

TENNESSEE

Maben B. Curry, Henry, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Walter Kurz, Somerset, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Edith E. Payne, Falmouth, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mildred K. Smith, Sterling, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Percy Bradshaw, Zuni, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Lila Luella Henry, Bow, Wash., in place of Grace Hayes, resigned.

Nancy J. Nance, Brush Prairie, Wash., in place of H. E. Pender, transferred.

Josephine F. Johnson, Endicott, Wash., in the place of E. S. Garland, resigned.

Thomas W. Tait, Gig Harbor, Wash., in place of A. L. Hopkins, deceased.

Ruth F. Walters, Moxee City, Wash., in place of C. E. Simon, resigned.

John T. Scott, North Bend, Wash., in place of D. P. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Theo V. Steele, Port Gamble, Wash., in place of Mike Capps, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 12, 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

Lincoln MacVeagh, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt and also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Yugoslavia now established in Egypt.

Hiram Bingham, Jr., to be a consul.

Andrew B. Foster to be a consul.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Ordnance Department

Capt. Horace Freeman Bigelow

To Infantry

Lt. Col. George Allan Miller

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, Infantry

Omar Nelson Bradley

Paul John Mueller

Leland Stanford Hobbs

To be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps

John Frederick Kahle

To be colonel, Air Corps

Edwin Bowman Lyon

To be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps

Reinold Melberg

To be colonel, Finance Department

Clarence Brewster Lindner

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Harvey Robinson Livesay

Raymond Osborne Dart

John Frank Lieberman

Brooks Collins Grant

William BeM Foster

Chauncey Elmo Dovell

To be captains, Medical Corps

Arthur Lynn Burks

Robert Charles Hunter, Jr.

To be captain, Dental Corps

Edward Ernest Rose

To be colonel, Veterinary Corps

George Jacob Rife

To be colonel, Pharmacy Corps

Thomas Grimsley Hester

To be colonels, Chaplain Corps

Edward Lewis Trett

Charles Coburn Merrill

To be captain, Chaplain Corps

Arthur Carl Piepkorn

POSTMASTERS

MARYLAND

Margaret B. Tierney, Kensington.

MISSOURI

Amos A. Ponder, Cardwell.

Jonathan N. Carter, Linneus.

Virginia L. Rutledge, Osage Beach.

NORTH DAKOTA

William T. Wakefield, Mott.

Garfield J. Mauritson, Park River.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Father in Heaven, we praise Thee that Thou hast called us to be collaborators with Thee; how wonderful to take some creation of Thine and adapt it to our needs; to make some creature better and happier, even as Thou didst bless little children. Thou who are the cornerstone of our faith, to erase Thy name from the memory of man is to rend the moral foundations of the world. Beneath Thy footfall it is destined to move sunward and only the clouds can mantle at Thy feet.

O God, instill in all our fellow citizens a growing sense of justice and personal honor that they may be God-fearing servants of our country. Grant that each may pursue his own labor, avoiding that which makes for division and disunity. All who have been delivered from affliction, all who have been blest with tidings of great mercies, touched by Thy sacrificial spirit, may they live on the higher levels of their natures, giving Thee free dominion over selfishness, pride, and every evil passion. O Thou who dost bring forth from the mute, unpromising earth harvests rich and abundant, O bring out of our hearts the fruits of peace, love, and brotherhood. Through Christ in whom eternal goodness and love are one. Amen.

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

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING APPLICATIONS FOR RELIEF UNDER SECTION 722 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

MR. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3363, an

act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER, DISNEY, KNUTSON, and REED of New York.

HEARINGS ON RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

MR. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 857) back favorably, without amendment, a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, current session, on certain provisions in the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended, relative to renegotiation of contracts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON THE CIVIL AVIATION BILL

MR. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 858) back favorably, without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 351) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the House document room and 500 copies shall be for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes and that the remarks I shall make may appear in the permanent RECORD as in the proceedings of November 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from addresses made over the British Broadcasting Co.'s station in London.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PREEMINENCE OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my own remarks, and to include therein a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Census.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRAGGING AGAIN?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to report to the House that Los Angeles County, in the State of California, leads all other counties in the United States in agricultural production. I shall quote from a letter written by the Director of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, which I shall extend fully in the RECORD. From it I read the following:

Los Angeles County is No. 1 in the tables for value of farm products, gallons of milk produced, value of dairy products, value of fruits and nuts, expenditures for machinery and implements, expenditures for feed, and expense of farm labor.

It was second in turkeys raised on farms, number of cows milked, number of chickens on farms, eggs produced, and total number of orange trees.

I am sure those facts will be of great interest to the Members of the House, and to the Nation.

The letter in full is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, November 11, 1943.

HON. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HINSHAW: The preeminence of Los Angeles County as an agricultural section is a matter of common knowledge, but you may be interested to know its relative rank among more than 3,000 other counties in the United States. The Census Bureau has recently ranked the 100 leading counties in 59 farm activities such as crops, livestock, farm expenditures, fruit and nut trees, etc. In 33 items your district appears among these selected counties, standing at the head of the list for 7 items and in second place for 5 farm products.

The State of California leads all other States in the number of times (537) its coun-

LXXXIX—596

ties have a place among the first 100, based on a wide variety of farm items.

I am sending you a booklet issued by the Census Bureau, entitled "Ranking Agricultural Counties." This publication shows the 100 premier counties in each of 59 phases of agricultural activities in the order of their rank, with details of their performance. A glance at the tabulation on page 4 should be especially pleasing to you and your district.

Los Angeles County is No. 1 in the tables for value of farm products, gallons of milk produced, value of dairy products, value of fruits and nuts, expenditures for machinery and implements, expenditures for feed, and expense of farm labor.

It was second in turkeys raised on farms, number of cows milked, number of chickens on farms, eggs produced, and total number of orange trees.

The county also figures extensively in other farm items, such as third in number of chickens raised; fourth in square feet of glass for horticultural specialties, and seventh in value; seventh in value of domestic animals, tons of commercial fertilizer purchased, and acres of vegetables harvested for sale; thirteenth in acres of cabbage; fifteenth in acres of green snap beans; sixteenth in cattle and calves on farms; eighteenth in total number of grapefruit trees; nineteenth in acres of cantaloupes (tied with a county in another State); twenty-first in acres of alfalfa and fourth in production; twenty-second in acres of dried onions; twenty-seventh in total number of pear trees and acres of sweet corn; twenty-ninth in acres of strawberries and seventh in production; thirty-first in acres of tomatoes; thirty-fourth in total number of grapevines and twenty-sixth in quantity produced; sixty-fifth in acres of sugar beets and fifty-third in quantity produced; seventy-third in total plum and prune trees and fifty-eighth in production; seventy-eighth in value of farm products used by farm households; and ninety-eighth in acres of hay.

Chambers of commerce, newspapers, school authorities, and citizens in general should find the foregoing information useful.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. CAPT, Director.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next following the disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nonpartisan Farm Machinery Committee of which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is

chairman and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is secretary, yesterday conferred with numerous representatives of the Government and various department heads in reference to the serious shortage of farm implements.

At that meeting I was surprised to learn through questioning some of the division heads present that only 125,000 farm tractors in addition to 30,700 units previously allocated have been authorized to be manufactured for the 1944 season. For 6,000,000 farmers in America this is but a drop in the bucket.

I was greatly disturbed to hear at this same meeting evidence brought out that our neighbor, Canada, is to receive 19,565 farm tractors from our factories for the same period and that Lend-Lease will export an additional 21,000 of the tractors our farmers need so badly.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely unwise to allow over one-fourth of our farm-tractor production to be sent abroad at a time when our own farmers are bending every effort toward producing the food that we in America must have to win this war. Our farms have been stripped of labor, necessarily perhaps, but I do protest against our farm power, represented by tractors, being given away with so lavish a hand.

It takes 6 months to manufacture a farm tractor, from the time the orders are placed for the steel to the day the tractor leaves the plant.

I shall have more to say to the House upon this subject at a later date and sincerely hope that this farm machinery problem will be gone into very thoroughly in the coming month as now is the time that we must prepare for 1944 food production or otherwise we have failed in our duty, not to the farmers of America, but to the boys on the front line.

WENDELL WILLKIE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times, Paul Revere Willkie has sounded an alarm to the Republicans of the Nation that they are inviting a repetition of the disastrous results of Warren G. Harding's nomination by pushing favorite sons into the Presidential campaign.

He goes on to say that a campaign is apparently under way to get enough favorite-son candidates into the race so that a dark horse can be pulled out of the hat.

Mr. Speaker, not being a spokesman for the Republican Party, I am unable to advise the members of that unfortunate organization, but I cannot see where there would be much more danger in their pulling a political dark horse, like Dewey, Taft, Vandenberg, Bricker, or MacArthur, out of the hat, as Mr. Willkie expresses it, and as he says they did in nominating Warren G. Harding, than it

would be to permit the utilities to pull a political black sheep out of the bag, as they are alleged to have done at Philadelphia in 1940.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of the legislative program today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the bills on the Consent Calendar will be called. On Tuesday the bills on the Private Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide an increase in the rates of compensation of pensions payable to disabled veterans, and so forth, under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, will be called up for consideration. We expect a rule to be reported out on that next Monday. We hope that the rule will be reported.

On Wednesday the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rates of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 a month will be called up for consideration.

On Thursday the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be brought up for consideration.

The tax bill will not be brought up next week but will be called up on Monday of the following week unless the Commodity Credit Corporation bill debate extends over into the following week, in which event the tax bill will be called up immediately at the conclusion of the consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the House be in session tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, we will meet tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the civil aviation bill and to include therein certain brief extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address by Hon. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter received from Prof. T. B. Charles, head of the department of poultry husbandry and acting extension poultryman, University of New Hampshire, November 9, 1943, in regard to the feed situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a certain letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a resolution from the Nebraska Stock Growers and Feeders Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a short statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an address by one of our county agents delivered at the Iowa-Nebraska Kiwanis clubs convention.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record by printing a speech delivered by Robert Nelson Anderson upon the life of Abraham Baldwin.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article from the New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to relinquish that time today and instead ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES—THE WARNING OF HISTORY

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, whether it is "planned that way" or not, the New Deal subsidy scheme may turn out to be America's Munich. This makeshift may be an appeasement scheme as deadly as the appeasement at Munich. How, you may ask, does their subsidy proposal

compare with that tragedy? Where is the parallel?

By building up military might from 1933 on, Hitler at Munich had the peace-loving nations in a dilemma. To refuse Hitler meant war, to appease him meant the sacrifice of a brave ally, Czechoslovakia. Chamberlain took the easy choice; he appeased Hitler, and yet Europe was turned into a flaming hell.

Here in America, from 1933 on, the New Deal has been creating a stock pile of inflation. Ten years of reckless spending and pyramiding debts has resulted in the creation of inflationary forces that threaten the Nation. Now Congress is told it must provide the side-office Caesars at the White House with unlimited funds for socialistic price-juggling schemes, or America will have runaway inflation. It looks like we have the Munich choice before us. Let us consider both possibilities.

First, if we allow their subsidy plans, we increase inflation but postpone its painful effects. The bitter truth about the steady decline in the buying power of our money will then be kept hidden from the people. How long? Perhaps until after election day next year.

Under their subsidy plan we would "baby" inflation along like we babied Japan before Pearl Harbor. We would increase our debts and widen the inflationary gap between swollen consumer income and restricted production. Nothing could be more inflationary. Just as Munich was supposed to assure "peace in our time," so will this rebate scheme assure economic "peace for a time." Munich failed! So will this device.

Consider the other choice of this economic Munich, runaway inflation. Like Hitler's military might in 1938, the accumulated inflation force can be used to blitzkrieg what economic freedom is left in America. Certainly the potentiality of deadly inflation exists. If that Frankenstein monster breaks loose, who is responsible for it?

In 1932 candidate Roosevelt pledged himself to stop the deficits that create inflation and bankruptcy. The deficits that alarmed him then totaled \$4,000,000,000. At the time of his pledge, the national debt was \$21,000,000,000. Since then the national debt has increased \$143,000,000,000, of which \$34,000,000,000 were piled up even before the war.

The responsibility for runaway inflation, if it occurs, lies with the administration that piled up these debts and stifled production. Perhaps the people of America, however, might be led to believe otherwise. If Congress could be found holding the sack when inflation broke loose, it would become the goat and the New Deal would evade the responsibility for their ghastly failure.

The two foregoing possibilities face this Congress. It seems that Congress has the Munich choice before it. Can Congress meet that challenge successfully?

I am not too sure that it can. The danger in their subsidy schemes can be camouflaged as cleverly as booby-trap mines. The administration largely controls two great means of public information, the radio and the motion picture. It would

be easy for the administration to claim it was trying to keep down the cost of living for the common people, while Congress was aiding profiteers and selfish interests. The people have been fooled before, and perhaps they might feel they can do it again. Take a look at the record.

