federal Bureau of Investigation had said to the heads of one of these agencies that he was guilty of subversive activities, and the agency, after they had that information, said that Dr. Wilkerson was all right with them.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for bringing that matter to the attention of the House. I want to say that some of the newspapers charged that party as being from Georgia which I want to deny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an amendment that I sought to offer today to the second deficiency bill.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from the Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects: One, a compilation of the benefits available to disabled United States servicemen in Illinois; second, an article from the Washington Post setting forth the fact that the lake levels in Lake Michigan are now 2½ feet above normal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a document entitled "Government Corporations—The No-Man's Land of Federal Finance." This is a publication of the Citizens' National Committee, and it constitutes an amazing and illuminating exposé of the dangerous and confused condition which has grown up under the secrecy of bureaucratic operations in the present administration. This document sets forth in detail the names, the uses, and the amounts of public funds involved in

these innumerable governmental corporations which have been woven into a web which threatens to entangle and strangle free industry and free enterprise in the United States. These corporations under their charters are authorized to engage in every line of business, regardless of the destructive effect on private business which this competition would impose.

As this study so well sets forth, the employment of the device of Government corporations has increased to such a tremendous—I might say to such a phenomenal—extent during the last decade, that today these corporations rival in importance and scope of operations the long-established and basic departments of the Government itself.

This study points out that the corporate form was very sparingly used by the Government prior to 1916. At that time it was the general policy of the Government to liquidate such corporate entities as soon as they had served their purpose. It is a singular, and perhaps a sinister fact that this policy seems to have been abandoned. The proponents of the use of this government device are prone to cite the flexibility and speed of action, together with the absence of control which Government corporations can achieve, as the justification for their creation and use.

It is an amazing fact, as disclosed by the Citizens' National Committee, that in the last 10 years Government corporations have increased their assets 500 percent.

We find that in the case of some of these governmental corporations there is no limit to their authority to issue obligations. In this field, the newest and most significant proposal is the creation of what has been styled a super, hybrid, quasi-governmental corporation to execute post-war plans, another rat hole, and a much bigger one, down which can be poured billions upon billions of the American taxpayers' money by irresponsible and power-mad bureaucrats without consent of the taxpayers themselves.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. On June 10 last the State Department released a press notice concerning the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration that purports to be a union of the nations for the purpose of general rehabilitation and relief.

We were told this morning by Dean Acheson of the State Department that under that agreement each nation pledges all of the resources at its command and that it was understood by the State Department that the administration could make the commitments for the United States for this Relief Administration body and that afterward the Congress could disapprove or approve or ratify that action as they saw fit, and decide whether they would make the necessary appropriations to implement the agreement. Does not the gentleman think that is one of those superhybrid

corporations in which our substance would be wasted?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I have just stated that this was probably the most significant proposal that has been advanced by the administration in connection with setting up these different governmental corporations. I think every Member of the House must have known for a long, long time that the Executive—and I refer to Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States—has been constantly encroaching upon the prerogatives of both the judicial and the legislative branches of the Government. I might remind those present that it was not so long ago when the President, impatient with the restrictions placed upon him by the then Supreme Court of the United States, asked Congress to add five new members to that Court which would give him a majority and enable him to exercise some measure of control over the deliberations of that body. I thank God that Congress had the courage to withstand the importunities and the pressures that were brought to bear upon Members of the House and Senate to force the acceptance of that proposal. Let me say further that from the things the President has said and done from time to time, it appears that he has overlooked no opportunity to criticize and belittle the Congress. Does he have in mind destroying the confidence of the people in their legislative branch of the Government? It would seem so, Mr. Speaker. If he could subjugate and destroy the usefulness of the Congress he would find himself in as autocratic a position as even Mr. Hitler himself.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. DISNEY rose.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman probably read the information that was released to the press, but of which the press carried very little. Article 1 states:

There is hereby established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

1. The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts, and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of the agencies so created, to manage undertakings, and in general to perform any legal acts appropriate to its object and purposes.

Can there be anything more far-reaching than that?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I think not. I assume the lady read from an Executive order. May I say that I doubt very much whether the Chief Executive would find himself in the position he has assumed had it not been for the change in the Supreme Court that has taken place since the gentleman in the White House assumed his responsibilities. He has appointed more than a majority of that Court. I assume he exercised great care in the selection of his nominees and that every one of them was selected because he saw eye to eye with the appointing power. Does this account

for the continuous seizure of power by the Executive? It would seem so, Mr. Speaker. It must be the knowledge that he has a friendly court of last resort to which he can appeal if the Congress would thwart the Presidential imperious will. Somehow I still have confidence in the Supreme Court of this land and that it will rise to its full responsibility and rebuke those who would destroy constitutional government in this great land of ours.

I do not know what the other Members of the Congress think about this developing situation; I do not know how many will be complacent enough to sit in their seats speechless and permit the man in the White House to assume all the duties, the functions, the responsibilities, and the prerogatives of all three branches of our tripartite system of government, but I want to assure the Members of this House here and now that I do not propose to keep silent under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to go to the country with the things that are going on and I shall do my bit to enlighten the people of this country where we are being led and what we are being led into by an administration that thinks it is wise enough, powerful enough and rich enough to bring the "four freedoms" to all the people of the world. He should stop, look, and listen to the conditions existing in this country and take cognizance of the fact that before he attempts, at our expense, to bring the "four freedoms" to the peoples of all the world, we should first establish them here. This has not as yet been done.

Mr. Speaker, referring again to governmental corporations, it gives us something to ponder about when we learn that as of January 31, 1943 the Government proprietary interest in corporations or agencies amounted to \$11,671,000,000 for only those corporations reported by the Treasury Department.

Many governmental corporations are authorized to grant loans. This granting of loans has, in turn, necessitated the creation of extensive machinery for management, control, and the disposal of collateral—in other words, getting the money to loan.

A Treasury Department report dated June 30, 1939, showed 14 Government corporations or agencies with a net profit, and 18 such corporations or agencies with a net loss. The net loss was \$1,654,000,000.

Partial list of these governmental corporations and agencies shows a total of 109,519 employees with a monthly payroll of \$19,025,787.

Thirty-two of these governmental corporations and agencies render no accounts to the General Accounting Office whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, this pamphlet on governmental corporations shows that never in the history of the United States have such enormous resources and sweeping powers, and such vast operations been conducted under such a complete cloak of secrecy. Although in the last few years we have had a flood of Government publications, with thousands of

people working to pour out alleged information upon the American public, yet the fact is that the concealment of vital facts concerning the growth of these governmental corporations is shocking. Their constant increase is dangerous in a nation of free enterprise.

A great deal has been said about invisible government in the United States, but, as pointed out in this illuminating pamphlet, here is an aspect of Government which, heretofore, has been invisible, but which is vastly more potent than most of the phantoms usually so described.

These governmental corporations are designed to escape the restrictions usually placed by the Congress upon governmental activities. They are so set up as to be able to have the benefits of Government resources, public authority, and official power, without the controls which free government has placed—and very properly—upon the grant and the exercise of official authority.

It is the more alarming when we learn that this record is itself incomplete. The Citizens' National Committee officials state that, so far as is known, there is no one in the Government of the United States, and no office, which actually knows the scope, ramifications, powers, and controls of these various agencies. Some of them are operated in complete secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, this effort by the Citizens' National Committee to let a little light into a very dark place is highly commendable, but it discloses an unpleasant situation which would take the power of the Congress, a long and careful investigation, an intense determination, and a good many thousands of dollars, to make the record complete. Enough is revealed in this pamphlet, however, to show the need for earnest and immediate consideration of this problem by the Congress.

After the recess, Mr. Speaker, I intend to have something more to say on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a release concerning the war power produced at Boulder Dam in the States of Colorado and Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD concerning the relations between the Congress and the Executive departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on the price of crude petroleum by Andrew M. Rowley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in connection with the second deficiency appropriation bill and to include a table of proposed airports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order previously agreed to, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the Congress I believe it is well for the Members to become better acquainted before they go home with the real critical situation confronting this country insofar as our petroleum requirements are concerned and petroleum that is available for transportation to the various sections of the country. I have just served on a special subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House investigating the petroleum situation of the country and the effect it was having along the eastern seaboard and also as it may possibly affect the military requirements of the Nation.

That committee, composed of four members of the House Naval Affairs Committee, visited several of the oil States, namely Illinois, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in order to get first-hand information in regard to the petroleum situation out in the field from the men who are operating and producing that precious material every day of the year.

The history of the oil shortage in the country is well known to everyone. It started with the devastating attack by the submarines only a year ago and continues up to the present time to the point that all the people and all the economy of the entire eastern seaboard have been seriously affected ever since the early part of 1942. The nominal peacetime requirements of the eastern seaboard, comprising the 17 States from Florida to the Canadian line, were about 1,500,000 barrels a day. That does not take into consideration at all the military requirements that we now have to assume in order that the forces abroad as well as the shore establishments here in our country may be well taken care of.

The deadly effect the enemy submarine was having on our tank ships was reflected in the low point reached in petroleum deliveries in May 1942 of a little over 1,000,000 barrels of oil daily.

During the early summer and fall of 1942 the amount of petroleum products brought to the eastern seaboard averaged about 1,150,000 barrels a day, or 350,000 barrels a day less than our peacetime requirements. That was due to the fact that the tank ship was prac-

tically eliminated as a means of transportation for the petroleum products from the Gulf Coast States to the eastern seaboard. Those that were not sunk were transferred to the military and naval service in order to bring these oil products to the far-flung battlefields and also to meet the oil requirements of the fighting fleet and its auxiliaries.

These tank ships previously brought in 95 percent of all the petroleum products transported to the eastern seaboard from the oil-producing States of the Union. With the practical elimination of the tank ships, or a large number of them, through destruction by German submarines and the withdrawal of others from peacetime requirements that were later placed in the military service, those tank ships were no longer available to carry the petroleum products to the eastern seaboard. This resulted in a complete revolution of the transportation of petroleum products as theretofore carried. Instead, railroad tank cars, which previously brought in less than 5 percent of all the petroleum products to the eastern seaboard, were pressed into service, and now over 70,000 of these tank cars today are bringing in approximately 65 percent of all the petroleum products transported to the eastern seaboard. The total being brought in by all means of transportation is approximately 1,400,000 barrels a day at the present time—900,000 barrels by tank car, the balance by pipe lines, barges, and other means. This is still 100,000 barrels a day less than our peacetime requirements. Out of this 1,400,000 barrels delivered per day, we must take care of the ever-increasing military demands, which is reaching tremendous proportions. It is no wonder, therefore, that the entire eastern seaboard has been facing a critical shortage of fuel oil and gasoline that has brought about great hardship and suffering to our people.

Mr. ROLPH. What was the reason that the cars did not bring it in—a difference in freight rates?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Simply because it was thought in the early days of the great crisis the tank cars were not available in great numbers.

As a result of the splendid work of the Office of Defense Transportation, headed by Mr. Joseph Eastman, its chairman, I think a very wonderful job has been done in providing the very necessary tank cars and which saved the economic life of our part of the country from serious consequences and stopping a great many of our people from freezing to death during the past cold winter period. As it was much suffering took place when people found themselves without sufficient oil to keep warm.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the early days when the tankers were first loaned to England, when I took up with Mr. Ickes the use of tank cars that office rather laughed at their use. I had

secured figures from Mr. Pelley, of the railroads, but even his figures were low and more tank cars have been used than he anticipated. They have done a fine job, but not enough.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Prior to the war the petroleum industry always made it a practice to have our storage tanks filled at the beginning of every winter in order that we would be properly taken care of during the winter months in the event any dislocation of our transportation system occurred during that period. As a result of the tremendous shortage of supplies coming into the eastern seaboard for civilian and military consumption during the past year, those stocks have dwindled to a point where they are at the very lowest level they have been for years. Now, we are facing another critical winter in the northeast section of the country and along the entire Atlantic seaboard with our stocks at a very low level.

The amounts of gasoline and fuel oil that will be brought in during the succeeding months will be nowhere near enough to meet all of our normal requirements, both military and civilian. This will mean the continuing on of the very strict rationing program of which you Members of Congress are well aware because the restriction applies to the District of Columbia as well as it does the entire Atlantic seaboard.

There is only one solution to this problem, in my opinion. It may well be divided into two questions. First, we must develop new production. Secondly, when production increases, then another, a third big pipe line must be built from the oil fields to the East. We find that last year, for the first time in many years, the consumption of petroleum products in this country was double the amount of new discoveries. In other words, our reserves throughout the country are beginning to dwindle. Unless something is done to stimulate production, to find new fields, to develop new explorations, to provide an incentive for the so-called wildcatter and independent who prior to this day discovered over 75 percent of the new wells discovered in this country, we are going to face a petroleum famine in this great Nation. Not this year or next, but the years roll along pretty fast and it will not be long before we will start to feel the effect of an oil shortage.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am tremendously interested in the gentleman's statement, and want to compliment and commend him and the committee on the very exhaustive research they have made in this connection. May I ask the gentleman if it is his recommendation that the price of crude oil be increased?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is the main point of my appearing here today on the floor of the House. In the meetings we had in the several States of the Union we had representatives of the State regulatory bodies appear before us, we had the outstanding geologists, we had independents, we had wildcatters,

we had representatives of the major companies, we had the brains of the industry; and the one plea to our committee was that when we got back to Washington we should make a special plea for an increase in the price of crude oil, because that in itself will be the only and the real incentive toward the development of new reserves and the production of more petroleum products that can be transported to the various parts of the country.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. I have been struggling with this petroleum problem to get a decent price for crude oil for some time. I wonder what suggestion the gentleman has toward getting a price where the producers of oil can produce at cost instead of at a loss?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We were told, and the facts bear it out, that the same price is paid today for crude that was paid in 1937. The index figure of the oil industry today is about 55 percent of what it was in 1937. The producer down through these years has had to pay all the cost of increased wages, increased cost of material, and increased costs all along the line. Yet the price that he is paid for crude oil today is the same as he was paid in 1937.