In 1933 a panic closed all the banks of this country. To this day the people blame Hoover and the Republicans for the panic. What is the truth? The truth is that the bank panic was largely brought about by two New Deal developments. First, the word got around in New Deal circles in January that when Roosevelt took office we would go off the gold standard. Informed insiders made a run on banks for gold. This panicky move was followed by a well-publicized agitation in Congress discrediting the R. F. C. and the banks. Together, these two moves produced the panic that ended in the bank holiday. Ten years have elapsed, yet this truth has never been placed before the American people.

Actually, the smart economists in the executive branch must be getting many a chuckle out of the discussion in Congress of the economic aspects of their subsidy scheme. They know their remedies for high prices are like taking aspirin for appendicitis. They know there is no protection from inflation in adopting a scheme that will benefit millionaires as much as day laborers, pyramid our debts, and multiply the numbers of the bureaucrats. They know blanket subsidies will discourage production, because the American farmer despises the socialism of their subsidy proposals. They know these facts better than Congress, but they may be thinking about election day. They have Congress over a barrel. Like Hitler at Munich, they hold the trump cards, the mighty pent-up force of live-steam inflation generated since 1933.

Fortunately Congress has a third alternative. It can enact legislation that will protect the standards of living for those groups hurt by the increased cost of living—and no one else. Here are two groups that need help: One is the people of the very low-income class, and the second consists of an important segment of our middle-class population whose medium small income has remained stationary during the past few years of rising taxes and prices. House bill No. 2997, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] provides a plan for helping these groups. Probably the bill needs improvements, but its basic principle fits the emergency created by New Deal bungling.

Administration spokesmen consistently cite the example of subsidies in the production of copper and other metals. But they refuse to carry out the same principle with foods. In copper the Government fixed a ceiling price that was profitable to the low-cost producers, and they subsidized only those who could not produce at that price-level. The producers supported the program, because it gave Government help only to those who needed it. Food producers almost unanimously oppose the Government's present subsidies, but they would sup-

port the Herter proposal giving Government aid only to those consumers who need assistance.

Where prices must be increased moderately to stimulate production, let Government meet that challenge by making available the machinery and manpower that will expand production and thus hold prices down. Ask a mother which she would rather have—a price on milk of 15 cents a quart, and no milk; or a price of 16 cents a quart, and sufficient milk for her youngsters? The mothers of America can answer that question, even if the new dealers play ostrich about it.

There cannot be inflated prices of products that are in ample production. Coffee is a good example—the price is ample—production is high, and there is no pressure on coffee prices. Let this administration take the brakes off production, and even the debasement of our money that has been going on for 10 years will not currently develop into inflation. The Republican food-study committee has consistently urged the appointment of a single food administrator—the practical approach to expanded production.

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

Mr. BUFFETT. Gladly.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has made quite a study of the food-subsidy program. During the current week we have heard numerous speeches and discussions about it. We know pretty well the attitude of the administration. We know the attitude of the kept economists in the bureaus of the Government. I wonder if the gentleman, who comes from a great farm State, can tell us something about the attitude of the producers themselves on this important matter of subsidies.

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes; I can.

Mr. MUNDT. I would be very happy if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. BUFFETT. I have been in correspondence with many producers and they have all been against the program. This morning I received a resolution from the Iowa Stock Growers' Association, the Nebraska association, and the Kansas association—all opposing this program. The producers are against it. To me, that is one of the amazing things about this problem. On a military matter this House goes to the military men and says, "What do you want?" Then we do what the military want. This is as great a problem in a war as is the military part of it, but we do not go to the producers because the producers are almost unanimously against it.

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

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Does the gentleman find in his own district that it is not only the large farm organizations and producers that are opposed to subsidies but it is the small producer and the small farmer as well?

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, because I have found exactly this situation. Not a single farmer has written me or not a single

farmer has gone on record, as far as I can determine, in favor of subsidies, and no organization of farmers that I have found any trace of has gone on record in favor of subsidies in my district.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I understand the administration farm organization, the Farmers' Union, is in favor of it.

Mr. BUFFETT. I am glad to have that information.

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

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

Mr. RAMEY. In fact, is not a subsidy merely taking it off the grocery bill and putting it on the tax bill, plus administrative expenses?

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman has answered his own question.

Mr. RAMEY. In view of that fact, is there any means of finding out what the administrative expenses will be, and whether the already great tax bill will be increased because of interest payments going on and on? Can that be reduced to a mathematical certainty?

Mr. BUFFETT. No; I do not believe it can. In that respect I think a page of history is worth more than a volume of logic. History shows that the expenses are usually as much as or more than the benefits received.

The method proposed in H. R. 2997, Mr. Speaker, is the third alternative in this difficult situation. It will cost much less than subsidies and help only those who deserve Government help on their grocery bill. It is the only method that is fair to the two great groups whose voices have not been heard on this problem—the soldiers who are fighting to save America, and the children who must pay the bill for the bungling of this period.

Inflation, Mr. Speaker, is not a new problem. All the financial patent medicines that are being trotted out now have been tried before and they have always failed. Look at the last chapter of the European inflations in the twenties, following the First World War.

An American official assigned to study those social upheavals finished up his analysis as follows:

The solutions that I have witnessed have all tended to leave the farmer on top, but the methods used were, without exception, damned rough; nor were these methods adopted pursuant to thought or studied preparation. They were spontaneous. They consisted of the country man simply rising up and beating the life out of the city man, a solution that is as simple as it is undesirable. The reasons for such conflict may be complicated, but the termination is simple.

The warning of history is plain here for responsible officials in Government, in labor, and in industry. America must solve this problem with a solution which will deserve and secure the hearty and unqualified support of the producers. That solution is not a socialistic subsidy scheme regimenting producers. It is not unbridled inflation. It is not a scheme designed to protect high salary and high wage earners from paying their fair share of increased costs due both to the war and governmental manipulation. Disguise these schemes as you will, the producer will discover their fundamental

dishonesty and revolt against them. The sensible solution is increased production, the adjustment of a few prices, and temporary Government aid for truly distressed consuming groups.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], for 20 minutes.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be granted those 20 minutes on Monday, following the disposition of any business on the Speaker's table and such special orders as have been granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Cedar Rapids Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PROPOSED QUESTIONING OF CABINET MEMBERS DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the matter I am going to discuss today is one that many Members have been thinking of for a long time. It is a variation of an old idea that has been before the Congress from time to time for 80 years. I have 45 minutes at my disposal, and my purpose in asking for this rather long time is because I want to yield freely to any Members of the House who are here, who want to make any statements or observations in connection with the matter under discussion.

On October 19 of this year I introduced House Resolution 327, which is brief, and which I shall read:

Resolved, That rule XXXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. There shall be held in the House immediately following the reading of the Journal on at least 1 day in each period of 2 calendar weeks, but not oftener than 1 day in any 1 calendar week, a 'question period,' which shall not consume more than 2 hours, during which heads of departments and independent agencies are requested to answer orally written and oral questions propounded by Members of the House. Each written question shall be submitted in triplicate to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such question, and, if approved by such committee, one copy shall be transmitted to the head of the department or independent agency concerned, with an invitation to appear before the House, and one copy to the Committee on Rules with a request for allotment of time in a question period to answer such question. Subject to the limitations prescribed in this paragraph, the Committee on Rules shall determine the date for, and the length of time of, each question period, and shall allot the time in

each question period to the head of a department or independent agency who has indicated to the committee his readiness to deliver oral answers to the questions transmitted to him. All written questions propounded in any one question period shall be approved by one committee. The latter half of each question period shall be reserved for oral questions by Members of the House, one-half of such time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee which has approved the written questions propounded in such question period and one-half by the ranking minority member of such committee. The time of each question period and the written questions to be answered in such period shall be printed in two daily editions of the Record appearing before the day on which such question period is to be held, and the proceedings during the question period shall be printed in the Record for such day."

The way this rule would work, if adopted, can be illustrated by a hypothetical case. Suppose the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House decided they would like to have Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, appear before the House to tell something of the details of the Moscow Conference. That is a matter in which the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House is particularly interested, and in which every Member of the House has a deep, a great, and a far-reaching interest. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House would let it be known that they are going to invite Mr. Hull to appear, and any Member who wanted to have a question asked of Mr. Hull, could file that question with the clerk of the committee, or with some member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and then, prior to 2 days before Mr. Hull was to appear, the committee would go over the questions filed with them, or would originate questions of their own, and then would decide the questions and the topics they wanted Mr. Hull to discuss. Prior to 2 days before his appearance copies of those questions would be sent to the Secretary of State, and copies would be sent to the Committee on Rules. The Rules Committee, after consideration of the importance of the subject matter and the recommendations of the legislative committee as to the amount of time necessary for the discussion would fix the amount of time to be allotted to Mr. Hull. Then, supposing he were allotted 2 hours to answer the questions submitted by the committee, one-half of his time would be spent in answering the questions that had already been submitted to him 2 days before, and published in the Record for 2 days.

The remaining half of his time would be consumed by answering questions from the floor of the House. Time for asking questions from the floor to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee. If more than one committee had a request pending for the appearance of an executive officer at the same time, the Rules Committee would fix the priority and order of appearance. I may say that before I filed this resolution I talked about this proposal with many Members of the House. I am especially grateful to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the gentle-

man from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and many other Members of the House, who have made valuable suggestions about this idea. This is, of course, a rudimentary resolution. Experience will have to show us whether it should be changed in one respect or another, but at least it gives us something to start with, something to work on, something to enable us to begin discussion of the subject.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do this to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the constructive thought that he has obviously given to this problem, and to say to him that I think he is striking at what is probably the most important single problem in the American Government today, namely, the relationship between the legislative and the executive. Does the gentleman's resolution limit the people to be questioned to members of the Cabinet, or would it be possible to have the heads of other governmental agencies as well appear before the House?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I may say that I was advised by the Legislative Reference Service that the words used here, "heads of departments and independent agencies," include members of the Cabinet, and that is the usual legislative description which includes members of the Cabinet.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And it also includes the head of such agencies as the Maritime Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, or any of the other independent agencies or commissions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the sessions where they appeared be closed sessions or would they be open sessions?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should think that would be determined by the Speaker or by whoever determines the matter now as to whether they would be executive sessions or open sessions. In the absence of some determination that they should be in executive session, I think they should be open sessions where the public and the press could hear what the Cabinet members and the heads of departments have to say.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It occurs to me there are two problems that may be involved here that the gentleman's proposal may very well be a means of helping to solve. One of those is the difficulty which Members of Congress frequently have in getting to these people who are making decisions; that is, the problem of attempting to reach them. I mean the physical problem, for one thing, and certainly it would be a great advantage to the Congress to be able to have one of the policy-making officials of the Government come before us with reference to matters we have very much in our laps which could be brought out, and he could be requested to discuss them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the gentleman's observations are eminently correct. For instance, I am sure every Member of the House would like to go down and talk to Mr. Hull about what happened at Moscow. Yet we know it is physically impossible to do that. We cannot take up that much of his time, so it would be very beneficial to all of us if arrangements could be made so that here, in our forum, and under our rules, we could have him here and could direct the course the discussion is to take. It would serve the purpose and certainly would save Mr. Hull a great deal of time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad I am fortified by the presence of my friend from Alabama, the great constitutional lawyer [Mr. HOBBS], and I would like to have him listen to this discussion inasmuch as I do not believe, under our constitutional system, we can compel the attendance of these witnesses or of these officers, although we could request it. I think likewise that under any rule which might be adopted they would have the discretion as to what questions they would answer and what questions they would refuse to answer. It is obvious from your reference, for instance, to the recent conference at Moscow that there may be certain military matters which were decided there which it would be very bad to have answered even in executive session. I do not think any of us would want to be burdened, for instance, with the knowledge of when and where the second front was to be opened. That is something we would rather not hear about and would rather leave to our military officers for decision. I believe my idea of the constitutional question involved is correct. I would like to be corrected if it is not.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the first place, I appreciate the observations which the gentleman has made. I am sure that the Congress, which is composed of the most intelligent and most loyal and most capable men in America, whose great concern is the welfare of this country, as it is the concern of every Member, has no Member who would insist a question be answered by a Cabinet member which would reveal any military secret and hurt the security of this Nation, whether it be in an open session or an executive session.

Now, as to the point you raise relative to the constitutionality of the proposal, I am going to discuss that later, but I want to say that there is absolutely nothing in our Constitution to prohibit the House of Representatives from adopting this rule. Under the Constitution each House of Congress adopts its own rules. This is one of the devices, this is one of the means open to us which I think our forefathers intended we should use. As evidence of that fact I may say that in the First Congress, in which sat many Members who were members of the Constitutional Convention, this practice was very wisely carried out by President George Washington, who was Chairman of the Con-

stitutional Convention. He appeared before the Senate on several occasions, and members of the Cabinet during that First Congress appeared before the House of Representatives in person.