Mr. DISNEY. The cost of production has gone up about 55 percent per barrel more than in 1937, but this stupid, dumb O. P. A. cannot be taught to understand that. They look at you blank and say substantially, "So what?" Nothing is accomplished. All of these facts that the gentleman has recited have been given to the O. P. A., with no results. Mr. Ickes has recommended at 35-cent increase, and nothing is done.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is the point that brings me to the floor of the House today, representing as I do a constituency which might well be called consumers. I believe I represent the point of view of all the representatives of the eastern seaboard States. We are in favor of Mr. Ickes' recommendation that he made back in April of this year to O. P. A. for a 35-cent per barrel increase for crude. That is the average price. It does not mean they will all be paid 35 cents. Some will be paid more and some will be paid less, but the average is 35 cents.

Furthermore, we are informed by the refiners that an increase of 10 cents per barrel on crude oil will only mean one-quarter of a cent a gallon increase in gasoline or fuel oil. Furthermore, the 35 cents that has been recommended by Mr. Ickes to the Office of Price Administration will mean less than 1 cent a gallon to the consumer along the entire Atlantic seaboard. To us it seems absurd and ridiculous that the Office of Price Administration or Prentiss Brown will leave this situation go by unchallenged and imperil this Nation because of a lack of petroleum products that we need to keep our economy alive, to feed our military machine and to keep our people from freezing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very exhaustive and fine report. Is it not true that if Mr. Ickes or some one person were given complete charge of prices and everything else, we would have a much better situation?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I believe there is altogether too much division of authority. I believe the same kind of a job that Bill Jeffers is doing in the rubber program can well be done on this fuel and gasoline situation if a competent man or board is selected for the task. Something has to be done and done quickly and the full responsibility is clearly on the Office of Price Administration. Unless they approve the 35 cents that has been recommended by Mr. Ickes, there is certainly going to be an oil shortage, and there will be great distress throughout the country. The military requirements must be met. The economy of this country of ours which is geared to the petroleum industry, will be placed in great jeopardy unless early and speedy action is taken.

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. I am glad to see the gentleman realize from actual experience and the taking of testimony that an increase in the price of crude does not affect the cost of refined products, except fractionally. It is a relatively unimportant matter. Usually folks back in this direction have the impression that a hike in the cost of crude results in enlarged prices for refined products, but, as I said, it is only fractional.

In line with what the gentleman said, let me read from a report made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House, just printed yesterday, which bears out the gentleman in what he says. I want one quotation to go in the RECORD at this point, if the gentleman will permit. The committee says, in part:

New discoveries have been declining since 1939. We use 1,400,000,000 barrels of oil a year, yet discoveries since 1939 have been at the rate of only about half of the consumption rate.

Think of it. Half the consumption rate in new discoveries.

This is a forcible announcement of the production decline.

They are not going to produce oil at a loss. That is what they are trying to do, and we are running into an oil shortage, as the gentleman says, as the result of this stupidity by the O. P. A. Unless the O. P. A. performs a little differently, this Congress when it comes back will come back with the determination to set up O. P. A. in a manner that it can reflect a sensible conclusion on a subject on which it has had complete information.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield. Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. In line with what the gentleman from Oklahoma

[Mr. DISNEY] just said, as a member of the committee that prepared this report, I would like to have the RECORD show at this point that we recommended that the whole question of petroleum, with reference to production, prices, and supply be transferred to the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ickes. That is the recommendation in this report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield. Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Oklahoma referred to the dumbness of O. P. A. Nobody could be that dumb. The O. P. A. is just as near right on oil as it is on corn, on meat, and on farm products, and on everything else. America is going to have to destroy O. P. A. or O. P. A. will destroy America.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will recall that in answer to a question I asked Mr. Donald Nelson, he said that he had authority vested in him by the President to adjust the matter and bring about more equitable distribution of oil and gasoline. That is in the record of those hearings.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I may also say with regard to the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma that last year we had about 3,000 wildcat drillings; that is to say, the men who go out like the men who look for gold with a little pickax on their shoulders to find the precious materials. The wildcatters in the petroleum industry are exactly the same kind of men. They are the men who go out into the wilderness hopeful that they will find something under the soil that will bring them wealth. That is the incentive, that is the urge, to get something that will bring them wealth; that is the same thing that brings out the development of oil that results in the discovery of gold, but because of excessive cost they are unable to continue.

In 1943 Mr. Ickes says he hopes that there will be drilled at least 4,500 wildcat wells in this country, but during the first 5 months of 1943 only 1,235 had been drilled.

On that estimate for this year, based on the drillings for the first 5 months, there will only be 2,964 as against the 4,500 that Mr. Ickes hopes will be drilled, simply because the wildcatters and the independents are going from the oil business into stock raising, into cotton raising, into cattle raising, and into farming. The wildcatter is giving up the oil business and leaving the oil industry because the incentive and the urge to earn and the urge to find wealth from the discovery of oil is being taken away from him through the many obstacles that are being placed in his way.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Following the suggestion of the gentleman, the number of completions of wells is growing less instead of more, so that Mr. Ickes' hopes that 4,500 wells will be drilled will not be fulfilled this year because the acceleration in the drilling curve of the number of wells and their completion is downward because of this nonsensical attitude of the O. P. A. about price. There is no other reason on earth for it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Oklahoma is exactly right.

Mr. DISNEY. The number of wells drilled is going to decrease rather than increase.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Oklahoma has put his finger on the exact situation. You can get results immediately as was shown in California when the incentive was given by increasing the price of crude oil, when a tremendous increase in the amount of crude oil that was brought to the surface and is now available for civilians and for the military requirements.

And along with the increase in price there must also be an easing off of critical materials; there must be more and better spacing allowed instead of the acreage being restricted to one well to every 40 acres; there must be a reduction in this requirement where it is clear that no destruction of efficiency in operation of the present wells will take place. Many complaints have been entered to our committee because of this spacing regulation, which is altogether too rigid. Members of the State regulatory bodies complained very bitterly about these restrictions, which they claim is preventing much more oil being produced.

There also must be better cooperation between the representatives of the Federal Government and the members of the local regulatory bodies. It seems from the evidence presented to our committee there is a lack of cooperation and understanding between the Federal Government and the local officials in matters of great importance to the petroleum industry.

The Selective Service should recognize the petroleum industry as one of the most essential in supporting the war effort. Many complaints were made that local boards gave altogether too little attention to the needs of retaining the skilled men in the oil fields. Great numbers of these skilled men were inducted into the armed service, it was claimed.