So it has never been considered that this requires any constitutional amendment. The point the gentleman raised as to whether we can pass a law to require Cabinet members to appear, does bring forth an interesting question. The better reasoning on the subject and the one supported by the greatest amount of authority, as I shall point out later, is that since Congress creates these offices and defines their powers and we require them to send written reports to Congress every year, we could require them to come and make oral reports to Congress. But under the wording of this resolution it is entirely permissive. They would not have to come unless they wanted to, under this resolution; but the force of public opinion would be so heavy upon them, if they did not come they would be held up to ridicule, and as Congress controls the purse strings I imagine they would be here unless they had an acceptable excuse. So, as a practical matter they would come and they would be glad to accept the invitation.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will yield further, I am heartily in sympathy with the gentleman's resolution. I do not want anything I might say to be considered as in criticism of the resolution. But I think it is wise to talk it out. Does the gentleman feel that the President or the President's Cabinet could be compelled to come? Undoubtedly, in that connection, the gentleman with his knowledge of history, remembers the attempt of Chief Justice Marshall to subpoena the President in the Aaron Burr trial. The opinion of most lawyers was that that was beyond the power of the courts, since the President was a constitutional officer. I should think the same rule would apply to his official family, the Cabinet.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that Cabinet members are not constitutional officers. They are not created by the Constitution. In the second place, I think the gentleman is entirely right in that Congress cannot require the President to come to a session of Congress. The Constitution provides, of course, that he shall make a report on the state of the Nation, which two Presidents did orally, and then the practice was discontinued until the time of President Wilson, who revived it. That is his duty, and aside from doing that, which he is required to do by the Constitution, Congress has no other control with reference to his appearance before the Congress. But as to the Cabinet, that presents a different question. However, it is academic insofar as this resolution is concerned, because this says only those will be invited who have indicated their willingness to accept the invitation.

In my remarks I will give the gentleman some of the authorities to the effect that Congress could require them to attend in person just as we can require them to submit their annual reports.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama, who is one of the great constitutional lawyers of the House.

Mr. HOBBS. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the way in which he has worded his resolution it would amply safeguard against this secondary embarrassment that might arise. In other words, your resolution requires that the question be submitted to the committee in charge of the particular matter or field of questioning, and also to the Rules Committee. In that way I should think that what the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] had in mind would be more than doubly safeguarded.

I realize, however, that his question is deeper than he made it appear in his statement, in this, that there might be some objection to some of the questions even being asked, just as many times the severest punishment is the indictment rather than the conviction. So here, if a question could not be asked for reasons of public policy, is it not contemplated in the gentleman's resolution that it would be submitted to the committee in charge of that field of investigation, and also to the Rules Committee? And is it not predominantly probable that where there was any question, those questions would be submitted in advance and discussion had between the committees and department head involved?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. The gentleman is correct about the intention of the resolution. There are two problems that face us and have to be dealt with. In the first place, we want to restrict the questions so as to hold them on the subject under consideration because we wish to prevent any embarrassment to the Government or to a Cabinet officer by asking improper questions. In the second place, we want to make it as easy as possible for any Member of Congress to ask a question. It is with those two problems in mind that I have been delving into this subject.

My first impression was that only those questions which were approved by the Legislative Committee and by the Rules Committee should be asked. The purpose of these checks was to see that they were proper questions, to see that they followed the line of the subject matter under consideration and also to see that they were not argumentative, that they were in proper form. In talking with some of the Members it developed that they felt there should be some means for a Member to ask questions from the floor. This resolution, therefore, provides that the last half of the period shall be consumed by questions from the floor. The time for asking questions would be under the control of the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the Legislative Committee which I think would be a protection. As a matter of fact, Members might make some statement here or ask a question of another Member which would be embarrassing to the Government, but it does not happen often; Members have

a great sense of propriety. I think with these safeguards we would be fully protected in the matter. There was also some criticism of the idea by several Members on the grounds that a number of Members may rise and ask a lot of irrelevant questions and thereby try to embarrass a Cabinet officer; that is the reason for providing that the Chairman and the ranking minority member should have the power of recognizing a Member for the purpose of asking a question from the floor.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield further to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. I ask this question merely for the purpose of exploring a little further the thought of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Has the gentleman from Tennessee thought of the possibility of limiting the right of questioning or the submission of questions so as to require the committees to consider in advance of publication in the Record any question relating to foreign affairs or to the conduct of a war? The answering of such questions could be declined of course on the ground of public policy. It seems to me that the gentleman, who has given evidently so much thought and great care to this resolution and its preparation might give us the light of his reflection on that question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's question. I have thought a great deal about that very thing.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The proposal of the gentleman, to say the least, is very ingenious, but does it occur to the gentleman that we are seeking to break down that barrier set up by our Constitution, by our forefathers that the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of this Government shall be separate and independent of each other? Cabinet officers are members of the President's family; they are a part of his set-up. A Cabinet officer cannot be divorced from the office of the President, because he carries out the functions of the executive branch of the Government. Does not the gentleman believe that to have them brought in here and subjected to cross-examination in this body would just about submerge the executive to the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will answer the gentleman's question in just a minute. Let me first answer the question of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], then I will revert to the gentleman's inquiry.

We will, of course, have to be guided by our experience in working out better methods of handling this procedure. I am sure that custom and practice will throw protections around it which will prevent any divulgence of confidential information that should not be given. In the first place, the Cabinet member could refuse to answer on the grounds of public policy. In the second place the commit-

tee would direct the course of the discussion, and the chairman and the ranking minority member would have the right to prevent anybody's asking a question unless they knew what the question was going to be. In the third place we could have executive sessions. I believe, therefore, that is not a situation we need worry about. I believe the patriotism and good sense of the Members would take care of it; also, if the protections we already have are not sufficient, we would have to adopt other protections as experience may show them to be needed.

Coming now to the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN], I intended to take up this issue later, but now is as good a time as any. He has raised the question as to whether or not this is a violation of the traditions of our constitutional form of government. I am glad he has made this query.

Fortunately, we have three separate and coextensive branches of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—we are fortunate that this is the case. I do not want to change this form or system in any way whatsoever. I think it is the best form of government that was ever devised, that the writers of our Constitution had almost divine inspiration in creating this plan; but I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that while it is often said that the branches of government are separate and distinct, this is not actually the case. As a matter of fact, the three branches are interwoven and fit into a plan where it cannot be said they are separate and distinct in the strict legal sense. It cannot be said for instance that all legislative power is in the hands of Congress. The fact of the matter is that Congress does not have the full say over laws that are passed. Any law that is passed in this body has to be signed by the President; so the President comes into the law-making picture. If the law is not signed by the President it has to be passed over his veto. In the event a motion to adjourn sine die cannot be agreed upon, the President can adjourn Congress. The President may call Congress into extra session. The Constitution provides that he shall report on the state of the Union to Congress and our President comes here at every session in order to report on the state of the Union. It is said that all executive powers are vested in the President, yet the Congress can fix the salary of the President; the Congress can decide the executive offices that are to be created and require those executive officers to report to the Congress. Congress can impeach an executive officer; Congress can impeach the President. We say that all judicial powers are vested in the Supreme Court and such other courts as the Congress may create. That is a provision of the Constitution.

As a matter of fact, the Congress can fix the terms of the court, Congress can fix the salaries of the judges, Congress can fix the number of the judges on any court, Congress can even say that a two-thirds majority in a case shall be sufficient for a decision, Congress defines the crimes or the laws that the courts

are to pass upon. Congress is not independent of judicial system. As a matter of fact, to show how much effect the judges have with Congress, any law that Congress may pass may be nullified and declared null by the Supreme Court, and even on occasions in impeachment proceedings involving a President, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court sits in at the impeachment trial. To say we have three separate and distinct divisions of our Government in the practical and actual sense is not correct.

Let me read just one thing that was said in the report of Mr. Pendleton for a select committee of the House of Representatives back in 1864, which I think is about the best answer I can give to the gentleman from Missouri:

This brief summary shows that the departments of the Government entrusted as they are with the legislative, executive, and judicial power, though separate and in some sort independent, are yet in their organization, in their applications intertwined and interdependent. They cross the boundaries of each other; they come in contact but not in conflict. They cross paths assigned to each without meeting or clashing in the pathways. They are cooperative and harmonious though distinct. They justify the saying of Mr. Adams applied to the lawyers of Cincinnati at a bar dinner given in his honor: "Harmony of conflict in elements is the true music in the spheres."

May I say further to the gentleman from Missouri, he may have the idea this is an invasion on our constitutional traditions because we have not used this useful plan for a long time. As a matter of fact, the record contains many instances where the First Congress of the United States brought in the President and the Cabinet members to advise the House of Representatives and the Senate on various proposals that were being considered. If there were any persons who knew what was meant by the Constitution, it certainly should be the Members of the First Congress.

Another very forceful answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is the action taken by the group of outstanding men who wrote the Constitution of the Confederate States. I think we are far enough away from the Civil War, so that we from the South can be grateful that the Union was preserved and those from the North can appreciate the ability and genius of some of the leaders of the Confederacy such as Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and Alexander Stephens. Alexander Stephens in spite of ill health, was one of the great statesmen and brains of his times. In the convention to adopt a Constitution for the Confederate States, Mr. Stephens was chairman of the Committee on Rules. The provisional government of the Confederacy adopted a resolution reported by Mr. Stephens that the heads of departments be admitted to the floor of Congress both in secret and open session.

The idea was later written into the permanent Constitution of the Confederate States, in the following language:

Article 1, section 6 (2): No senator or representative shall, during the time for

which he is elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the Confederate States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments of which have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the Confederate States shall be a member of either house during his continuance in office. But congress may, by law, grant to the principal officer in each of the executive departments a seat upon the floor of either house, with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department.

The Confederate Constitution was very similar to the Constitution of the United States. It followed the idea of the three separate powers. Its framers did not believe it would adversely effect the functions of the three separate divisions.

In 1864 a select committee of Members of the House of Representatives was appointed to consider a provision to enable Cabinet members to participate in debate on the floor of the House. This committee of seven unanimously recommended the adoption of a resolution amending the Rules of the House to make this possible. The report of the committee is a legislative masterpiece. It is found in Miscellaneous Senate Documents, volume 1, at page 15. Congressman Pendleton, who hailed from Ohio, was thereafter elected to the Senate.

In 1881 a select committee was appointed from the Senate to consider S. 227, which provided that the principal officers of the executive departments could participate in debate affecting their departments. This select committee unanimously recommended the legislation. The report was signed by seven outstanding Members of the Senate—Senators George H. Pendleton, W. B. Allison, D. W. Voorhees, J. G. Blaine, M. C. Butler, John J. Ingless, O. H. Platt, and J. T. Farley.

A proposal similar to this has been recommended by such eminent men as President Howard Taft in his message to Congress on January 3, 1913; by President Woodrow Wilson, Hon. Elihu Root, President James A. Garfield, and Hon. John W. Davis.

I could cite many favorable arguments in favor of the proposal from many noted and thoughtful historians, such as Dr. Charles A. Beard.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is making a very challenging and constructive proposal in this resolution. I have read it carefully several times and, as the gentleman knows, I have discussed it with him at great length and find it to be both intriguing and compelling. Like other Members who have interrogated him earlier, I had some doubts and some reservations about its constitutionality and its workability, but I must say that the longer I consider it, the more frequently I discuss it with the author, who has given it a tremendous amount of thought, the more impelling I feel myself toward the resolution.

I wonder if this is not a correct analysis of the situation brought up by the gentleman from Missouri. There

was never intended by the constitutional forefathers to be a barrier set up between these three departments of government. They were intended to cooperate, each independent of the other, but to work together. There was not to be a barrier between the functions of one with the other and anything which steps up the speed of cooperation without destroying the balance of power, which is the essential thing, is what we are driving at. If we can speed up the cooperation and speed up the workability of the three departments without destroying the balance of power, I think we have made a proper achievement. Does not the gentleman feel that if this resolution can be worked out so that neither the authority nor the independence of the cabinet officers nor of the Congress is jeopardized, we will have stepped up the speed of government without in any way destroying the balance of power?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman has made a most valuable statement and has expressed the idea so much clearer and in much more forceful language that I could hope to employ. As the gentleman has said, this is a device that is open to us without interfering with our good system of separation of powers. Our separation of powers is guaranteed by the Constitution in the provision which says that no Member of the Congress shall be entitled to hold any other office in the Government. That means, then, that under that provision there must and will always be a separation of powers.