It must be kept in mind, and clearly understood, that the economy of this country is closely geared to the petroleum industry. Our homes require fuel oil in order that our people can be kept warm. Our industries and business enterprises require millions of barrels of gasoline each year to operate their trucks and automobiles. Our farmers need tremendous amounts to operate farm machinery. Our people have a right to expect that everything be done to relax the

present restrictions on the use of gasoline, so they may have the benefit of the use of their automobiles. They, of course, and first of all, want to see our military requirements met, but they do feel that everything is not being done to solve this great problem, and I am thoroughly in agreement with their point of view. Oil, in its many forms, is one of the most precious of our critical supplies. Everything should be done to encourage its production. Then will come, and I feel quickly, a widespread demand for another large-diameter pipe line from the oil fields to the eastern seaboard. The present program of tank cars, barges, pipe lines, including the 24-inch and the 20-inch, will fall far short of meeting our military needs and civilian requirements of the eastern seaboard. Let us have action. The situation demands it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program is concluded, if it is, and if I have the opportunity, that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on this same subject. And in this connection, I want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts for the very splendid presentation he has made of this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

REPRESENTATION IN OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, for years Pacific Coast States have been calling attention to the fact that in Federal Government appointments our section is woefully forgotten. North, south and east, yes; but practically none from the west. No one from our section is in the Cabinet or on the Supreme Court. The identical situation applies to almost every department and bureau in Washington.

Let me cite one case. In yesterday's mail I received a copy of letter written by the Pacific States Butter, Eggs, Cheese, and Poultry Association addressed to the regional director of the Wage and Hour Division in San Francisco. The communication reads in part:

I have just received a copy of release R-1984 from your Administrator, Mr. L. Metcalf Walling. This release sets up a general industry committee of 21 to deal with meat, poultry, and dairy products, and it calls a meeting in New York for July 13 to investigate conditions in the industry and

recommend to the administrator minimum wage rates for all the employees, etc. This release also states, "Such representatives have been chosen with due regard to the geographical regions in which such industry is carried on."

As there is not a single representative for the Pacific Coast States and none for the industry from the entire territory west of the Rocky Mountains it would appear that your Mr. Walling is of the illusion that there is no poultry, dairy, or meat industry west of the Rockies. In fact, I note only one industry representative west of the Missouri River, which is the larger half of the United States and has more than 6,500,000 head of milk cows, this being approximately 28 percent of the total United States milk cow population.

So far as I am aware, no one out here has ever been asked to recommend appointees for these committees who would be in position or who might have any knowledge whatsoever of the dairy and poultry industries here and so far as I am aware even your own regional office has not been consulted on it. The absence of any appointees seems to confirm that. Of course, if the matters to be dealt with were exclusive to eastern territory, then it would be different, but these are obviously standing committees, and the text of the release indicates consideration of national problems as a whole.

Mr. SPEAKER. Our section should be represented on the meat committee and every other Federal activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

UNITED STATES ACADEMY OF FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 3167, a bill to create a foreign-service academy, or what might be called a West Point of diplomacy.

In introducing a bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service, I am proceeding on the premise that knowledge is power. The more information that we have as individuals, the better we serve, and the more we attain. The more information we have as a Nation, the better we serve ourselves, and the world and the better we protect ourselves from those forces that would destroy us. I have spent many months working on the plans for the creation of such an academy. I am indebted to a number of my colleagues, foreign-service officers, educators, and newspaper men and women for their helpful suggestions.

For many years, we have had a Military Academy and a Naval Academy. Why not have a West Point of diplomacy? Why not have an academy to train our young people in peaceful commerce, greater understanding, and in the art of getting along with the nations of our one world?

We are now fighting a war of great magnitude. American taxpayers' dollars are being spent in every part of the world, but, what is more, American boys are fighting on every body of water, on every continent, and on countless islands of the sea. American blood is being spilled around the world; the graves of America's brave dot the entire globe. We cannot turn back. There are many things that are necessary in our national life, or these dead will have died

in vain. In my opinion, one of those things is that we must have a foreign service better than any other foreign service in the entire world. At this point, let me say that I am not criticizing our present diplomatic and our consular service. I am not criticizing what has been done. America is going to have to live in the future, and we shall need a larger and better force than ever before in our history.

I wish to take up some of the provisions of my bill and explain them.

Section 1 provides that in order to promote peace, greater understanding and good will throughout the world, there shall be created an academy to be known as the United States Academy of Foreign Service.

In section 2 I provide that the management of the academy shall be vested in a board of trustees composed of three Representatives, three Senators, and the Secretary of State. The trustees shall control the academy, the Congress controls the trustees, the people control the Congress.

In section 3 I have provided for the selection of the faculty. Considerable discussion has been had on how the president and the faculty of such an academy should be appointed. It should not be political. Why not call on the educators of the country to help set up this academy? Therefore, I have provided that the Governor of each of our 48 States shall submit the name of one educator to the Secretary of State; that the Secretary of State shall select from these 48 educators 12 who shall serve on the committee on faculty to select the president and the members of the faculty of the academy, and to sponsor them for a period of 2 years. This section also provides that not more than 1 of the committee of 12 selected by the Secretary of State shall be from any one Federal Reserve district. The purpose of this is to have this committee reflect the educational leadership throughout the entire Nation.

In section 4 I have provided that the course of study at this West Point of diplomacy shall extend over a period of 6 years, 4 years to be scholastic training within the academy and 2 years of apprentice training in this country in American manufacturing, transportation, agriculture, marketing, finance, and other business. In this section I provide that the course of study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the study of government, political and governmental theory, comparative religion, history, literature, science, composition, mathematics, economics, geography, foreign languages, agriculture, finance, international law, business and trade practices, and military and naval observation. Provision is made that students may be assigned to our military or naval academies temporarily for instruction in military observation. America must know what is going on in the world. We cannot continue to be suckers and survive as a first-class nation.

Section 5 provides a method for the appointment of students to the Academy of Foreign Service. This is patterned after the method of selecting cadets and

midshipmen. The purpose of this is to have a geographical spread to the student body. The academy and its graduates will then reflect America as it is, no more, no less. The periodic return of these graduates to the various sections of the 48 States will give to their relatives, neighbors, and friends the benefit of their observation in foreign lands.

Later on, I provide that these graduates after they are in the foreign service must spend at least 1 year out of 5 in this country. We do not want our foreign service to lose sight of the fact that America is their country. We do not want them to get out of tune with America, America's problems, America's ideals, and America's hopes. They will assist America in taking her part in the world of tomorrow, but at the same time they will preserve, protect, and defend the sovereignty of the United States. These young men and women who will go to this academy will represent the great heart of America. Their course of study, as stated, will include 2 years' apprenticeship in this country. These provisions, plus the rule that they must spend at least 1 year out of 5 in this country, all are for the purpose of keeping them American. America is part of the world. We cannot retract from it. At the same time, we cannot solve all the problems that will arise in the future, because we do not know what they will be. We cannot now design all the necessary international machinery that will make us foolproof for peace throughout all time, but we do know that knowledge is still power. We do know that we have a better Navy because of Annapolis. We do know that we have a better Army because of West Point. By the same premise, we will have better results remaining at peace by providing for a trained foreign service.

Section 5 also sets forth the requirements for admission. It is limited to native-born citizens of the United States, men and women who have reached their eighteenth birthday and have not passed their twenty-second birthday, and who have had at least 2 years of college or university education. In addition to this, the academy shall require an entrance examination, but this entrance examination is an aptitude test to ascertain one's intellectual capacities, not their attainments, and to ascertain their aptitude for the foreign service. That will be the general requirements for admission.

I have made special provision to admit members of our armed forces into this Academy for 3 years following the war, and have provided that any individual who has served in the armed forces of the United States in World War No. 2 outside of the continental United States for a period of at least 6 months may enter the academy, if appointed, upon passing the entrance examination only. I would like to state why this provision is made. Within our armed forces we have many well-trained and high-type individuals who will have done an expert job in observing in various parts of the world. They are now seeing day to day what you and I read about. Their knowledge of the world and world problems

is valuable to the United States. These soldiers will have a better knowledge of the geography, economics, and the customs and habits of the people of the world than those of us at home. They know America's weakness and they know America's strength. They know the weakness and the strength of other nations. They would make good Foreign Service officers. What group other than the veterans of World War No. 2 could better help form and carry out the foreign program of the United States? I have made this provision not for the purpose of helping soldiers and sailors and marines, because such a small percentage will ever be given the opportunity to attend this academy, but this provision is made to help the United States. It provides for the peacetime service of the men and women who carry the scars of battle. I am not unmindful of the fact that in the Constitutional Convention we had a predominance of men who fought in the Revolution.

Section 6 of the bill provides that the board of trustees may require a student entering the academy to submit a statement to the president of the Academy reciting that he will serve the Government of the United States where assigned for a definite period.

In section 7, it is provided that the graduates of the Academy of Foreign Service shall be appointed Foreign Service officers without the examination provided for in the act of May 24, 1924, and that they shall have preference over all other applicants. In that same section, I make provision for the using of the graduates of this academy in other governmental work besides that of the diplomatic and consular service. This section provides that these graduates shall be available for assignment, first, to the State Department and the foreign service. Second, that they may be assigned to the Department of Commerce for service in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and other related duties. I believe that, if America proceeds in the right direction, we can build up a great foreign trade in the post-war days. I think that American genius and daring under our system of private enterprise can compete with any other system in the whole world. America has never seriously set herself to the task of selling her products abroad. I firmly believe that American boys will return when the war is over with very definite ideas on what they can make and sell in foreign lands. Many of those boys will go into business. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce should have a trained force to help American businessmen sell their products abroad, thereby providing employment at home and for a greater use for the products of our factories and our farms. At the same time, we will raise the standard of living in the countries where our products are sold and we will encourage friendly relations toward our country.

In the third place, I have provided that the graduates of this academy shall be available for assignment to the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations and other service relating to the

production, distributing, and marketing of agricultural products. The world has never had a surplus of food. Rather than a program of destruction and restriction, why not let the Government of the United States lead out with a program to send the products of our farms around the world? There are many problems involved in such an undertaking, but the least we can do is to provide the best-trained individuals possible for this job.

Last, I have provided that the graduates of this academy may be assigned to the Department of the Treasury of the United States for service in connection with international finances and currency, tariffs, debt adjustments, and related activities. Each one of these enumerated functions constitutes a difficult problem. Maybe we cannot get all the answers now, but we do know that education combined with practical experience, as we propose here, will come nearer getting us the answer than blind experimentation. I believe that, if such an academy is established and trains hundreds of capable people for this great job of getting along in the world, of making friends and perpetuating our economy built on the principles of abundance and private enterprise, we will be much closer to world peace.

A mother of two boys who are now fighting abroad talked to me about the military progress that Japan made in the early part of the war and the treachery that was played by Japan upon the United States. She said to me, "Didn't anybody know?" I think the answer is that perhaps some people knew, but not enough knew all the facts. With a trained force as this bill provides, with countless eyes and ears seeing and listening around the world, America will be better advised. A graduate of this academy will be an educated person, trained in the arts of diplomacy, plus a technical expert, plus a practical business individual, plus a shrewd military observer. It will help keep Uncle Sam out of trouble, but, what is more, if trouble comes, we will have in this force a vast storehouse of knowledge concerning the fundamental economy, civil and military, of every country and every part of the world. I believe we should have a West Point of Diplomacy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an outline of the War Institute as conducted by National University.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House previously agreed to, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I am about to make, also to extend my remarks and include therein a release from the State Department of June 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FIFTH FREEDOM

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have offered the following concurrent resolution today:

That it is the sense of the Congress that, in addition to the four freedoms as the principles for which we are fighting the present war, there is a necessary fifth freedom for which we are fighting known as freedom of individual enterprise and initiative.

If we are to maintain our present standard of leadership among the nations of the world, we must add to the "four freedoms" which complement the Atlantic Charter a fifth freedom—freedom of individual enterprise and initiative—for it is through the spirit of individual enterprise and initiative of the American people that America has become great.

This spirit has been emphasized since the very beginning of the Republic, when both our pioneer men and women dared to do and die to conquer the wilderness and build a mighty Nation. It was further exemplified by the founding fathers in writing the Declaration of Independence and has ever guided our people in the many trying epochs which have marked America's progress.

It is this fifth freedom, which we have always enjoyed, that has made possible our great productive effort and accomplishment since Pearl Harbor and without the exercise of which we could not hope to look forward to victory. This fifth freedom has bred our leaders of industry, has developed the most resourceful and inventive artisans and mechanics in the world.

Should this fifth freedom be suppressed in the post-war world, our industrial leadership would vanish and we should be reduced to the level of the totalitarian countries, which offer no inducement or promise to the individual, who would merely become servants of the state. Indeed, without the fifth freedom, freedom from want and freedom from fear would be wholly impossible of attainment.

No future of abundance would be possible for the American people under a system which would deny opportunity for private enterprise. Instead, we should be reduced to a mere subsistence level without the comforts and luxuries to which our people have become accustomed and which should be the heritage we pass along to our children.

Today our boys are fighting and dying on the far-flung fighting fronts of the world, not only to preserve freedoms enunciated by the President, but to insure that those who survive will return to a land—their land—where the American way of life as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights will continue to exist.

UNIFORMITY OF FREIGHT RATES DESIRED

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide uniform rates for the transportation of property by railroad throughout the United States.

It cannot be denied that there exists a disparity in rates for the transportation of property by railroad between territories in this country. I am proposing this legislation at this time to again give notice that the existing discriminations should be eliminated and a uniform rate established.