May I say that I am very grateful to the thoughtful gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for his many suggestions. I appreciate greatly his interest in and support of this measure.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I want to congratulate the gentleman for introducing this resolution and for opening debate on this subject. As the gentleman knows, I have long been interested in it. I have investigated somewhat the conduct of the Canadian and British Parliaments in this respect, and I have seen this parliamentary questioning in action. I feel that it will in some form or other add greatly to the functioning of our Government.

I want to, if I may, offer this comment on the constitutional question. We are quite accustomed to having the Supreme Court receive before it a Cabinet officer, the Attorney General or the Solicitor General as is usually the case, a member of the executive branch, if you please, who argues his case before the Supreme Court, not in chambers, not before a committee of the Court, but before the Court itself. The members of that Court in turn interrogate him most sharply, this member of the executive branch, a lawyer representing the executive, an executive appointee before that Court. However, we never feel that the Court is invading the province of the executive by interrogating the executive in public or that the executive is overpowering the

Court by arguing most strenuously and vehemently for its position before the Court.

It seems to me all that is involved here is a more immediate method of cooperation, so that we bypass a lot of circuitous channels and streamline our Government by getting the executive immediately before those of the legislative branch who have questions involving legislation that the executive wants and we are, therefore, not violating the Constitution, but implementing the proper functioning between the branches of government.

There is one question I would like to put to the gentleman and that is whether there may not be in the Constitution an authority for this sort of thing where the Executive is required to report to the Congress on the state of the Nation.

Would not that obligation be delegated to these Cabinet members and other administrative officials who would come here directly on behalf of the Executive to report on the state of the Nation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman for the very valuable contribution he has made to this discussion. I think that definitely is a precedent in our Constitution, that we do not have to be actually separated from one another in trying to perform our respective duties because the Constitution provides that the President shall make a report, and we, as a matter of fact, require all of these agencies to send their reports to Congress, although these reports are very long and few Members read all of them. The analogy the gentleman draws with reference to the Solicitor General appearing before the Supreme Court proves the point.

Also along the line of what the gentleman said, it is well known that we do receive advice, and we have frequent communication with the judges in considering legislation. The Judicial Conference, which is composed of the senior judges, meets every year, and they have bills under consideration. Their recommendations—and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] will bear me out in this—are very helpful to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the House.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not want to take up too much of the gentleman's time because he is presenting a very interesting discourse on a very important and timely subject, but I should like to call his attention to an article in the current issue of *Fortune Magazine* which advocates a course similar to the one the gentleman is suggesting today, and refers to the early practice in our country where the Cabinet officers did appear before Congress. It states that at that time Alexander Hamilton was supposed to be rather arrogant with the Members of Congress, so they decided that they were not going to listen to him.

There is also the precedent of the President himself going before the Senate to discuss preliminarily the terms of

a treaty. When the Senators asked rather sharply about it and proposed some modifications, the President got rather huffed, and I believe his words were that he would be damned if he would ever go back. So the practice which apparently was intended by the Constitution was changed in the very first days of the Government. There is no constitutional reason why it cannot be revived if it is in the interest of better government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is entirely correct. The article in *Fortune* entitled "Our Form of Government" is a very challenging one which I hope all Members will read. The reason President Washington and members of the Cabinet did not continue the practice was that, with all due deference to the founder of our country, he was the type of man who had his say and he was not of the temperament to debate or join in arguments. Had he been of a different mood I am sure we would today have the procedure I am proposing. They did not set up machinery for its operation so the practice was discontinued, just as the practice of the President reporting in person to Congress on the state of the Union was discontinued by Thomas Jefferson because he did not happen to be a good speaker before a large audience. He, along with George Washington, was a great man of early American history. I revere Jefferson and Washington. But their particular personalities had a rather unusual effect upon future American history.

When President Wilson revived that practice, many people said that he was upsetting the tradition of the Constitution of the Nation. As a matter of fact, he was doing nothing of the sort, he was just bringing back into practice a very useful device that was given to us and allowed us by the Constitution.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I wish to panegyrize the gentleman for having brought before the House this important proposal. I realize that any encomiums of mine are superfluous, as the proposition speaks for itself. So I merely wish to say that I hope the gentleman will continue working for this worthy reform.

In that connection, I direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the late Woodrow Wilson, following his graduation from Princeton in 1879, wrote a series of articles in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, then a popular magazine, over several monthly issues, in which he discussed this very point and later incorporated them in his monumental work, *Our Congressional Government*. He pointed out that that was one of the advantages of the English parliamentary system over the American form of government, in that it brought more closely to the elective representatives of the people the functions of the cabinet members of government, as obtained in Great Britain and Canada.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, and I should like

as far as possible to put this forth as a good American practice that would be good for us under our form of constitutional government, rather than get too much on the English idea, because the fear that we might be aping the English is really what has defeated this proposal in the past.

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

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

Mr. HOBBS. After all is said and done, is it not in essence a question of distance? Is there any such bulwark or wall or partition between Cabinet officers or executive heads of departments as has been envisioned by our friend the gentleman from Missouri? Do not we consult them and do not they welcome consultation on any of the measures pending before Congress? Is it not done all the time, either in one of these outlying rooms or in their own chambers?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is quite correct. This brings the consultation into the open where we can all hear what is said and where we can all participate, and have open, face-to-face discussion rather than cloakroom discussion or discussion in our offices.

Then, another thing, it prevents a repetition before several committees or Members. It would save a lot of time. It is another way of doing what is already being done, but doing it in a very much better way.

Mr. HOBBS. May I say to the gentleman before he concludes that I congratulate him upon his statement and upon bringing this bill before us. I believe it will be overwhelmingly endorsed. Thereby the gentleman will have rendered a great service to our Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman. I will be satisfied if the resolution is passed, rather than be overwhelmingly endorsed. I am not as optimistic over the outcome as the gentleman from Alabama.

We hear a lot these days about the reform of Congress. I do not think reforms are needed in the sense we usually use the word "reform." There is nothing wrong with the personnel of Congress. By and large, we have excellent membership composing outstanding men and leaders in American life. What we do need is to use some of the mechanisms that fortunately are available to us under our Constitution which will enable us to do our work better. What is needed from the executive branches is information, not ordinary information but expert, detailed information.

We are coming into the most important, complex, and challenging period of world history. We have to improve the administration of laws by our executive departments, and we have to improve the way Congress works. This is one of the most effective methods whereby we can improve our congressional system. We can use this method to secure more and better information. It is impossible to read all of the hearings coming from the various committees. It would be vastly useful to the Members if, on great and important problems, we could meet

those to whom we must look for information face to face and discuss the issues with them. Many matters coming before Congress these days are of interest to the members of all committees. They transcend the special interest and jurisdiction of any one committee. These reports and issues should be discussed in our own forum, under procedure decided by us.

Dozens of resolutions for the creation of investigating committees are filed during each session of Congress. The fact that these resolutions are filed shows that the Members are seeking information and it shows a desire for knowledge of facts. During this Congress we have authorized the appointment of several select committees to make special investigations into the way executive departments are carrying out their functions. After a law is passed, we have no direct method of ascertaining whether the intention of Congress is being carried out. The Smith committee is now making a special investigation of the instances in which the intention of Congress was not followed in the administration of laws. The necessity for most of the investigating committees would be obviated if we could bring the administrators into this forum and here, face to face, require them to give an account of the stewardship of their departments.

A procedure would be inaugurated, if this resolution were passed, which would establish the importance of Congress in the public mind. At present executive administrators hold press conferences. These press conferences are given more play in the newspapers and over the radio than action taken by Congress on important measures. If the plans and proposals for the administration of laws are brought out on the floor of the House pursuant to questions from Members, the important news would arise from what was said on the floor and not what was said at some press conference.

This procedure would be beneficial to the Cabinet members and heads of the departments. In the first place, the President in making appointments would have to take into consideration that they would be called upon to appear on the floor of the House and the President's administration would be judged to a considerable extent by the impression these administrators made. He would be doubly sure that he secured outstanding men as heads of the executive agencies of the Government. The procedure would enable the administrators to obtain the people's view as expressed directly by the people's representatives. The administrators would consider more deliberately their decisions if they knew they would be called upon to give an account of what they were doing before the House. There could be no ghost writing. These men would have to know their departments and be able to give facts.

It frequently happens that rumors or unjust criticism are spread about executive officers. If this criticism comes from a Member of the House, the executive officer has no opportunity to answer except through the newspapers. Under

this procedure he would be given an opportunity of appearing and explaining his side of the controversy.

In summing up the advantages, I think I might well use the words of Senator Pendleton's report—

The advantages of the system proposed are so obvious and manifold that the committee feels relieved from a detailed statement of them.

There are many angles to this question that I would like to discuss this afternoon. Later on I expect to secure more time for a further discussion and on that occasion I expect to bring forth some of the objections that have been or may be raised to this type of legislation and try to answer them to your satisfaction.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I feel confident that the gentleman has offered this proposal, not as being the last word in the machinery for arranging a question period, but as affording a basis for discussion of this subject.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In the same spirit I wish to raise this question, which I mean to be constructive, on the proposed machinery in the gentleman's resolution, which I have read with great interest and with some care. Someone may object that the present proposal loads the question period too strongly in favor of the party in power, the majority, and that in the interest of obtaining order, and an orderly questioning, the gentleman has sacrificed certain of the freedoms which exist under our House rules. Our House rules are an attempt to keep an even balance between the rights of the majority and the minority and the individual Member. It is possible, under the machinery proposed, that the individual Member's rights to propound questions as in other parliamentary bodies could be so circumscribed that they might be stifled entirely, and that the minority would have no voice as such under the machinery set up. I know the gentleman has considered and weighed alternative proposals which might go further in the direction I mention, and I believe that when this matter is taken under study by the Committee on Rules, we will then have time, I hope, to discuss and debate the particular wheels and cogs in this machinery that will make it function so as to protect the Cabinet officer, and also protect the rights of the minority, the majority, and of the individual Member.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more, in order to answer the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not want to leave the Well without saying something in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio. I do not want

anyone to get the impression that this is a partisan issue in any respect whatsoever. I do not want anyone to get the impression that I intended to write the resolution in such a way as to give advantage to one side or the other. This is a device, as I say, that will be helpful to Congress, as a whole, regardless of which party is in power. If it does work out so as to give any party an advantage I want it changed to give each side an equal opportunity. I thought it did as presently written, because it provides as to questions as to be answered, that the time shall be controlled by the committees, and I think committees generally recognize the rights of the minority. The second half of the time is to be controlled, one-half by the chairman and one-half by the ranking minority member. If that does not work out fairly and equitably, I want the resolution changed to do so, because certainly I want the rights and prerogatives of the minority and of the majority fully protected in every way.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] for 30 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. WINTER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Did I understand the majority leader correctly today to state that there will be a session of the House tomorrow, Saturday?

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will yield a moment further, I would like to say, speaking as one of the members associated with the drive-for-action committee, that we congratulate the majority leader on having this session on Saturday, which, of course, is rather unusual and departs from the established custom of the House. As announced by the drive-for-action committee, our purpose is to hold the House in session every legislative day except Saturdays and holidays until and unless a definite legislative program is presented to the House by the Democratic leadership.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. A program of constructive and remedial legislation is the goal sought by the drive-for-action committee. Consequently, it is encouraging this morning to find, first, that a legislative program has been announced for next week, and one for the week following has been hinted at. Second, we are gratified that the majority leader has extended the program to include tomorrow, because we feel that certainly there is reason enough for the House to be in session tomorrow, reason enough, in fact, for the House to be in session morning, afternoon, and evening until some of these serious problems concerning America are brought before the House for solution. The drive-for-action committee will be here, as has been true during the week, and the Republicans will be here in three and four and five times the

number of Democrats tomorrow, just as we have been here in a similar overwhelming percentage every day this week. Not only that but we challenge the majority leader to ask for a quorum call tomorrow, to prove that point.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WINTER. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order that I had for today go over to tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I cannot yield further at this time; I am sorry.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice that the gentleman was very kind in yielding to the members of the drive-for-action committee.

Mr. WINTER. If I have time when I get through my speech I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I cannot yield now.

WHY AN OIL SHORTAGE?

Mr. Speaker, the United States is fast approaching a most serious bottleneck in the discovery and production of crude oil which, if not prevented, may vitally cripple our war effort and most certainly will play havoc with the economic life of the Nation.

The cold, hard facts, are, first: That we are consuming our petroleum reserves much more rapidly than we are discovering new sources of supply, and second, that by reason of the administration's short-sighted, bungling, inefficient policy in dealing with this situation, the production of crude oil has been curtailed and over 500,000,000 barrels of crude oil now in the sands of the oil-producing States of the Nation may be lost forever.

If we continue to permit the petroleum reserves of the United States to decline during the present emergency we must expect paralyzing results in the economic life of the Nation.

The oil industry is entering a period in which an unceasing effort must be made to close the breach between increased demands on the one hand and dwindling reserves on the other. The only practical way our oil reserves can be increased is to discover new pools.