The Transportation Act of 1940 contained an amendment directing the Commission to institute an investigation in reference to our freight-rate discrimination and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness which may be found to exist. The Commission had already instructed a formal investigation of the class-rate structure of common carriers by railroad anticipating this direction by the Congress. This investigation has been under way now for 3 years. The testimony closed on April 1, and all parties were given until June 30 to file the briefs. This deals with rail rates, which is Docket No. 28300, and classification, which is Docket No. 28310. It is obvious that following the arguments before the Commission that it will take some time for the Commission to determine what its decision will be.

I realize this is a stupendous task and a most important one for the entire Nation. A final decision should not be postponed indefinitely, and an order should be made within a reasonable time.

It is the position of some members of the Commission that the problem of classification must be solved, before we can have any uniform rate structure. We have already in existence classifications of property for transportation by rail and I am proposing in this bill that all property not so classified will be determined for the purpose of transportation by rail as "commodities," and uniform rates to be applied accordingly.

The Congress should define a policy regarding freight-rate levels to establish uniform freight rates throughout the country. The Commission's investigation is to ascertain whether existing rates violate existing law.

Mr. Speaker, the question of freight-rate discrimination is not a new one. Much interest has been manifested for years in an effort to equalize our rate structures and it is inevitable that the time will come when one section will not be favored over another. It is only fair, just, and right that we have the same opportunities in every section of this country for development.

There has been much misunderstanding and confusion about this tremendous problem. I would like to try to clear up in my humble way some of the confusion and misunderstanding that exists in the different sections of the country. Also, to endeavor to give you the true picture as best I can, showing the disparity and

inequalities that exist between rate territories.

Some believe, for example, that the freight rates on a certain article from a given point in the southwest territory to a given point in the northern territory is higher than it is from the same point in the northern territory to the same point in the southwest territory. This opinion is erroneous. It costs the same amount to send a classified article from El Dorado, Ark., to New York City as it does to send the same article from New York City to El Dorado, Ark.

The inequality exists by different rate structures in designated zones or territories. Our freight-rate structure in the United States is developed on a regional basis. There are three general territories. The North, the South, and the West, within each of which there is a separate and distinct rate structure with higher rates in the South and West than in the North.

The regional freight-rate structure may be explained in part by the historical development of the railroads. The railroads developed as short feeder lines to move the products from the interior to the water terminals. They were necessarily localized and grew up in each territory independent of other territories. As commerce developed between the territories and bridges were constructed over the rivers, they developed a system of inter-territorial freight rates. The rates in most cases between the territories were constituted by adding the rates to the borders and the local rates beyond, but in recent years these rates have been constituted on a somewhat lower basis, which reflects within the border territories.

The result is that rates from the South, Southwest, and West to the North are higher than they are in the North and lower from the North than within the South or West.

In a discussion of freight rates it is necessary to distinguish between class rates and commodity rates.

Class rates usually apply to high-grade commodities, such as manufactured articles, and move on a mileage scale which is substantially higher in the South and West than in the North. The commodity rates which move the bulky raw materials, such as coal and iron ore, are on so many different bases it is impossible to generalize concerning them other than to state that on a limited number of commodities there are substantial regional differences in levels with higher rates in the South and West than in northern territory.

For illustration, if you use the average first-class rate in the North as 100, the average relation of the southern rate is 139 and the West which is divided into a number of subterritories with class-rate levels ranging from 128 to 184. To move an article rated first class within the North 100 miles, we might say that the first-class rate was \$1 while in the South the same article moved the same distance would cost \$1.39 and in the West from \$1.28 to \$1.84. For instance, if a manufactured commodity moved from Nashville, Tenn., to Terre Haute, Ind., a dis-

tance of 200 miles of which 100 miles was in each territory, you would add the charges of \$1 and \$1.39 to obtain the interterritorial rate. This created an interterritorial problem, for the Nashville shipper pays \$2.39 to move his product to Terre Haute while a competitor in the North at Columbus, Ohio, would pay only \$2 for a similar distance of 200 miles to Terre Haute.

An identical problem exists when a Nashville producer ships to Spartanburg, S. C., a distance of 200 miles. The Nashville shipper would pay \$2.78 while the Columbus shipper would pay only \$2.39 for a similar distance of 200 miles to Spartanburg.

Of course, this is a very crude illustration and does not represent the actual mileage or actual rates, but it demonstrates the interterritorial rate problem. This is particularly true of the class-rate structure which applies to high-grade commodities such as manufactured articles. The southern and western territories are at a rate disadvantage on shipments of most manufactured commodities moving on class rates in competition with the northern manufacturers in their respective territories.

Some concrete examples might be helpful. Pottery is manufactured at Zanesville, Ohio, and Memphis, Tenn. It moves in carload lots of 24,000 pounds in each territory. Zanesville is 429 miles from Peoria, Ill., and Memphis is 443 miles from Peoria. The freight charges on a car of pottery from Zanesville to Peoria are only \$96, while the charges from Memphis to Peoria are \$129.60. The Memphis shipper has a disadvantage of \$33.60 per car for substantially the same distance in competition with the Zanesville manufacturer to a point in the North. The southern manufacturer has a similar disadvantage when competing with the northern manufacturer in southern territory. For example, the freight charges on a car of refrigerators from Philadelphia to Raleigh, N. C., a distance of 410 miles, is \$116, while it costs an Atlanta, Ga., manufacturer \$146 to move a car of refrigerators to Raleigh, N. C., a distance of 421 miles. This illustrates that the southern manufacturer is at a rate disadvantage in competition with the northern manufacturer both in the South and in the North. The northern territory has an even greater advantage over the manufacturers in the West and Southwest. Pittsburgh, Pa., is 640 miles from Cairo, Ill., while Fort Worth, Tex., is only 630 miles from Cairo, Ill., yet it costs \$176.40 to move a carload of refrigerators from Fort Worth to Cairo and it only costs \$140.40 to move a carload of refrigerators from Pittsburgh to Cairo.

These are typical illustrations of the class-rate structure that moves many manufactured articles. It should not be overlooked, however, that the South has some lower freight rates than the North on low-grade commodities and even on manufactured or semimanufactured articles, but the general rate structure follows the historical pattern of higher rates in the South, Southwest, and

West than in the East, which is reflected in the interterritorial levels.