Why has not this discovery effort been made? There are several reasons—foremost of which is the economic uncertainty in the oil industry which has been brought about by the failure of the President and his short-sighted bureaucratic advisers in O. P. A. to allow a price adjustment sufficient to permit the industry to find new reserves and to rehabilitate old fields, which, if properly handled, are capable immediately of increasing the production of crude oil by several million barrels annually.

The only sound and practical way to get more oil is to allow those who take the gamble to go after it a sufficient price to make it a profitable venture if oil is discovered.

The price of crude oil has remained practically static since 1941. During that

same period material and equipment costs have greatly increased, labor has gone up in many instances 100 percent or more, and manpower has become scarce.

In the midcontinent area, in which my State of Kansas is located, discovery, development, and production costs of the oil industry are as high, and in many instances higher, at the present time than they were in 1917 and 1918, when crude oil was bringing \$2.50 a barrel. The price today is approximately \$1.17 per barrel. This same condition exists in every other oil-producing State in the Nation.

The basic reason why our stocks of crude oil above ground and the production of new crude oil has declined is due to the fact that instead of drilling more wells and pumping their stripper wells, many producers have been forced to curtail drilling operations and abandon semidepleted fields and stripper wells in order to avoid bankruptcy. When there is no profit, or, at least, not a chance to break even, there is no incentive for a producer to carry on.

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

Mr. WINTER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It may be interesting to you to know that the Federal Government at the present time is spending \$138,000,000 on this Canadian oil exploration project, known as Canol project, which is 75 miles south of the Arctic Circle. Thus far they have an estimated 3,000 barrels, check this with a daily United States production of 4,250,000 barrels. Just another "boondoggling" project. I am of the opinion that if they spent \$138,000,000 exploring for oil in proven territory in the various States throughout the United States we would have secured several hundred thousand barrels of oil a day. Now if they are going to hold the line on oil production in the United States let us hold the line on reckless spending up in Canada. Now it is about time that we afford some relief to a gasoline-hungry American people for civilian use and for war purposes. This requires more oil. And as you state, the only way we are going to get additional oil to meet the demands of the civilian population and for war purposes as well, is to give the producer at least a lifting cost commensurate with his cost to produce the oil. The price on oil was frozen at critically low levels in October 1941.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct.

Mr. GAVIN. In my territory I may say all are stripper wells. The production will be down about 2,300,000 barrels in the field this year. It is the oldest oil-producing area in the United States. Two million three hundred thousand barrels, that would be equivalent to from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 gallons of gasoline that could afford relief along the eastern seaboard where the shortage is acute. The field is on the western edge of the eastern area and it would take care of the people of the New England States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York, who are crying for gasoline and fuel oil. And still there is this short-sighted policy of the impractical

theorists over in O. P. A. and their "hold the line" policy that is crucifying the stripper well producer. Economic Stabilizer Vinson came out with a statement to muddy up the waters. They are determined to ration the ever-smaller quantities available instead of giving a fair price to stimulate and increase the production to meet the needs to carry on this fight to win the war. And still they hold the line, cutting the heart out of a business that is striving to do its part in the war effort.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. He is to be congratulated. He has been making an effort to get this very vital question settled. There is one thing that is sure, if there is no profit, at least not a chance for the oil operators in the oil industry to break even, there is no incentive for any of these producers to carry on. You have to have a proper incentive in order to get increased production and discovery of crude oil.

The Petroleum Administrator for War asked the oil industry to drill 4,500 wildcat wells during 1943. In 1942 the industry drilled 3,166 wildcat wells against 4,000 requested by the Government. On this same basis the industry will have drilled approximately 3,300 wildcat wells by the end of this year.

By no means will all of these wildcat wells be producers. The estimated reserves of new pools discovered in 1942, when the industry drilled 3,166 wildcat wells, was approximately 260,000,000 barrels. The average discovery cost is approximately \$50,000 per well. You can readily see that the industry has invested in the 1942 reserve of 260,000,000 barrels approximately \$156,000,000, or 60 cents per barrel for discovery charges alone, to say nothing of production, maintenance, transportation costs, and taxes.

In 1942 the new oil reserves located failed to equal the oil produced from operating wells by more than one-half billion barrels. This simply means that for every new barrel of oil discovered we are now using two. It also means that we cannot delay vitally needed exploratory operations. We must have new reserves and we must start now to find them and not wait until the economic life of the Nation breaks down completely before we begin to act.

This does not mean that the oil industry is in a failing condition, but it does mean that if we continue to draw from the barrel without replenishing the supply that sooner or later the barrel will be empty, and this is exactly what we are doing. For the past 4 years we have been taking from the barrel considerable more than we have added. For example, in 1941 production of crude oil in the United States was approximately 1,400,000,000 barrels. During the same period of time we only replenished our reserves with new oil discovered by approximately 430,000,000 barrels. This same condition prevailed in 1940-42, and 1943 will show even a larger depletion of our reserves as against new oil discovered.

If we continue to follow this same procedure for a few years more our oil supply will be completely exhausted. When a barrel of oil is produced and used—it is gone—and it cannot be restored as

one blade of grass replaces another. Neither can it be replaced by the magic of bureaucracy.

The public has been led to believe that our oil shortage has been brought about by the extraordinary demands made on the petroleum industry by the war and that by continuing rationing until the war is over that the oil shortage will automatically end. This is not correct. Oil diverted from civilian to military use has contributed very little to the situation. Of our daily production of a little over 4,000,000 barrels only one-fourth is earmarked for our military use—and by rationing we have cut our civilian use by about the same proportion. If our military demands have to be further revised upward civilian use will have to be further decreased by a like amount.

For several years before the war we were producing and using practically as much petroleum products as we are using now. We had 30,000,000 automobiles and trucks averaging about 4,000 miles driving per year, using approximately 240,000,000 barrels of gasoline, to which must be added the fuel oils, the lubricants, industrial fuels, tractor fuels, kerosenes, aviation gasoline and motor oils and many other petroleum byproducts. In fact, it required considerable over 1,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil per year to supply these demands before we entered the war.

The administration is to blame for this erroneous belief by the public on the oil situation. The public was first told that east-coast rationing was necessary because of a lack of transportation and not a shortage of oil. Next, the public was told that it was necessary to extend rationing to the entire Nation to conserve rubber—not to conserve oil. In the meantime the transportation problem was solved by the railroads and by the construction of additional pipe lines from the oil-producing area to the East. Then the public was informed that it was necessary to impose more stringent rationing regulations because military requests have become so great that there is now an actual shortage of oil. Is there any wonder that the public is bewildered?

Unless the administration is forced by Congress, before it is too late, to remove the shackles, which its magicians in O. P. A. have fastened on the oil industry, the public is going to receive the severest shock of all when they are told that rationing of oil may have to be continued for several years after the war because of the refusal of the bungling bureaucrats in O. P. A. to realize that a price adjustment is necessary and not a subsidy in order to increase our oil reserves, so that production of crude oil can keep pace with consumer demand.

Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, recognized the need for immediate action in this oil debacle. On August 13, 1943, when gasoline rationing was being discussed with Mr. Ickes and a congressional committee, Mr. Ickes stated:

During the last 4 years we have used our known reserves much faster than we have

discovered new sources—twice as fast, as a matter of fact * * *.

Mr. Ickes further stated:

Unless important new discoveries are made * * * a widening gap between the productive capacity of the United States and the anticipated crude-oil requirements will develop. * * * The decline is expected to continue so that daily production will drop another 100,000 barrels by the first quarter of next year.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very clear and fine statement that he is making in connection with this all-vital problem. As the gentleman knows, I come from one of the great oil-producing States, the State of Oklahoma. Out in my home county we are situated in the center of the largest proven gas field in the world, the Hugoton field. Anywhere you drill in my county, from the north border to the south border and for a distance of 35 miles east and west you can get a gas well at an average depth of about 2,700 feet. The geologists and those who know about the oil business are confident that in my home of Texas County and in Cimarron County just to the west where they have recently brought in a huge gas well at a different depth, there must be great pools of oil.

I have talked to various representatives of oil companies about the situation and the reason that they cannot explore is because those wells will probably require exploration to a depth of 8,000 or 10,000 feet.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. And with the increased cost of labor, materials, and everything else, they cannot afford to go in and make this exploration with present crude oil prices. The gentleman mentioned something about subsidies. I wonder if I am correct in assuming that it is the policy of those in charge of the oil program—I mean the O. P. A. crowd who are running the show, rather than, the Petroleum Administrator, because everyone will concede that it is the O. P. A. which is now running the oil business, the same as most other businesses—that by refusing this small increase in price they are trying to put this industry in the same condition they are trying to put every other business in the country in, namely to require the industry to embrace a subsidy program.

Mr. WINTER. There is no question in my mind but what the gentleman is correct. I want to thank him for his very fine contribution.

Realizing the seriousness of the situation, Mr. Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator, recommended a minimum raise in the price of crude oil of 35 cents a barrel. This was all he could do. He could not grant an increase, even though he recognized the necessity for it, because that authority is not vested in the Petroleum Administrator. That power is vested in the O. P. A. On May 4, 1943, the O. P. A. Administrator rejected the recommenda-

tion of Mr. Ickes, but at the same time admitted indirectly the necessity of a price increase by offering Government financial aid to the oil industry in the form of a subsidy.

Since that time the oil industry's war council together with the Petroleum Administrator for War have been vigorously urging an overall increase in the ceiling price of crude oil in line with exploratory and production costs. The matter was finally taken to the Economic Stabilization Director and on October 29, 1943, the Director issued a directive in which he stated:

There can be no general increase in the price of crude oil.

Now, gentlemen, I ask you who is formulating the policies for the United States? Is it this Congress, the representative of the people, or these bureaucrats here in Washington?

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

Mr. WINTER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman on that point if he can explain it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, the Congress would certainly have a right to pass any legislation fixing the price of oil if it wanted to do that. I suggest that the gentleman go through the regular legislative processes, and if a majority of the House and Senate feel that there should be an increase in the price of oil the Congress will pass such legislation.

Mr. WINTER. A majority of the House and Senate has not been able to get a chance at it because the administration, through its policy, is holding up this type of legislation and will not allow it to come to the floor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It seems to me the gentleman is arguing for a minority of the House. If a majority of the House and Senate wanted to do something they certainly can do it.

Mr. WINTER. They can if they can get a chance under the rules.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who just made the remark with reference to what Congress might do about it has signed petition No. 14 which would bring the Disney bill now pending in one of the legislative committees of the House before the Committee of the Whole House for action. Those who are in charge of the administration's program—and the gentleman is on that side, and one of them—have thus far succeeded in seeing that the bill does not reach the Congress for action through the regular channels. My colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] introduced a bill which we believe will afford the necessary relief, and there is a petition on the Clerk's desk now to get the bill before the House so that the Congress can act on it. This bill which we are trying to get before the House for consideration is in the same category with numerous other bills that the people are interested in, stifled in administration-controlled committees, so that the Congress does

not have a chance to speak on the subject.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I do not know about any administration-controlled committees, but I do know that if a majority of the House or a majority on a committee believes that legislation such as the gentleman from Oklahoma has introduced, is wise legislation, the House could certainly pass it. I do not see any necessity for railing at the head of the Interior Department.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman did not answer my question. Has he signed petition 14, so we can get some action on this important legislation?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I certainly have not signed it. I certainly have not. It is not the usual way of getting legislation.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It just happens that I just looked at petition No. 14 on the Speaker's desk, and there are 111 signatures asking Congress to consider the Disney bill. The Disney bill was introduced by the great and good Democrat from Tulsa, Okla. He is a member of the same party as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 111 is less than one-fourth the membership of the House. You evidently do not have a majority.

Mr. WINTER. I would say to the gentleman the petition has only been on the Speaker's desk a few days.

Mr. MUNDT. And it only requires 218 signatures to bring the bill out. If the gentleman will use his vital energy toward a constructive purpose, he can get enough Democrats to sign that petition and we will get it up tomorrow, because we will be in session tomorrow.

Mr. WINTER. However, Mr. Vinson, the Director of Economic Stabilization, in the same directive, indirectly admitted the urgent necessity of a price adjustment when he further stated:

The Petroleum Administrator is directed to formulate without delay a program to provide additional financial incentives for exploration and development of new fields in conformity with the standards outlined above and, if feasible, additional financial support for marginal stripper-well and repressuring operations short of a general price increase. On formulation of selective incentive programs by the Petroleum Administrator consistent with the stabilization program the Economic Stabilization Director will direct execution of the programs by such other agencies as may be concerned.

In other words they are further tightening the web of bureaucracy around the oil industry of this Nation.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Is it not true that there are hundreds of rigs ready to drill and plenty of money ready to finance the operation of these rigs if their operation would only be permitted by the agencies which are now withholding them from exploration?

Mr. WINTER. Absolutely; and they do not need any subsidy to do it.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I have not been privileged to hear all of the very splendid argument being made by the gentleman from Kansas, but I wish to ask the gentleman if he has touched on the possibility of getting much greater production from the 70,000 stripper wells in the country? In my own district in southern Illinois, the Twenty-third Illinois, there are many old stripper wells producing from 2 to 4 barrels of oil a day each.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct; I am familiar with it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Vinson in his report, as I read it, stated that about 17 percent of the total production of oil in the United States now comes from stripper wells; yet thousands of them are being abandoned because they cannot get cost of production, because they cannot get this increase of 35 cents, 40 cents, or 50 cents a barrel.

Mr. WINTER. Every day sees more stripper wells abandoned.

Mr. VURSELL. When a stripper well is abandoned oil that we need for the Army, the Navy, and civilian use in that well is gone forever, because no one will ever drill again to try to get those few extra thousand barrels of oil out of the ground.

Mr. WINTER. I may say to the gentleman in that connection that there are 296,000 of that same kind of stripper wells throughout the United States that are now on the verge of being abandoned, and abandoned forever. I want to thank the gentleman for the extraordinary effort he has been making in his attempt to correct this condition.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the bill that is coming up soon to put in this experimental station is going to bring about the necessity of some action of this kind by the departments?

Mr. WINTER. It is a part of it but mainly the bill provides for the construction of this experimental station. I am not opposed to that, but it will only result in the spending of \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 of the taxpayers' money unnecessarily. It could be avoided by raising the price of this basic commodity.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how many marginal stripper wells have already gone out of production because of failure to increase the price of crude oil?

Mr. WINTER. I have such figures in my office, but I do not have them at my fingertips. About 2 years ago what was known as the independent producers controlled about 60 percent of the oil reserves of the Nation. But by reason of the independent producers not being able to carry on because of increased production costs, they have had to abandon

and sell their properties until now they control only about 25 percent.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman given the House or the country any reason why the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has not been followed of allowing some increase in the price of crude oil?

Mr. WINTER. I am coming to that in just a few minutes.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. I should like to emphasize what was said. The gentleman is making a very timely and constructive argument on this oil situation. I do not quite understand whether this oil from these stripper and marginal producer wells is lost forever if these wells are capped, but I believe that is the fact. So it is a permanent loss to the Nation that cannot be recovered.

Mr. WINTER. Those wells are lost because once they are abandoned it is almost impossible to get them back in production, as I understand it, except by repressure methods which cannot be carried on successfully at the present price of oil.

Mr. JONKMAN. This seems to me to be a needless and inexcusable policy which will result in the loss of one-ninth of our entire output.

Mr. WINTER. The stripper wells do not represent one-ninth. There are approximately 296,000 stripper wells, with an average daily production of 2 barrels each. There are 105,000 other producing wells, with an average daily production of approximately 35 barrels each.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. HEIDINGER. In answer to the gentleman from Michigan I may say that on the 4th day of October the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma made the statement in the Senate that 10,500 of these wells were abandoned in 1942 resulting in an estimated loss of 44,000,000 barrels of oil.

Mr. WINTER. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois on that point that there are approximately 500,000,000 barrels of oil in these wells in semidepleted pools that is going to be lost if something is not done about it. A great part of it is in the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania; some of it is in mine, some of it is in the district of the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I may say there is an estimated billion barrels of oil in the Pennsylvania fields waiting to be taken from the sand. From 7,500 to 8,000 of these wells are on the pumps, but in many instances leases are being abandoned, wells closed down and the machinery and equipment sold for junk.

Once they pull the casing on that well there will never be any economic justi-

fication for drilling another hole to secure that oil because the field is an old field and will produce no gushers, although if the lease were kept in production, that quarter- or half-barrel or 2 or 3 barrels they have been getting every day for the past 50 or 60 years would continue to be gotten for years to come. When there is no incentive back of it and they cannot get the lifting cost, they abandon the wells and the result is the casing is pulled and oil in the ground is forever lost to the American people when, as a matter of fact, there is a potential billion barrels of oil there. P. A. W. has said we will be short 337,000 barrels daily in 1944, so we need every drop of oil that we possibly can get. Mr. Vinson favors incentives and subsidies. We do not want incentives or subsidies. Subsidies mean additional taxes. The burden of taxes is carried over until the future, so that our boys who are over there fighting at \$50 a month to get their insides punched out on the sands of north Africa, or dying like rats in a submarine or being blasted out of the air will come home and find they have to pay the bill. All we are doing in paying subsidies is handing these taxes on for those American boys to pay, or, in other words, taking the bread and butter out of their pocket to pay for the war. They fight the war and now we want them to pay for it. I want no part of subsidies.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection, to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. The gentleman is making a very able address in pointing out the absolute necessity for an increase in the price of oil to bring about production and to keep the production that we now have. In my own district, there is one field known as the Colmer Field in west central Illinois, in which there are 400 stripper wells that are really not paying any reasonable return. Many of them are paying no return. I happen to have an interest with a couple of friends in a few of those stripper wells. We have not had one penny out of them for over 4 years. We are barely getting enough to pay the pumper and to clean them when it is necessary. If it were not for this war effort in the last 2 years we would have closed them up, pulled the casings, sold our engines and everything else for junk and recovered what we could, but we are going along using what little reserves we have in a last effort. If we want to continue, I think the thing to do is to bring this before the House and let the House decide it. If all the Representa-

tives of the great oil fields of the Southwest would sign Petition No. 14 to bring it out on the floor for consideration, it would help a great deal.

Mr. WINTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I was talking about this directive that has been issued by Mr. Vinson. Let us look at it. What does this directive mean? It simply means the payment by the Government of a subsidy—a bonus—and perhaps providing nonrecourse loans for exploratory and development operations. The oil industry wants nothing whatever to do with such a program. All the industry wants is to be given an opportunity to proceed under its own power as an integral part of our American system of free enterprise, unhampered by bureaucratic planners.

The subsidy-bonus-nonrecourse loan plan has been in effect for many months in the lead- and zinc-mining industry, and it has utterly failed to increase the production of lead and zinc or to locate new reserves. If such a system is put into effect in the oil industry, I venture the prediction it will cost the taxpayers of this Nation millions of dollars and not increase our oil reserves by one single barrel of oil.

The only sound way to solve this oil crisis is to permit a price adjustment sufficient so that the basic commodity—crude oil—can be discovered and produced at a reasonable margin of profit on a competitive basis. Such a policy would immediately stimulate exploratory work in an effort to increase our reserves. It would permit our producing wells to step up production nearer to total capacity. In Kansas alone, this would amount to a daily increase of approximately 18,000 barrels, and it would permit the development of a large number of semi-depleted oil fields by pressure methods which would materially add to our stock pile of crude oil above ground.

But the administration, through O. P. A. and the Economic Stabilization Director, has turned thumbs down on the recommendations of the oil industry, the Petroleum Administrator, and the Governors of the oil-producing States and has ordered its power-drunk bureaucratic magicians to reach into the bowels of the earth and bring forth oil.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GAVIN. I think this is a very important matter and that this Disney bill would result in determining whether or not we, the duly elected Representatives of the people, have a voice in the conduct and operation of the Government or whether we must be silent forevermore and the policies and programs involving our respective areas in the United States be determined by an impractical group who are attempting to restrict, strangle, and put this branch of private enterprise out of business. We in Congress ought to determine this matter. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EERHARTER] says, there are certain ways by which we can secure results. We ought to have a show-down with the O. P. A. once

and for all and find out whether they are going to run the country with a lot of college professors who have not the slightest conception of what it is all about, or the Congress, duly elected by the people, is going to run the country.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is exactly right.

Members of Congress, it is our duty to speak up and not accept these crackpot theories when they are contrary to sound judgment. There is sure to be a terrible day of reckoning on this issue unless we demand action and get it now.

If the oil industry was able to start today with increased exploratory drilling it would be 9 months to a year and a half before any substantial increase in oil reserves could be expected.

We cannot afford to take a chance on having a repetition of a major catastrophe in oil like the administration permitted to occur in rubber and which is now threatening to break down a major portion of our transportation system.

Congress is the only hope of preventing a major catastrophe in this oil crisis. But we must act and act immediately. Not next year, or the year after, but now.

On June 7, this year, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] introduced a bill (H. R. 2887) which provides:

That the powers and functions conferred by the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, upon the Price Administrator, with respect to crude oil and the products thereof and the derivatives therefrom, are hereby transferred to the Petroleum Administrator for War.

The bill further provides that in the fixing of prices for crude oil and the products and derivatives therefrom, that the Petroleum Administrator for War shall consider the necessity for exploring for crude oil and the maintenance of a competitive position in the petroleum industry and to that end no price ceiling for crude oil or the products or derivatives therefrom shall be fixed or maintained by the Administrator below a price, the index of which is equal to the price index of "all commodities" as reported from time to time by the United States Department of Labor in its wholesale commodity price index for all commodities as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and has been there since the 7th day of June—5 long months during which time our oil supply has been steadily dwindling. Apparently the Administration leaders have been successful in their efforts to prevent the committee from acting on this bill, or similar legislation, because the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] after waiting all these months for action has placed discharge petition No. 14 on the Speaker's desk in an effort to bring this matter before the Congress.

This crude-oil crisis vitally affects the entire Nation. Without oil we could not operate our mechanized war equipment on land, sea, and in the air; without oil our vast system of transportation would immediately collapse, and without oil the wheels of our gigantic industrial system would cease to turn.

With the exception of the food we eat and the water we drink, oil is without doubt the most vital commodity necessary to sustain the economic stability of the Nation. It is not only of concern to us in the oil producing States but it affects the daily life of every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

In conclusion, I most urgently request every Member of the House to sign discharge petition No. 14 so that we can bring this vital matter before the House of Representatives for action before it is too late.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas for the splendid statement he has made. It might be well to point out here that the request on behalf of the oil industry for an increase in the price of crude oil is not out of line, in that I believe they agree the increase should be 50 cents per barrel, which would increase the price of gasoline approximately 1 cent per gallon, which also would not be out of line. Putting it on a comparative basis, we talk about the question of parity. Crude oil is now about 60 percent of parity, as I understand it.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the price of crude oil could be increased 50 cents per barrel, it would not even bring the price of crude oil up to parity. I think the gentleman from Kansas perhaps pointed out the fact that we are getting now about the same price for crude oil that was paid back in 1939, and the cost of production then, of course, does not compare with the cost of production at the present time.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Again I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas on his splendid statement.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman himself is to be congratulated on the splendid work he is doing on the steering committee to bring this matter before the House.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman's statement that it is the duty of Congress to act, and the opportunity now leads me to suggest that we had a meeting of the steering committee this morning in order to effect plans to get enough signatures to this discharge petition to get the bill onto the floor of the House. There are quite a number of Members here this afternoon. I think it is of great importance that the men who have listened to the gentleman's splendid and able address get busy with their colleagues in an attempt to get enough signatures to this discharge petition to get the bill before the House, where Congress, in my judgment, will do something about it.

Mr. WINTER. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

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

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. What the gentleman says about the price is absolutely correct. I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate this matter for the Committee on Naval Affairs. We found that in substance what the gentleman says about the price is true. I for one do not think 35 cents is enough.

Mr. WINTER. I do not, either.

Mr. GAVIN. It is not enough in my territory. We need a dollar a barrel.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman believe that price alone will take care of the serious condition that now obtains?

Mr. WINTER. I do not believe that price alone will do it, but I do believe if we pass a bill something like the Disney bill, which will give authority to the Petroleum Administrator to set the price and take off all the red tape the O. P. A. has hung around the oil industry, those things together will go a long way toward increasing our oil reserve.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman's statement is very fine. I do not agree with him on the political side, but that is the gentleman's business. If we take the red tape off the P. A. W. and the O. P. A. we shall have more millions of gallons of oil in this country than we have ever had before, and this Nation will not be a dependent Nation but an independent Nation.

Mr. WINTER. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. I have taken it upon myself to try to get the members of my delegation to sign this petition. I have signed it and at least two others have signed it. We are trying to get more signatures. We are doing all we can, because we know the condition is serious.

Mr. WINTER. It is imperative that we get something done about this situation.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. May I say to the gentleman that it would cost the consuming public only approximately a cent more per gallon of gasoline, and they would be glad to pay that to get the gasoline.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on six different subjects.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] may be permitted to address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the National Association of Salesmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COFFEE). Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] for 30 minutes.

"REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR"

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, "Remember Pearl Harbor" and salute the devoted people of Hawaii who have so loyally carried on since December 7, 1941. They never faltered. They never lost heart for a second. They knew what they were up against, but they dug in all the harder. The citizens of my home city of San Francisco have been more closely associated with Hawaii than any other group in the United States. It is fitting that I take this opportunity of expressing the admiration every American holds for our countrymen living out there in the middle of the Pacific.

"Remember Pearl Harbor." Why America has been thinking continually of Pearl Harbor since about 1873, when a survey was made of the Hawaiian Islands as to their military significance to this Republic. Let me read a letter written to Senator John T. Morgan by J. M. Schofield of St. Augustine, Fla., under date of January 13, 1898:

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with the request contained in your letter of January 9, I do not hesitate to write you without reserve in respect to my views upon the pending question of annexation of the Hawaiian Islands.

From the time, 25 years ago, when I made a personal examination for the purpose of ascertaining the value of those islands to this country for military and naval purposes, I have always regarded ultimate annexation of the islands to this country as a public necessity. But the time when this should be accomplished had to depend on natural political development. In the meantime our national interests should be secured by the exclusive right to occupy, improve, and fortify Pearl River harbor so as to insure our possession of that harbor in time of war.

To illustrate my views on this subject, I have likened that harbor to a commanding position in front of a defensive line which an army in the field is compelled to occupy. The army must occupy that advanced position and hold it at whatever cost, or else the enemy will occupy it with his artillery and thus dominate the main line. If we do not occupy and fortify Pearl River Harbor, our enemy will occupy it as a base from which to conduct operations against our Pacific coast and the isthmian canal, which must, of course, in due time be constructed and controlled by this country. The possession of such a base at a convenient distance from our Pacific coast would be a great temptation to an unfriendly nation to undertake hostile operations against us.

One of the greatest advantages of Pearl River Harbor to us consists in the fact that no navy would be required to defend it. It is a deep, land-locked arm of the sea, easily defended by fortifications placed near its mouth, with its anchorage beyond the reach of guns from the ocean. Cruisers or other warships which might be overpowered at sea, as well as merchant vessels, would find there behind the land defenses absolute security against a naval attack. A moderate garrison of regular troops, with the militia on the island, would give sufficient protection against any landing parties from a hostile fleet. Of course an army on transports, supported by a powerful fleet, could land and capture the place, but that would be an expensive operation, one much less likely to be undertaken than the occupation of an undefended harbor, as a necessary preliminary to an attack on our coast or upon our commerce.

The value of such a place of refuge and of supplies for our merchant marine and our cruisers in time of war can hardly be overestimated, yet the greatest value to us of that wonderful harbor consists in the fact that its possession and adequate defense by us prevents the possibility of an enemy using it against us.

So far as I know, the leading statesmen, no less than the military and naval authorities of this country, have always been in accord on this subject. While it has not been proposed to interfere with the continued occupation by foreign nations of their military strongholds in this hemisphere, it has been publicly and emphatically declared that none of those strongholds shall ever be allowed to pass into the possession of any other nation whose interests might be antagonistic to ours. Now, for the first time, the occasion has arisen to carry into effect our long-declared national policy. A little state like Hawaii cannot stand alone among the great nations, all of whom covet her incomparable harbor. She must have the protection of this country or some other great nation. But a protectorate without sovereignty is the last thing this country could afford to assume. In the absence of authority to regulate and control the intercourse between the islands and other countries controversies must arise which would lead to war or to the loss of our invaluable military possession in the islands. No halfway measures will suffice. We must accept the islands and hold and govern them or else let some other great nation do it. To fail now to carry into effect our own great national policy upon the first occasion offered to us would, in my judgment, be one of those blunders which are worse than crimes.

To my mind what may be regarded perhaps as the sentimental aspect of the question is entitled to consideration. A colony of intelligent, virtuous, and patriotic Americans have rescued a country from barbarism and raised it to a high state of civilization and prosperity, until in the natural course of events the government of that country has

fallen entirely into their hands. They now ask the privilege of adding that country to their own native land; of returning with their new possessions to the parental fold. Can they be turned away to seek a home among strangers? Not without violating one of the most sacred laws of nature and incurring the penalty which must, sooner or later, necessarily follow.

I am, dear Senator, with great respect,
Sincerely yours,

J. M. SCHOFIELD.

The Senate and House of Representatives of the United States by joint resolution, dated July 6, 1898, ratified annexation. President William McKinley signed it the next day, and so the Hawaiian Islands became an integral part of our Republic.

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

Mr. ROLPH. I am delighted to yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from California upon bringing to the attention of the House that historic and significant document, and in connection with the circumstances of annexation I point out that annexation was achieved by joint resolution, rather than by treaty, because of the inability of those supporting annexation to obtain a two-thirds vote in the Senate, indicating that in the face of the foresight of such men as Mr. Schofield, there were still many people in the United States who did not realize at that time, as he did, and as the Americans of Hawaii did, the enormous value to this country of those islands.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much and appreciate his observation. I am calling the attention of our colleagues to the fact that the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii has lived there for many years. He was an infant when his parents arrived in Honolulu. His father later became Governor of the Territory. I feel honored to have the gentleman make his explanation about the way Hawaii was annexed.

Let me repeat one portion of the Schofield letter:

To my mind what may be regarded perhaps as the sentimental aspect of the question is entitled to consideration. A colony of intelligent, virtuous, and patriotic Americans have rescued a country from barbarism and raised it to a high state of civilization and prosperity, until in the natural course of events the government of that country has fallen entirely into their hands. They now ask the privilege of adding that country to their own native land; of returning with their new possessions to the parental fold.

Now let me quote from committee report accompanying Senate Resolution 127. It is Report No. 681 of the Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, and is dated March 16, 1898:

We also hold toward the missionaries, who have brought into Hawaii the light of the twin stars of Christianity and constitutional liberty, a national debt of gratitude that good conscience will not permit us to forget; and to their worthy children we owe protection in the enjoyment of the blessings of free republican government that they have created in Hawaii, under our fostering care, with faithful labor and Anglo-Saxon courage.

To our own people who have emigrated to Hawaii under the open invitation of our

national policy and under the pledges given by Congress and our Presidents that no foreign power should disturb their rights we owe all the friendly care that a father can owe to his sons who have with his consent left their home to seek their fortunes in other lands. Not many of them have gone to Cuba, Jamaica, Mexico, or Central or South America, or even to Canada, to reside with kindred people, but, under our encouragement and promises of protection, a large and splendid body of Americans have gone to Hawaii to reside, not feeling that they have expatriated themselves, and have carried with them the highest virtues and the most advanced education in art, science, agriculture, and mechanics, and have established homes there that are, many of them, equal in elegance and comfort to any in the United States. To these people, and also to the preservation of the native population against a speedy destruction, involving property and life, we owe the duty of rescuing them from the silent but rapid invasion of the pagan races from Asia. This invasion is concerted, and is far more dangerous to Hawaii than if it came on ships of war with the avowed purpose of subjugating the Hawaiian Islands. It is the stealthy approach of a "destruction that wasteth at noonday." The immigrants from Japan retain their allegiance to that Empire, and yet they claim full political rights in Hawaii notwithstanding their alienage.

In this demand they have the undisguised encouragement of the Japanese Government. These privileges are demanded as rights.

The only objection to annexation came from Japan; the same Japan which struck below the belt at Pearl Harbor. You and I well remember December 7, 1941, when the stealthy punch was delivered. Japanese emissaries were right here in Washington, ostensibly negotiating with Secretary of State Hull for amicable adjustment of our differences. What a sham—such hypocrisy—yes, my colleagues, millions of Americans yet unborn will "remember Pearl Harbor."

Quoting from the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission statement of January 1943:

"Remember Pearl Harbor," vowed the entire Nation; and nowhere in our country has that vow been upheld more strongly or more resolutely than by the people of the Territory. They, perhaps more than the residents of any other section of the United States, have reason to know the dread devastation and destruction wrought by our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, now let us look at the record to see how those who followed in the footsteps of the early American settlers are acquitting themselves. Let us review briefly Hawaiian developments since 1898.

The United States underwrote a Hawaiian national debt of \$4,000,000. At the time cash value of public property in Honolulu and other towns added to value of public domain in the islands was estimated to be at least \$9,000,000. The Federal Government actually started with a profit of \$5,000,000. But no agreement is worth the paper it is written on unless it proves beneficial to both parties.

At the start, therefore, the United States Government underwrote \$4,000,000 of indebtedness. Hawaii had assets of some nine million. Forty-three years later, in 1941, the United States Treasury collected nearly \$14,000,000 in tax payments from Hawaii. Twelve States

in the Union actually paid less than the Territory.

How is that for a good business deal for the Federal Government? Now, let us look at Hawaii.

As a separate republic, Hawaiian top yearly sugar movement to the United States was in 1897—192,508 tons, value about \$12,800,000. In 1940, Hawaii produced 976,667 tons, valued at \$53,000,000. So you see annexation was also extremely beneficial to the islands.

On December 7, 1940, the Secretary of Agriculture estimated the total sugar consumption of the continental United States for 1941 at 6,616,817 tons.

The Secretary estimated the total quota for the year at 8,032,074 tons.

The quotas for the various producing areas at that time were established as follows:

| | Tons |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Domestic beet..... | 1,862,811 |
| Mainland cane..... | 504,995 |
| Hawaii..... | 1,127,420 |
| Puerto Rico..... | 959,088 |
| Virgin Islands..... | 10,716 |
| Philippine Islands..... | 1,237,764 |
| Cuba..... | 2,297,533 |
| Foreign countries..... | 31,747 |

In other words, Hawaii's contribution to the Nation's sugar bowl before the war was about 14 percent. The Philippine quota was slightly more. With the Philippines cut off, all domestic sources of supply, which of course includes Hawaii, became increasingly important. The sugar refiners of the United States are working in close cooperation with those responsible for providing food for our armed forces, both home and abroad. Military requirements come first. Refiners are reserving certain of their facilities for the exclusive use of the armed forces. Increasing quantities of sugar are being furnished under lease-lend.

Island population in 1900, 2 years after annexation, was estimated at 154,001.

The 1940 census showed 426,664, made up as follows:

| | |
|--------------------|---------|
| Hawaiian..... | 14,359 |
| Part Hawaiian..... | 50,470 |
| Puerto Rican..... | 8,332 |
| Caucasian..... | 106,381 |
| Chinese..... | 28,834 |
| Japanese..... | 157,990 |
| Korean..... | 6,854 |
| Filipino..... | 52,607 |
| All others..... | 837 |
| Total..... | 426,664 |

Of the above total, 81,813 were aliens. The two largest groups of aliens are Japanese, 36,678, and Filipinos, 35,498.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Does the gentleman have the figures for the fiscal year 1943?

Mr. ROLPH. No, I have not.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In the fiscal year 1943 the Territory of Hawaii paid in excess of \$76,000,000 to the Federal Treasury, more than did 13 States combined, and more than the citizens of 33 States on a per capita basis. Also, I should add to that that the great progress of those islands is in large measure the result of the very generous policies of the Federal Government, and the deci-

sion at the outset to give the people of those islands a large measure of local self-government and control developed in them a keen sense of responsibility and obligation to Uncle Sam.

Mr. ROLPH. In other words, it has been a very splendid and happy relationship from the start. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. As a member of the Committee on Territories, from which committee legislation concerning the Hawaiian Islands comes, I compliment the gentleman upon the very fine address he has made, and I appreciate the situation existing between Hawaii and our own Government here on continental United States. Is it not a fact that the legislation which is sought by the people of the Hawaiian Islands is almost without exception of a very high type? That is, they are not asking for any consideration that the merits of the situation would not grant. We have found them to be very modest in their demands, and the distinguished gentleman who represents them, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] here in the House has the confidence and respect of every member of that committee.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much, and would add that the gentleman's own city of Portland, is one of the cities on the Pacific coast that enjoys a substantial trade with Hawaii. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I know how very much his constituents are interested in the welfare of everything for the benefit of Hawaii.

Hawaii's two basic crops are sugar and pineapple. I have spoken of sugar. Pineapple is also highly essential for the war effort.

Quoting again from Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:

The pineapple industry likewise, despite heavy contributions to the war effort in labor, equipment, and materials, also has been able to continue production in almost normal quantities. Shipments for 1941 were 11,491,000 cases of pineapple and 11,284,938 cases of pineapple juice. The Federal Government purchased substantial quantities of these and has announced that its requirements for the coming year would exceed 34 percent of the canned pineapple pack and 21 percent of the juice pack for Army, Navy, and lend-lease consumption.

These achievements by the sugar and pineapple industries were made possible in a measure by the cooperation of public and private school authorities who reduced the school week in the junior and senior high schools from 5 to 4 days in order to permit thousands of students in these classes to volunteer for work in the fields.

Now, let me quote the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission further:

Any discussion of the contribution of civilian Hawaii to the national war effort should include the paramount record established by the Territory in the purchase of War Savings bonds and stamps, particularly since the Treasury Department began establishing quotas for all States and Territories in May 1942. In that month, Hawaii's quota was \$992,000. Its total sales were \$5,985,000, or a percentage of 603.3 of the sales to quota, Hawaii leading all of the States and other

political subdivisions in this respect. In June the Territory's quota was increased to \$1,365,000; its sales were \$4,841,000, or 354.7 percent of sales to quota, the Territory again leading the Nation in this respect.

In the first 4 months of the fiscal year beginning July 1942 the Treasury Department at Washington announced that Hawaii led all States, Territories, and other political subdivisions of the Nation in percentage of sales to quota, with a mark of 138.7 percent. * * *

* * * A special War bond drive to commemorate the December 7, 1941, attack was held throughout Hawaii on its first anniversary under the sponsorship of the Treasury Department, the Army, and the Navy. It was hoped that sales of at least \$1,000,000 worth of bonds could be effected on this day. The "bargain day" line-ups at the regular bond outlets, as well as 15 additional temporary booths erected at strategic locations in Honolulu were so great on December 7, however, that it was necessary to continue the sale on 2 additional days to accommodate all prospective purchasers. As a result, total sales of War bonds exceeded \$5,000,000 on these 3 days. Each of the bonds purchased was inscribed with a special "Remember Pearl Harbor" stamp.

The second anniversary of Pearl Harbor is just ahead of us. The people of continental United States honor our fellow citizens in Hawaii—for steadfast loyalty in the face of dire peril; for consecrated devotion to those principles Americans cherish more than life itself; and for supreme adherence to the tenets which are the bulwark of democracy. Hawaii has kept the faith. Mauna Loa, Diamond Head, and Waikiki are closer to our hearts than ever. As long as there is a Capitol in Washington, we shall remember Sunday, December 7, 1941. Pearl Harbor is the American symbol of resistance to treachery and deceit. The Japanese by one underhanded stab in the back drew Americans closer together than we had ever been before. In years to come, Pearl Harbor will grow in stature and in affection as one of America's greatest shrines. To our fellow Americans out there in the mid-Pacific we send sincere greetings from the Chamber of the House of Representatives. Good luck and God bless you. We on the mainland are with you to the end. Aloha nui.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Before the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] leaves the floor I would like to express my deep appreciation of his remarks about the people of Hawaii and I am sure they will take new courage from what you have said. Finally, in the language of our people, let me say, Mahalo nui loa.

Mr. ROLPH. Thank you very, very much.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the regular business and any special orders already entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the conclusion of any special orders that may have been allowed, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

RUSSIAN NEWSPAPERS DISTRIBUTED IN AMERICA URGE SLAVIC PEOPLE TO UNITE INTO ONE RACIAL BLOCK

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, within the last 48 hours there was read to the House from the Clerk's desk a report from the President of the United States on lease-lend in the present war. We learned for the first time the amount of lease-lend in reverse that we have received from the British Empire. Contrary to the general impression in the United States, we are also receiving in reverse lease-lend from Russia. But it is of a character and nature which I do not believe the American people will look upon with favor. Since we entered this war as an ally of Russia, the Russian Government, by its voluntary act which the American people applauded, dissolved what is known as the Comintern, an agency set up in its own Government to breed and foment world revolution for the purpose of destroying capitalistic governments on this earth, including the United States of America. That act of the Russian Government strengthened the ties of friendship and encouraged our confidence, faith, and sincerity in the Russian Government and her people. Recently there was held in Moscow a conference attended by four of the great Allied Nations, in which the United States participated. We sent our very distinguished and illustrious Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, as the representative of this Government. The purpose of the conference was to coordinate, as I understood, the efforts of the Allied Nations in this war, to bring about greater efficiency and understanding.

We commend the purpose of that meeting. We are informed that it was a success and I believe it was. We welcome our Secretary of State on his return from his successful mission to the Soviet capital.

But there has just come to my attention information which in some degree is a discordant note in the otherwise harmonious relationship existing between the United States and Russia that I want to give to the House and to the country. We all know that our ships have been taking lend-lease material and aid to Russia. The ships that have been taking butter, munitions, trucks, machine tools, a whole tire factory, and other materials of war to Russia, have been returning, lately with tons of printed matter in the form of newspapers to the extent of 300,000 copies monthly. Those ships have been arriving at ports on the Pacific coast of the United States. These newspapers are printed in a num-

ber of foreign languages. Some of them, I am reliably informed, are on sale at newsstands in the city of New York and others are destined for distribution among workers in Michigan, Illinois, New York, and the mining regions of Pennsylvania. This printed matter comes from Moscow. What is the purpose of the distribution of these papers in the United States at this time, printed by a friendly nation, one with whom we are in the closest cooperation in the greatest conflict the world has ever seen and a nation that we today respect and admire? The courage and patriotism of the Russian soldiers and the Russian people in their determination to free their own land from the heel of the oppressor is most praiseworthy. We join in every effort that they make in that respect. But why should they in this hour, when we are granting aid to them, permit the distribution in this country of newspapers containing articles urging the formation of racial blocks in the United States? These papers are to be distributed in the settlement of the Croats, the Lithuanians, the Ruthenians, the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Serbs and other groups of Slavonic origin in this country. They are printed on good paper. They are well illustrated and ready for distribution. They have the widest circulation among these groups in the States I have mentioned. This newspaper route between Moscow and the United States is of recent origin. It was organized after the very widely publicized dissolution, as I say, of the Comintern. The largest edition comes out in the Polish language and is known as the *Walna-Polska*. It is edited by a very remarkable Polish woman named Wanda Wassilveska. This woman is known as the Polish Earl Browder. She is a citizen of Russia and is the wife of the Soviet Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Alexander Kornijesuk.

This woman has earned the distinction of being made an honorary colonel in the Red army, but her activities have been more literary than military. All of these foreign-language newspapers which originate in Moscow have one editorial theme, the necessity for the organization of a Cominslav movement in the United States. American citizens of Slav origin are urged to unite in one racial block within the borders of this country. Why should they urge an organization of racial blocks in the United States? There is no place in this country for any racial block. I think it is a reflection upon the people of foreign extraction in our country. They are as loyal, patriotic and devoted to the United States and to the cause in which we are now engaged as other citizens of the United States.

The idea of circulating among them newspapers containing that kind of an appeal, coming from a country with whom we are now allied, in my judgment is in bad taste at this time. What is the purpose? Will it not raise a large question mark in the minds of many American people as to what purpose is behind the organization of this Slavic bloc in the United States? Let us hope that one of

the things that was discussed at the Moscow Conference might have been the subject to terminate the distribution of any propaganda in this country, that might tend to divide the American people in their united effort to win the war.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. To clear up a thought in my mind, with reference to the gentleman's statement, which is exceedingly interesting, were those publications, official publications, sponsored by the Russian Government?

Mr. DONDERO. I cannot answer that, but I would like to comment on the gentleman's question and say that I do not believe that any kind of literature is permitted to leave Russia without the consent of the Russian Government.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe that is correct, of course. Another question along the same line: Can it be inferred from this work that you have described that the Comintern is in fact still functioning?

Mr. DONDERO. That I do not know. I am simply stating the information as it has come to my attention. I might say this is neither private nor secret. It was made public on the 9th of this month, through the column of Helen Lombard entitled "Wartime Washington," writing for the Bell Syndicate.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think the gentleman's remarks are a splendid contribution toward better relations with Russia. I think anything of this kind should be brought into the light, just as the gentleman has brought it out, and that we should not only hear the discussion here, but that it should be fully and thoroughly investigated by our State Department and an understanding reached with Russia.

Mr. DONDERO. We have shown every evidence that we desire to stand united in a supreme effort to win this contest, not only for the United States, but for Russia as well. Let nothing come between us to interfere with that effort.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRANT of Indiana, for 10 days, on account of Naval Affairs Committee business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day deliver to the White House for forwarding to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 809. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.;

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith; and

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, November 13, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Monday and Tuesday, November 15 and 16, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 49 and H. R. 2328, to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code relative to the mailing of certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings, etc.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

909. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of his annual report for the fiscal year 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

910. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting revision No. 1 of the December 31, 1943, Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

911. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Distribution Methods and Costs, Part 1—Important Food Products"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

912. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting copies of the Quarterly Estimates of Personnel Requirements for each of the department's reporting units for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

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. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, current session, on the bills H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015, to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 857). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 351. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 858). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on the investigation of certain transactions of the Waterman Steamship Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Resolution 52. Resolution on the investigation of certain transactions of the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 3655. A bill to impose tax upon income derived by nonprofit organizations from dividends as a result of ownership by such organizations of substantial or practical voting control of private corporations for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 3656. A bill to grant men and women of the armed forces of the present war base pay and family allowances for 1 year after their separation from the service or release from active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3657. A bill to provide adjusted-service compensation and to provide a 3-month furlough with pay prior to discharge for persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to facilitate absentee voting by members of the armed services of the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 3658. A bill for the relief of the dependents of John Richard Schulz, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3659. A bill for the relief of Anne Locker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELMER:

H. R. 3660. A bill for the relief of Perry Bryant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3661. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 3662. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Grim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY:

H. R. 3663. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the district court for the district of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of residents of St. Georges, Del.; 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:

3533. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the employees of the Columbia Brewing Co. and signed by 56 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.

3534. Also, petition of Joseph F. Dedek 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.

3535. Also, petition of Ed. Mueller 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.

3536. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Resolution of the Des Moines Club of Printing House Craftsmen, Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Burch bill (H. R. 2001); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3537. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition of Rev. A. L. Allison and 10 other signers of the First Presbyterian Church, of Monmouth, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3538. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of the citizens of Arthur, Ill., asking legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3539. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Trowbridge and Strasburg, Ill., requesting the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3540. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Licking County, Ohio, presented by Mrs. W. G. Hoover, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit 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.

3541. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the State bar of California, recommending to the Congress of the United States that sections 811 (d), (5), 811 (e) (2), 811 (g) (4), and 1000 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code be repealed as of the date of their enactment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3542. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of J. S. Allen and 13 other citizens of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3543. Also, petition of Paul W. Duffy and 65 other citizens of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3544. Also, petition of George M. Gibson and two other residents of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3545. Also, petition of W. H. Farmer and 17 other citizens of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, our Father, at the secret shrine, the sanctuary of the soul, be pleased to hear our prayer. Make us strongly conscious of the efficacy and merits of divine guidance. The spirit of our glorified Lord makes the difference in our lives, cleansing from our hearts smoldering hatred and muttered irreverence from our lips.

Amid the brawl of clashing selfishness, help us to offer to our country an advance in sacrifice. O give us the spirit of our chivalrous ranks who are forgetting self that God's clean winds may again fill the lungs of a world in unspeakable tragedy. Let us catch their spirit, proving that because they are fighting and dying we shall be a nobler people; thus in the end the bitter loss shall be a glorious gain. O mighty Son of Israel, come and restrung the broken

harps of men and retune them to the harmony of that peace which is destined to leap from the horizons of the world; with the incense of Thy holy altar, fill the whole temple of our Republic, we beseech Thee. Do Thou take all confined hearts, grasp all selfish minds and use them as Thy earthly vessels to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. 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, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3363) entitled "An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. DAVIS to be the 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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) entitled "An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.

ABSENTEE SOLDIER VOTING

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein parts of a resolution I have introduced providing for the absentee soldiers voting, and also to include parts of a bill that has been introduced setting up a Federal election commission ostensibly for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to House Joint Resolution 190, which I have introduced, recommending to the various

States that have not already done so that they make such provisions as are necessary for the men in our armed forces to vote by absentee ballots.

It also makes it mandatory on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department to do everything possible to expedite the distribution and return of these ballots.

It also provides free air-mail service for these absentee ballots and communications in connection therewith.

The resolution reads as follows:

House Joint Resolution 190

Joint resolution to facilitate absentee voting by members of the armed services of the United States in time of war

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed services of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general, primary, or special election held in his election district or precinct in time of war.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed services in time of war.

(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

This resolution should be passed instead of the dangerous, drastic, and unconstitutional measure now pending, which would set up a Federal election commission here in Washington, four members to be appointed by the President and one by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from among the Justices of that Court. That measure would violate the Constitution of the United States, override State laws, and subject every person who helped to hold an election in any precinct in any State of the Union to indictment and prosecution in Federal court for alleged violations of its provisions, and impose a penalty of \$5,000 fine or 5 years in the penitentiary, or both, in each case.

My resolution would enable the men in our armed services to vote by absentee ballots, and speed the ballots to them and back by free air mail, without violating the Constitution, overriding State laws, or wrecking the election machinery of any State. It would save those sacred attributes of our American system for which our men in the armed forces are now fighting on every battle front in the world.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a speech by General Hines, Administrator of the Veterans' Bureau, and in the other to include a release in reference to the Naval Laboratory.