There has been some recent comment by Mr. Robert S. Henry, of the Association of American Railroads, and by Mr. J. B. Hill, of the Louisville-Nashville Railroad, in reply to an article by Governor Jones, of Louisiana, relative to the interterritorial freight rates which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post recently. These railroad representatives have stated that the southern carriers have established low rates to competitive markets in the North. It is true that the southern railroads have granted a number of comparable rates to southern manufacturers, but this has not been done in all instances. Moreover, while as low rates sometimes apply, higher minimum rates for a carload shipment from the South sometimes negatives completely the low rate. For example, the shoe manufacturers at Nashville, Tenn., have slightly lower carload-rate levels and about the same less-than-carload rates to Toledo, Ohio, a distance of 485 miles, as have shoe manufacturers located in Endicott, N. Y., which is 477 miles from Toledo. The carload rate of 99 cents per hundred pounds from Endicott applies on minimum shipments of 15,000 pounds, whereas the carload rate of 87 cents from Nashville applies on 24,000 pounds as a minimum. As a result of the higher minimum weight required of southern shippers of shoes the total charges for 15,000 pounds would be assessed at the less-than-carload rate, which is 24 cents higher than the carload rate. This would make the total charges on 15,000 pounds of shoes from Nashville \$166.50 as compared with total charges of \$148.50 for the same quantity shipment of shoes from Endicott, N. Y. All such factors must be taken into consideration, together with the fact that the southern manufacturer must negotiate for lower rates, and usually it is not obtained until the industry is actually established. The uncertainty in obtaining a lowered rate in the South naturally hinders the establishment of new industries.

This situation has been under constant attack for over 70 years, and in recent years has received much attention from those concerned with the national welfare, but Congress has not laid down any definite policy. It has left the matter to the Interstate Commerce Commission which has generally assumed a judicial attitude by considering matters only when complaint is made or filed.

It has been contended that costs, operating conditions, and differences in traffic have justified higher rates in the South, Southwest, and West than in the North. The further contention is made that the industrial development of the South and West has been affected by freight rate differences only to a limited extent, and if the rates were adjusted some northern manufacturers would presumably lose rate advantages of long standing which would have an adverse effect on their business. Of course, the

regional differences in class rates have affected the industrial development of the country, and the point that some manufacturers in the Northeast would lose advantages has no merit. The mere fact that some shippers or localities would lose rate advantages should be no bar to revision of the existing rate structure. The rate structure should not be manipulated to favor the location of industries in any particular region, nor should it place obstacles in the way of locating industries where production costs are lowest or where for other reasons it is advantageous to locate an industry.

A number of studies made by the Bureau of Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission since 1930 show that railroad freight costs were slightly lower in the southern region than in the eastern district, but higher in the West. A comparatively recent case, *State of Alabama v. N. Y. C. R. R. Co.* (1939, 235 I. C. C. 225), indicates that the Commission questions the assumption that railroad costs are higher in the Southern than in Eastern territory.

An analysis of the average carload costs shows that the costs in the South are approximately 4 percent below eastern costs and western costs are approximately 6 percent above eastern costs.

There has been some hesitancy about accepting these cost studies because of the difficulty of reconciling the figures with the rather poor financial showing which has been made by the southern and western roads. An analysis shows that since 1936 the southern roads have shown a greater rate of return on their investments than the eastern roads in each year except 1940, and that had it not been for the relatively large passenger deficits in the South, the southern roads would have made an even better financial showing.

This is the general picture of the freight rate situation, which my bill is intended to correct. It is the responsibility of this Congress to determine the policy on these important matters. It is only by such definite determination and by the establishment of definite policies that we can hope that those in charge of the administration of these policies can discharge their full responsibility. We have reached the stage in the development of this country where national problems must inevitably be approached on a uniform basis, giving equal opportunity throughout the Nation for our continued progress and development. The Constitution of the United States of America provides: "That Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

I hope and trust that the policy of this legislation I am proposing will be adopted by this Congress and that for the best interest of the people we can establish equal opportunities for development by the establishment of uniformity of rates and thereby build a greater America for all of our people.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I presume the bill which the gentleman has introduced will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of which both he and I are members, and I hope that that committee will be able to give consideration to that bill at a very early date because it is a matter of great concern to the people of the South.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland (at the request of Mr. D'ALESSANDRO), indefinitely, on account of ptomaine poison.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1286. An act to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943, to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the acquisition of corn by governmental agencies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 997. An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps;

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1316. An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 986. An act to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 997. An act to establish in the Medical Department of the Army a corps to be known as the Pharmacy Corps;

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of J. Frank Meador;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

558. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

559. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend certain titles thereof to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

560. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an estimate, with justification attached, of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the General Accounting Office during the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

561. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, requesting consideration as to changes in S. 1250, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

562. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale, exchange, or other disposition of certain securities held by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. Senate Joint Resolution 47. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation; with amendment (Rept. No. 676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 678. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 679. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 288. Resolution to provide for additional compensation for Leslie M. Rapp, minority clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 680). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 295. Resolution providing for the employment of a clerk in charge of printing for the majority caucus room and clerk in charge of printing for the minority caucus room; without amendment (Rept. No. 681). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 296. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 281 by the Committee on the Public Lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 682). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 290. Resolution to provide for the expense of continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 119 by the Select Committee to Investigate Farm Security Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 683). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 3160. A bill to provide for the payment of the 6 months' death gratuity to certain dependent parents of deceased members of the land forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3161. A bill to provide for payments to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax receipts on account of certain land acquired for use by the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 3162. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold to pay for gold purchased by the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 3163. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal contribution to the States shall be in lieu of requiring repayment from recipients of old-age assistance and to prevent requiring liens for repayment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3164. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y., and for other purposes," approved June 14, 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3165. A bill to remove restrictions on Indian property now held in trust by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 3166. A bill providing for taxation by the States, Territories, and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3167. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3168. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California," approved May 18, 1928; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3169. A bill providing for the issuance of recovery bonds to stimulate orderly reconversion to peacetime production after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 3170. A bill to provide for a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3171. A bill to authorize the submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan for the prevention of the pollution of the waters of Lake Michigan; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3172. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide uniform rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that in addition to the "four freedoms" there is a fifth freedom of individual enterprise and initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 293. Resolution providing for employment of four additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 294. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Chronological List of Major International Events Prior to the American Declaration of War Against the Axis With Ostensible Reasons Advanced for the Occurrence of the Event," as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3174. A bill for the relief of Chatham M. Towers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3175. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Hohman, Julia Hohman, and Mary Haberman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1967. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Adella S. Brown and 70 other citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against the wastage of sugar and grains in the manufacture of beer, wines, and distilled liquors, and asking that legislation be voted for to prevent this waste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1968. Also, petition of Mary S. Clough and 50 other citizens of Schenectady County, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1969. By Mr. DIRKSEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1970. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Monroe County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1971. By Mr. NORRELL: Petition of Mrs. C. C. Smith, of Monticello, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1972. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Porter, of Monticello, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1973. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of H. N. Bleier, of Paragould, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1974. Also, petition of Mrs. R. S. Johnson, of Paragould, Ark., and others petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1975. Also, petition of Marion Satterfield, of Brinkley, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1976. Also, petition of Ben E. DeVall and Brinkley, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1977. Also, petition of A. R. Ford, of Paragould, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1978. Also, petition of H. C. Seefeldt, of Brinkley, Ark., and others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1979. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of C. F. Schenk and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1980. Also, petition of H. E. Schoenfeld and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1981. Also, petition of Peter Saguti and 87 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1982. Also, petition of Henry Mather and 17 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1983. Also, petition of Sam Levy and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2802, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1984. Also, petition of the Jefferson Hotel Co., signed by 100 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1985. Also, petition of James L. Gartland and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1986. Also, petition of Frank Klingel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1987. Also, petition of Ed. Johanning and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1988. Also, petition of William Smith and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1989. Also, petition of Harry Ladenberger and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1990. Also, petition of the Dome in St. Louis and signed by 19 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1991. Also, petition of William E. King and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1992. Also, petition of Jesse J. LeMoine and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1993. Also, petition of John J. Shetterly and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1994. Also, petition of H. E. Bullock and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1995. Also, petition of Walter H. Judge and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1996. Also, petition of Robert Kopff and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1997. Also, petition of Charles J. Schweitzer and 16 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1998. Also, petition of W. B. Ossek and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1999. Also, petition of the Krebs Buffet, and signed by 28 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2000. Also, petition of Frank Jukubiak and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2001. Also, petition of Walter Burke and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2002. Also, petition of J. Comerio and 38 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2003. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. John B. Woodward and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2004. Also, petition of the board of education employees, shops division, and signed by 58 St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2005. Also, petition of W. W. Huff and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2006. Also, petition of O. L. Blow and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2007. Also, petition of Adolph C. Beyer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2008. Also, petition of George W. Fitzgerald and 16 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2009. Also, petition of Elbert A. Klump and 13 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2010. Also, petition of Ella Cook and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2011. Also, petition of J. M. McLaughlin, Jr., and 14 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2012. Also, petition of John Dodd and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2013. Also, petition of the Polish Home Association of St. Louis and signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2014. Also, petition of Charles F. Gray and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2015. Also, petition of Harry J. Kargus and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2016. Also, petition of H. Balbenbush and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2017. Also, petition of Frank Klotzer and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2018. Also, petition of Oscar D. Hartman and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2019. Also, petition of Fred R. Lesch and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2020. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Peter J. Finnerty and others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation, particularly House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2021. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Mrs. Martin Aas and 28 other residents of Thief River Falls, Minn., supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2022. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of West Virginia, Clarksburg, W. Va., opposing all proposals to consolidate veterans pensions, disability, retirement, hospitalization, and vocational rehabilitation benefits with civilian benefits as administered under social security laws; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2023. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Mearie A. Vullien and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2024. Also, petition of John Kehoe and nine other residents of Spokane for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration Rent Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2025. Also, petition of C. T. Buckland and 10 other residents of Millwood, Wash., for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration Rent Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2026. Also, petition of A. W. Mollenhauer and three other residents of Spokane for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2027. Also, petition of Mrs. R. Greenwood and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2028. Also, petition of B. S. Coad and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2029. Also, petition of Robert L. Weniger and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2030. Also, petition of Ivan H. Abraham and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2031. Also, petition of Emma Herndon and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2032. Also, petition of A. B. Bennett and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2033. Also, petition of John S. Athey and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2034. Also, petition of Julia Talbot and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2035. Also, petition of Nellie Richter and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2036. Also, petition of Edna K. W. Nelson and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2037. Also, petition of F. W. Richardson and two other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2038. Also, petition of Mrs. J. D. Zimmerman and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2039. Also, petition of Mrs. L. K. Loffler and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2040. Also, petition of E. A. Cornelius and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2041. Also, petition of Alice R. Hart and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2042. Also, petition of Florilla Hopper and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2043. Also, petition of Alta Firth and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2044. Also, petition of Mrs. R. J. Hanlose and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2045. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Fred Smith and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2046. Also, petition of Lillian Burns and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2047. Also, petition of Isabell McGilvery and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control

directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2048. Also, petition of Claire Cannell and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2049. Also, petition of Mary A. Martin and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2050. Also, petition of H. G. Phair and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2051. Also, petition of Charles M. Barket and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2052. Also, petition of W. E. Arnett and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2053. Also, petition of Thomas W. Bailey and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2054. Also, petition of Jane Schultz and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2055. Also, petition of A. L. Pratt and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2056. Also, petition of Helen Hupp and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2057. Also, petition of E. H. Davidson and 11 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2058. Also, petition of Scott C. Sharp and 11 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2059. Also, petition of William Reilly and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2060. Also, petition of Elizabeth Hicks and 11 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2061. Also, petition of F. Croneath and 12 other residents of Spokane and Millwood, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2062. Also, petition of Maurice J. McHugh and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2063. Also, petition of F. W. Mauser and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2064. Also, petition of Hattie Krups and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2065. Also, petition of Fred W. Curtis and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2066. Also, petition of Bertha E. Nagel and five other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2067. Also, petition of Howard P. Ball and 14 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2068. Also, petition of Grace Boettgo and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2069. Also, petition of Tena Madsen and five other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under the provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2070. Also, petition of Mary M. Seeley and six other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2071. Also, petition of A. S. MacDonald and 20 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2072. Also, petition of Mary Mitchell Joy and 12 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2073. Also, petition of Mary C. Hale and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2074. Also, petition of Edward T. Russell and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2075. Also, petition of Raymond L. Haines and nine other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2076. Also, petition of Hermione McPhee and eight other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2077. Also, petition of M. W. Wright and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2078. Also, petition of J. S. Lewis and 10 other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2079. Also, petition of Rose M. Maher and seven other residents of Spokane, for redress of grievance under provisions of the Office of Price Administration rent-control directive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

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

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

O Thou who makest Thyself known and heard not in the whirlwind nor in the earthquake, but in the still small voice, we would hush our thoughts to silence as we bow our spirit at this altar of prayer. Before we speak to one another about the Nation's life we would open our hearts to Thee from whom no secrets are hid. From the tumult of an angry world we seek the sanctuary of Thy presence, not that we may escape the world but that we may turn to the perplexing maze of its tragic problems with strong spirits and quiet minds. In a shaken world we seek stability. In an anguished world we need inner peace. In a fearful world we want confidence and courage. In a world of rising and falling systems we crave a vision of Thine eternal kingdom which has no frontiers.

Grant us the wisdom and the vision here to fashion laws that may be the expression of the fairer ideals of freedom and brotherhood which are now seeking their incarnation in a new age which has struck the tents of a past content. May those who here serve the public weal be wise interpreters of Thy eternal law, the brave spokesmen of Thy will and of Thy truth which sets men free from ancient wrong. So send us forth, to serve the present age sure that, though the earth were removed and the mountains cast into the midst of the sea, the Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, July 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on July 7, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following act (S. 1109) to increase by \$300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 33

and 34 to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to a further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8 and 9 to the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its adherence to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24, 25, and 26 to the bill; that the House insisted upon his disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24, 25, and 26 to the bill; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2703. An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2936. An act to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled, "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; and

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay.