

2180. By the SPEAKER: Petition of G. R. Mitchell, of Knoxville, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2181. Also, petition of Rose M. Palmer, of New York City, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2182. Also, petition of 4-H Club representatives, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to 4-H Club activity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2183. Also, petition of the Regular Veterans Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 16, 1941)

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

The Reverend Merritt F. Williams, canon of Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast taught us in Thy holy word to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free," give us grace to remember that this liberty comes to us only because we are Thy sons, created in Thy image; that it is the liberty of doing what is eternally right; that it is the blessed freedom of knowing the truth, loving and serving the truth.

Quicken within us the sense of our sonship. Put far from us any temptation to think meanly of our humanity. Strengthen us in our devotion to the cause of eternal right. Guide us into Thy truth. Help us to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 16, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2096) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 547. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city

of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River;

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 4692. An act relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities;

H. R. 4853. An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans;

H. R. 4905. An act to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition;

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii;

H. R. 5305. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926;

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite-coal-producing regions of the United States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hatch	Reed
Bilbo	Hayden	Reynolds
Brewster	Herring	Rosier
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Brooks	Holman	Schwartz
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lodge	Tobey
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maloney	Wagner
Davis	Maybank	Walgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis

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

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL WORKS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2096) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 10, after "land", to insert:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities at a cost not to exceed \$18,750,000, and to establish the same as a naval air station: *Provided further*, That in the purchase of Floyd Bennett Field the Navy Department shall take into consideration expenditures by any Federal agency from Federal funds in or for developing such field prior to acquisition thereof by the United States.

And on page 2, to strike out all of section 3 and insert:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to the Congress on or before January 10, 1943, a statement by projects of the obligations incurred pursuant to the authorization provided in this act.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the two House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTROL OF INFLATION—RECOMMENDATIONS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram I have received from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, setting forth an important part of the economic program of that organization as developed at the recent twenty-third annual convention held in Chicago.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., December 11, 1941.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Delegates to the twenty-third annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, assembled here from 40 States and Puerto Rico, representing at least 2,000,000 farm people, acutely aware of the threat of inflation to our domestic economy, unanimously adopted the following resolution and ask you to give it your earnest consideration:

Inflationary forces are being set in motion which, unless Congress acts, will prove disastrous to all economic groups. Uncontrolled inflation must be avoided at all costs. Agriculture knows from bitter experience the disastrous consequences of inflation of prices,

wages, and profits, and the inevitable deflation that follows.

In order to prevent disastrous inflation, we urge prompt action by Congress to establish, for the period of the national emergency and for an adequate time thereafter, a Federal authority to establish maximum prices for commodities on a selective basis to the extent necessary to prevent inflationary price increases. We insist that such legislation recognize the parity principle as between labor, industry, and agriculture. In order to prevent the average price received by farmers for any agricultural commodity being depressed below parity through the operation of price controls no price ceiling should be established on any agricultural commodity or the products thereof, at a price less than 110 percent of parity.

To be effective such legislation must include authority to control inflationary wages as well as inflationary prices. We cannot give our support to any legislation to control prices which does not provide for control of inflationary wages comparable to the control of industrial and farm prices.

Tax powers should be used to a greater extent to control inflation and to meet the current fiscal needs of the Nation by recapturing excess earnings and excess profits due to defense expenditures, and by lowering exemptions and levying increased taxes based upon ability to pay. Safeguards should be provided to assure that all such powers granted be terminated at the close of the emergency. In view of the inevitable effects of war upon monetary and exchange relationships and price levels—both nationally and internationally—we renew our insistence at this time for the establishment of a monetary authority, which shall be charged with maintaining a stable price level. In the meantime every legitimate means available to the administrators of fiscal and monetary policy should be used so as to maintain a stable price level and avoid inflation.

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm
Bureau Federation.

COMMITTEE REPORT FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 16th instant.

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, reported it on December 16, 1941, with amendments and submitted a report (No. 915) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 916).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6219. An act to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 917).

PROCEEDING IN RELATION TO SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Con-

tingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 208 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 208), submitted by Mr. HATCH on December 15, 1941, was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 81, agreed to March 10, 1941, and Senate Resolution 167, agreed to September 15, 1941, and Senate Resolution 186, agreed to November 1, 1941, all of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, relating to the proceeding now pending before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine whether WILLIAM LANGER is entitled to retain his seat in the Senate, is hereby increased by \$6,000.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 16, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson;

S. 904. An act for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson;

S. 1190. An act for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville;

S. 1428. An act for the relief of Walter M. Anderson;

S. 1623. An act to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes; and

S. 2077. An act amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation-program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BULOW:

S. 2138. A bill relating to the claim of Louis H. Deaver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2139. A bill to provide for performance of the duties of chiefs of bureau and the Judge Advocate General in the Navy Department, and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2140. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2141. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2142. A bill to provide for the automatic issuance of national service life insurance to all persons in active service in the land or naval forces in such amounts as are necessary to give them \$10,000 of free insurance for the period of the war; to the Committee on Finance.

PRICE CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 5990, the so-called price-control bill, which I ask to have appropriately referred. I am offering this amendment at the request of the commissioner of insurance of the State of Massachusetts, who is fearful that unless some corrective action is taken, the enactment of the bill as it is now drawn would seriously affect State supervision of insurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and printed.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CLARK of Missouri, viz: Strike out section 11 and insert the following new section:

"Sec. 11. Section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Any person in the active service, and while in such active service, shall be granted such insurance without medical examination upon application therefor in writing (made within 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act), and upon payment of premiums: *Provided*, That after the expiration of such 120-day period any such person may be granted national service life insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

"(2) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, dies or has died in line of duty (including death resulting from disease or injury incurred in line of duty), without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least \$5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance as of the date of entry into active service on October 8, 1940, whichever is later, in the sum of \$5,000 payable as provided in section 602 (h), except that payments hereunder shall be made only to the following beneficiaries and in the order named—

"(A) To the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unmarried;

"(B) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

"(C) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

"(3) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, suffers total disability in line of duty without having in force at the time of such disability insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War

Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least \$5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance in the aggregate sum of \$5,000 effective as of the date such disability was so suffered but not prior to October 8, 1940. Such premiums shall be waived during the continuation of such total disability. The administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from the national service life insurance appropriation to the national service life insurance fund such sums as may be necessary to cover all losses incurred and premiums waived under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

"(4) The benefits and privileges extended by this section are hereby so extended by the Congress because many of the personnel of our armed forces (1) were unable to comply with the prerequisites necessary to the granting of insurance by reason of extended duty in the North Atlantic, Hawaii, the Philippines, and other outlying bases; (2) had failed or neglected to apply for such insurance in the expectation that their service would be peacetime service only; and (3) by reason of the suddenness with which war was thrust upon us, had not sufficient time to apply for such insurance prior to engaging in combat. The Congress hereby declares that no further relief of such character will be granted."

BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REENROLLMENT OF HOUSE BILL 6208

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, several days ago both the Senate and House passed House bill 6208, known as the black-out bill. In that bill there is a provision for the purchase by the District Commissioners of certain equipment and also a provision that the District Commissioners may borrow from the Treasury of the United States money to the extent of \$1,000,000. The language of the bill is not in form to suit the Treasury of the United States and they have requested a correction of the language. I send to the desk a concurrent resolution dealing with the subject and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 6208) entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", be, and the same is hereby, rescinded; and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reenroll the said bill with the following change, namely: In the engrossed Senate amendments, at the end of amendment No. 6, strike out the word "section" and the period, and insert the following: "section, and there is hereby appropriated for this purpose \$1,000,000 out of any money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States not otherwise appropriated."

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. COLIN P. KELLY, JR., BY HOPSON OWEN MURFEE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., by Hopson Owen Murfee, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISTRICT MOTOR-VEHICLE-FUEL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-

vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments have been adopted. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, when the Senate took the recess it was considering House bill 5558. I desire to state briefly the status of the bill and its effect.

The bill as it is before the Senate, including the three committee amendments agreed to yesterday, provides for an increase in the District gasoline tax, which at present is 2 cents, to 3 cents per gallon from January 1, 1942, for 9½ years, through June 30, 1951, to cover the highway development program of the District as presented. That increase will produce one and one-half million dollars a year. In the opinion of the District Committee, that is sufficient to meet the needs of the program, and any larger tax is not necessary at this time.

I will state briefly the history of the bill. As introduced in the House, the bill provided for a 1-cent increase per gallon. The District Committee of the House recommended a 1-cent increase per gallon; but when the House passed the bill it raised the tax by a 2-cent increase per gallon, making the tax a 4-cent tax instead of the present 2-cent tax. The Senate committee now concurs with the House committee, and says that a 1-cent increase at this time under these conditions is adequate; and that is what is before the Senate in the bill as now amended, with the committee amendments.

I may point out that this tax is, of course, in addition to the Federal 1½-cent tax, which applies throughout the country.

While I believe the issue should be determined on the basis of the needs of the District; the question is constantly asked as to what the taxes of other States are. Therefore, I will state them briefly for the information of the Senate.

The tax in Maryland is 4 cents a gallon.

The tax in Virginia is 5 cents a gallon. There is one State in the Union that has a 2-cent tax.

There are 10 States that have a tax of 3 cents, as this bill would make the tax in the District of Columbia.

There are 17 States that have a tax of 4 cents, 11 that have a tax of 5 cents, 5 that have a tax of 6 cents, 1 that has a tax of 6½ cents, and 3 that have a tax of 7 cents.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator mind informing the Senate as to the average gasoline tax in the country?

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the average, computed flatly, is 4.4 cents a gallon, and that the average weighted so as to allow for the volume of purchases is 4 cents a gallon.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator think the District of Columbia should have at least the average tax throughout the country?

Mr. BURTON. No; I should say not. The reason is that the District of Columbia does not represent an average of the highway requirements of the Nation. It is clear that in most States the bulk of the gasoline tax is collected in the metropolitan areas, but out of it must be paid also the expense of the primary and secondary rural road systems; whereas here in the District, although, of course, all of the tax is collected in a metropolitan area, because the whole District is metropolitan in character, it does not have to bear the burden of any intercity or rural primary and secondary systems. Therefore, inasmuch as all of the District's gasoline tax goes into the District's highway fund, I believe it is quite appropriate that the District gasoline tax be at a rate that is a little lower than the rate in those States that also pay for a rural system of roads out of such tax.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator say whether the proposed 3-cent tax is adequate for all highway improvements for the District?

Mr. BURTON. I should say that it, together with the existing resources and the ordinary Federal aid that comes to the District as it does to other States, is adequate not only for the present needs but to carry out, so far as we can now see under the emergency, the requirements of the District due to its increased traffic.

I may add the statement, which I think is pertinent in the consideration of the bill, that the District of Columbia has had the 2-cent tax since 1924. The needs of the District for improved highway conditions have increased with the increased population and volume of traffic; but the District has not increased its gasoline tax. If it had done so about 7 years ago, it would have met the need for improved freeway and modified freeway construction which is necessary to take care of the increased volume that comes with increased traffic. Therefore, the condition today is that the people of the District are about 7 years behind in their construction program. The proposed increase in the gasoline tax would enable them to catch up with that program over a 10-year period.

Mr. BYRD. What revenue will be derived from the additional 1-cent tax?

Mr. BURTON. About one and a half million dollars a year.

Mr. BYRD. Is there not great need for improvement of many of the streets in the District of Columbia by underpasses and other very expensive construction of that kind?

Mr. BURTON. That is exactly what is contemplated under this measure. The District of Columbia has made one of the best surveys of its engineering requirements that has been made in the United States. It was prepared by the Department of Highways of the District of Columbia from facts gathered by it and also by the United States Public Roads Administration and the District of Columbia Department of Vehicles and Traffic. The result of such surveys is the recommendation that the improvements that should have been made and are now needed constitute a program

that will cost about \$35,000,000. There is now available toward that program out of the present income, without any increased tax, about \$1,700,000 a year.

Mr. BYRD. From what source does it come?

Mr. BURTON. It comes from the present highway fund; and the present highway fund is made up primarily from gasoline taxes, motor-vehicle fees, and certain assessments, as they are called; not from the general fund. No money of the United States has been placed in the highway fund since 1937. It has been carried by District funds since that date; in fact, it has so carried since 1934, in the larger part.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot follow the Senator when he says that the present highway fund is \$1,700,000 and that we now have a 2-cent gasoline tax, and that the revenue from the additional 1-cent tax will be \$1,500,000.

Mr. BURTON. One million seven hundred thousand dollars is the portion of the highway fund that would be available to apply to this \$35,000,000 program. Some of it, of course, has to be used for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Does that include the additional tax?

Mr. BURTON. The \$1,700,000 does not include the increase of 1 cent. If there is an increase of 1 cent, there will be available from the District \$1,500,000 more annually, making a total of about \$3,200,000 for this program. The program is a \$35,000,000 program, extending over 10 years. An annual revenue of \$3,200,000 would make \$32,000,000 during the 10 years. The other \$3,000,000 or so which the program calls for will come from the normal operation of the Federal highway aid or its contribution on access roads, such as any State would get.

Mr. BYRD. Does any part of this revenue come from taxes on real estate?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. BYRD. It comes from no other source of taxation than the gasoline tax?

Mr. BURTON. There is a table attached to the report of the committee which shows exactly the sources from which the highway-fund money comes. The report is on the desk of the Senator, and the table is on the last page of the report.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator think the fact that the District of Columbia, up to this time, has not increased its gasoline tax makes it more important now to make a larger increase than 1 cent?

Mr. BURTON. It might be argued that if we were in a condition of peace, when there were no priorities involved, and if we were in a condition where there were no other great taxes being thrust upon our taxpayers, we should advocate a 2-cent increase, and complete this program in 8 years. But under present conditions I think it is perfectly clear that the municipalities and the Nation owe it to the Nation to defer, where possible, their nondefense items, so far as they can defer them, and insofar as priorities are not involved in them. Municipalities also owe it to the Nation to keep taxes for their local purposes as low as pos-

sible, so that their citizens may be better able to pay the defense taxes that are being forced upon them at the same time. That is what we are proposing to accomplish by holding this increase down to an increase of 1 cent per gallon.

I may add that what has taken place in the last year here in the District and in Virginia is of importance when we are passing on the matter as it stands before us. Within the last few months there have been located on the Virginia side of the river War Department and Navy Department buildings.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a fact, is it not, that up until the time of the present emergency the 2-cent gasoline tax was sufficient to take care of the ordinary requirements of the District of Columbia with reference to street and road construction, repair, and improvement?

Mr. BURTON. I should say not. The survey which has been carefully made over a period of years indicates that the revenue derived from the 2-cent gasoline tax has enabled the authorities in the District of Columbia to keep the roads in repair, and to take slow forward steps toward the needs of the highway department, but that we are far behind, about 5 to 7 years behind, on what have been called the major operations needed by the District, insofar as its highway engineering is concerned.

Mr. OVERTON. I was advised as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee that until the time of the present emergency there were sufficient funds to take care of the highway needs of the District of Columbia, and that there was no necessity for any increase in the gasoline tax, and in some years we had a surplus of unappropriated highway funds. We have always adopted any recommendations made by the Commissioners and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to appropriations for highway improvement in the District of Columbia.

When this emergency arose—and I shall be very glad to call the attention of the senior Senator from Virginia to this fact—and when it was decided to erect the tremendous War Department Building on Virginia soil, it became necessary to make a considerable outlay for street improvements, for access roads to the bridges across the Potomac, in order that Federal employees, and people who may be visiting the District, and Senators and Representatives may be transported into the balmy atmosphere of the State of Virginia when they have business to transact with the War Department. A very large amount of this fund is to be used to build the access roads leading to the grand and glorious old State of Virginia. Am I right about that, I ask the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BURTON. A part of these funds will contribute toward the construction of access roads, and the Federal Government will also contribute some, because they will have to relieve the congestion at the several bottlenecks at the entrances to each of the three principal bridges which lead into Virginia.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct, and an increase in the highway fund has been rendered necessary very largely by reason of the establishment of this tremendous, grand, and glorious War Department Building in the State of Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to remark as to that, Mr. President, that it was the War Department which insisted that this building be erected in Virginia, and one of the objections of the Senator from Virginia to this increase of 1 cent in the gasoline tax is that the fund will not be sufficient to make adequate the outlets both in Virginia and within the District of Columbia.

I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that the streets of the city of Washington are becoming practically impassable, and that underpasses should be built, and large sums must be expended, for the purpose of enabling the people in Washington to go over the streets. I think an increase of only 1 cent in the gasoline tax, if that is all the money that is to be available—and I understand the Senator to say it will be, that no appropriations will be made except from the gasoline tax fund—it will be totally inadequate to meet the great traffic problem which now confronts the city of Washington.

Mr. BURTON. With reference to that very point, I think it is important for us all to realize that there is a point beyond which it is not possible efficiently to tear up the streets in a city at one time, even to aid in the reconstruction of its highway system. The million and a half dollars which will come from this fund, plus the million seven hundred thousand available from existing resources, plus the fund of about a million nine hundred thousand which was included just a few days ago in the deficiency appropriation bill, having to do with the highways of the District of Columbia, and access to the Virginia side, will provide in 1942 every bit of reconstruction that can be handled within the District of Columbia, with due regard to moving the traffic in the District during that period of time.

As a matter of fact, due to the location of the new War and Navy Department buildings in Virginia, the whole program is being shoved ahead about 2 years, with the idea of completing these access roads, if possible, before the end of the year 1942. If we can complete those access roads before the end of 1942, we will have moved the \$35,000,000 program ahead about 2 years. That can be done within the resources made available in this manner, providing a 1-cent increase in the tax, plus the Federal funds.

I may refer to one other factor which will appear if we increase the tax by 2 cents. There is a peculiar and interesting situation which developed in the testimony, which may be well known to Senators now in the chamber, that outside of the District of Columbia the price which the public pays for gasoline, including the larger taxes of Virginia and Maryland, is the same price that is being paid within the District. Obviously some one is taking the loss in order to bring that about, or making a contribution, or

absorbing the difference. That situation arises from the fact, evidently, that retail dealers outside of the District would not be able to add, in the case of Virginia 3 cents, and in the case of Maryland 2 cents, to the District's 2-cent tax, and still sell their gasoline.

It was testified before the committee that the wholesale companies were absorbing that difference, and that therefore within the area of the metropolitan long-range operations of Washington, perhaps 50 miles around Washington, there is a substantially uniform "Washington" retail gasoline price to the public, although the full Virginia taxes are paid and the full Maryland taxes are paid where the gasoline is sold in those States in the neighborhood of the District, but outside of the District limits.

The gasoline companies are taking the loss, which is all right with me if they choose to do so, but when we increase the tax within the District of Columbia by 1 cent, and thereby add one and a half million dollars to the District's resources for public purposes, the retail price also will go up in Virginia and Maryland. As a result, people outside of the District, but near to its borders, will pay their additional 1 cent also, and the beneficiaries will merely be the wholesale companies which have been absorbing the difference. If we raise the tax by 2 cents, that result will be doubled outside of the District, and still with no benefit to the public outside of the District.

Mr. BYRD. I am not disturbed about the differential between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia, but I think the gasoline tax is the fairest tax that can be devised to pay for road construction. I think the city of Washington is lagging behind in a tremendous way in the construction of its streets. It used to take me 5 or 10 minutes to get to my hotel from the Capitol. Now it takes 15 or 20 minutes, or a half hour, due to the congestion. I suggest to the Senator that the program is totally inadequate to meet the situation as it exists now, and as it will be in the years to come.

Mr. BURTON. The program as supported by the Committee on the District of Columbia is based upon a survey made by the United States Public Roads Administration, and the Director of Highways of the District, approved by the District Commissioners. I believe that it provides for all that can be done in tearing up the roads within a given time so that the improvements can be completed in a 10-year period. I think that will meet the needs suggested by the Senator from Virginia as well as it can be done.

As the bill now stands before the Senate, with the amendments that have been agreed to, it stands as a bill for a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax for the period from 1942 to June 30, 1951. It is in that shape before the Senate, of course open to further amendment, but it is now in precisely the shape in which the Committee on the District of Columbia recommended its passage.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few moments about this bill to increase the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia. The bill was brought before the Senate for action late

yesterday evening, and while I have no more interest in this particular measure than every other Senator should have, I thought it would be preferable to withhold action on the bill until more Senators were present, as it was quite apparent that a quorum was not present when the bill was being considered yesterday evening. Therefore, at my request, the arrangement was made to hold the bill over so that more Senators would have an opportunity to learn the merits and demerits of the bill and to be able to protect their constituents back home.

Mr. President, I have an interest in the bill because I feel that the tax in the District of Columbia should be more nearly equalized with the tax in the adjoining States. I feel that the tax should be more in line with that in the immediate surrounding territories. I feel that if the tax is not properly adjusted it is quite likely that the State of Texas and other States will be called upon to contribute to the maintenance and upkeep of the streets and roads of the District of Columbia, because there will be a lack of funds from the tax which is now in effect or from the 1-cent increase which is proposed by the committee.

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

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. BURTON. I wanted to remind the Senator that the table, carried in the report of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which the Senator is a member, emphasizes the fact that since 1937 there has been no contribution whatever from the general fund, and practically none since 1934. With the addition of one and one-half million dollars which will be added to the gasoline-tax fund from the proposed increase of 1 cent per gallon in the tax, does the Senator still feel that there would be a danger or likelihood that the general fund of the United States would be called upon to subsidize the District?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I base my statement that there is a likelihood that we all shall be called upon to contribute to it, upon past history. I refer to the contributions that have been made from the general fund to the District of Columbia since the year 1925, up to and including the year 1940, ranging from \$5,000,000 a year to \$9,000,000 a year, and making a total of \$118,875,000 which has been contributed by the States represented by the Members of this body.

In that connection I wish to show how some of that money has heretofore gotten from the general fund over into the road fund of the District. I quote from a letter written by Engineer Commissioner Col. David McCoach, Jr., dated June 5, 1940, in which he says in part:

For your information, there is enclosed a statement showing highway department appropriations from the fiscal years 1925 to 1941. This tabulation does not include the amount appropriated for police traffic control, Officer of the Director of Vehicles and Traffic, and the Division of Trees and Parking of the Highway Department. Up to and including the fiscal year 1933 strictly highway activities of the District of Columbia drew more than \$2,000,000 annually from the general fund of the District for its work.

That, Mr. President, is what has taken place. I should now like to read from the report of the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] on House bill 5558. I read from page 2 of the report:

Due to the limited amount of these appropriations, they have been insufficient for at least the past 7 years—

Mr. President, these appropriations of \$2,000,000 a year were made up until 1933. Since 1933 this is what has happened, according to the committee report:

Due to the limited amount of these appropriations, they have been insufficient for at least the past 7 years to provide for the major operations on the highways of the District, which have become increasingly necessary to meet, to the best advantage, the rapidly increasing demands of motor-vehicle traffic.

That shows that for the last 7 years road funds have not been sufficient. We all know that a very disgraceful traffic-congestion condition now exists in the District. We do not need the services of some expert engineer to make evident to us that a large expenditure of money will be necessary to remedy the traffic conditions which at present exist in the District of Columbia. It is my opinion that the necessary road money should come from a gasoline tax in the District. I do not think there is any doubt that an enormous amount of money will be necessary for this purpose, and if a sufficient amount is not raised by an increased gasoline tax, I expect the deficiency must and perhaps will come from citizens of Texas and every other State in the Union.

Mr. President, another point I should like to bring out for the Senate is that this little pocket of the District of Columbia now has only a 2-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax, whereas the adjoining State of Maryland on one side has a 4-cent tax and the adjoining State of Virginia on the other side has a 5-cent tax. It is to be assumed that the price of gasoline within the District would be from 2 to 3 cents less than the price in Maryland and Virginia immediately outside the District, but from practical experience we all know that is not always true. We find the price of gasoline in some places in the District to be just as high or higher than it is outside the District. We find that it is very difficult to drive our automobiles on the streets of the District because of the congestion. If we want to take a little automobile ride, we must cross the line and get out into Virginia or Maryland to enjoy their highways, which have been paid for by a higher gasoline tax in those States, and while driving in those States it has been my experience that I can generally find a place where I can buy gasoline at a lower price than I can within the District.

I do not accuse anyone of any ulterior motive, but I do claim that by the existing set-up we have created a situation whereby those who are engaged in the distribution and the sale of gasoline can profit by the existence of this low-tax pocket between the higher-taxed States, and it is my humble opinion that, of course, they are profiteering.

Mr. President, I do not wish to impose upon the citizens of the District an ad-

ditional burden of taxation, but it is my opinion that they are already paying the tax, and, instead of the money going into the treasury of the District, it is going into the coffers of the major oil companies that have a monopoly and control the prices in the District of Columbia and in the surrounding States. It is my opinion that through their manipulation the general motoring public is paying this tax, but it does not go into the treasury of the District of Columbia. It is my contention that this tax should be equalized.

I could give many illustrations of how those engaged in this business are trying to cover up a little thing here and uncover a little thing there in order to make us believe that they are not collecting this tax. The able Senator from Ohio has explained to us that an imaginary boundary has been set up beyond the real boundary of the District of Columbia by commercial interests whereby they try to equalize this tax by what they call a refund to the dealers within the no-man's land existing between the real boundary of the District and the imaginary boundary. The dealers within that no-man's land try to meet the lower District prices, and in order to offset the loss which they take, the major companies or the distributing companies are supposed to make a refund. How they do that within the law I do not know. But, inasmuch as it is quite likely that all retail dealers within the States of Maryland and Virginia pay the same wholesale price for their gasoline exclusive of the tax, I do not consider it to be right for the distributor to make a refund to some of the dealers in Maryland and Virginia who live in the no-man's land and not make the same refund or rebate to the dealers in Maryland and Virginia who live just beyond the border line of no-man's land.

This is a difficult situation; one which I do not think we should expect the commercial interests to work out. I think the Congress of the United States should solve the problem which exists by raising the tax to a point approximating the tax imposed in the two adjoining States and other surrounding territory. As I understand, the average of the taxes in all the States is something over 4 cents a gallon. To equalize the tax as between the 5-cent tax in Virginia and the 4-cent tax in Maryland and the 2-cent tax in the District, the tax in the District should be made $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents a gallon. I think that is what should be done.

If there is no immediate need for this money—which I very much doubt—I think it is better that the money be in the treasury of the District of Columbia than in the treasuries of the oil corporations which sell gasoline and obtain higher prices on account of the discrepancy in taxes which exists.

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

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BURTON. I do not quite follow the last argument of the Senator. As I understand the present situation in the area outside the District of Columbia to which the Senator refers, the gasoline

companies themselves are refunding something like \$1,000,000 for every cent of difference in the tax. Therefore, if we should raise the tax within the District, such action would benefit the public within the District; but insofar as the area outside the District is concerned, if we should raise the gasoline tax in the District, such action would then simply place additional money in the hands of the oil companies. To increase the tax in the District would benefit the oil companies outside the District without benefiting the public outside the District.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am not quite so sure that the refunds to stations outside the District are being made in full. We all know that an ideal situation would be an identical tax on gasoline in every State. Then the people would not cross State lines to buy their gasoline in States having lower gasoline taxes. The tax should be equalized in that manner. Possibly it will not be equalized in that manner; but we can today contribute to the equalization of the gasoline-tax situation in some degree by leveling it up in the territory consisting of Virginia, Maryland, and the District. We can do that without endangering the interests of anybody and without it costing anybody much, if any, more than he is now paying for gasoline. It is my contention that this should be done by raising the tax in the District from 2 cents per gallon to 4 cents.

I do not have available experts to go into the situation and disprove all the statistics which have been presented to us. The Senate endeavored to obtain some help along that line, but the House of Representatives concluded that we did not need experts in our offices to do research work for us. So we are denied that facility and are forced to rely upon the rule of thumb and what we think is the common-sense policy. The House of Representatives evidently has all the research experts it needs. It has gone into this matter fully; and although the House committee recommended exactly what the Senate committee has recommended and reported the bill with a 1-cent increase, the House of Representatives, with the aid of its expert advice, which we are denied, discovered that that was the wrong policy, and on the floor of the House the gasoline tax was increased from 2 to 4 cents a gallon. That is exactly what I think we should do by the Senate.

If hereafter there should be a shortage in the highway funds of the District of Columbia, the individual States which are levying taxes on their own citizens which average more than 4 cents a gallon may be called upon to make up the deficiency here in the District. I do not think the citizens in Texas and other States should have to tax themselves to build their own roads and then on top of that tax themselves to pay for roads and streets here in the District. The gasoline tax here in the District should be high enough to pay for its own streets and roads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment in line 7, striking out "2

cents" and inserting "1 cent", was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, of course it would be ideal, as suggested by the able junior Senator from Texas, if there were no disparity in the tax rates prevailing in the various States of the Union. It might be a very happy situation if the Congress had the authority, and should exercise the authority, to abolish all taxes on gasoline levied by the various States and impose a Federal tax which would be equal in all the areas of the United States, and then distribute the funds among the various States.

But that is not the situation and cannot be the situation. Each State levies a gasoline tax in accordance with what its legislature and its constituted authorities deem to be necessary to meet the highway requirements of that State. That is generally true, although some of the States do divert gasoline taxes from highway purposes to other purposes.

I think there can be no question that no tax should be imposed upon a people greater than the requirements of the particular locality in which the tax is imposed, whether it be a Federal, State, county, or municipal tax. The requirements of the District of Columbia were thoroughly investigated. This matter has been studied, not for days or weeks, but for months. A report has been made that the requirements of the District of Columbia do not call for the imposition of a gasoline tax greater than 3 cents a gallon.

If we are to undertake to raise the tax beyond the necessities of the District of Columbia, as presented to us by the report of experts who have studied the requirements of the District, in order to meet the tax rates in the various States, we shall be thrown into hopeless confusion. I do not know what the gasoline-tax rate is in the State of Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is 5 cents.

Mr. OVERTON. In some States it is 7 cents. In other States it is 4 cents. In others it is as low as 2 cents. We cannot undertake to impose a gasoline tax in the District of Columbia which will be in harmony with the tax prevailing in other States, because the rates vary so radically and there is not the slightest semblance of uniformity. If nearby States wish to get in harmony with the tax levied in the District of Columbia in order, for instance, that more gasoline may be sold in Virginia and Maryland than is presently being sold, those States can meet that situation by lowering the gasoline tax in their States rather than by having us unnecessarily increase the gasoline-tax rate in the District of Columbia. I take it that the State of Virginia requires 5 cents a gallon in order to meet its highway requirements, and that Maryland requires 4 cents.

The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia has spoken about the bad condition of the streets of the city of Washington. It is my observation that the streets of the city of Washington are in better condition than are the streets of the city of Richmond or of the city of Baltimore.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator entirely misconstrued what I said. I was referring to the congestion in the streets, which makes it practically impossible to travel up and down the streets. The Senator will not deny that.

Mr. OVERTON. I will not deny it.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator will not deny the further fact that if there were money available for the improvement and widening of the streets, and for building underpasses and overpasses, if need be, there would be much less congestion on the streets.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator; but I am taking the report of the experts who have made a study of the question, rather than the opinions of individual Senators.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator need any experts to tell him that he can hardly traverse the streets of the city of Washington? All he has to do is to get into an automobile and try it.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, the highway program will meet that condition of congestion.

If we follow the argument of the Senator from Texas to its logical conclusion, the Senator from Texas ought to prevail on the States of Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, and other States adjoining the great Lone Star State of our Union, to levy tax rates exactly in accord with the tax rate on gasoline levied by the State of Texas. Of course, there is a disparity. There is a disparity ranging from 2 cents a gallon up to 7 cents a gallon in the different States; but how are we to correct it? Are we to correct it by levying a 7-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline in the District of Columbia? Are we to correct it by levying the 5-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax which prevails in the State of Texas, or the 4-cents-a-gallon tax which prevails in the State of Maryland, or the 5-cents-a-gallon tax which prevails in the State of Virginia? There is only one way to handle the problem and that is to levy a tax which is sufficient to meet the necessities of the taxing authority; and that is what this bill proposes to do.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I had no intention of conveying the thought that the equalization should be on the basis of equalizing the District of Columbia gasoline tax with the taxes in all the other States. I did make the statement that I believed it would be an ideal situation if the tax in the District of Columbia and in all the States should be the same; but my purpose regarding equalizing the tax in the District of Columbia is purely and simply to equalize it with the gasoline tax paid in the immediate surrounding territory. The District of Columbia is a little pocket between States paying larger gasoline taxes.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me interrupt the Senator, if he will permit me to do so. Is the tax rate levied on gasoline in Texas equalized with the tax rate levied on gasoline in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Arizona, Louisiana, and the other States surrounding Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; and that is exactly what I am proposing here. It is not identically equalized, but it is equalized to such a degree—

Mr. OVERTON. Is there not a considerable disparity between the taxes levied on gasoline in the various States adjoining Texas and in Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Wherever that disparity has existed it has been a great inconvenience; but it has been eliminated to such a degree that today the differential is not so great as to tempt residents in one State to drive for miles to patronize gasoline stations in another State.

That is exactly what I contend for here—that we should equalize the District of Columbia gasoline-tax rate with the gasoline-tax rate in the immediate surrounding territory, so that citizens living in each district will contribute to the upkeep of their own highways by buying gasoline in their own district or their own State.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, automobile drivers might have some apprehension in going into the illimitable reaches of the huge State of Texas, because they might lose their way and not get out. [Laughter.] So I can understand the contention made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. We should not care if they never did get out. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana will give me some information relative to the amendment which commences in line 9, on page 1. I have read the report, but I do not see any reference in it to the amendment. The amendment to which I refer is the one which provides that when motor-vehicle fuel is sold by an agency of the United States for use in privately owned vehicles certain provision for the payment of the tax shall be made. Can the Senator give me information as to what governmental agencies are selling to privately owned vehicles?

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is in a better position than I am to answer the question. I will yield to him if he desires me to do so.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I may say that under the law as it now stands there is a section, known as section 14, which provides that if any agencies of the United States sell gasoline they shall pay the same tax. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Iowa is merely for the purpose of making the law conform to any increase in the tax that may be made. I was not advised in the hearings that any such sales are now being made, but I understand that some such sales have been made in the past, whereby the Government actually did retail some gasoline; and section 14 was enacted to make sure that when the Government retailed gasoline it was required to collect the same District tax as applied to other retail sales. The amendment merely continues the present law so as to include the proposed increase in the tax.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. No testimony or information was presented in the hearings to the effect that Federal agencies were in fact selling gasoline for use in privately owned motor vehicles?

Mr. BURON. There was no such information; but if the amendment were not made in the bill, section 14 of the existing law would provide that if any governmental agency should sell gasoline under such circumstances it would charge only a 2-cent tax, while everyone else would charge a 3-cent tax; and, of course, that would be highly detrimental.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I will conclude by making the observation which I made at the beginning of my remarks: That is, that it is a sound proposition that taxes should be levied only in such amounts as are required by the necessities of those upon whom the tax is imposed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana says that no taxes should be levied which are higher than the necessity for which the taxes are imposed. I submit to the Senate that if there is complete satisfaction with the program of street improvement in the city of Washington, in view of the terrific congestion which exists in Washington and the need for overhead passes, underpasses, widening of streets, and perhaps new streets, then, of course, we should not increase the gasoline tax. I agree with him that no tax should be levied which is higher than the necessities require; but it should be remembered that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is adopted it will provide \$1,500,000 more for street improvement in the city of Washington, and I believe the motorists in Washington will gladly pay the \$1,500,000 if they have to do so. As a matter of fact, in some instances the tax is not passed on to the users of gasoline. However, I feel sure that they will gladly pay it in order to improve the streets in Washington.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is my understanding that action is to be taken on the bill prior to 1 o'clock today. If that be the case, I should like to have the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will conclude by saying that no fairer tax can be levied than the gasoline tax, because it imposes the cost of road construction and road improvement upon the users of the roads. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas and give to the city of Washington \$1,500,000 more, paid by the users of the streets, for the improvement of the streets of Washington and to relieve the terrific congestion which now exists.

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

Texas to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I understand that the question will come up in the form of a vote on the original committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore it will be before the Senate in the form, Shall the bill be amended by substituting "1 cent" for "2 cents"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, a vote in the affirmative will be in conformity with the action of the District Committee in making an increase of 1 cent a gallon, or \$1,500,000 increase in money; and a vote of "nay" would be a vote for an increase of 2 cents, or \$3,000,000 in money?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the committee amendment strikes out "2 cents" as provided in the House bill; and therefore the vote is simply on the committee amendment, and not on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 7.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Chair please restate the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment striking out "2 cents" and inserting "1 cent."

Mr. O'DANIEL. So that a vote "yea" would be for a tax of 1 cent a gallon and a "nay" vote would be for a tax of 2 cents a gallon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is attending a conference at the White House. He has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—52

Alken	George	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Brewster	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Bunker	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Butler	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	Lodge	Van Nuys
Caraway	Lucas	Wagner
Chavez	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	White
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wiley
Danaheer	Maloney	Willis
Davis	Mead	
Ellender	Norris	

NAYS—27

Bankhead	Green	O'Daniel
Brown	Hayden	Pepper
Byrd	Herring	Radcliffe
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Doxey	McFarland	Smathers
Gerry	Maybank	Spencer
Gillette	Murray	Truman
Glass	Nye	Walsh

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Connally	Smith
Bailey	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Murdoch	Tydings
Bilbo	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Bone	Reed	
Bridges	Shipstead	

So the amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If no further amendment be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill—H. R. 5558—was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1951."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REENACTMENT OF OVERMAN AND TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACTS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take up for consideration Senate bill 2126.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6233, to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I inquire what bill is it?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yesterday the House passed House bill 6233 which is identical with Senate bill 2129 passed by the Senate, except for one simple provision, making it mandatory instead of optional to file certain reports, which I will explain later on.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6233. Is there objection to that request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6233) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, yesterday the House passed a bill identical with the one which we had under consideration and passed yesterday, Senate bill 2129. The House made one change. It changed the word "may" on page 6, line 14, to "shall." The bill at that point refers to reports required of the Alien Property Custodian, or whatever agency the President may designate for the custody of alien property. The change makes such reports mandatory instead of optional. It strengthens the bill along the line proposed in some of the committee amendments yesterday. I was in consultation today with Chairman SUMNERS, of the House Committee, and I ascertained that his committee will agree to all the amendments adopted by the Senate yesterday. If the Senate will permit that additional change in the bill, it will make it unnecessary for the bill to go to conference, and it can be enacted at once.

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

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. From the parliamentary standpoint, the House bill having been passed and messaged to the Senate, and the Senate bill having been passed and messaged to the House, is it the purpose of the Senator from Indiana to take up the House bill and move to strike out all after the enacting clause and include the text of the Senate bill as passed yesterday, with the additional amendment which the House has put into its bill?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is my purpose.

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

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. This morning I had a conference with the legislative draftsman, the adviser to the Senate on legislative matters, and also with Mr. Ginsberg, who has been acting before the Banking and Currency Committee as counsel to Mr. Henderson, on the point of whether, under title II, we were making adequate provision for price-control legislation if and when it is enacted. Since the Banking and Currency Committee has already spent many days in hearings, and there is under consideration a bill to effectuate price control, it was the opinion of Messrs. Wood and Ginsberg, as well as my own for what it is worth, that if we do not now say something about the impact of the price-control legislation on title II, we may be opening the door wide to the modification of contracts which will completely

destroy the effectiveness of the price-control legislation.

Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that I mention the matter at this time so that the legislative history of the pending bill will reflect the fact that it has now been discussed. It is probable that, when the price-control bill is written, we can incorporate therein language which will refer back to title II of the pending bill in such fashion as to make it perfectly apparent that title II will function, or be caused to function, subject to the price-control limitations in the bill to be reported. Since it is not as yet existing legislation, we naturally do not wish to say that title II is subject to the provisions of a bill yet to be passed.

I mention the matter, therefore, let me say to the Senator from Indiana, so that he may be advised of what we have in mind and the point that we shall wish to take up. I assume that there will be no objection on the part of the Senator from Indiana to at least a tacit understanding in that particular.

Mr. VAN NUYS. On the contrary, I think the Senator from Connecticut has made a very material contribution to the history and intentment of the Congress in the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I now move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill, and insert the provisions of Senate bill 2129 as passed yesterday, with one change; namely, on page 6, line 14, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall", so as to read:

And the President shall, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision—

And so forth.

Mr. VAN NUYS' amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 6233, and to insert:

TITLE I—COORDINATION OF EXECUTIVE BUREAUS IN THE INTEREST OF THE MORE EFFICIENT CONCENTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this title, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary, which regulations and orders shall be in writing and shall be published in accordance with the Federal Register Act of 1935: *Provided*, That the termination of this title shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this title and during the time that this title is in force: *Provided further*, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war: *Provided further*,

That no redistribution of functions shall provide for the transfer, consolidation, or abolition of the whole or any part of the General Accounting Office or of all or any part of its functions.

SEC. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this title the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, governmental corporations, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, any moneys heretofore and hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said functions, except to the extent hereafter authorized by the Congress in appropriation acts or otherwise.

SEC. 4. That should the President, in redistributing the functions among the executive agencies as provided in this title, conclude that any bureau should be abolished and it or their duties and functions conferred upon some other department or bureau or eliminated entirely, he shall report his conclusions to Congress with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this title are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this title is in force.

Upon the termination of this title all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this title to the contrary notwithstanding.

TITLE II—CONTRACTS

SEC. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any contracts in violation of existing law relating to limitation of profits: *Provided further*, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record under regulations prescribed by the President and when deemed by him not to be incompatible with the public interest.

TITLE III—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

SEC. 301. The first sentence of subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, and under such rules and regulations as

he may prescribe, by means of instructions, licenses, or otherwise—

"(A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency or securities, and

"(B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent, or prohibit any acquisition holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation, or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest,

by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and any property or interest of any foreign country or national thereof shall vest, when, as, and upon the terms, directed by the President, in such agency or person as may be designated from time to time by the President, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe such interest or property shall be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States, and such designated agency or person may perform any and all acts incident to the accomplishment or furtherance of these purposes; and the President shall, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision either before, during, or after the completion thereof, or relative to any interest in foreign property, or relative to any property in which any foreign country or any national thereof has or has had any interest, or as may be otherwise necessary to enforce the provisions of this subdivision, and in any case in which a report could be required, the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, require the production, or if necessary to the national security or defense, the seizure, of any books of account, records, contracts, letters, memoranda, or other papers, in the custody or control of such person; and the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, take other and further measures not inconsistent herewith for the enforcement of this subdivision.

"(2) Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same; and no person shall be held liable in any court for or in respect to anything done or omitted in good faith in connection with the administration of, or in pursuance of and in reliance on, this subdivision, or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder.

"(3) As used in this subdivision the term 'United States' means the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction in all cases, civil or criminal, arising under this subdivision in the Philippine Islands and concurrent jurisdiction with the district courts of the United States of all cases, civil or criminal, arising upon the high seas: *Provided, however*, That the foregoing shall not be construed as a limitation upon the power of the President, which is hereby conferred, to prescribe from time to time, definitions, not inconsistent with the purposes of this subdivision, for any or all of the terms used in this subdivision."

Sec. 302. All acts, actions, regulations, rules, orders, and proclamations heretofore taken, promulgated, made, or issued by, or pursuant to the direction of, the President or the Secretary of the Treasury under the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, which would have been authorized if the provisions of this act and the amendments made by it had been in effect, are hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed.

Sec. 303. Whenever, during the present war, the President shall deem that the public safety demands it, he may cause to be censored under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time establish, communications by mail, cable, radio, or other means of transmission passing between the United States and any foreign country he may from time to time specify, or which may be carried by any vessel or other means of transportation touching at any port, place, or Territory of the United States and bound to or from any foreign country. Any person who willfully evades or attempts to evade the submission of any such communication to such censorship or willfully uses or attempts to use any code or other device for the purpose of concealing from such censorship the intended meaning of such communication shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

TITLE IV—TIME LIMIT AND SHORT TITLE

Sec. 401. Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

Sec. 402. This act may be cited as the "First War Powers Act, 1941."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6233) was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. REYNOLDS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the motion made earlier by the Senator from North Carolina to proceed to the consideration of the bill then referred to by him been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us have that motion agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry. Was this bill reported yesterday?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was reported yesterday.

Mr. McNARY. So it is on the calendar?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is on the calendar. In answer to the Senator's inquiry I will state that it is listed as order of business 952, Senate bill 2126, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2126.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I very much hope the Senator from North Carolina will not press his motion to take up today the bill on the subject of draft ages. It seems to me that we have not the necessary information on which to determine what we should do. Personally, I do not know whether I want to oppose lowering the ages to 20 and 19, and I shall not know until I can read the testimony of General Hershey, the various Army officials, and the other men who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and the Military Affairs Committee of the House.

The hearings before the Senate committee are not on our desks. They are not available to Senators. The hearings before the House committee have only just been made partially available. I sent for one a short time ago, and obtained it from the House.

This is a question of numbers. All of us agree that we probably need a much larger Army than we have today. Certainly I am prepared to admit that that should be done; but how many men can be taken from the existing registration? Is it necessary yet to go on to those who are 20 and those who are 19? Is it necessary to register those from 45 to 65? Frankly, I do not know today, and if I should make an argument on the subject I should make it with no confidence that I was right.

This is a numerical calculation. There are only a million and a half men in the Army today, and 17,000,000 are already registered under the existing draft law; 1,200,000 men will attain the age of 21 years between now and the first of next January; and my impression is that the Army itself does not expect to draft more than a million men during the coming year.

Is this step necessary yet? I do not know; and I make a serious and solemn plea to the Senator from North Carolina not to put us in the position of opposing what we may not wish to oppose, of making arguments without sufficient facts, without an opportunity to go into the reasons and the facts that are presented. The reasons are not presented in the committee report; and any Senator who reads our committee report is still left completely in the dark as to the reasons for this action, and whether or not it is necessary.

So I ask the Senator from North Carolina if he will not be willing to make this matter a special order of business for tomorrow, instead of pressing it for action today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Naturally the members of the Committee on Military Affairs desire to bring about a favorable vote, and the passage of the bill. We have considered the bill to some extent. We have had before us representatives of the War Department, including General Hershey, of the Selective Service System, and those who are in charge of matters pertaining to national defense are particularly desirous that we give immediate consideration to the subject now in hand.

With reference to the testimony of General Hershey and others who are familiar with and have at hand and in mind the figures mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, I may add that it is not only the intention of the Senator from North Carolina to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the testimony of General Hershey, but it is also the intention of the Senator from North Carolina to bring to the attention of the Senate the statement of General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, himself, the statement of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, in regard to this matter, a statement by the Secretary of War, and statements by numbers of others.

Insofar as the availability of men is concerned, we shall be in a position during the debate to provide the able Senator from Ohio with answers to all his inquiries in reference to the availability of men in the draft, men who have already been registered, the number who have been called, the number who will be called, and the number we might count upon securing from those who registered in the draft, aged from 21 to 36, under section 2 of the original Selective Service Act.

In view of the fact that those in charge of our national defense, those who are in charge of the armed forces of the United States, are insisting on and requesting immediate consideration, I trust that without objection we may be permitted to proceed with the debate, in order that the bill may be explained to Senators now present, and those who may come in later, and who are interested in this question, which I concede is an extremely important one to the American people.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it not a fact that the House has already refused to lower the draft age as recommended by the Senate committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The House has not refused, according to my understanding. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House, under the direction of Chairman MAY, held hearings for several days, when a number of the authorities of the War Department, and some representing the Selective Service System were present and testified. I have before me the typewritten transcript of the hearings before our committee.

It is my understanding that in reporting the bill the House committee recommended that the age limits of those liable

to military service should be 21 to 44, inclusive, whereas after our consideration, on the recommendation of the President of the United States and the Secretary of War, of General Marshall himself, of General Hershey, the head of the Selective Service System, and of innumerable others, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in executive session yesterday, after having for several days considered the provisions of the bill, voted unanimously—that is to say, every member of the committee of 18 who was present voted—to adopt the recommendations of the President to require military liability or military service on the part of citizens between the ages of 19 and 44.

Mr. DANAHER. When did the House Committee on Military Affairs take the action stated?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand the House Committee on Military Affairs reported their bill fixing the ages from 21 to 44 day before yesterday.

Mr. DANAHER. What happened between the time when the House Committee on Military Affairs voted not to drop the age limit below 21, and yesterday, when the Senate Committee on Military Affairs voted to drop it to 19, which was so impelling on the minds of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, I am not aware of any information which might have been given to the whole House committee in public hearings, or to the committee or members of the committee in executive hearings, or any information which any member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House might have had other than that obtained in the committee in executive session, or in public hearings. I do know, however, that every member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate who was present during all the hearings and during the time when the questions were directed to the authorities who appeared, voted to report the bill including men from 19 to 44 years of age. They voted to report it for sundry reasons which I shall endeavor to explain.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. How long would it take to make available to us the report of the hearings which were held before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have before me now the transcript of all of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in typewritten form, but I have no knowledge that they have already been put into printed form.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to pay due tribute to the unanimity of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in whom I have great confidence, but the fact remains that on Monday or Tuesday of this week the House committee refused to lower the age from 21 to 19. Yet the Senate committee, on evidence not before us, has voted unanimously, the Senator says, to drop the age from 21 to 19. I may be very much in favor of dropping the age, too, but I certainly should like to know why it should be done, and I should like to see the transcript of the hearings,

just as the Senator from Ohio has so pointedly remarked that he would.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to our majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. On a motion to take up a bill I do not know that it is pertinent to inquire what may have actuated a committee of another body in taking action different from that taken by a committee of this body. It seems to me we might very well adopt the motion of the Senator from North Carolina to proceed to consider the bill. No one can tell how long it will be debated. My judgment is that probably the only controversial matter in the bill is the matter of age.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is true, section 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. And that is not a complicated problem. Men may have their views about it, and I might suggest to the Senator from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, in charge of the bill, that if as the debate proceeds there appears any good reason for withholding the vote on the bill until tomorrow, I do not know that there would be any objection to that. It seems to me we should proceed, however.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am sure there would be no objection to postponing the vote. Of course, in all fairness, I am not desirous of pressing for a vote today, as mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Every Member of this body is interested in the bill on account of its tremendous, widespread importance, and I would not insist upon a vote on the bill finally until every Member of this body who wanted information had an opportunity of securing it. As the debate proceeds in the Senate, if Senators have not, as a result of the debate, secured information which they desire and do not feel that they are in a position to make up their minds as to whether to support any one section or all the sections or the bill itself, naturally I should not object, and I do not believe any member of my committee would object, to the bill going over until tomorrow for a final vote, in order that Senators might have an opportunity to read the report of the hearings in printed form.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Conceding the necessity for expedition, I wish to ask the Senator a question bearing upon the necessity for this imminent action today. I wish to read the Senator three sentences from an Associated Press dispatch, and ask him if it is a correct presentation of the facts. I quote the Associated Press:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14.—War Department officials made clear today that it would be a long time, if ever, before any men outside the 21-35 age group are drafted for the Army, despite the proposal to require all aged 18 to 64, inclusive, to register.

I read another sentence:

Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, warning against any hysteria—

Warning against any hysteria—

in connection with the draft extension, said there was no way of telling when it might be

necessary to tap the reservoir of men outside the 21-35 group. "We can meet the situation today and tomorrow with the present draft-age limits of 21 to 35," Hershey said.

Now I submit to the Senator that if that is an accurate reflection of the situation as it has been presented officially to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, there certainly is no 24-hour pressure to proceed to a conclusion.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator, in answer, that I would not be so presumptuous as to undertake to say what the War Department intends. That is a matter for the War Department to determine. Insofar as General Hershey's statement is concerned, I naturally concede that we are not going to need these additional men today or tomorrow, but the Nation is now at war, and therefore I deem it our duty to meet the issue as it arises from day to day. I can see no necessity for putting off until tomorrow the question of deciding whether we shall reduce the registration age from 21 to 18 and raise it from 36 to 65, or for putting off the question of inducting into the service for military liability those who have reached the age of 19 and those up to the age of 44. Why put the matter off? The War Department officials have been here and have testified. General Hershey has been here and has testified. It is certainly conceded that we shall need millions of men if we are to bring about ultimate, complete victory, which we all agree we shall do. So why put off until tomorrow that which we can accomplish today? At least we can go into the methods of dealing with the question, at least we can discuss the measure, and then if there are Senators here who are not desirous of voting upon the bill today because they have not had the opportunity to read the hearings, they will have tonight for that purpose, and tomorrow we can vote on the measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's fervid dedication to the cause which we all embrace, and I have no quarrel with anything he has said. But the Senator has not answered my question. I should like to refer to my question, upon the answer to which I should like to base my judgment as to whether it is necessary to move today. I ask the Senator whether the Associated Press statement which I read is a correct reflection of the situation, namely, that General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, warning against any hysteria in connection with this action, announces that it will substantially be a long time, if ever, before the draft will reach below the age of 21?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If General Hershey made that statement, I would not undertake to deny any statement he made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, did he make it? That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know whether he made the statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator think he would like to have a day to find out whether General Hershey made the statement?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not think it makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It makes a great deal of difference to me.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think the first thing this Nation should do is to make a tabulation of its manpower available in order to—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with that statement 1,000 percent. I am not objecting to the registration completely. Without any doubt whatever we ought to know what our manpower is between the ages of 18 and 65.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is what the bill calls for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The bill also reduces the draft age to a point where we have no business reducing it unless it is necessary. If it is necessary, of course, we must do it. I am asking the Senator whether the Selective Service Director has said it is not necessary for some time to come.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know that such a statement was made by General Hershey.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Neither do I.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I assume it was, since it is authored by the Associated Press, a most reliable organization. But since I do not know, I cannot undertake to say whether he made it or whether he did not. General Hershey is the head of the Selective Service organization, and General Hershey certainly would not have appeared before the House committee and before the Senate committee on yesterday, and the day before, and the day before that, and testified with regard to this matter, unless he was interested in the passage of such a law. I shall in the course of this discussion bring to the Senate's attention the testimony of General Hershey, not only before the House committee but his testimony before the Senate committee.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wanted to suggest that I do not know whether the article which the Senator read purports to quote what General Hershey said in the committee, or whether it is from a statement he gave out, or whether it is a quotation of something he said otherwise; but in either case it is difficult to point out a single sentence, from what may be the long testimony of a military officer, and base any opinion upon it. It must be qualified by other things he said in connection with the whole program. It seems that on a motion to take up a bill we cannot accurately interpret something that a military officer, or a Senator, or anyone else has said, based simply upon an isolated sentence that someone picks out of a long statement and uses for publicity purposes. Whatever General Hershey said before the committee undoubtedly appears in the hearings, and I certainly trust that printed copies of them may be available today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say that we have the hearings before us in typewritten form, and it is the intention of the Senator from North Carolina to bring them to the attention of this body.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator will.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Where are the hearings? If I could have a copy of them, I should be very glad to see what General Hershey said. I do not have a copy of the hearings on my desk.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not have a printed copy of the hearings. I have a typewritten copy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly there are no printed copies. The testimony is not generally available to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say in answer to that question that the hearings will be ready in printed form tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I recall very well what General Hershey said before the committee. I do not think the A. P. dispatch which the Senator from Michigan has quoted is a correct interpretation of General Hershey's position at all. I recall that General Hershey told us it was his business to have the men ready when they were called for by the War Department. He said that was his job. He knows nothing about when they will be needed. He said he simply writes the checks. He compared his position to that of a banker. When the money is called for the banker has to have the money. General Hershey said that when the Department calls for the men he wants the men there so he can supply them. He is in no position to know when the War Department will need the men. He made that very clear to us. That will appear time after time in the testimony. So I do not think the press dispatch which has been quoted is a correct interpretation of General Hershey's attitude toward the passage of this bill. I think every member of the committee knows that General Hershey wants the measure passed and wants it passed promptly, so that he will be assured of the men when they are called for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator from Colorado concede that the establishment of the falsity of this quotation is as important from his point of view as is the establishment of its truth?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with that statement; but as our leader has stated, I do not think we can pick up a stray sentence somewhere and pin a whole decision on it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have not picked up a stray sentence. I have picked up the opening summary made by the Associated Press in respect to the existing situation. All I am asking is whether it is true, and that I have an opportunity to find out whether it is true. If it is not true, I want to know it as much as does the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All I am trying to say is that I do not think it is a correct interpretation of General Hershey's attitude; and I am sure that after

the Senator from Michigan reads the testimony of General Hershey he will agree that General Hershey had no such thought in mind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I want an opportunity to do. That is all I am asking for. I cannot do it now, because the hearings are not available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator should have the opportunity of reading the hearings.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak only because the Senator from Colorado seemed to bind all the members of the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, by what he said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I had no such intention.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator spoke of what we all felt.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senators who sit across the aisle that for many days I very patiently listened to General Hershey and the other military witnesses. At the end of that time—and I am merely expressing my own opinion—I had heard so many conflicting and contradictory expressions of opinion upon this very issue that I have no idea, after having listened to all the testimony, what the attitude of the Army is at the present time with respect to immediately taking into service boys between the ages of 19 and 21.

Senators will find in the record, when it comes into their possession, several statements exactly indicative of what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said—that there is little probability of any boy between the ages of 19 and 21 ever being called. They will find other statements to the effect that the Army considers this group of boys the best Army material. It may be concluded from those statements and from many other statements that the Army expects to use them immediately. So I say to distinguished Senators that, in my opinion, when they read the hearings they will not be very much further advanced than they now are.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no disposition to delay this matter, but the House is now considering a similar bill. I am informed that there is no probability of the House bill being passed today. If it is passed today, it will be very late. If the motion which is now before the Senate should be agreed to, would it not be well further to agree that there will be no vote today, so that if the House bill is passed today and is sent to the Senate tomorrow, we can then substitute the Senate bill for the House bill, or make arrangements for immediate action?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, I am not desirous of pressing for a vote on the bill today if it is desirable to defer the vote until tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am reminded that situations similar to this have arisen many times. I recall the practice of the Senate. I have no objection to immediate consideration of the bill, but in view of what has been stated, I do object to its immediate disposition.

Heretofore when the record of hearings has not been made available to Senators we have discussed measures informally and deferred the vote until a day or two later. That has always been the practice. It is a wholesome one and a fair one. Senators who are not on the committee should have an opportunity to read the testimony. It now appears that there is only one copy available—a typewritten copy in the hands of the chairman. I assume that by tomorrow the record will be available in printed form for all Members of the Senate. We cannot expect an intelligent vote unless Senators have access to the evidence taken before the committee. That is perfectly plain. The practice to which I refer has been followed in the Senate ever since I first came to the Senate, nearly a quarter of a century ago, and I insist that it is a wise practice. It is one which has the sanction of usage in a case such as this. The chairman of the committee may discuss the matter, and then it may go over until opportunity is afforded to Senators to read the testimony. Then we can vote tomorrow or the day following.

I submit that we should follow the usual practice, and should now come to an agreement that there will be no vote today, and that tomorrow opportunity will be given to every Senator to express his view after familiarizing himself with the printed testimony.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in this discussion I suggested that we go ahead with consideration of the bill, and that if it should develop that there is any reason for not voting today, it should go over until tomorrow. The only difficulty about that is that nearly always when we enter into an agreement of that sort at the beginning Senators feel at liberty to leave the Chamber, and do not remain to listen to the discussion.

I should not like to agree now on any hour tomorrow when we should vote. I think that a delay of 24 hours in the consideration of the bill will probably not be a vital matter. However, I hope that officers of the Senate will see to it that the hearings are printed and made available for every Senator. I hope that can be done this afternoon, even if the Printing Office finds it necessary to put on a special shift of printers to do the work. Therefore I suggest that the motion of the Senator from North Carolina be agreed to, and that we have an understanding that there will be no vote today on the bill or on the controversial age question.

Mr. McNARY. And that fair opportunity be given tomorrow for debate upon the subject.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is perfectly agreeable to me. I hope it is agreeable to other Senators.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, all the minority and those associated with the minority are asking for is a fair opportunity to determine the issues involved in any bill so that they may cast an intelligent vote. We want to go along; we are going along, and have been going along, and expect to continue to go along if we have fair treatment, which we know we shall receive.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina very much appreciates what the able Senator from Oregon has stated. I wish to repeat that there is no disposition whatsoever on my part to insist upon a vote today, either on the question of age limits insofar as liability for military service is concerned, or on any other section which pertains to registration or military liability. I know that Senators desire to familiarize themselves with the testimony. I appreciate the suggestion which has been made. It is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. With that understanding—and there will be no difficulty about it—I suggest that a vote be taken on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

PRICE CONTROL—OILS AND FATS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of 28 Members of the Senate I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have it read and immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 209), as follows:

Resolved, That the Price Control Administrator be, and he hereby is, requested to suspend the order issued by him on the 12th day of December 1941, fixing a ceiling on oils and fats, and take no further action in the matter of ceilings on oils and fats until final action has been taken on the pending price-control bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask that the clerk read the names of the Senators sponsoring the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the names will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The resolution is offered by Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BILBO, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. DOXEY, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. LEE, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HILL, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. PEPPER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the request for immediate consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. McNARY. I am wholly uninformed and unaware as to the situation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to make a statement in explanation of the resolution.

Mr. McNARY. I should be glad to hear the statement; but in fairness to every-

one concerned, I think we should probably have statements from both sides.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am hopeful that there will be only one side.

Mr. McNARY. I should prefer to have action taken tomorrow or another day. Is the matter impending, immediate, or emergent?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not exactly; but the situation is somewhat similar to that in connection with another measure which was under discussion; and some of us would like to get away.

Mr. McNARY. I wish we all might.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The exchanges are closed, and all the markets for sales of these commodities are closed; and from that standpoint I think it is a matter of emergency.

I should like to make a statement; and then, if the Senator does not want the resolution considered it will be all right to put it over.

Mr. McNARY. I should be very glad to have the Senator make a statement in explanation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As the Senator from Oregon knows, 28 Members of the Senate—practically all the Senators from the regions affected by the order which applies to cottonseed oil and lard, desire to have the resolution agreed to at once. The order issued last Friday night by Mr. Henderson in his position as price administrator fixes a ceiling on edible oils and fats. I shall not undertake any discussion of his right to issue the order; I am assuming, for the purpose of this discussion, that he had the right to do so. I will merely point out, representing the group of 28 Senators, the reason why we think the Senate should agree to the resolution.

The order did not fix the price as of the closing of the exchanges on the day it was issued. If it had done so, we would not now be making our request. Instead of fixing the price as of that time, the order was made retroactive, in the nature of an ex post facto order, and went back to November 26, a date arbitrarily selected—we do not know why it was selected—at which time the prices of cottonseed and cottonseed oil were much lower than they were the day the order was issued.

The result is, as I have said, that the whole trade has been thrown into confusion. The effect is a very great loss to the owners—farmers and dealers—of a large quantity, nearly a million tons, of cottonseed, and to the independent crushers of cottonseed, who have on hand, and ready for the crushing process, nearly 2,000,000 tons of seed, and who have a very large quantity of cottonseed oil which they have crushed from seed bought from the farmers at a price higher than the price Mr. Henderson has fixed in his order.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have just come in, and I did not hear all the Senator's statement. Is not one of the effects of the order that it virtually takes money out of the pockets of the little manufacturers and the little dealers, and puts it into the

hands of the big concerns, which are commonly called the trusts?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think there is any question about that; the order has given the processors a great windfall. In connection with the order fixing this price, let me say to Senators, there is no sale for cottonseed oil except to a few refiners; and the refiners own approximately one-half the "crude" mills in the South. The others are independent mills. Of course, the independent mills must sell their oil to the refiners. There is no other outlet for it.

When the order was made fixing the price of crude cottonseed oil 125 points lower than the market price—from 12½ down to 11¼—it provided a cheap price on crude cottonseed oil for processors; and, although I do not know why it did so, the order excepted from its effect and its operation shortening made by the refiners from cottonseed oil. In other words, they get it cheaper under the order, and their product made from cottonseed oil is expressly excepted from the operation of the order. There is no appeal; there is no judicial procedure provided.

This matter comes up when we are just about ready to pass a price-control measure which will contain formulas in some form to guide and direct the Price Administrator in fixing price ceilings.

Now let me say, for the benefit of Members of the Senate who are not on the Banking and Currency Committee, that at a meeting of the committee this morning it was agreed that after the appointment of a subcommittee, which has been appointed, the full committee will meet on the last Friday in December—before Congress reconvenes in January. I do not know the calendar date, but it is just 2 or 3 days before Congress will meet. It is further understood—the majority leader was present, and he participated in the understanding, and there was unanimous agreement by the members of the committee—that every possible effort will be made to have the bill ready to be taken up on the floor of the Senate immediately when the session convenes after the first of January.

So the resolution merely requests Mr. Henderson to suspend further action until the Congress shall have an opportunity to act on the price-control measure.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the resolution require him to rescind the order already made and to establish the status quo as of that time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct—to preserve the status quo as of the time he made the order; then, if he shall subsequently make an order, he will make it under the measure which we shall consider early in January.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon in a moment.

We are all very much interested, as the Senator can see, in getting action on the measure. We want to have the markets reopened. The order has brought about terrible financial suffering. We are all

flooded with telegrams from all sections of the Cotton Belt. Every Senator from that entire section is intensely interested, as the Senator from Oregon can well see.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion let me say that I took occasion to ask Mr. Henderson to state why he set the price on cottonseed oil, and I have received a reply from his office, given to me by Mr. Lee in his office, to the effect that he set the price in order to protect the consumers. We all know that the consumers of cottonseed-oil products buy cottonseed-oil products from retail grocers, and we can go anywhere in the land and will be unable to find how the order has benefited any consumer, because there is too much play between the producer and the consumer. Mr. Henderson sets the prices on the farmer, and the farmer is the one who pays the bill. The consumer does not receive any benefit.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The resolution simply makes a request of Mr. Henderson; we feel sure that he will observe a request made by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am convinced from what has occurred this morning that it will be very difficult to enforce a price-fixation bill if we are going to disturb it every few days by a resolution. That statement does not concede that there is any real authority in the Administrator to enforce this edict upon his part.

I recall some months ago what occurred in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when Mr. Henderson was there. I asked him directly to exhibit his authority, by statute or otherwise, or even under an Executive order. He was unable to do so. I think the testimony clearly indicated, in response to some questions I propounded, that he was only acting upon the theory that there would be general compliance with his request. That, unquestionably, is the only authority he is exercising in this instance. But the pending proposal is a manifestation of what will occur if we shall enact a price-control bill. Those displeased will present resolutions requesting the Senate to take action to suspend orders made by the Price Administrator. We find today a number of Members of the Senate, representing the South most capably, asking that the Senate express its views concerning a matter of which I have no knowledge at all. I do not think a third of the Senators have any knowledge of the subject. I think, if the issue is drawn here, it should be thoroughly considered, and it would be fair to the Administrator to ask him to give us a statement concerning his attitude. There must be some reason why the Price Administrator, so-called, has enforced his order on the cotton producers, but here we are proposing to express an ex parte view and to say that the action which has been taken is wrong, and that the Administrator should not have taken it. The Senate is asked to confirm the action of a very representative group in the Senate.

I do not like the policy; I do not like the practice; I can foresee what we are coming to. If we desire to legislate in that field, it should be done by a repealing or

modifying statute and not by resolutions similar to the one now presented.

I think I may say that I have exhibited a great deal of fairness in my attitude toward cotton and those interested in cotton, and my position has been well known. I think I expressed myself most generously a few days ago when a bill was offered by the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I entertain a very warm, healthy, and pleasant feeling for those engaged in growing and making cotton, but I cannot sit idly by and permit a practice to become established here that would, in the future, embarrass every Member of the Senate.

For the reasons I have stated, I hope the very reasonable and able Senator from Georgia will permit this resolution to remain on the table, if he does not want it referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction. It should not go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for that committee has no jurisdiction in this case. Jurisdiction has been conferred by action of the Senate on the Committee on Banking and Currency. Thus the resolution should either go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, or remain on the table, to be brought up under the rule after an adjournment as a resolution coming over from a previous day for automatic consideration, or it could be called up by any Senator any day on his own responsibility. That would be fair; that would give an opportunity to the so-called Price Administrator—I speak of him with no disrespect; but I am sure he is without authority, although probably acting in the best of good faith and intention—to make a statement, for I submit that we may have to determine whether there are two sides to this question and not only one side to it.

With that statement, I object to the consideration of the resolution today, and I suggest to the Senator that he either at this time have the resolution referred to the committee or have it go over for a day, and it can be brought up at any time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under objection, the resolution goes over under the rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, under the rule, if the resolution lies on the table, can it be called up tomorrow for action?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate adjourns today, it may be called up tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will then withdraw the request for consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, have there been any hearings upon this bill at all?

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is not a bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, upon the proposal which has been submitted by the Senator from Alabama, have there been any hearings or any testimony?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; the order of the Administrator was only issued a few days ago. It put everything into confusion and disrupted the markets. Not only with respect to cottonseed oil but with respect to other oils and fats.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish the Senator from Alabama would make that point clear. The impression seems to prevail in the Senate that the action taken by the Administrator affects only cottonseed. I was advised by the office of the Price Administrator that it affects 1,800 different fats and oils derived from vegetables, plants, and animals. It certainly affects the soy bean oil market, the lard market, and the market for all fats and oils. It is not confined merely to cottonseed. Perhaps the situation is more acute with respect to cottonseed now because this happens to be the exact season when cottonseed is being marketed and crushed, but the order also applies to all vegetable fats and oils; it affects the producers of soy beans, and indirectly affects the butter market.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I have not read the order; it has not been available; but my understanding is the same as his, that it applies to all edible oils and fats, of every sort and character and description, except butter and shortening made from other than cottonseed oil.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the resolution which has been offered is a simple Senate resolution. If adopted it would have no force and effect in law save as a request backed by the sentiment of the Senate. The order which is asked to be rescinded has had a vast effect upon a large interest in my State. In my State there are a great number of mills which buy cottonseed and process it into oil and cake and other incidental products. These mills have purchased the cottonseed in my State at a higher price than will be permitted under the order issued by Mr. Henderson, and, as the result, stand to lose a considerable sum. The mills have sent me telegrams and letters protesting against this order, and naturally they are asking for some relief.

Mr. President, I do not desire to place in the RECORD copies of all the messages and letters which have come to me, but I do desire, if I may have permission, to place in the RECORD, as a part of my statement, a memorandum which has been handed me by some one qualified to pass upon this question. I stand sponsor for the memorandum, and ask that it may be made a part of my remarks.

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

The memorandum is as follows:

While it may be possible farmers have sold 95 percent of their this season's seed, surely this fact alone is unworthy of any honest, equitable, or fair consideration of the matter, for ginners and oil mills may have 25 percent in seed or products unsold, and the futures market is carrying more than 1,500 contracts, offsetting hedges.

Futures markets, ginners, and oil mills have relied on Mr. Henderson's assurance about September 1 and following his announcement after the close of the market August 28 to the effect that futures markets would

not be disturbed unless speculation brought about unreasonably high prices.

December futures contracts closed on August 28 at 12.43 and on September 2, the next trading day thereafter, and following Mr. Henderson's assurance, December closed at 12.86 and during the succeeding 30 days and in perfectly normal markets December advanced to above 14 cents on October 2. December 12 December futures contracts closed at 13.65 bid offered at 13.95, or 25 to 50 points below the high of October 2.

After the close of the market at this price, Mr. Henderson announced his proposed ceiling of 12.50. In doing this, and to express it in the very mildest of terms, Mr. Henderson broke faith with the futures markets and with the cottonseed oil trade as a whole.

His argument that his action is of minor importance to the farmers because they have sold 95 percent of their seed is a disgraceful one coming from a Government official, and does violence to the most elementary principles of honesty and fair dealing. On its face it is deliberately designed to unwarrantably rook one group of American citizens simply because it affects only to a minor degree another group. Nothing could be more undemocratic, more dictatorial, or more contrary to the principles for which we are fighting; and in the last analysis and in the long run could do no greater harm to the cotton farmers themselves.

The only free money which the poorer class of cotton farmers, and which constitutes the vast majority, have comes from their cottonseed. Farmers have no facilities for holding their seed; excessive moisture content often prohibits holding, but, regardless of these two facts, the farmers' urgent need for free money requires them to sell seed as fast as harvested.

Therefore, someone must carry 75 percent of the seed, or their products for distribution between the end of one harvest and the beginning of another. The burden of carrying this has heretofore been distributed between the ginners, oil mills, refiners, and the futures markets. The ultimate consumer picks up the load only from day to day. The present is not the only cotton season. There will be another cotton season next year. If the cottonseed and cottonseed oil trade is faced with the unbearable condition which Mr. Henderson would impose, who will stand in the breach between the farmer and the ultimate consumer next year and make a ready cash market for the farmers' seed day after day as they bring it to the gin?

If Mr. Henderson considered the price above 12.50 to be unreasonable, why did he not so announce on August 28, when December closed at 12.43?

Is there a scintilla of honesty in his withholding his announcement until the cottonseed oil trade had functioned, as was their custom in taking up the burden between the farmer and the ultimate consumer, and assuming that burden from harvest end to succeeding harvest?

As to the reasonableness of Mr. Henderson's price of 12.50, it is worthy of note that in June 1917 futures contracts reached 16.25, and in May 1918 they reached 20.25, at which price a ceiling was placed by the Government Food Administration. In other words, the ceiling fixed by President Wilson's administration in 1918 was 62 percent higher than that proposed by Mr. Henderson.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator from Alabama that when the question of the tax on oils and fats was before the Finance Committee it proved to be a very complex and elaborate question. Coming from a State which is a great consumer of fats and oils, both individu-

ally and in a number of different industries, I certainly hope that there is something to which the Senator can direct me and which I can read or study in anticipation of a vote on this proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We are not trying to seek anything by this resolution except time; that is all. We are asking the Administrator to suspend his order and that it may go over until the Congress acts, if it shall act, and gives him authority and a formula under which he may act. That is all we are asking.

Mr. LODGE. I presume the Senator will have a statement to make giving the details in justification for this proposal at the proper time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I will be glad to go into the matter further, as will other Senators. This is not a matter in which merely the Senator from Alabama is interested. Do not let the Senator get the impression that this is an individual proposition. It is a matter of concern to the constituents of all the Senators who sponsor the resolution and to a great many others. We have been bombarded by our constituents—farmers, cotton mills, and many other interested parties—urging us to do something to obtain relief from this totally unexpected order. No hearings were held on it by the Department. The Administrator consulted nobody. The proper officials of the Department of Agriculture, I am informed, were not consulted about it. Like a bolt out of the sky came this order which upset values and took value out of the cottonseed still in the farmers' hands, cottonseed in the crushers waiting to be crushed, and out of the raw product of the cottonseed. There is a degree of consternation, and all we are asking, I will say to the Senator, is not the writing of any statute on the subject or the taking of any legislative action, but we are asking for delay—a suspension of this order—so that the trade may go ahead about its business for the next 2 or 3 weeks; that is all.

I have pointed out to the Senate that there is a clear-cut understanding by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the majority leader that the bill which will regulate and control price fixing will be taken up, if the Senate is willing to take it up—the majority leader will do what he can to have it taken up—the very first thing after Congress reassembles about the 5th of January. So no indefinite delay is sought. We simply ask to delay it long enough to let Congress itself write the formula under which these price-fixing orders shall be made. That is all we are asking.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not seen the resolution because it has not been printed. Am I to understand that it simply seeks to prevent the Price Administrator from interfering with the prices of these oils and fats?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It requests him to suspend his order and postpone final action until Congress acts on the price-control bill.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think there is a likelihood that similar action would be requested by every other interest in the country if we should take it in the case of one?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Price Administrator should make retroactive orders as injurious as this one has been, I think there ought to be such requests; but I do not know of any other orders he has made which have been so injurious to so many persons as this order has been. If the Senate makes this request, I do not think the Price Administrator will make any more orders of that sort until his authority is established and formulas are adopted and standards are set up to govern him in issuing price-fixing orders.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement at this time about this order of O. P. A. C. S., and to offer for the RECORD a letter from Mr. Oscar Johnston, of Mississippi, one of the best-informed men on agricultural problems in the United States. He is president of the National Cotton Council of America, and a man who knows more about marketing and marketing conditions than a great many men who are here in Washington engaged in price fixing, particularly as they apply to agricultural products.

I wish to call attention to one or two facts.

This order was issued on December 12, but the price ceiling was fixed on the basis of the levels prevailing on November 26. The order applies to all fats and oils except butter and perhaps one or two other exceptions. It is, of course, a fact known to all who have given study to it that many of the oils and fats are interchangeable. But this is the situation which has been created by Mr. Henderson's order, or his organization's order:

Early in the season a statement was issued and action was taken which had the effect of driving down the price of oils. Thereafter, some modification of the action taken was made, and the O. P. A. C. S. became a party to what is tantamount to an agreement with the producers of oils and fats in this country, and, as the producers and processors contend, made the statement publicly that no further effort would be made to place a ceiling on cottonseed and cottonseed oils, peanuts, and peanut oils, and other oils, including soybeans, unless there was a run-away price which threatened to get out of hand. Nobody wanted a run-away price. At the time of the peak movement of cottonseed to the market, when the crushers were buying the cottonseed, O. P. A. C. S. tacitly approved of the movement at the then level of prices.

Now, get the picture: When cottonseed was moving and reaching the peak of the movement, O. P. A. C. S. sat still, in view of its former statement that no ceiling would be placed on oils unless run-away prices were threatened, allowed a great part of the cottonseed to move to the market at a certain level of prices, and then, on December 12, when prices were back where they had been when a large part of the crop was actually moving to the market, fixed a ceiling, but not at the level of prices on December 12, but at the level of prices on November 26.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but let me first make a further statement.

Mr. Johnston summarizes the whole thing in this paragraph, and he is entirely correct. This is a letter written to Mr. Henderson. He says:

Your action may not have been so intended, but, regardless of intent, the action constitutes a serious breach of good faith on the part of a governmental agency.

And this is sound.

No governmental agency or bureau is ever justified in imposing an arbitrary and artificial ceiling upon the price of cottonseed oil, or any other manufactured product, at a level below the maximum price which prevailed for cottonseed oil, or any other such product, during the marketing season when processors were acquiring their raw materials at prices based upon the then prevailing prices of the products of those raw materials.

And O. P. A. C. S. tacitly approved the prices at which the raw material moved into the hands of the processors, and then fixed a ceiling at a prior date in the season, which means bankruptcy to many of the small crushers.

This is what happens:

The buyer of cotton seed, the small crusher, goes to his local bank and makes arrangements to buy seed. He buys them on a market that Mr. Henderson has tacitly approved. He buys them at a level that O. P. A. C. S. has approved during the peak of the season. He puts up his money. The capital borrowed is invested in this product. He cannot crush all these seeds. He can crush only what he can conveniently store or can immediately sell. The smaller crusher does not hedge. They think, over here, that he hedges; but the ignorance of some men who are fixing prices is simply abysmal.

They think they hedge, but they do not hedge. The big refineries hedge, the big crushers hedge, but the little crusher does not, as a rule, hedge. He cannot hedge cottonseed; he cannot hedge peanuts; he cannot hedge other fats. He can only hedge in the oil market, and he does not do it, and he cannot do it, practically. So he borrows money, buys at the prevailing market price, which has the apparent approval of Mr. Henderson, and then Mr. Henderson puts the price under the level at which he has bought his raw material, meaning, of course, that the oil crusher will be bankrupt, and the farmer who has yet held his cottonseed—and many of them do hold it for the purpose of purchasing fertilizer in 1942 or in the subsequent year—will stand a terrific loss.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not desire to interrupt my colleague in the very able argument he is making, and I know he will make this matter entirely clear to the Senate. I hope, however, that he will point out in terms of dollars and cents the effect of this order issued by Mr. Henderson. O. P. A. C. S. stood by and saw the little ginners and the little independent crushers purchase cottonseed at \$60 a ton. Then, without warning, at this season of the year, when they could not possibly have disposed of those seeds or the oil therefrom, he has fixed the price of oil on the basis of

slightly more than \$51 a ton for cottonseed, imposing a loss of practically \$9 a ton on hundreds of little businessmen, small ginners, and independent crushers, scattered throughout the entire cotton section. All farmers who have seed naturally sustain the same loss.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague is entirely correct; and the loss is terrific. No one in the South wants to see run-away prices, wants to see inflation, in the sense of rapid price rise, which will be destructive, and more destructive than even direct taxes; but at the same time, when early in the season an effort was made to hold the price of oils in check, and when throughout the season the Price Administration allowed everybody interested in cottonseed and peanuts to go in the market and buy at a price, and when they now propose to fix a ceiling which will crucify them, it simply cannot be justified. Mr. Johnston's conclusion is eminently sound.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that yesterday Mr. Henderson and two or three of his assistants appeared before a committee, not a regularly constituted committee of the Senate, but a group of Senators who are interested in this subject. He said he desired to stop what he called "run-away prices." If that was the purpose, why did he fix some other price than the price on the day fixed by the order? Why did he not fix December 12? Why did he select another date? Did the Senator understand that Mr. Henderson ever explained that feature of the matter? I did not understand him to explain it at all. In my judgment, he could not explain it. If he wanted to stop run-away prices, why in the world did he not select the day when he issued the order, which was December 12? Why did he go back of that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me to interject, several weeks prior to the issuance of the order prices were higher than when Mr. Henderson made the order. It was not the result of any run-away prices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Inasmuch as we are discussing Mr. Henderson's order, and some of the Senators have suggested that they had not had opportunity to read the order, I ask unanimous consent to present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the order issued by Mr. Henderson, together with my telegram to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

PRICE SCHEDULE NO. 53—FATS AND OILS

The outbreak of war has disrupted trade in certain fats and oils with the result that normal price relationships are disturbed and inflationary price increases threaten to develop. Supplies of domestic fats and oils are substantial, and no serious shortage for defense or civilian requirements is in prospect. Nevertheless, because of recent speculative activity, the danger of serious inflation and price spiraling has made it imperative to issue

immediately a schedule temporarily establishing maximum prices. Because of the interchangeability of fats and oils it is necessary that maximum prices be established for all fats and oils. To effect this purpose of price stabilization it is necessary to limit prices to those which preceded the recent speculative and sharp rise in prices which distorted the normal price relationship between the various fats and oils. The date of November 26, 1941, when the closing price of the December future for cottonseed oil on the New York Produce Exchange was 12.50 cents per pound best accomplishes this purpose.

Should unwarranted price rises occur at stages of distribution not covered in this schedule, appropriate action will be taken by this Office.

Accordingly, under the authority vested in me by Executive Order No. 8734, it is hereby directed that:

Sec. 1351.151. Maximum prices for fats and oils:

(a) On and after December 13, 1941, no person shall sell, offer to sell, deliver, or transfer fats or oils, and no person shall buy, offer to buy, or accept delivery of fats or oils at prices higher than the maximum prices, except that contracts entered into prior to December 13, 1941, providing for a price higher than the maximum prices, may be carried out at the contract price. The maximum prices shall include commissions and all other charges.

(b) For any kind, grade, or quality of fat or oil the maximum shipping point price shall be the highest shipping point price at which the seller sold, on November 26, 1941, such kind of fat or oil of approximately the same grade, quality, and amount to a similar purchaser for nearby delivery. The maximum delivered price shall be this maximum shipping point price plus actual transportation costs.

(c) In the event that the maximum price cannot be determined under subsection (b) above, the maximum shipping point price shall be determined as follows:

(1) When the sales price per pound, exclusive of transportation charges, in the seller's most recent sale between October 1, 1941, and November 26, 1941, for nearby delivery to a similar purchaser, of approximately the same kind, grade, quality, and amount, exceeded the December future price of cottonseed oil on the day of such sale, the maximum shipping point price shall be 12.50 cents plus the number of points by which such sales price, exclusive of transportation charges, exceeded such future price; or

(2) When the sales price per pound, exclusive of transportation charges, in the seller's most recent sale between October 1, 1941, and November 26, 1941, for nearby delivery to a similar purchaser of approximately the same kind, grade, quality, and amount, was less than the December future price of cottonseed oil on the day of such sale, the maximum shipping point price shall be 12.50 cents minus the number of points by which such sales price, exclusive of transportation charges, was less than such future price.

(d) In the event that the maximum price cannot be determined under either subsection (b) or (c) above, the maximum shipping point price shall be the highest price for which approximately the same kind, grade, quality, and amount of such fat or oil was purchased by the purchaser from any other seller on November 26, 1941. The maximum delivered price shall be this maximum shipping point price plus actual transportation costs.

(e) In all other cases, the maximum prices shall be the market price for such product of the same kind, grade, quality, amount, and type of purchaser on November 26, 1941.

¹ Secs. 1351.151 to 1351.158, inclusive, issued pursuant to the authority contained in Executive Orders Nos. 8734, 8875, 6 F. R. 1917, 4483.

(f) The above prices shall be the maximum prices for all transactions except for cottonseed oil and lard futures contracts traded on the New York Produce Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade, respectively. For such contracts the maximum prices shall be the closing prices on these exchanges as of November 26, 1941, for all the months then traded in as follows:

Cottonseed oil	
	Cents per pound
For delivery during 1941:	
December.....	12.50
1942:	
January.....	12.47
February.....	12.47
March.....	12.49
April.....	12.49
May.....	12.50
June.....	12.50
July.....	12.53

Lard, Chicago	
	Cents per pound
For delivery during 1941:	
December.....	9.77
1942:	
January.....	9.95
March.....	11.32
May.....	11.52
July.....	11.72

Sec. 1351.152. Less than maximum prices: Lower prices than the maximum prices established by this schedule may be charged, demanded, paid, or offered.

Sec. 1351.153. Records and reports: Any person receiving or delivering fats or oils on and after December 13, 1941, under any contract entered into previous thereto at prices higher than the maximum prices established by the schedule shall report such delivery or receipt to the Office of Price Administration within 10 days thereof stating (a) the name and address of the buyer and seller; (b) the actual date of the contract; (c) the date of delivery or receipt; and (d) the price, quantity, and description of the product sold. A transaction involving the transfer of less than \$250 need not be reported.

Every person making any purchase or sale of fats or oils on and after December 13, 1941, shall keep for inspection by the Office of Price Administration, for a period of not less than 1 year, complete and accurate records of each such purchase and sale amounting to \$500 or more, including the date thereof, the name of the purchaser, the price paid or received, and the grade, quality, and amount sold.

Every person affected by this schedule shall submit such reports to the Office of Price Administration as it may from time to time require.

Sec. 1351.154. Modification of the schedule: Persons complaining of hardship or inequity in the operation of this schedule may apply to the Office of Price Administration for approval of any modification thereof, or exception therefrom: *Provided*, That no applications under this section will be considered unless filed by persons complying with this schedule.

Sec. 1351.155. Enforcement: In the event of refusal or failure to abide by the price limitations, record requirements, or other provisions of this schedule, or in the event of any evasion or attempt to evade the price limitations or other provisions of this schedule, the Office of Price Administration will make every effort to assure (a) that the Congress and the public are fully informed thereof; (b) that the powers of government, both State and Federal, are fully exerted in order to protect the public interest and the interests of those persons who comply with this schedule; and (c) that the procurement services of the Government are requested to refrain from selling to or purchasing from those persons who fail to comply with this schedule. Persons who have evidence of the offer, receipt, demand, or payment of prices higher than the maximum prices, or of any

evasion or effort to evade the provisions hereof, or of speculation or manipulation of prices of fats or oils, or of the hoarding or accumulating of unnecessary inventories thereof, are urged to communicate with the Office of Price Administration.

Sec. 1351.156. Evasion: The price limitations set forth in this schedule shall not be evaded whether by direct or indirect methods in connection with a purchase, sale, delivery, or transfer of fats or oils, or by way of premium, commission, service, transportation, or other charge, or by any other trade understanding, by making discounts or other terms and conditions of sale more onerous to the purchaser than those available or in effect on November 26, 1941, or by any other means.

Sec. 1351.157. Definitions: When used in this schedule, the term—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, or other business entity dealing in fats or oils.

(b) "Fats and oils" means all fats and oils, whether raw, crude, or refined (including olive oil and lard) sold in tank cars, drums, tierces, and sacks, except "essential" mineral and chemical oils, butter, and finished fats and oils products not specified above.

(c) "December future price of cottonseed oil" means the closing price of the December future contract calling for delivery in December of bleachable prime summer yellow cottonseed oil as established on the New York Produce Exchange.

(d) "Points" means the number of hundredths of 1 cent per pound.

(e) "Nearby delivery" means delivery not more than 60 days after the date upon which the contract was entered into, except where, by well-established custom, the term is used to describe deliveries within a somewhat longer period.

Sec. 1351.158. Effective date of the schedule: This schedule shall become effective on December 13, 1941.

Issued this 12th day of December 1941.

DECEMBER 16, 1941.

Mr. LEON HENDERSON,
Price Control Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

Confirming telephone conversation with your Mr. Lee in answer to my telegram of December 13, asking why you set a maximum price on cottonseed oil, your answer was that the price was set to protect the consumers. I congratulate you on such a worthy motive but I cannot approve your roundabout and ineffective method. Consumers buy their vegetable shortening and oleomargarine at retail stores and not from farmers, therefore, if you sincerely want to protect consumers why don't you set the retail prices on cottonseed oil products? This loose-jointed procedure which you are following can only be construed as another deliberate blow against our impoverished cotton farmers of Texas and the South. I strenuously object to your setting a maximum price at this time on any agricultural products, but if you are determined to pursue this policy, I want to urge that the price of cottonseed oil be raised considerably and under no circumstances should it be set below prevailing price at the time your edict was issued. I urge you to immediately make this correction.

W. LEE O'DANIEL.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that I may have the privilege of putting in the RECORD, in the body of my remarks, the letter from Mr. Oscar Johnston, of the National Cotton Council of America, dated December 13, addressed to Mr. Henderson.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Memphis, Tenn., December 13, 1941.
Mr. LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: The press reports today that you have imposed "temporary emergency price ceilings over all fats and oils except butter at levels prevailing on November 26."

We fully recognize the necessity of proper steps to prevent hoarding, profiteering, and inflation, but your order of Friday, December 12, if correctly reported, is, in our judgment, a complete repudiation of the policy announced by you August 29 last with respect to cottonseed oil. The announcement referred to is your press release of the date stated, which was issued simultaneously with and referred to your order Schedule No. 25, entitled "Elimination of Speculation and Inflationary Price Practices With Respect to Fats and Oils and Their Products." The press release referred to contained at the outset the following statement: "At the same time he withdrew an earlier statement by his office that ceiling prices would be placed on cottonseed oil. If action becomes necessary in the face of a run-away-price situation, it will cover both cottonseed oil and competing products. Mr. Henderson stated that no such situation was now expected." On that date crude cottonseed oil was selling in the Cotton Belt at approximately 11 cents per pound and refined oil was quoted in New York at approximately 12¼ cents per pound.

Thereafter, the price of both crude and refined oil advanced steadily and by September 11 crude oil was selling in the belt at prices averaging 12½ cents to 12¾ cents per pound, with refined oil quoted in New York at prices ranging from 13¾ cents to 13¾ cents per pound. At this time the movement of cottonseed from the farms to the mills was approaching the peak. Evidently you did not then regard these prices as being a run-away-price situation. You took no action. On the contrary, on September 11 you issued a supplemental order intended to clarify the order of August 29 and permit resumption of futures trading in fats and oils.

Accepting your announced policies in good faith, the cottonseed oil mills proceeded to purchase the cottonseed crop from the producers at prices based primarily on the prevailing prices of cottonseed oil during the marketing season. These prices remained at or near the 12½-cent level for crude oil throughout September and well into October. After mid-October the oil market declined somewhat, due in major part to forecast of an unprecedented soybean crop and in part to substantially increased imports of coconut and palm oils; but, even with the decline, the price has generally remained above the level of 11¼ cents, which you have selected for the ceiling. It should be emphasized that, due to an unusually early and rapid harvesting season, the great bulk of the cottonseed crop, especially in the central part of the belt, was purchased during September and the first half of October when the higher oil prices were prevailing.

In your press release of August 29 you stated: "Since new-run seed is now beginning to flow to the mills, it is desirable that the threat of specific action directed toward cottonseed oil be removed. In this connection, consideration has been given to the fact that cottonseed is the source of the only unpledged income of a large number of small producers. Today's action will permit them to seal this year's crop at prices which represent a fair and proper relation to other fats and oils or oil-bearing products." You were correct. Because of that

statement, the bulk of the cottonseed crop moved from producer to crusher at prices averaging well above \$53 per ton, basis prime. Much of this seed was sold at or above \$55 per ton. With the price of cotton linters arbitrarily controlled and fixed at a relatively low level by the Government, the price of oil was the chief factor sustaining prices paid to producers for their seed.

Concluding your press release of August 29, you stated: "An advisory panel, which will include representatives of crushers, refiners, manufacturers, processors, and distributors, including retailers of all of the products involved, as well as representatives of the consuming public, will be appointed by Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply to consider any hardships, inequities, or other problems arising from operations of the schedule and any adjustments, modifications, or supplements that may be warranted." We respectfully ask if such a panel has been appointed.

The price fixed by the order of last Friday is substantially below price levels which prevailed during the time in which the bulk of the seed crop was marketed. A price of from 13¾ cents to 14 cents per pound on the New York Commodity Exchange, justifying a price of not under 12½ cents for crude oil in the belt, was not regarded by you as a run-away price in September and October last. What, then, can justify a ceiling now of approximately 11¼ cents for crude oil?

Producers who have not completed the marketing of the current crop are seriously injured by the order. When the producers come to market their 1942 seed crop they will be further seriously adversely affected as a result of the inconsistency of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply in permitting a price level to obtain throughout the period in which a large part of the seed crop is purchased by the mills and then arbitrarily, and without apparent reason, breaking the price of the products of the commodity before those products have been marketed. Fear of similar action in the future and sound business practices will necessitate the purchase hereafter of cottonseed by crushers at prices which will allow margins sufficient to protect them against a similar situation in subsequent years.

Your action may not have been so intended, but, regardless of intent, the action constitutes a serious breach of good faith on the part of a governmental agency. No governmental agency or bureau is ever justified in imposing an arbitrary and artificial ceiling upon the price of cottonseed oil, or any other manufactured product, at a level below the maximum price which prevailed for cottonseed oil, or any other such product, during the marketing season when processors were acquiring their raw materials at prices based upon the then prevailing prices of the products of those raw materials.

We are thoroughly sympathetic with the many problems involved in efforts to prevent inflation and appreciate the consideration and cooperation heretofore shown by you in efforts to work out difficulties which have arisen with respect to ceilings on products of the raw-cotton industry. We are confident that it is not your intent or desire that the grave injustices which will arise from this situation shall continue. We urge that you direct your personal attention to the correction of this situation at once.

Very truly yours,

OSCAR JOHNSTON, *President.*

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I give notice that tomorrow morning at the first opportunity I shall seek to call up my resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will come up automatically just before the close of the routine morning business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its readings clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1544) to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should have been glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], who has been waiting to make some remarks, but he is not in the Chamber at the present moment.

Mr. President, before proceeding with the general discussion and an explanation and description of the bill to extend the selective service, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the fact that the Selective Service System has nothing to do with determining what men shall be selected for service insofar as military duty is concerned. It is the business of the Selective Service System merely to register men and make a tabulation of the manpower, as required under the basic Selective Service Act, which covered men between the ages of 21 and 36. It is the duty of that organization to have ready and to make available men for service in the different branches of the armed forces of the United States of America when called for by the Army or by the Navy.

With reference to men whom we need for service, or whom we may call upon, and in particular reference to the question at issue, that of the age limits, whether there should be included young men from 21 upward to men who have attained the age of 44, or whether younger men should be included, as under the Senate bill, men between 19 and 44, I wish to read what I might properly classify as secondary testimony, testimony given by the Assistant Secretary of War for the Chief of Staff, who at the time of the meeting of our committee unfortunately could not be present.

Nevertheless, statements made heretofore by General Marshall, according to my recollection, would verify the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. John J. McCloy.

I read from the testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs of yesterday, December 16:

The CHAIRMAN. We would be very glad to have the Secretary make any statement that he has.

This statement of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs was made as the result of a suggestion by the junior Senator from Alabama (Mr. HILL), who stated that the Assistant Secretary of War was present and that we might hear him.

Hon. John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War, testified as follows:

I don't know that I can add anything to the discussion. I did have a long chat this morning with General Marshall.

That was yesterday morning.

I asked him how he felt as to the necessity of this bill, and he was quite emphatic. I think that there are a number of considerations that we cannot cast aside, but I will stress only those that he spoke of.

In the first place, he said that he thought there ought to be a leavening of younger men in the Army, from a purely military point of view; that they were young and vigorous; and that to mix them in with the older men was a good thing.

But what he was perhaps most concerned with was the over-all effectiveness of our manpower as it relates both to military effort and production effort.

Referring, Mr. President, I may add, to the registration of those within the ages of 18 and 65, as provided by this bill, and as provided likewise by the House bill.

Mr. McCloy, continuing, said:

He felt very strongly that to the extent that you excluded the men below 21, you would be impairing the productive effort of the country, because the men that had the skills were in the higher ranges. He felt that the younger men had not yet developed their industrial capacities; they had not yet assumed dependents; and that, generally, to the extent that they were not called upon, it would place a greater strain upon the production effort of the country. He stressed that point particularly.

He also pointed out that we didn't know when we might have to oppose these men against other armies, which are composed to a large part, incidentally, of very young men; that it would probably not be for some time before we would do that or could do that, but he did not feel that it was fair to the age groups above 21 to put all of the strain on them, when by broadening the base you would have a more sensible solution. In that way you don't place too heavy a strain and you don't gouge out of any one age group too many men.

In other words, Mr. McCloy said that General Marshall stated to him that he believed in the leavening process.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has referred to the age limits in other armies. Can the Senator tell what the age limit is in the British Isles under the British draft at the present time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not believe I have that information at hand, but I

shall procure it. I collected some data upon that question and, according to my recollection, General Hershey presented some information in regard to age limits which, as I recall, refers only to the wars in which the United States has participated. According to my recollection, the minimum age for registration for military service in the British Empire is 18 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not talking about registration. I am talking about draft.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The minimum age for registration for draft is 18 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wonder if the Senator is correct in that regard?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand from the military authority at my side that it is 18½.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was advised this week from a source which meant nothing in particular, and therefore I cannot attribute any authenticity to it, that the British House of Commons within the last fortnight had declined to reduce the age limit for draft purposes to 18½. I submitted the inquiry to General Hershey, but as yet have had no response. That is not his fault. He has not had time to respond. I was wondering if the Senator from North Carolina knew whether there was any truth in that statement.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not. I think the Senator very much for making the inquiry, because I think it would be very well for the Members of the Senate to be informed as to the minimum age limits of those in all armies, even including those of the Axis Powers. I think such information would be very well received by the Members of this body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has no information at the present time, for instance, as to what is the minimum draft age in Canada?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I have not. I will try to procure it by tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like very much to have it; and I should also like to know, yes or no, if it be true that the British House of Commons within the last fortnight has legislated against a reduction to 18½ years as the limit for those to be drafted into service.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That the House of Commons had refused to make such a reduction?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is the Senator's information? I shall endeavor to procure that information for the Senator. No doubt, General Hershey has it.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator understands that, if this measure is passed, of course the lower limit will be 19. All men above 18 years will be registered, but will not be called into service until they become 19.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that, but I want to know what the British do.

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot answer that. But we are well within the suggested limit in that respect because, un-

der the provisions of this bill, the age for military service will start at 19.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That does not mean anything.

Mr. CHANDLER. It means what it says.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I mean as respects the British attitude.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I shall secure for his information, and for my own likewise, the minimum-age limit for registration and for military and other service, not only in the Allied nations but among the Axis Powers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. The information would in no sense be controlling so far as our problem is concerned, but yet it would be illuminating in view of the long war experience the other powers have had.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Quite so. I thank the Senator very much for directing the inquiry to me.

Mr. President, proceeding with the statement made yesterday before our committee by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. McCloy, of his conversation with General Marshall:

Now, he also suggested that these men might be 20 or 21 years old by the time they are called upon to fight, but he hastened to add, and he made it very clear, that he didn't want to have any limitations, if possible, in this bill, excluding from combat the 19-year-olds, because they would be assimilated in units, and he didn't want to have to have a roll call before they went into action and say, "All men below 21 stand to the left, and all men above 21 stand to the right."

There was one other thought he had. We are going to have to rely on a great many young men, particularly for our Air Corps. A great many of our volunteers go into the Air Corps. We are going to get the cream and the flower of our young men into the Army by volunteering. Is it fair that they should go and leave the other fellow at home? I don't know that we will ever get to the point where we are going to compel men to become flying cadets in the Air Corps, but a great many young men, 19 years of age, are going to volunteer for flying, and we are looking forward to it. Pilots these days have to be young.

You will have some drain on them, and I don't think, as an element of fairness, we should say, "All right, you volunteer for this hazardous duty, but we won't draw your brother for perhaps a somewhat less hazardous duty."

I have stated rather inadequately the conversation I had with General Marshall, and also with the Secretary briefly after I had talked with him.

He is referring to Secretary of War Stimson.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can the Senator tell me what the present low age limit is for volunteering for pilot service in the Air Corps? Is that 18?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think 18 is the minimum.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can the Senator have the information definitely procured for us?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very glad to procure that information, I will say to the Senator from California.

Mr. President, let me add preliminarily and very simply that, according to my construction of the bill, it merely provides for the orderly registration of the manpower of the Nation; that is to say, for the military, agricultural, industrial, and civil defense of the Nation. Secondly, it merely provides for the extension of the years of service in Group A down to the age of 19, and in Group B up to the age of 44. The report of the Military Affairs Committee was presented yesterday and was printed, and is now on the desks of all Senators.

This bill merely makes a number of amendments to the basic Selective Service and Training Act, which we passed in 1940. The principal purposes of the bill now under consideration are to extend the age limits of the persons who may be required to register under the act, and to extend the age limits of the persons who are liable for training and service under the act. The bill also amends the present act in several minor respects.

The first section of the bill amends section 2 of the present Selective Service and Training Act. Section 2 of the present act fixes the ages of the persons who may be required to register. That section of the present law reads as follows:

Sec. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States and of every male alien residing in the United States who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 21 and 36, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

I have just read section 2 of the present Selective Service and Training Act.

The bill as reported by the committee merely amends the section above quoted by extending the requirements of registration to men between the ages of 18 and 65, instead of men between the ages of 21 and 36, as provided by the existing law.

The bill also extends the requirements of registration to all male persons residing in the United States who are within the prescribed age limits. Thus there would be included some persons who are residents of the United States and are nationals of the United States but who are not citizens of the United States and are not required to register under the existing law. Otherwise, the bill leaves section 2 of the present act unchanged.

Section 2 of the bill amends the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the present law. That provision of the present act states what persons are liable for training and service under the act, and reads as follows:

Sec. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien residing in the United States who has declared his intention to become a citizen, between the ages of 21 and 36 at the time fixed for his registration, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

The bill changes that provision in the following respects only:

First. The liability for training and service is extended to men between the ages of 19 and 45, instead of to men be-

tween the ages of 21 and 36, as provided in the present law.

Second. Several changes are made with respect to the liability of aliens. Under the present law, aliens are liable only if they have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. Under the terms of the bill reported yesterday by the committee, aliens would be liable whether or not they had declared their intention to become citizens. However, aliens who are citizens or subjects of a neutral country would be relieved of liability upon making application in the manner prescribed by the President; but the making of such application would debar them from ever becoming citizens of the United States. It is provided that enemy aliens shall not be inducted unless they are acceptable to the land or naval forces.

Third. Liability for service would be extended to certain persons resident in the United States who are nationals of the United States but who are not citizens thereof, as in the case of some citizens of our insular possessions.

Mr. President, returning to the question of registration and the question of military liability, the difference between the House bill and the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is that the House bill places the lower age limit at 21, and the Senate committee recommends that the lower age limit be 19 years.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that I have before me a letter from the White House, over the signature of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, who approves of the proposed registration, and who writes under date of December 15, 1941, as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I write to confirm that I fully approve and endorse the bill for the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. MAY in the House on Friday last.

I approve the proposed congressional declaration of policy, the provision for the registration of all our manpower between 18 and 64, inclusive, and the extension of liability for military service so as to include all the age groups from 19 to 44, inclusive.

That is what is embodied in the bill as reported from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, whereas, as I stated a moment ago, the age limits in the House bill are 21 and 44.

The President's letter continues:

I consider the registration provision an essential instrument for the orderly planning of our national effort.

As to the extension of liability for service, I approve it as a means of providing a sufficiently large pool of men available for service in our land and naval forces (including the air forces) adequate to meet all contingencies now foreseeable.

These two features of the bill supplement each other. I consider them of equal and prime importance.

The reasons for the bill are more fully set forth in the letter sent by the Secretary of War on Saturday last to Representative MAY and Senator REYNOLDS. I endorse without qualification the Secretary's statement in that letter.

I am sending an identical letter to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Speaker, and the majority and minority leaders of the House.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

In view of the fact that the President of the United States made mention of a letter directed to me by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, I desire to bring the letter of Mr. Stimson to the attention of the Senate, to read it into the debate, and to make it a part of the RECORD. The letter reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 13, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I submit herewith the following statement concerning the proposed bill which was discussed with you and certain members of the Military Affairs Committee on Friday providing for comprehensive amendment of the Selective Service Act.

The heart of the measure lies in three features:

(1) The proposed congressional declaration whereby it is set forth that "the Nation is fighting for its existence and its future life," will "accept no result save victory, final and complete, over all the enemies of the United States" and that consequently "it is imperative that liability for military service be extended to further age groups and that a complete inventory of the manpower of the Nation be taken by registration";

(2) The extension of the present registration provisions of the present law so as to provide for the registration of all males between 18 and 64, inclusive, instead of between 21 and 35, inclusive, as now provided; and

(3) The extension of the liability for military service to the ages 19 to 44, inclusive, in lieu of the provisions of the present law.

The purpose of the proposed registration provisions is to obtain a comprehensive and accurate survey of the whole mature manpower of the Nation. This is in line with the experience of the other principal nations engaged in this war and is, in my judgment, a necessary measure to enable the orderly application to the task in hand of our whole manpower, both for military purposes and for the vast production which we are undertaking. On the other hand, this registration is merely a registration to enable an inventory of our whole manpower so that we may know what we have with proper data as to occupations and skills; and the bill carries no power whatever to draft men for other than strictly military service.

Indeed, it has been suggested by some of the Members of the Senate that this is a labor-conscription bill.

The letter continues as follows:

The purpose of the provision extending the liability for military service to the ages 19 to 44, inclusive, is to make available, if and when necessary, a great pool of men to meet all contingencies now foreseeable. While the traditional age for liability for military service in this country is 18 to 45, it has been deemed wise to place the lower limit at this time at a year later—viz, 19.

The broad purpose of the bill is to provide a framework into which we can steadily and solidly build, stone by stone, the structure which will accomplish victory.

I wish most respectfully to express a caution against the inclusion in the bill of any restrictions as to the priorities whereby men may be called for military service or restrictions or as to administrative procedure, because all such restrictions might turn out to be shackles that would hamper the organization of our land and naval forces and the conduct of the war.

I wish to express a similar caution against asking the war-making departments to pin themselves down to statements of policy as to the size of the forces contemplated or the age groups to be called for military service. Naturally we must have plans, but in a vast cataclysm such as is now in progress with its rapidly changing developments, it is apparent that plans must change with events and that any statements now made might be subject to change almost overnight.

I desire to emphasize the psychological or moral effects of the passage of a great measure along these lines. It will make clear to the American people the character of the effort that will be required to defeat the vast forces arrayed against us. To the outside world it will be a symbol that we are providing the means to make good our declared policy to "accept no result save victory, final and complete."

I believe the enactment of a measure substantially in accord with this bill is indispensable to the national effort and that it will constitute one of the great foundation stones upon which victory will be built. Finally, I urge that such a measure be enacted with all reasonable promptness. We need it now.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
*Chairman of the Committee
on Military Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.*

In addition to that letter, I desire to call attention to a letter which was directed to Capt. Francis V. Keesling Jr., Legislative Officer, Selective Service System, under date of December 15, 1941, dated at Washington, D. C., and written by the National Committee on Education and Defense, an organization which for some time past has been vitally interested in the subject of age groups and deferments and registration. The letter reads as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION AND DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1941.
Capt. FRANCIS V. KEESLING, JR.,
*Legislative Officer,
Selective Service System.*

According to your request, I am submitting a copy of the resolution adopted by the subcommittee on military affairs of the National Committee on Education and Defense on Friday, December 12, 1941:

"That, recognizing the gravity of the present situation and the necessity for mobilization of total manpower, the subcommittee endorses the proposed legislation extending liability for military service of men between the ages of 19 and 44, inclusive.

"Fully aware of the solemn responsibility placed in the hands of the President and of his representatives in administering the provisions of this proposed legislation, the subcommittee expresses confidence in national headquarters, Selective Service; it urges the continuing exercise of wisdom in selecting for the administration of this legislation only those persons who have demonstrated a deep sense of human values; and emphasizes the necessity, both in the successful promulgation of the war and for the period of reconstruction of maintaining an adequate supply of men trained for leadership and in occupations and professions vital to national safety and interest.

The members of the subcommittee on military affairs present at this meeting were: Walter C. Eells, American Association of Junior Colleges; Guy E. Snavely, Association of American Colleges; W. A. Lloyd, Association of Landgrant Colleges and Universities; Morse A. Cartwright, Institute for Adult

Education; George Johnson, National Catholic Educational Association; Willard E. Givens, National Education Association; George F. Zook, American Council on Education. Also present, President E. C. Elliott, Purdue University. Members not present: L. H. Dennis, American Vocational Association; Fred Engelhardt, National Association; Isaiah Bowman, Association of American Universities; Harry Woodburn Chase, chairman of subcommittee (confirmed by telephone).

FRANCIS J. BROWN,
*Executive Secretary,
Subcommittee on Military Affairs.*

I have already brought to the attention to Members of the Senate the statements made by General Marshall as to the age groups and the leveling off of age groups as conveyed to us by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. McCloy. I shall, in a moment, bring to the attention of the Members of this body the age limit minimum and maximum, as utilized during the wars in which the United States has participated, which information was provided the committee by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I have been troubled by section 6 of the bill now before the Senate, and, though I have spent some time reading it and rereading it and the law which it amends, I am not sure yet that I have a clear understanding of its effect. Let me state what I understand to be the purpose and effect of the section. Then I wish the Senator from North Carolina would either confirm my statement or correct it.

I take it that section 6, in effect, strikes out the last six or seven lines which follow "(2)" in subsection (e), of section 5 of the present law. Those lines being stricken out, the draft boards under rules and regulations prescribed by the President are given authority to make classifications according to age, with the net result that the registration boards will have authority to defer, first, because men are employed in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employments the continuance of which is deemed vital; second, to defer because a man's presence is necessary in civilian life and the maintenance of the national health or safety; third, to defer because of dependents; and now this amendment gives a fourth ground for deferment, which is age.

Am I right in my understanding?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am afraid the Senator is not correct in his understanding in regard to the deferment groups.

Mr. WHITE. If I am not right, let me ask another question. Does the amendment take from the registration boards authority to defer because of dependency?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It does not.

Mr. WHITE. Does it take from the registration boards authority to defer because they believe a man's presence in civilian life is essential to the maintenance of public health and safety?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In answer to the question, I call the Senator's attention to section 2 of Public Law 206, Seventy-seventh Congress. That law provides for

certain deferments and exemptions under Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

I merely call the Senate's attention to paragraph (2) of section 2:

Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, there shall be deferred from training and service under this act, in the land and naval forces of the United States, until Congress shall declare otherwise, the men who, on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year, (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth.

Mr. WHITE. I had overlooked that provision of the statute; but there is retained in the draft boards the powers of deferment which they now have?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHITE. I wanted to be sure about that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my understanding. Inquiry was made about that yesterday before the committee, and my recollection is that the statement is correct.

Mr. President, in pursuance of the matter pertaining to ages, on yesterday General Hershey brought to our attention, from the records of the office of The Adjutant General of the United States Army, certain figures with respect to the ages of soldiers who have served the country in time of war.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will yield in a moment. The figures furnished the committee show that in the War between the States the enlistments consisted as follows in particular reference to minimum ages:

There were 25 who served who were only 10 years of age; there were 38 who served who were but 11 years of age; there were 225 who served who were but 12 years of age; there were 300 who served who were but 13 years of age; there were 1,523 who served who were but 14 years of age; there were 104,987 who served who were but 15 years of age; there were 231,051 who served who were but 16 years of age; there were 884,891 who served who were but 17 years of age; and of the age of 18, the year below that fixed for military service by the pending bill, in the War between the States, 1,151,438 boys actually served who were only 18 years of age.

The statement continues:

Twenty-one years and under (these two classes make the total number of enlistments), 2,159,798; 22 years and over (these two classes make the total number of enlistments), 618,511; 25 years and over, 46,626; 44 years and over, 16,071; total enlisted, 2,778,304. The estimated number of individuals in the service is given as 2,213,365.

There is a notation as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 55, part II, page 1131, Sixty-fifth Congress.

Further in reference to ages, I desire to say that our committee was informed that the minimum age limit for military service—that of 19 inclusive to 44—has been recommended by the Navy, the Ma-

rine Corps, and the Army, and all branches thereof.

I now yield to the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHY. I thank the Senator.

I wish to have the Senator revert, if he will, to his answer to the question put by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. The Senator from North Carolina stated that his understanding was thus and so, and that he interpreted the matter thus and so. In view of the fact that section 6 actually rewrites paragraph 2 of section 5 (e) of existing law as amended, I ask that the Senator, in order to clarify the RECORD, read precisely what the existing clause is which is being rewritten and superseded by the proposed language appearing on page 4 of the bill. Does the Senator feel free to do that?

I have no desire to cause the Senator to digress from his studied plan of presentation; and it is quite agreeable to me that, when the authority shall be located, he recur to this point.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I will say to him that in the statement which I prepared for the Senate, in brief, but I hope understandable, explanation of the various changes in paragraphs, I was coming to paragraph 6, but I had intended this afternoon only to read the letters in support of the age groups from the President, the Secretary of War, and others particularly interested in the age groups, and thereafter to suspend, because I understand that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], desires the floor for a brief while in reference to the passage of some legislation that he desires, and also the able Senator from Ohio. I shall be glad to revert to that matter.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator. There are on the calendar of the Senate two bills—

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator will pardon me, I will yield to him in just a moment. I wish to complete a statement which I dictated this afternoon in reference to the bill, and then I shall endeavor to accommodate the able Senator from Massachusetts and also the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question concerning the pending bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Am I to understand that the authorities are asking that the age limit be dropped from 20 to 19 because the men in that group will likely be needed, or because they feel that such men constitute splendid soldier material, or both?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Both.

Mr. TYDINGS. What was the testimony before the committee as to the primary reason for lowering the age limit from 21 to 19?

Mr. REYNOLDS. General Marshall has stated that he is desirous of bringing about a leveling of the group. Of course, we all know that the real fighting men in the armies of the Axis Powers are the younger men; and we know, of course, that particularly in our air forces we must have the younger men, because they are possessed of more daring, and they

like the service, and they are more active and more alert. We find that our volunteers who are going into those forces are young men; and, as I believe General Marshall stated, it is not exactly fair to permit some of these young men to volunteer for that dangerous, hazardous branch of the service and permit others who are equally strong and who may in some instances not have the dependents that the volunteer has, to avoid service. For the two reasons the able Senator mentions it has been suggested that the age limit be reduced.

Mr. TYDINGS. Both those points were brought out before the committee, were they?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My recollection is that they were, and I think they were brought before the committee particularly by way of the statement by General Marshall, through the aid of the Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the question because, so far as I can, in war I should like to give the Army, and I hope to give the Army, and believe I will, so far as my support is concerned, everything they think is necessary to provide an efficient force.

Mr. REYNOLDS. We know that to be so.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I was curious to know of the reasons offered. As I understand the situation, in round numbers about a million and a half more men are available between the ages of 21 and 35, allowing for disability, dependency, and what not.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; generally speaking.

Mr. TYDINGS. There probably will be a million and a half more in that group in addition to the million and a half Regular Army that we now have, making in round numbers between three million and three and a half million men.

In this war—which probably will not be as short as we should like to have it because of the widespread area over which it is being fought—if we are to have a larger Army than three and a half million, it obviously will be necessary either to let in some who, for one reason or another, have heretofore been excluded, or to find a place where we can get additional men.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is quite true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator whether I am substantially correct in saying that if the age limits were fixed from 21 to 35, allowing for those who would be excluded because of dependents, for physical disability, and for other reasons I have not mentioned, the Army probably would get only about a million and a half more effectives.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That would depend entirely upon the physical and mental requirements.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am assuming that the standard is something like it has been in the past.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, therefore, counting Regulars, National Guard, and draftees, who now number 1,600,000 in round figures, with the million and a half who would come in between 21 and 35, we should have somewhere between three

and three and a half million men in the total land forces of our Government, including the air force. So if we are to have a larger Army, including the air force, of three and a half million men over a period of years, it will be necessary either to go back again into that group and take some who were originally eliminated, or to lower the age to 19.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator is quite correct.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me ask the Senator if that statement is not subject to a very important correction, which I desire to point out to the Senator from Maryland. In the next 2 years we shall have young men becoming of age to the number of 2,400,000. The majority of those young men will be in good physical condition and without dependents.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why does the Senator say "in the next 2 years"?

Mr. DOWNEY. Every year approximately 1,200,000 young men become 21. In 2 years we shall have 2,400,000; and General Hershey's figures are that that would yield, in very fine material, 1,200,000, one-half the number, in 2 years.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. So I desire to say to the Senator from Maryland that if in the next 2 years we should be able to officer and train and house an army of another 1,600,000, say, plus three or four hundred thousand volunteers under 20, at the end of that time we should still have a vast reservoir of 1,200,000 men.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the arithmetic of my friend from California is correct, but I think he has overlooked the fact that when we take in a man 2 years from now he does not immediately become a soldier. We should have to put another year, at least, on top of that before a man would be able, with a tremendous expansion of this kind, to be an effective, all-around, well-trained soldier. Therefore, if we take the figures given by the Senator from California, it would mean we would be 3 years away from that day, rather than 2 years.

As I see the matter, we may not now have all the equipment which should be furnished these men, but there are certain things which a soldier must know before the equipment is required. I assume that the Army is not going to ask for men in such quotas that when they reach a certain stage, when weapons become a part of their training, the weapons will not be reasonably available. That is the reason, I assume, why they wanted this larger reservoir, namely, so that they could get an early start, and have the Army of the strength required in a year or two at the outside, rather than in 3 years at the outside, because in a war time is of the essence.

Mr. HILL and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator

from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama, then I will yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. HILL. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Maryland has stated, that the testimony showed that the War Department has no idea of having what we might call a "broomstick" army. We are not going to take men in more rapidly than we are prepared to train them.

Being a distinguished soldier himself, the Senator from Maryland knows that plans have to be made in advance. The War Department has to know now what it can draw from, what the pool is, where the men are coming from, what their ages are to be, what kind of men are to be available. The Department has to know now in order to make plans for the war in which we are engaged.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not profess to know what the Army's plans may be in the kind of war we are now fighting, but I do know that we are going to hold the Army responsible.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. And we can look only to the Army to win.

Mr. HILL. Of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore, if they make out a reasonably common-sense case for any particular piece of legislation, all of us in this body having voted for war on all three fronts—that is, against Germany, Italy, and Japan—we are almost bound to give the Department anything which has the semblance of common sense attached to it. Otherwise, we will be in the position later of holding the Army accountable; but they will say, "We wanted to do that, but you would not let us do it."

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from North Carolina will yield further, in connection with what the Senator from Maryland has just stated, as the Senator well recalls, in the resolutions recognizing a State of war to exist with Japan, Germany, and Italy, the President was authorized and directed by the Congress to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the three different countries, and "to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."

The War Department says, "We are going to make our plans for this war, and we have to know what these resources are. What are you going to let us have?" The Senator from Maryland, being a distinguished soldier himself, as I have said, knows that the War Department is going to make its plans, and those plans must be predicated on the idea of taking care of any and all eventualities. The War Department should know what these resources are.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is perfectly obvious we had better have a larger standing

army than we will need than have a smaller standing army than we will need. In other words, we had better have all the forces the Department indicates we need—and I hope we may never have to use them—than to need them desperately in the future in some unforeseen situation and not have them. We are in a war which is "all out," and therefore it seems to me that, hard though it may be, if a reasonably common-sense case is made out supporting any request of the Army, it is up to the Congress to give to them everything it possibly can in order to make it overwhelmingly certain that the war will be won. Nothing could be worse than to give them less than they need.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I may add that we cannot give the Army all it requests and feels it necessary to have unless we have the registration provided for, and thereby know where the manpower is, where it is to come from, and the physical condition of the men.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maryland indicates that we cannot afford to be too late and we cannot afford to have too little. If we are to err, we must err on the side of doing too much. Some gentlemen entertain the idea that perhaps we should let some other nation win this war for us. Of course, I want our country to do all it can to help any other nation that is fighting on our side, and I rejoice every time one of our allies wins a victory against the common enemy. We want to do all we can to carry out the lend-lease program. But I for one believe we should make our plans, lay all our predicates, so that if it comes to a point where it is necessary, we can rely and will rely on our own strong right hand.

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, then I will yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] fails to consider in his statement, I think, the fact that there are already men in these age groups in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and that volunteers are coming in from all over the country. We have taken into account 300,000 of those young men for the Army.

It is important, as the Senator from Alabama has stated, to register these men, so as to know where the men are, and how many of them there are, in order that when we get ready to call them, they will be available.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield again?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], himself a distinguished soldier, reminded me this morning of the fact that the average enlistment age in the Navy today is 19 years. In that connection, I remember that one of the ablest and strongest arguments I have heard on this floor was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], another able sol-

dier, by the way, who made the point that many men in this age group—fine men—are now volunteering and crowding the recruiting stations, and if we have to use them, if we have to have men of that group, then we should equalize the burden; we should make all men within that group liable for the same service, and for the same defense of their country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his very generous comment. I make no claim to any eminence as a military man—or otherwise, for that matter. I had a very unusual and unique experience. I was in the Army during the Spanish-American War, and I was in the Army during the World War, and I claim to have been in more wars and fought less than any other American. But that is aside.

I wish to ask whether the Committee on Military Affairs had considered the practicability of registering all men of 19, or even 18, but putting men under 21 years of age in a deferred classification, not calling them for compulsory service, until we had combed over the lists of those over 21. I have a feeling that that should be done.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There was some discussion of that subject in the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know the War Department wants them as young as it can get them, because when young they are easily impressed, they have more optimism, they think more of a general than we do, they salute more quickly, they run errands very readily, and all that sort of thing. But I dislike to vote to send boys off to the war when there are sitting around on cracker barrels discussing how the Government should be conducted so many men who should be in the Army themselves. Does the Senator get my point?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do; yes.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say that I am in entire agreement with the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who says that we must not be too late in providing a certain-sized Army; but let me point out to him that we are too late today in many respects. We have already been so very neglectful in many particulars that the size of our Army for the next year, and 2 or 3 years, is definitely fixed. I expect to argue more at length tomorrow, and I shall then produce facts which are unassailable, and which I think were admitted by General Hershey.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that we cannot arm, and officer and train, and equip more than a million additional soldiers in the next 12 months. We now have a million eight hundred thousand in the Army. A consideration of all the figures shows that we cannot handle more than a million during the next 12 months. That is the maximum, that is the optimum. As a matter of fact, if we tried to call out that number many of them would not have

proper cantonments, or ammunition, or officers. But if we spread ourselves, if we reach the maximum we might hope for, we might take 1,000,000 more men. The point I desire to make to the distinguished Senator from Maryland is that we have in this reserve men from 21 to 36 years of age—1,600,000 men, and the selective-service officials themselves said that in the next 12 months we cannot possibly assimilate and officer and handle any more than an additional 1,000,000 men.

I also desire to point out, as I said to the distinguished Senator, that in the next year 1,200,000 young men will become 21 years of age. Six hundred thousand of them will make fine material. So if we take the maximum the Army itself says it can use, 1,000,000 men, we will have 600,000 of the present reservoir left, and we will have another 600,000, or we will still have a total of 1,200,000 at the end of the year.

Sufficient ships are not available, and we cannot build them for 2 or 3 years, to transport an army of 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 men. We have not the steel with which to manufacture the guns needed by them. Today we have not the rubber necessary to provide the trucks to provide the necessary transport.

Mr. President, I am told that on February 1 an order will go to Detroit which will result in hundreds of thousands of men being unemployed, for by reason of the order, after February 1, not one new automobile may thereafter be constructed except strictly for military purposes; only trucks may be constructed. The O. P. M. says that if the Army shall attempt to place another million men in military service in America we must have five or six million additional men producing for them, and that our lend-lease program in Siberia and China will suffer.

Mr. President, these facts have not yet been considered. No witness has appeared before the committee who even knew how to analyze these facts which are now being considered in Washington. We on the Military Affairs Committee acted in the dark and in confusion. I say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that he will not have before him the facts from which he will be able to form an intelligent opinion, and I intend tomorrow to endeavor to demonstrate this to the Senate of the United States, Mr. President, in connection with a motion to recommit this great and important bill to the committee.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has been very kind in answering questions with respect to men who are between the ages of 19 and 21. Why did the registration go so high as to 64 years of age? What reason was given for registering men, we will say, over 45 years of age? What was the purpose of registering men from 45 to 65 years of age?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In the first place, if we register every male citizen in the United States between the ages of 45 and 65, every single man between those ages will have impressed upon him the fact that he is subject to be called by his Gov-

ernment when the Government finds it needs him. In addition to that, it will make him feel that he is a part of the great machinery being organized for victory. Further, we do not know how many men we shall be obliged to call upon to serve in the armed forces; we do not know how many men will be called upon to put on uniforms, for conditions are changing from day to day. We want to register men between 45 and 65 years of age in order to ascertain their physical condition, in order to ascertain what they have been doing, what they are doing now, and, therefore, what they are capable of doing when they are called.

Let me say also that it would have a fine psychological effect upon the American people. It would serve notice on the people that every single man within the length and breadth of this land is called upon to serve now, during black-outs, in the defense of his country, and to bring about the victory which the people are demanding. It would let the world know that, instead of doing a lot of talking, we are taking action, and that we have actually gone "all out." The first step in that "all out" program is nothing more nor less than registering every male in the land from 18 to 65 years of age.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator understands that I am not critical. I am simply seeking information.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. Mention has been made of the size of the Army. Frequently I have heard it said that we do not want an Army of over 3,200,000 men. We are going to fight all over the world. We shall need a large Army. Germany itself, as we all know, and as has been testified before our committee, has a minimum of 8,000,000 men in uniform and under arms.

Mr. TYDINGS. And fully trained and equipped?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Fully trained and equipped, as the Senator from Maryland suggests. No one knows how many men are fighting in Russia, but it has been estimated that the total number of men under arms and in uniform on the Axis side is about 15,000,000, and on the allied side about 15,000,000. We must take into consideration the number of men we shall need to defend our country, to defend our possessions, and to send abroad, because in all probability we cannot win the war merely by the utilization of battleships and airplanes and submarines.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will yield in one moment. We should take into consideration the fact that we must have thousands upon thousands of armed men in our outlying possessions. We must keep thousands and thousands of our men, and great quantities of equipment, in Iceland, Greenland, Newfoundland, and probably some day we will take over St. Pierre and Miquelon, islands which belong to the French. We must have men in Bermuda, perhaps in the Bahamas, perhaps in Jamaica, where we have a naval base in Trinidad, in Puerto Rico, and farther south, including British

Guiana, and if we ever take over French Guiana we must have men there, and in addition to that we must have men in the Pacific.

The Senator from Maryland, as chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, knows that for the first time we are now recognizing that we must build fortifications and develop naval bases, and man them with American manpower, in Alaska, in the Aleutian Islands, which extend 1,500 miles from our most northern base at Unalaska to the back door of Japanese territory.

Mr. TYDINGS. I asked the Senator the question assuming that his answer would be somewhat along the line he has so painstakingly expanded.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say further that my general impression is that registration in the higher ages is not always necessarily for purely combatant service, but it is to get a line on the manpower of the country, and the presumption is that, at least as we stand today, those in the higher age brackets will to a large extent be either completely or largely eliminated from consideration for military service.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Quite so.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the purpose is to get a line on the total manpower of the Nation that might conceivably be used either in active combat or in noncombatant service.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Maryland so well says, the registration is proposed in order to get a line on all the manpower of the Nation. Such information might prove most helpful, and would be directed in a way—

Mr. TYDINGS. That does not mean the men in the higher ages will be drafted.

Mr. HILL. No; there is no idea that they will be drafted at this time, but it does mean that the men who are subject to draft can be drafted more intelligently, for if it is known what the older men can do, it can be determined whether certain industries may be dislocated by drafting younger men engaged in such industries. If there are a great many mechanics among the older group, we will know what can be done so far as drafting the younger men is concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Such registration is necessary. It would be foolish to take a specialist in some vitally necessary field where there is a deficiency and use him as a private soldier. In such a case the national welfare would be better served by leaving him where he is, where he can render the greater service.

I asked the question only because I could not conceive that we would include those of the age of 65 in a purely military draft, and I desired to elicit the information which has been given.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the committee should also make it clear that the idea is to keep current information about the men of the Nation. When once they are registered it becomes their duty under the law

to advise their local boards as to any change in their status, their address, or their occupation, and any other information the War Department may need. When there is a change in their situation it is their duty to advise their local boards.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is absolutely correct. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has been very patient. I promised to yield to him. He wishes to obtain consideration of a bill.

Mr. WALSH. I am very grateful to the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I shall shortly conclude for the day and yield the floor to the Senator from Massachusetts. However, I ask that I be recognized tomorrow when the Senate reconvenes. I am concluding at this time for the purpose of accommodating the able Senator from Massachusetts, and for the reason that I am trying to have the record of the hearings printed and placed on the desk of Senators as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Referring to the question raised by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] in connection with section 6 of the bill, that section provides as follows:

SEC. 6. Paragraph (2) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States, of those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the men so deferred."

In order to clarify the situation, section 6 strikes out subsection (2) of section 2 of Public Law 206, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to section 5 (e) of the Selective Service and Training Act. It strikes out the entire subsection as it appears in Public Law 206, and substitutes the language which I have just read.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] raised the question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent to have that part of Public Law 206 to which I have referred made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, there shall be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States until Congress shall declare otherwise, the men who, on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year, (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or

naval forces for such training and service, and (3) have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth: *Provided*, That any of such men may after volunteering for induction be inducted pursuant and subject to the provisions of section 3 (a) of this act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall, as soon as practicable and when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, release from active training and service under section 3 (b) of this act, and transfer to a reserve component of the land forces for the same period and with the same rights, duties, and liabilities, as any other person transferred to a reserve component of the land forces under the provisions of section 3 (c) of this act, regardless of his period of training and service, any person who has heretofore been inducted into the land forces under this act, who requests such release, and who had attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of his birth on or prior to July 1, 1941, and prior to such induction: *Provided further*, That any person so released under this paragraph who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, has served satisfactorily shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect which shall be in the same form and have the same force and effect as a certificate issued under the provisions of section 8 of this act.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, section 4 of the bill amends section 5 (a) of the present act, which now provides that certain specified classes of aliens shall not be required to register and shall not be liable for service under the act. This amendment provides that there may be added to these classes persons who are not citizens of the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

Section 5 of the bill amends paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the present act, which now authorizes the deferment of men who have dependents or who are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. The amendments made by the bill give authority to provide for different classifications for the purpose of determining order of availability for selection for induction.

Section 6 of the bill amends paragraph 2 of section 5 (e) of the present act. This paragraph was added by the act of August 16, 1941, and contains the provisions of the present law which provide for deferment of men over 28 years of age. The amendment made by this bill eliminates all those provisions of the present law and substitutes therefor provisions which authorize the President to provide for the deferment of men by any age group or groups, as he deems to be advisable in the national interest, and to terminate any such deferment upon a similar finding.

Section 7 is a technical amendment to make the definition relating to age groups correspond to the new age limits for registration and liability for service.

Section 8 of the bill, repeals section 15 (c) of the present act, which defines the term dependent and reads as follows:

(e) The term "dependent" when used with respect to a person registered under the provisions of this act includes only an individual (1) who is dependent in fact on such person for support in a reasonable manner, and (2) whose support in such a manner depends on income earned by such person in a business, occupation, or employment.

Section 9 of the bill provides that persons inducted under the act into the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard shall be members of such components, and further provides that during wartime the periods of service of such persons may be extended for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. Similar legislation has recently been enacted with respect to persons inducted under the act into the Army and with respect to enlisted personnel in the Navy.

Section 10 amends the first proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the present act, which now permits persons between the ages of 18 and 36 to volunteer for induction under the act. This amendment raises the age limits for such volunteers to 45 years.

Section 11 of the bill as reported by the committee gives all personnel on active duty in the military or naval forces 120 additional days within which they may secure, without medical examination, insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. This section further provides that after the expiration of such 120-day period such personnel may be granted such insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and satisfactory evidence showing them to be in good health.

Mr. President, I have previously requested that I be recognized tomorrow on the reconvening of the Senate. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

COMPOSITION OF THE NAVY—CONSTRUCTION OF NAVY VESSELS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are two identical bills on the calendar, Nos. 950 and 951. Calendar No. 950 is Senate bill 2125, and Calendar No. 951 is House bill 6223. The title of both bills is, "To establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes." I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6223, Calendar No. 951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6223) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to increase the authorized composition of the Navy in under-age vessels by 150,000 tons of combatant ships and to authorize the President to undertake the construction of such types and tonnages of combatant ships as he shall determine to be necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

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

Mr. WALSH. I ask that Senate bill 2125 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2125 will be indefinitely postponed.

PROHIBITION OF POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS AND EXPLOSIVES ON BOARD CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2119, Calendar No. 946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2119) to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this bill was introduced at the request of the Department of Justice in order to protect ships against sabotage by persons bringing explosives on board. The subject is not now adequately covered by our statutes, especially in the case of ships which have been recently seized under our new statutes. The Judiciary Committee unanimously recommends the passage of the bill, and urges that it be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who brings, carries, or has in his possession any dangerous weapon, instrument, or device, or any dynamite, nitroglycerin, or other explosive article or compound on board of any vessel registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, or any vessel purchased, requisitioned, chartered, or taken over by the United States pursuant to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1941 (Public, No. 101, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), without previously obtaining the permission of the owner or the master of such vessel, or any person who brings, carries, or has in his possession any such weapon or explosive on board of any vessel in the possession and under the control of the United States or which has been seized and forfeited by the United States or upon which a guard has been placed by the United States pursuant to the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220, U. S. C., title 50, secs. 191-194), without previously obtaining the permission of the captain of the port in which such vessel is located, shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned

not more than 1 year or fined not more than \$1,000, or both.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the personnel of the armed forces of the United States or to officers or employees of the United States or of a State or of a political subdivision thereof, while acting in the performance of their duties, who are authorized by law or by rules or regulations to own or possess any such weapon or explosive.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, nominating Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

John H. Flynn, of Pelham Manor, N. Y., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Nan Wood Honeyman, of Portland, Oreg., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg., to succeed Judge Fred Fisk, whose term of office will expire on April 30, 1942.

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

Several officers for appointment to temporary rank in the Air Corps; a Reserve officer and several honor graduates for appointment; and sundry officers for promotion, all in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

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

Sundry officers for promotion, and several citizens for appointment, in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 18, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 17 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

POSTMASTERS

MAINE

James G. O'Connor, Bangor.

MISSOURI

William T. Scott, Centerville.
William H. Fleahman, Jonesburg.
Joseph F. Suellentrop, Linn.
Edna B. Wood, Nixa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father and our God, storms may come and adversity may break upon us, even there shalt Thy hand lead us, and Thy right hand shall hold us. This is the trust to which Thou dost invite us and the promise which Thou dost make to the untroubled heart. Even the darkness hideth not from Thee, but the night shineth as the day.

In such a world as this, with its deep sorrow, with hearts that ache and backs that break, with its humiliating yokes of unseen crosses, forbid, O Lord, that we should leave unexpressed the thought of good cheer, the gracious word which may come as a ray of light in the earthly house of some poor tenant. Help us to be conscious debtors, living by each other and for each other. Heavenly Father, do Thou lead us to do good to the bad, to the ungrateful and to the ungracious, thus joining hands with the Saviour of the ages, as He went forth to war against falsehood, selfishness, and all manner of evil; let us follow in His train. We pray in His holy name. Amen.

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

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Committee on Appropriations to bring up for consideration on Friday next a joint resolution providing for emergency appropriations.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Who has the floor?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserved the right to object and got the floor in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to object to the request of the gentleman from Missouri, but I think we must realize the fact that we are still a legislative body. I do not believe it is good judgment to give permission to take up a bill when we do not know really what the text of the bill is going to be. The gentleman from Missouri will have no difficulty in getting up any emergency bill on Friday. I think the gentleman should withdraw his request until he gets his bill ready, and then we will cooperate fully in seeing that it is brought up.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, of course, I will withdraw the request if that is the wish of the gentleman from Massachusetts. May I say there is nothing controversial in the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all the more reason why we can wait and take it up in the regular way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws his request.

"SEND US MORE JAPS"

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are many stirring phrases in American history, but a new one has been added this morning.

We are familiar with the great words of great Americans on great occasions, both in victory and disaster. In defeat, there is Lawrence's despairing appeal, "Don't give up the ship"; in victory, Perry's laconic message, "We have met the enemy and they are ours." There is Farragut's terse order, "Damn the torpedoes. Go ahead"; and many here remember the quiet command of Dewey at Manila, "You may fire when ready, Gridley."

But yesterday morning, when contact was again established with Wake Island, and the gallant little remnant of American marines still holding the shell-torn atoll beneath a tattered American flag, was asked what was most urgently needed, the word came back defiantly, "Send us more Japs." It was a message in keeping with the finest tradition of American heroism and service, and it speaks the spirit of united American sentiment today—"Send us more Japs."

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE WRIGHT MEMORIAL, KILL DEVIL HILL, N. C.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BONNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the Record.]

DECEDENT ESTATE LAW

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEOGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the Record.]

THE VOTE ON WAR RESOLUTION

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I left Washington Thursday, December 4, and arrived in San Francisco Sunday morning, December 7, for the purpose of accompanying the chairman and a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands on an official visit to Hetch Hetchy, relative to San Francisco's hydroelectric power—a matter of very great importance to the United States Government and to my city; also to study and hold hearings with reference to legislation now pending before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which is most vital to the future of the American Merchant Marine.

I was in San Francisco but a few minutes when word was received of the cowardly and unprecedented attack by Japan on Pearl Harbor. War was declared on Japan the following day, Monday, December 8. Had I been here I would have voted "yes" for the declaration of war against Japan—likewise I would have voted for a declaration of war against the other Axis Powers.

NAVY YARD WORKERS OFFER LIFT TO F. D. R.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday will probably be observed as "Give Day" at the Portsmouth Navy Yard, with the more than 10,000 workmen prepared to work without pay as they expressed it, "to give our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, a lift in the all-out effort to defeat the Axis Powers."

The 350 employees of the foundry were the first to announce that they were going to work next Sunday without pay and by the close of the day shift, approximately half of the other shops had signified their intentions of doing likewise. By tomorrow morning when employees of the three shifts in the larger shops have had an opportunity to express themselves it is believed that the entire personnel will have fallen in line.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MILITARY CENSORSHIP

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, all of us agree I am sure that some censorship is necessary to protect our interests in times like these. I believe we agree also that the effectiveness of military censorship will depend pretty largely upon cooperation of press, radio, the people, and perhaps to a greater degree upon the Director of the Censorship. It is for this reason that I believe the Nation will appreciate the appointment by the President of Mr. Byron Price, executive news editor of the Associated Press, to direct this censorship.

During a long experience on the staff of a daily newspaper it was my pleasure and privilege to know Mr. Price quite intimately, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Nation may depend upon him to allow publication domestically of as much news as is wise to be published, and to reduce to a minimum the publication of news abroad that might be of value to our enemies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record, and permission for a second extension of remarks and to include therein a statement by the Trade Union Committee to Defend America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the Record.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a letter addressed to the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a short quotation from the Times-Herald of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not go away the first of the month so I was here to vote for the declarations of war. I was hanging around the House hoping that perhaps the distinguished and superior-in-dignity body at the other end of the building would find time to take up and consider and perhaps pass the amendments to the Wagner law which we put through last year, also that they might find time to consider the legislation we sent over the other day dealing with the strike question—the Smith bill, which seems to have been lost after it left the House.

Perhaps we made a mistake day before yesterday in not giving the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol the \$4,500 each for additional assistants, for which they asked; with another executive clerk for each they might be able to learn that we have sent some legislation over there that ought to have their attention. [Here the gavel fell.]

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 391) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, be and he is hereby elected to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER SHOULD HEAD PRICE CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, we are going to pass some kind of price-control legislation very soon. A great deal of talk has been heard about harmony between the Republican and Democratic parties. I feel that should the President of the United States announce that when the price-control legislation is passed he would place ex-President Hoover at the head of that organization it would have more to do in bringing about harmony between the two parties and the people of the United States than anything else that could be done. Mr. Hoover is the only living ex-President of the United States. Administering the price-control legislation will be one of the most important jobs during this crisis. I think that Mr. Hoover, with his wide experience during the last World War and the ability he has shown at all times, would be a good man for the job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address which I delivered recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some figures from the War Department, also a statement from the New York Times giving the comparative size of the armies of the world.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Dr. William E. Masterson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include a copy of a bill I have introduced to appropriate funds for the construction of Douglas Dam, copy of a letter from the President of the United States, one from Mr. Batt, of the O. P. M., and a statement from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

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

There was no objection.

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

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning in the column entitled "Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round" an article under the signature of Mr. Drew Pearson and Mr. Robert S. Allen which contains this excerpt:

The outbreak of the war obscured the incident, but the House ate crow in a big way on its action last summer barring David Lasser, former head of the Workers Alliance, from Government employment. After a careful investigation the Appropriations Committee completely exonerated Lasser of any Communist affiliations. Representatives JOHN TABER, New York, J. W. DITTER, Pennsylvania, and EVERETT DIRKSEN, who made the original accusation, ducked the committee session when Lasser was cleared.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the language clearly invades the legislative integrity of a Member of the House in that I was not

a member of the subcommittee which handled the matter, and therefore could not duck any committee of which I was not a member. I believe this constitutes an invasion of the privileges of the membership.

The SPEAKER. The rule covering this matter states:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members individually in their representative capacity only.

The Chair thinks the gentleman states a question of personal privilege.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not trespass upon the patience and good nature of the House under the rule which admits of a presentation for 1 hour. I can say what I have to say in 5 or 6 minutes.

First, may I say that I recognize that Drew Pearson and Bob Allen are busy men getting out a daily column and appearing on the radio once each week. It is to be assumed that they cannot always verify the things that come to their attention, and certainly there must be information placed at their disposal which comes from other sources. Inasmuch as unverified information sometimes finds its way into the columns, one can readily understand how this language may have appeared in the Daily Merry-Go-Round.

The only trouble with it, of course, is that it is a good deal like the definition of a crab that a little boy got from his father. The boy wanted to get a definition of a crab and his father said, "My son, a crab is a small red fish that walks backward."

The young man was quite dissatisfied with the definition, so when he next encountered a Gloucester fisherman he said to him, "My father told me that a crab is a small red fish that walks backward." He asked the fisherman if that was correct, and the fisherman said, "Son, it is substantially correct, except that a crab is not a fish; it is not necessarily small; it is not red; and it does not walk backward."

That is the trouble with this article. It impeaches me at home in those papers which carry the Merry-Go-Round and make it appear that I ran out under fire and ducked a committee session. Obviously, I could not duck a session of a subcommittee on supplementary deficiency appropriations which considered the matter of David Lasser for the very good reason that an examination of the subcommittee list will indicate that I was not and am not a member of that subcommittee.

Secondly, the insertion of the legislative provision in the third supplemental defense appropriation bill for 1942, which provided for the reinstatement of Mr. Lasser upon the W. P. A. rolls, or to that effect, does not constitute, in my judgment, an exoneration of Mr. Lasser.

In the third place, the subcommittee sessions of the Appropriations Committee are closed sessions. I was not advised that Mr. Lasser was to appear on the 14th of November; I was not invited to

appear; and I did not have an opportunity to refute the testimony that may have been offered there. I was in attendance at the full committee hearing on the 3d of December, when the entire bill was considered by the Appropriations Committee. One cannot make a point of order in a committee session; consequently, this provision, being subject to a point of order, could not have been taken from the bill in the full session of the committee.

I was on the floor on the 4th of December and on the 5th of December when the third supplemental appropriation bill was being considered. I camped on this floor religiously at that time, and when we got to the Lasser item on the 5th day of December I think everybody in this Chamber who was present will know that I reaffirmed my position with respect to Mr. Lasser, and insisted that he ought not to be reinstated on the rolls. I stated to the House I would not make a point of order, but would offer an amendment to strike that provision and let it be tested on its merits. I did not duck a subcommittee meeting not the meeting of the entire Appropriations Committee nor the floor sessions when the Lasser matter was considered.

In the next place the House did not eat crow, as is indicated in this article, because Mr. Lasser is not on the pay roll today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made the point of order on the floor, and I am satisfied from a survey of the sentiment that prevailed here on the 5th day of December that Mr. Lasser had no show whatsoever of ever getting on the pay roll of the Government if it were left to the disposition of this body. It is doubtful whether a half dozen votes could have been obtained in his behalf.

In the next place, it seems that the subcommittee may have done me the courtesy of advising me of the Lasser proposal, because a Member of this House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies on the 14th of November, and there presented the case for Mr. Lasser. I was not informed of the fact and had no opportunity to appear although I was available on that day.

On the same day the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], also a Member of this House, sent a memorandum to the subcommittee on deficiencies under date of November 14, 1941, in which he stated that he also thought Mr. Lasser was a pretty good fellow, and not a Communist.

There is nothing in the testimony that I can find to indicate that Mr. Lasser was exonerated or that the Committee on Appropriations made any extensive investigation at all. All that appears in the record is, first of all, the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]; second, the memorandum from the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]; third, a statement by Mr. Lasser; fourth, a statement that was made by Mr. Lasser to the Workers Alliance in June 1940; fifth, a statement made by Mr. Lasser to the national executive board of the Workers Alliance the same day; sixth, an editorial from the Baltimore Sun; and, seventh, an edi-

torial from the Washington News. That is all you will find in the record.

On the 5th of December I appeared on the floor and reaffirmed the statements I made about Mr. Lasser, and I think they are incontrovertible.

Finally, I stated that if Mr. Lasser had gone to the other Members of the House in his own behalf, certainly he should have come to the author of the amendment to the Emergency Relief Act in June of 1941 which separated him from the W. P. A. rolls, but he never came. However, last Tuesday morning, December 9, Mr. Lasser called and we had about a 30-minute conference. I said, "Mr. Lasser, did I do you an injustice, and were there any inaccuracies in the remarks I made on the floor of Congress?" He said, "No; there were not, but the inferences are unjust."

I said, "Mr. Lasser, inferences are the things a jury, for instance, gets from all the testimony. I presented the testimony. The inference is a wholly individual thing. It is a matter of opinion with various individuals. You may feel that you have been unfairly treated in that there were unjust inferences drawn, but I believe the record still insists that you have been running with subversive groups who have the communistic taint, and you ought to stand up now and take your medicine and not ask to go back on the rolls of the United States of America"

Finally, it should be observed that on December 5, when, for the second time, I reaffirmed my position with respect to Mr. Lasser and presented Mr. Lasser's own words from the testimony which he offered before the Appropriations Committee and from documents issued by his own organization, not a single Member of this House offered to take the floor in Mr. Lasser's behalf. No member of the subcommittee which heard the case, no member of the Appropriations Committee, and no other Member of the House rose in his place to defend the provision which the subcommittee inserted. Can it then be said that the House ate crow since Mr. Lasser is not on the Federal rolls today?

As for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the Members of this body are so familiar with the courage which they have exhibited over many years of constructive legislative service that it is unnecessary to refute the assertion that they ducked the subcommittee meeting.

Let me conclude the whole matter by stating that the record shows the inaccuracy of the item in question and that it is one of those unverified things which sometimes creep into the press. I submit the matter to the Congress without temper or animus and only for the purpose of keeping the record accurate.

PAYMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Do-

mestic Allotment Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 1 of the House engrossed amendments strike out "1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice and tobacco" and insert "1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945 and 1946 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
W. J. BULOW,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) giving the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

(1) The bill (S. 588), as passed by the Senate, eliminated those provisions of section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which provided for State plans to effectuate the purposes of such act, and for the making of grants to States to carry out such plans. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make soil-conservation payments to agricultural producers was made permanent. The House amendment does not disturb the existing provisions of section 7 relating to State plans. Instead, it retains those provisions but extends to January 1, 1947, the period during which the Secretary of Agriculture may make payments and grants in aid to agricultural producers under section 8 of such act. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

(2) The House amendment extended for 3 years the period during which the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized under the act of May 26, 1941, to make loans at the rate of 85 percent of parity upon certain agricultural commodities. The conference agreement adopts the House provision with an amendment extending the loan authority of the Commodity Credit Corpora-

tion for 5 years instead of 3, and including peanuts among the commodities on which such loans are to be made.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the House has just adopted the conference report on Senate bill 588. One section of this bill provides for loans at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price upon the 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.

With regard to peanuts, I wish to make the following statement to avoid any future misunderstanding with respect to the intention of the committee and the Congress relating to loans on peanuts.

First. Subsection (e) of section 359 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts," approved April 3, 1941, directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available loans upon peanuts if quotas are approved by not less than two-thirds of the farmers voting in a referendum, and further provides that such loans shall be made "only on the marketing quota for each farm."

It is, therefore, understood that such 85-percent loans shall be made only on the quota peanuts for each farm and it is not intended that such 85-percent loans shall be made on nonquota peanuts or excess peanuts.

It is further understood that said act, so approved April 3, 1941, authorizes, permits, and contemplates the production of excess peanuts or nonquota peanuts and provides the method in which they shall be marketed, and that by the production of such excess or nonquota peanuts the producer does not thereby become a noncooperator. It is, therefore, the intention that said 85-percent loans shall be made on quota peanuts notwithstanding and without regard to the fact that the producer of such quota peanuts may have also produced and marketed excess peanuts or nonquota peanuts or peanuts for oil.

I desire that this statement be considered as a part of the legislative history of said bill and report.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. R. M. Evans, National A. A. A. Administrator, on the 28th of November before the convention of the Illinois Agricultural Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last evening.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Alexander Seversky.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 390.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 1, line 13, after the period, insert: "It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill."

On page 2, line 1, after "adopted", insert "and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6215, which has for its purpose, as you are already advised, a further extension of the draft. The amendment just adopted merely insures that the committee amendment may be considered as an

original bill, and therefore makes the rule a more open one, if such a thing is possible.

It allows the House to amend the bill so as to work its will. The maximum age limit for service may be cut down or raised, and the minimum age limit may be raised or lowered as the House may see fit. I am sure that every Member of the House must feel most keenly a responsibility in arriving at his decision on this momentous question affecting, as it does, millions of our youth and our manhood in every walk of life in the Nation's domestic and economic life. This Congress in the past several months has been called upon to face stupendous issues. This is but another one. I am confident that the House will approach the issue with but one thought in mind—to face the issue squarely and fearlessly, regardless of political repercussions, thinking only of the ultimate welfare and safety of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's house is on fire. We, the Members of Congress, may be the fire station which must first answer the alarm and provide the materials with which to combat the flames. There is no time for bickering. The fire must be extinguished. The Congress and the American people must realize that we are engaged in no holiday excursion. We are in a death struggle on the side of the democracies who are sorely assailed by the totalitarian powers. I have no desire to appear as an alarmist or a pessimist; but need I remind you, in the light of the kaleidoscopic events which are occurring, that not only are our Government, our way of life, and our institutions threatened, but we must struggle for the salvation of our very lives. Can we longer afford to debate or falter when we realize what is going on abroad? Today the public is being prepared for the loss of Hong Kong; Singapore and the Philippines are dangerously threatened. The Axis Powers are set upon securing as their immediate objective these two barriers that now block their paths to the raw materials—principally oil and rubber—so essential to provide their war machine for a period of long operations.

If Singapore and the Philippines fall, they not only receive these essential raw materials but they remove us from the Pacific and the eastern arena of warfare. Moreover, they cut off rubber and other essentials which are necessary for our and the British machines. That these strongholds in the Pacific are vulnerable must be apparent to all who read and think. That they must be held at all costs in order that our own continental shores may be protected is quite evident.

So, Mr. Speaker, in this crisis we are called upon at the instance of the President of the United States, the Commander-in-Chief, and those in charge of the Nation's defense to further broaden the base of the draft to furnish the manpower so essential to the operation of our own war machine and the Nation's defense. That we will grant this authority is a foregone conclusion. As to whether we will give it within the exact limitations which the Army has requested is for this Congress to decide.

But that we will broaden that base is unquestioned. So far as I am personally concerned, I must confess my inability, not being fully advised in the premises, to say that the age limit shall be fixed at 65 on the one hand and 18 on the other hand. While it is hard for me to see the necessity at this time to dip into the high-school ranks to recruit the youth of the land, I shall be perfectly willing, as one who is vitally affected, to accept the aggregate opinion arrived at in the consummate judgment of the Congress of the United States. That we must have the manpower to man the machines of war is obvious. That we will have it will be demonstrated by this House today.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot leave this momentous subject without again calling the attention of the House and the country to the thought that in this great undertaking it is going to be necessary for someone other than the young manhood of this country to sacrifice, if we are to win this gigantic conflict. You and I are agreeable to sacrificing our sons in order to prevent this country being added to the list of Hitler's victims. But I know I bespeak your sentiments when I say also that you and I want to see all of our citizens in every walk of life make whatever sacrifices are necessary in order to enhance the opportunities which these young stalwarts must have to prevent their making the supreme sacrifice in vain. There must be a complete cessation of selfish advancement in this country at the expense of these young soldiers. Profiteering in industry and the commercial activities of the land must be surrendered to the commonweal. Strikes in war production must be made as unpopular by an incensed and righteous public opinion as desertion in the Army. This Congress must say to these young men whom it calls to the front line of the Nation's defense—to the trackless waste of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, in the Philippines, on the Malay Peninsula, Iceland, Africa, and possibly even in far away Russia—that we are going to give you the sinews of war with which to fight. We do not propose that they shall be sacrificed either in the icy waters of the Atlantic or Pacific, or upon the wastes of Russia and Africa, unprepared and without the planes, guns, and ships that are so essential to giving them a fighting chance against a ruthless enemy. Let us keep faith with those whom we call to the Nation's colors. If the American people in their resolution will determine that this shall happen we can and will win out in the death struggle that lies ahead.

Let us here and now resolve in this hour, while there is yet time, that we will keep the faith with those whom we send abroad to fight the Nation's battles. Let a reunited American people resolve here and now that come the tears, the sweat, and the blood we will sacrifice, we will produce, we will forget political and personal advancement and relegate selfishness to the background, and we will win.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Sacks].

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider the bill for the expan-

sion of the draft. I rise today to call attention of the House to a situation that has arisen in my city of Philadelphia, and I imagine in many cities of the North. I had in my office during this week end over 500 young American boys of the Negro race, who were refused enlistment in Philadelphia because the War Department said they had no vacancies. They were refused the right to enlist, although they are included in this bill about to be passed. These boys believe in America and they want to fight to protect America. They are willing to lay down their lives. I wrote a letter to Secretary Stimson, calling his attention to this matter. I feel it is the duty of the Army at this time to make provision for the American rights for these boys, not only to be drafted, but the right to enlist to serve their country. In Philadelphia this last week we were sent over 1,500 troops to guard our navy yard and our defense industries. They are colored troops, led by their commander. They are guarding the city of Philadelphia today, the only troops guarding that city. Yet Lieutenant Reed, of the recruiting service, told me on Monday that they had received an order from Washington saying that these boys cannot enlist at this time, boys who desire to enlist and to serve their country. I hope the House will take this matter up and give them an opportunity to enlist, because we need the men, as proven by necessity for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

DECEMBER 16, 1941.

HON. HENRY STIMSON,
The Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In this hour of crisis for America, thousands of our American boys and men are hastening to enlist, glad of the opportunity of laying down their lives for their country.

It is generally understood that there is a great demand for a large army, and because of this I cannot reconcile the fact that discrimination because of color has manifested itself. Many men of the Negro race of my city, Philadelphia, have been turned away by enlisting officers because they are colored. In my opinion—and I cannot help but feel that you will agree with me—this is unjustified discrimination, in definite opposition to the principles of democracy upon which this war is based.

I have taken the matter up with Lieutenant Reed, of the Philadelphia office, who informed me, over the telephone December 15, that the reason for this action was that they had orders from Washington that there were no vacancies for colored men at this time.

It is my hope, and I respectfully request, that you have this matter thoroughly investigated, to the end that those men of the Negro race, who are ready and anxious to enlist in the armed force of their country, be accorded that right and privilege.

Respectfully yours,

LEON SACKS.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. We are faced with a very difficult and serious question that we must decide here today. We must decide what we think is for the best in-

terest of America, and that is all that is at stake in all of these measures—what is best for America. How can we help to win this war? I confess, although I have done a good deal of thinking about it, that I do not know the answer to the problem of whether we should vote for a 21-year age limit or a 19-year age limit. The War Department, those in authority, the experts, have recommended 19 years, and I have a very high regard for the advice of General Marshall and General Hershey. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, by a practically unanimous vote, has recommended to this House an age limit of 21 years.

We all know that this war is an entirely different kind of war from that we were engaged in 23 years ago. That war did not compare in magnitude to the war in which we are now involved. In the Pacific we are fighting against the greatest military and naval power of the east, and in the west against the greatest military power almost in the world's history. In the last war we had 21 Allies and 5 navies on our side—the British Navy, the French Navy, the Italian and the Japanese Navies, and our own. Up at the front there were the British Army, the French Army, the Belgian Army, the Italian Army, and a host of other armies. Other nations had been fighting for years against the Central Powers, including Russia, Rumania, Serbia, and Portugal. This is an entirely different war. In that war 23 years ago we lost only 50,000 killed in a year and a half. Today now, in 10 days of warfare, we have lost approximately 3,500 killed. In 10 days we have lost 7 percent of what we lost in a year and a half in the last war. The conflict is on a different scale. Therefore, as we consider this bill we must realize that we are obliged to mobilize our full manpower and all of our resources in order to win the war.

No one knows how long the war will last. It may be over in a year. If Russia is victorious and Japan cannot reach the oil in Java and Sumatra, the war may be over in a year; but if Japan can obtain oil and if the German Army is victorious in Russia, then this war may go on indefinitely for any number of years. The War Department naturally, in good faith, has proposed a long-distance program of mobilizing all of our manpower, and has presented to the proper committees of the Congress a plan providing for an age limit of 19 years.

I confess that I do not know the answer. I dislike voting to take boys into the service below 21 years as much as any Member of Congress. I would much prefer if we could work out a compromise between 21 and 19, and vote for 20 years, and then they may be called after their twentieth birthday—not right away on their birthday, but during the succeeding year they would be given military training, and they would not go into actual fighting before 21. Perhaps that is the proper compromise. That is at least the one that I would favor at the present time before the debate starts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. That is the compromise that I would favor in advance of debate. Perhaps after hearing

the arguments, I may vote for 19 years. I want to go into this with an open mind and listen to what is said on both sides. At the present time I favor the 20-year age limit. Call it a compromise, if you will, but I think it more generally will satisfy the American people and bring about more unity toward winning the war. It certainly will not disturb or bother me if it is made either 19 or 21.

What we must realize if we are to win this war—and we are determined to win it—is that we need more production, more merchant ships, more tanks, more warships, more airplanes, more munitions and, above all, more men—men by the millions.

I wonder if you have the same feeling that I have listening to some of these short-haired women and long-haired men talking about civilian defense and community security here in Washington, and talking at the dinner tables about being bombed, and their houses being destroyed here and throughout the Nation. I do not believe there is much chance of our being bombed. Certainly if we are bombed in Washington it might help to augment the war tempo in America. It might serve a very good purpose. But I am not very much in sympathy with these people that blather at the dinner table about their houses being bombed, and their own safety and security. It makes no essential difference whether we are bombed or not. That is not going to win the war. Our fighting forces—our Army, our Navy, our air force, and our Marines—are going to win the war. Those who are going to do the fighting are the ones that we have to back and support to the limit and depend on for final victory.

It will have very little effect on the war whether a few bombs are dropped here and there over America. Let us realize in the beginning that we must provide arms and men for the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Corps, and nothing is too good for them from the start. They are going to do the fighting and dying and we must furnish them with the weapons to finish the job.

Let me say to some of my friends in Congress who have been coming to me and suggesting they would like to go into the armed forces and obtain commissions, what I have invariably answered, I cannot see the slightest reason for any Member of Congress taking a desk job, an administrative job in the War or Navy Department, or any other. If they are going to serve in a combat outfit in the Air Force or on board a destroyer, or in a combat unit in the Army, that is an entirely different thing. I would urge any Member of Congress to go who wants to do that, and envy him. But there is no reason in the world for any Member of Congress to put on a uniform, and a pair of spurs, to keep his feet from slipping off a desk in the War Department. They can better serve their country right here during the war, with the experience they have in Congress.

In view of the letter read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS] in regard to denying the colored people the right to volunteer I want to make some comments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

As one who served with colored troops in the last war, and if I get an opportunity with a combat outfit, I want to serve with them in this war. I offered an amendment to the draft bill which was finally accepted on the floor after a considerable fight, providing that there should be no discrimination against the colored soldier who was drafted; that he could go into any of the branches of the Army service. That is the law today. Supporting what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS] had to say, I have received letters from Detroit and other cities stating that colored people were being denied the opportunity to enlist, to serve in our armed forces, in a war for what? For freedom and democracy! Who has a better right to serve than the Negroes? Who has a better right to volunteer in a fight for freedom and democracy than the colored men of America?

Of course, they are entitled to enlist, and I propose to find out what is preventing them from being accepted.

I served last July with a number of colored regiments at Fort Bragg, N. C., headed by southern white officers, some of the best officers in the United States Army, and they are all of one accord, that those colored troops are doing a fine job. These were in anti-aircraft, artillery, infantry, and engineer regiments.

I wrote this letter today to Maj. Gen. Emory S. Adams, The Adjutant General of the War Department:

I am writing to ask if you could give me information in regard to the voluntary enlistment of our colored citizens? Many complaints have reached my office that colored volunteers are being rejected in Philadelphia, Detroit, and other places.

It seems to me that inasmuch as we are fighting this war for freedom and democracy there should be no distinction whatever between our white and colored citizens in our armed forces, and that Negroes should not only be permitted but encouraged to volunteer.

If we are to have an armed force of 7,000,000 men, approximately 700,000 will be colored soldiers. I had incorporated into the original draft bill an amendment that aimed to prevent any discrimination against colored soldiers so that they might enter into all branches of the Army.

I am further interested in knowing what is being done to organize colored divisions. Certainly, with an Army now approximating 2,000,000 and 2,000,000 more to be trained during the year, there should be at least a half-dozen colored divisions.

I will appreciate it if you will send me the information relative to the volunteering of our colored people immediately.

Thanking you for your attention to this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Let me quote what the President of the United States has to say on December 9, 1941, and I endorse every word in it:

We are now in this war. We are all in it—all the way. Every single man, woman, and child is a partner—

Not every white man, but every man—white, red, and colored—regardless of race, color, or creed—

in the most tremendous undertaking in our American history.

That is good, sound American doctrine from the President of the United States. It calls for unity, 100-percent unity, in America—not 90-percent unity, but 100-percent unity from all our people.

Now, getting back for a few minutes to this particular amendment: We have an army of 2,000,000 that has been in training for almost a year. We shall probably train another 2,000,000 during the year. This will make an army of 4,000,000. It will take at least 3 years to train an army of 7,000,000 provided for by this bill. Nobody knows how long this war will last. This bill really means mobilizing our manpower to the extent of 10,000,000 Americans.—7,000,000 or more in the Army, 2,000,000 in the Air Corps, and 1,000,000 in the Navy and Marine Corps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

If we are to go to war—and we who were opposed to it said this time and time again—if we are going into this war, there is only one kind of war to fight; that is a total war, an all-out war. This is the only kind of war the American people understand or that the Congress understands, a war to victory as soon as possible, fighting in every single continent of the world with American expeditionary forces. It would be cowardly and craven, now that we are in this war, to say to the British, to the Communists, or to the Chinese, "You go ahead and fight the war; we will supply you with guns." This is not the American way. We have declared war in the American constitutional way, and Congress has voted for expeditionary forces. I am for a total all-out war with an army of 7,000,000, one-tenth of which to be made up of colored soldiers with at least half a dozen colored divisions, an air force of 2,000,000, and a Navy and Marine Corps of 1,000,000 in order to win the war at the earliest possible moment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession a letter from the President of the United States bearing the President's own signature. The President's letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, December 15, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I write to confirm that I fully approve and endorse the bill for the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. MAY in the House on Friday last.

I approve the proposed congressional declaration of policy, the provision for the registration of all our manpower between 18 and 64, inclusive, and the extension of liability for military service so as to include all the age groups from 19 to 44, inclusive.

I consider the registration provision an essential instrument for the orderly planning of our national effort.

As to the extension of liability for service, I approve it as a means of providing a sufficiently large pool of men available for service in our land and naval forces (including the air forces) adequate to meet all contingencies now foreseeable.

These two features of the bill supplement each other. I consider them of equal and prime importance.

The reasons for the bill are more fully set forth in the letter sent by the Secretary of

War on Saturday last to Representative MAY and Senator REYNOLDS. I endorse without qualification the Secretary's statement in that letter.

I am sending an identical letter to the Speaker and the minority leader of the House and the Vice President and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

That letter and the recommendations which were made to the Congress in a letter of the Secretary of War were not made facetiously or in an arbitrary manner. Those recommendations were made after deep thought and study by the President of the United States, who is also the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, and by his military advisers.

There is only one thing we of America must watch: We must not adopt an attitude of self-complacency. We saw what happened in France; we saw the results of the idle and thoughtless statements, "This is a phony war," made some time ago. That was worth 50 or 75 divisions to Hitler, because it indoctrinated the minds of the people of England and France with self-complacency. Then Hitler flung his mechanized legions against the soldiers of France and England, and we know the results. We in America must not be lulled to sleep; we must be constantly on our guard. The American people are determined. The American people are on guard. It is the duty and the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to be equally determined and on guard.

Last week we evidenced to the country the type of decisive leadership it sought. By our action of last week the Congress has impressed the people with an excellent example. There was perfect teamwork last week between the executive branch, the President of the United States, and the Congress. We want this teamwork to continue. By our example we have shown Hitler, Mussolini, and the war-mad totalitarian leaders of Japan that the legislative branch of our Government, the Congress of the United States, can function effectively and decisively in a crisis.

In a war there must be a leader. We have a leader—a constitutional leader. Under war conditions, of necessity, the President must be given great powers. This is the purpose of this bill. Our leader, the President, is not only the President of the United States but is also the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. We must give to the Commander in Chief the power not only to meet immediate problems and situations under war conditions, but we must give him the power to make long-range plans. He and his advisers in the War Department and the Navy Department must be supported.

The amendment to reduce the lower draft-age limit to 19 years, which will be offered, I understand, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessary to attain that purpose. With all due respect to the distinguished members of the House Committee on Military Affairs, we cannot have too many leaders in this crisis. While I recognize they are all outstanding military leaders, while I

recognize they are undoubtedly great tacticians, while I recognize they probably could lead the Army to success in this conflict, yet I cannot accept their judgment in these days in preference to the judgment of the President of the United States and his military and naval advisers.

In this crisis we must all be good soldiers, and that applies particularly to the members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House so far as this bill is concerned. They cannot and they should not on a matter of policy challenge the judgment of the President of the United States and of General Marshall, both of whom have recommended that the age start at 19 years. This power is necessary. We can rely on the President and on General Marshall in war, as we must, and we can and must rely on them in these days to exercise in a proper manner the powers which are conferred upon them.

Today we are one House, with no middle aisle dividing the two great political parties. As an individual Member of this body and as majority leader, I am proud of the spirit that exists in this body. It is the spirit of America on the march. "Remember Pearl Harbor" means something to us today just the same as decades ago "Remember the Alamo" was the rallying cry of the valiant Texans in their fight for freedom. "Remember Pearl Harbor" means remembering the treachery of the Japs, a contaminated, contemptible people, for all future time. It also means our determination to revenge that dastardly and infamous act of deceit and treachery.

A week ago last Monday we declared war on Japan. A few days later, with only 17 or 18 minutes' debate, we made legislative history in the United States. A few days later we declared war against Germany and Italy without a word of debate. That was leadership on the part of every Member of the Congress, not the leadership of the Speaker, the majority or minority leaders, but leadership of the Congress itself, congressional leadership, setting an example for the War Department, the Navy Department, and all other governmental activities, setting an example to the people of the United States. We set that example last week. Are we going to upset it only 10 days later by refusing to accept the recommendations of the President of the United States?

When the amendment is offered to reduce the age limit to 19 years I shall support it. I cannot in this crisis permit my individual judgment, even if it differed, to rise in opposition to the judgment and the recommendation of the President, the judgment and the recommendation of General Marshall, whose business it is to defend our country when attacked. He made this recommendation, the President has made it, and it is the duty of Congress, as I see it, to be valiant soldiers, you and I as Members of the House, not as members of two political parties, and, above all, as Americans and as soldiers, we should vote for the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS].

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Portsmouth (N. H.) Record of yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, every man in this House knows definitely who is going to do the fighting in this country; every man in this House has supreme confidence in those who are going to do the fighting in this war, and not a person here doubts the ultimate result of this great contest. It is the youth of America who are going to do the fighting, and, at the risk of repeating what I may have said on this floor perhaps several times before, I will cite a few instances of the type that makes up and will make up the American fighting forces.

I recall many incidents on the football field where you can find out what the spirit of the boys is in a great united contest where it is only a question of college prestige. I had a quarterback, and he is typical of American youth, who played a game after his jaw was broken. He came off the field, after helping to win the victory, holding his jawbones in place with his hands, and expressing the hope that he would not be criticized because his injury might have taken his mind off the game. I know of another instance where a man played a half of a game, carrying the ball for gains time after time, yet when he was examined later it was found that both shoulders were broken. That is the spirit of the American youth.

I saw a story this morning which I think is typical. You all saw it. Whether it be true or not, it really reflects the spirit of the American boy. When they managed to get in contact with Wake Island, and asked the marines what they would like to have sent to them, they said, "Send us more Japs." That is the spirit of fighting men.

I cannot pass upon the merits of the bill before the House at the present time. I shall listen to the debate. I simply know that every man who goes into the Army must have something to drill with and to fight with. This Congress, in view of this bill and the great war facing us, should cut every bit of red tape that can possibly interfere with the production of guns, planes, tanks, and things that our Army must have to fight with. I say now without fear of contradiction that some bureaus are obstructing the Army in what it desires. There is delay, there is red tape, and the responsibility for cutting that red tape rests upon the Congress.

We have another responsibility. Much as we may desire to help other countries, nevertheless in the situation which now confronts our own Nation we must see to it that essential war materials we sorely need for our armed forces are not allo-

cated and shipped away to foreign nations.

We must not strip our country of the things necessary for its defense, for we have an intensive war to the west of us, a war that must be won. So whatever you do here, keep one thought in mind is my advice—do not take more men into the camps than we can properly equip and train. Adequate equipment is a condition precedent to producing an efficient fighting force. Let the procedure be orderly, practicable, and resultful. Let the Congress never give up its responsibility to search with meticulous care every move that is made by this Government to the end that an invincible armed force takes the field, the sea, and the air in defense of the cause to which the United States is committed.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to discuss the merits of the bill at this time, although I may have something to say on it when it comes up for general debate and for consideration under the 5-minute rule.

The acting chairman of the Committee on Rules has given me this brief time in order that I may make a statement not only for myself but for the committee, of which I happen to be a member, in order to keep the record straight, or, at least, to keep it fair and to let it speak the truth.

On yesterday afternoon I was one of those who joined in the applause for the distinguished majority leader, for whom I have the most affectionate regard and the highest respect, on his statement that, thank God politics has adjourned and that unity now prevails in this House and in the country, and that it is no time for unkind or unjust criticism.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is perhaps too modest to say for himself what I want to say for him, that for the last 4 or 5 days, with the exception of Sunday, and certainly including all day Saturday until late in the evening, the Committee on Military Affairs had before them all the witnesses whom they thought knew anything about this very important subject. The witnesses were heard in great detail. Every member of the committee on both sides of the committee was given the most ample opportunity for cross-examination. After everybody who desired to testify had been heard the committee went into executive session, and I undertake to say that I have never seen manifested a finer or more patriotic spirit in order to get this bill out in the best possible form.

It is true that there was not a unanimous agreement. I happen to be one of those, along with the distinguished minority member on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], who supported the original text of the bill. But there is one thing I say, absolutely, and I think I speak for every member of that committee when I say it, that not a person on that committee set himself up as superior to the War Department or to the military experts of the country. No member of the committee

claimed then or now that he is a military expert.

I simply plead for fairness to the committee of which I happen to be a member, and say that the committee, in an honest, patriotic effort to come here and do their full duty and present all the facts, together with a printed record as disclosed by the hearings which are now before you, and likewise a full and ample report, have done what I at least have always tried to do, whether in the court-house or in legislative halls, to present the facts and let the jury determine what is fair and best to do.

I do not profess to know much about military affairs, but I do say that I and every member of that committee are just as conscientious in an effort to arrive at what is best in this critical hour as any man who undertakes to criticize us. So I say for the record that I am here to plead again for unity.

I do not know what is best to do about this matter. I was much impressed with the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I do not know whether it is best to set the limit at 19, 20, or 21 years of age. I know that after that terrible debacle at Pearl Harbor, this House, by a practically unanimous vote, with only one vote against it, pledged absolutely every resource in this Nation to the winning of this war; and that means men and material.

I hope you will give dispassionate and patriotic consideration to this bill. If you want to disregard the views of every man on the committee, you are at liberty to do so; but I assure you that there has been an honest and sincere effort by the chairman and every man on that committee to present the facts and the evidence as they were laid before us by the War Department and by those who know national defense. I am one of those who have the greatest confidence in the War and Navy Departments of this country. I am following their leadership in this mighty conflict. Theirs is the primary duty to win this war. I am one of those backing our Commander in Chief in this mighty conflict. What he says is necessary to win this war, I am for. When he sends a letter here such as that read by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I tell you that for my part I am going down the line. That is what I did in the committee and that is what I propose to do now. At the same time I am not setting myself up as knowing more than the military experts of the country, which we were charged with doing a few minutes ago. I believe in General Marshall and his staff and they have always had my support, just as they are having today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee to Investigate Air Accidents may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and condense my remarks as printed in the Record of yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, when we left the floor on yesterday we left it in the warm glow of affection and unity of purpose. I was somewhat surprised at the remarks of our distinguished majority leader with reference to this bill. I have read with a great deal of interest the report of the splendid Committee on Military Affairs on this matter. I want to be guided by their views in the debate on this important bill. I believe it to be one of the most important matters we have had to consider in this House outside of a declaration of war, in that it deals with the lives of the boys between 18 and 21 years of age.

I could not help but think that, after all, when we consider the rosters of the football squads of the Military and Naval Academies, West Point and Annapolis, we can look at the ages of those boys and see whether they are 18 or whether they are 20, 21, and 22.

I think it is a very vital matter to consider and I am sure that the great Committee on Military Affairs is ready and anxious and willing to give us what is their solemn judgment, because there is one group that is going to know whether this is a "phony war" to which the majority leader refers, and that groups is composed of these lads who will soon give up their lives in defense of this country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a most crucial hour. A time when the whole world is on fire. A time when nearly all civilized nations of the earth are engaged in war.

The legislation before us this afternoon is for the purpose of further assisting our country in the prosecuting of our part in that conflict. This measure is an important one. It deals with the human problem. This Congress wants to do the right thing regarding it. The bill provides, among other things, that the draft age shall be increased to 45 years, and reduced to include boys as young as 18 years. The Military Affairs Committee of the House, after taking testimony from those familiar with the question, and after considering the problem in its entirety, have recommended that the minimum age for induction of men shall remain at 21 years for the present. I feel the recommendation of the committee should be followed. It may later develop that the minimum age should be reduced to 18. If so, Congress can do it, and will do it promptly, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, we now have approximately 2,000,000 men in our armed forces. It will have to be increased just as rapidly and promptly as human energy can provide for it. I understand it is expected to double that force and have 4,000,000 men under arms within a year, and to increase it to probably 7,000,000 during the following year, and to do it even sooner, if possible.

Mr. Speaker, we are advised approximately 17,500,000 registered for the draft in 1940. According to selective-service authorities, seven and a half million are eligible for service. Furthermore, 100,000 young men reach the age of 21 years every month. That means 1,200,000 additional boys are of military age each year. Another thing to be considered is that young boys are right now crowding the enlistment places by the thousands.

I know it is difficult to compare this situation with the World War. It will be remembered that while the age limits were 21 to 31, that our armed forces were more than 4,000,000, and that although the age limit was reduced shortly before the close of the war, none was drafted under 21 years. And let it be understood these 18-year-olds in the meantime will be needed especially on the farms to help produce for those who are doing the fighting.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only a question of inducting men into the Army or the Navy. The great big problem is to provide housing, arms and equipment, hospitals, and all of the things necessary to provide trained and properly equipped armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has shown that it can act, and act quick in an emergency. It will do it in this case, if and when it is necessary to do so.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we cannot build cantonments, and turn out tanks, guns, planes, and other materials just by appropriating the money, although that is necessary. It is going to take the everlasting cooperation, work and sacrifice of millions of men and women in order to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, our country has been attacked. We are engaged in the most gigantic struggle at arms the world has ever known. America is playing the most important part in that conflict.

This is so much worse than the first World War. In that war we had many countries on our side, we had a half dozen navies fighting with us. Not so today.

Mr. Speaker, the picture is not very bright this afternoon.

The Americans know how to sacrifice when they are called upon to do it. They will do it now. With a united people the United States of America will make a determined and supreme effort to bring this terrible crisis to a successful conclusion just as soon as it may possibly be done. Let us hope and pray that the day of victory is not too far distant.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to offer a word of commendation of and to express my satisfaction with a recent action of the War Department which has let down

the bars considerably as to educational requirements for air pilots, as well as for navigators and bombardiers who must man the air force of the United States Army.

I maintain that it has been absolutely necessary to do this in order to conform with the proposed program of expanding the air force which the Army contemplates. As I understand the present program, it will call for some 20,000 air pilots a month. This will necessitate abolishing the old regulation of requiring 2 years of college education in order to become an air pilot. The requirements for navigators have never been 2 years necessarily. They call for, as I understand, a high-school education. However, the proposed plan calls for eliminating the educational stipulation for air pilots, and this will open a vast new reservoir for the air force of the Army, which will be built into a force second to none throughout the world. The War Department is simply following the general provisions which I advocated when I introduced a resolution to this effect about 6 weeks ago, and when I emphasized that you cannot lick Hitler with a Phi Beta Kappa key alone.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TERRY. What will be the minimum age requirement for the air-pilot training corps?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In answer to the gentleman, according to the information I have had, and I may be wrong, but my information is that the age will be 21 as the minimum age. However, I believe in wartime commissions for the air force will be allowed at a younger age. At any rate, boys under 21 will be allowed to volunteer, and, if accepted, can find a place in the air forces of our country.

Mr. TERRY. Does not the gentleman feel it would be fair, if we are taking boys younger than 21 into the Army, to reduce the minimum-age requirement for those who go into the Air Corps? In other words, give them a chance.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the House so decides, I will say to the gentleman, it is only fair that it should be extended to the air force. As I understand, thousands upon thousands of young Americans have tried to get into the air force in the past and have been deliberately denied that privilege because they were unable to meet educational requirements, and I am glad that this is being changed.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested a few moments ago in the remarks of our distinguished majority leader, able, fearless, patriotic, and one who has done a grand job with the majority side, and I think has done a great deal toward welding the House together as a whole. Heretofore on so many occasions the cry has been "Stand by the committee." The Military Affairs Committee is an able, conscientious, hard-working committee.

They have had some tough going in the last few weeks and in the last few months. They have been closer to the military picture and the military problems of this Government than any group I know in the United States outside of some of the actual Army officials, and I am not so sure they are not in a better position to get a better picture than the department officials. Now we are met with the statement that probably they are setting themselves up as knowing more about military tactics than the officials. I do not agree with that. I think these gentlemen are just as conscientious as the gentleman from Massachusetts would have been or would like to have been or is.

We are dealing now with both a military problem and a human problem and this House has to deal with both of those problems. I am not saying that military men and naval men have never made a mistake. I am not saying the House has never made a mistake, and try as hard as we may, we are still going to make some mistakes. The public sentiment, the patriotism, the loyalty, and the unity of this country have been soaring upward. Let us not deter it. Let us not, at this time, unless there is some good reason—and I must admit that I believe this House is entitled to better logic and better reasons than just to say that somebody has said so and so would be good.

This House is willing and is going to remain willing to do whatever is necessary to defend this country, and we are called upon "to be soldiers." Yes. But the Members of this House will not be soldiers all of the time in the sense that they must take orders all of the time, because we are called upon to be thinking soldiers. We have to think, we are charged with thinking, and when a general comes in and says so and so exists or that he knows so and so, then it is our duty to say, "Give us good reasons, some good logic in support of the statement." If these boys, 18 and 19 years of age, are needed, do not worry about the youth of this land being willing and able to play their part, but let us have some good sound logic, some good reason, some figures showing that they are needed and some figures showing that they could be trained, and then some figures showing that they ought to be put into action now, before we begin to empty the farms, homes, colleges, and the schools of the country of the boys who would have nothing to do after they were drafted. If there is some good reason, give it to us.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the consent of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6233. An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution relative to the reenrollment of the bill (H. R. 6208) to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6215, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. I trust that I may be able to approach the discussion of this measure coolly and without passion and avoid in any possible way any feeling of hysteria. First I begin with an expression of my heartfelt appreciation to my colleagues on the Committee on Military Affairs, particularly my good friend and right-hand man, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], and also the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], for coming to the defense of the House Military Affairs Committee, against the groundless criticisms of our distinguished majority leader, but I am not going to take my time here in responding to the criticism that has been cast at the committee, by the floor leader. Therefore, I shall proceed to discuss the legislation without reference to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes. I yield to my friend the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman speaks about criticism having been made. If the gentleman had listened to my remarks he would have seen that there was no criticism, except that I paid my respects to the military ability of Members, and I said that in the matter of the difference between their judgment, and the judgment of the President of the United States, and the judgment of General Marshall, that I feel constrained to follow the judgment of General Marshall and the Commander in Chief in this conflict. If the gentleman calls that

criticism very well. I think it is fair debate.

Mr. MAY. There was a veiled criticism that we are not "good soldiers," in the gentleman's remarks, when I have stayed here late hours in the night, and no longer than last Monday night remained in my office until 10 o'clock, in an effort to get this legislation before the House so that the representatives of the people might have an opportunity to consider it. And I am here today to lay down a fundamental that I stand for and shall stand for so long as I live, and if it puts me on the spot, then I am on a spot where I have been practically all of my life, and never wavered at any time. I do not believe that the time has come, even though we are in war, when legislators have lost the function to do their own thinking. I regard this as the legislative department of the Government, and I regard every man on the floor of this House in his rights as the equal of every other man, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican. I reserve to myself the right to disagree even with the Commander in Chief, if it becomes necessary to do it, but let me add, that in this crisis I am ready now not only to support the Commander in Chief and the Army and Navy of the United States, but I am ready to shed every drop of blood that is in my veins, if it becomes necessary, for the preservation of human freedom and the preservation of this country that I love.

Let us see what the facts are. Why bring the officials of the War Department before any congressional committee, if it is not to get information? Why bring them for information unless the committee is going to consider it? It would be a useless, futile performance. But we brought the Director of the Selective Service System, through which these men must come when they go into the Army. We not only deprived ourselves of taking a day off on Saturday, but we worked until after 5 o'clock in the evening in order that he might tell us everything he knew.

Among the outstanding things that he told us in discussing the available reservoir of manpower for military purposes was that even with the registration of 17,500,000 men who were registered in October 1940, there was a reservoir of 7,500,000 men eligible and capable of military service. In addition to that, he told us there were 1,200,000 young men under 21 years of age who reached the age of 21 every year, year after year.

Your committee, though it is subject to criticism, of course, and sometimes ought to be criticized in the exercise of its best judgment and conscience, every one of them without reference to politics or any other thing except the welfare and safety of the American Republic, have brought out a bill fixing the military age limits at 21 to 44, inclusive, and we have not only that reservoir fixed but this great flow of eligibles coming in at the rate of 1,200,000 a year. We felt—or I did—that we could afford to let these little boys in their teens, from 18 to 21, remain back until we need them. If I am not mistaken, this House has already demonstrated its

capacity to act when it needs to act. When the time comes that we must wreck the school days, destroy the youthful opportunities of boys 18 years of age in this country, then your House Military Affairs Committee will be the first to be here with a bill to draft them if and when they are needed. But let us not do it until we do need them. Let us not destroy the hopes and ambitions of fathers and mothers for their children. Let us not destroy that unity that is 100 percent in America today behind the President of the United States in the prosecution of this war. But let us go at it soberly. Let us make up a draft bill that will give them ample power to get all the manpower they need, but let us wait about taking the youngsters until we need to take them. Let us wait to see if we can find out whether or not the manpower in some European countries is going to be used. Now, let that sink in.

As I said awhile ago, we have that great reservoir of manpower. We have the machinery set up in this bill to handle—all of them. The only remaining unsettled question will be when the time comes, if it ever does come, and God forbid that the time ever will come, when we have to draft 18-year-old boys; but when the time comes the machinery is set up and the House of Representatives can in 30 minutes, as it did the other day in about 30 seconds, pass a bill extending their duties in the Army beyond the Western Hemisphere. But let us be sober and deliberate. Let us be sensible. Let us send word to the President that we are behind him 100 percent; but I think in justice to the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee or any other Member of Congress who is taken to task when he perhaps is not guilty, if the President wanted me to have the information that is contained in the letter, a duplicate of which I have, I should have had it before the Rules Committee passed on the rule and had adjourned. I did not have it during the hearings. I am sorry I did not. I am following the President, and I will follow him just as long as I am able to walk. When I cannot walk I will get down and crawl. When I cannot crawl, then I will say something for the good of the Army or the prosecution of our cause, for the prosecution of the cause of humanity throughout the world. But let us be sober and deliberate about this thing and let us go along like statesmen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

When we come to the question of considering amendments I want you to remember that if an amendment is offered to reduce the age to 19, that is a matter for the House of Representatives and not for me. But I think you are entitled to know what your House Military Affairs Committee has found out in the meantime, so that you can intelligently make up your judgment along with that which you already know in your own right, by your own experience.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that he approved of keeping the family together during the terms of the young men up to 21?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Now, will the gentleman kindly inform the House why with that approval extending the age to 21, there should be any inclusion of registration from 18 to 21? Why not begin the registration at 21?

Mr. MAY. Well, that registration from 18 to 65 is very proper, I think, for this reason: The Army will have an inventory not only of the young men below 21 but they will have an inventory of the older people above 44, and out of those two inventories they will be able to determine the uses they can make of them, and they will know when they come of age and be prepared to consider those coming into military age, that is, 21 years old, while those in the age brackets above 44 can be selected for nonmilitary service and thousands of them are waiting to be given an opportunity to serve their country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that an unfavorable reference has been made to the membership of the Military Affairs Committee in connection with their judgment on this bill. For my part, I have always had the highest respect for the chairman and members of this committee as being minded to conscientiously legislate in the proper way for the best interests of the Army and the War Department and the country. At this particular time, however, I find myself in disagreement with the majority recommendation of the committee as outlined in the bill which was reported as against the provisions of the bill submitted to the Congress by the President, the Secretary of War, and the General Staff. I want to remind you that I am aware of the fact that legislation in any way involving compulsory service of young men is not popular, whether the service be for war or something else. I recall speaking here during the days just before we voted the extension of the Selective Service Act. I recall a great many things that were said. I want to remind you that I was, from the start, unalterably opposed to intervention in this war on our part including an A. E. F. I opposed the measures sending our ships into belligerent ports. But there is a great difference between today and those days. We have had war declared upon us by three countries, one of which was the same country we were at war with in 1913.

In the first World War we raised 4,000,000 men, but we could not have raised more than 4,000,000 men, as has been said by some, between the ages of 21 and 31. We were obliged to change the ages from 18 to 45. Fortunately, that war soon terminated, and such will probably not be our good fortune this time.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. EDMISTON. The gentleman knows that not a single man below the age of 21 was drafted, because the war ended before the machinery could be put into action to draft anyone below 21.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is correct.

Mr. EDMISTON. So not a man below the age of 21 was drafted in World War No. 1.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish to emphasize the fact also that at that time the war was fought in France. The action was localized in France. The whole picture was infinitely better than our picture today. Practically all of the equipment of the American Army of 2,000,000 men in France was supplied to us by the British. Some was supplied by the French and some by the Italians.

People ask: What need have we for an army of 4,000,000 today? Any person well informed on the subject knows we must figure or at least plan on a much larger army than that whether it is used or not. In 1917 the airplane was in its infancy. In those days there were no giant airplane factories. We were not then obliged to equip and supply the forces of most of the countries whom we were going to assist. Today we have these tremendous aviation plants and the industry of America is many times what it was in those days. There is a compelling demand for mechanics of all types drawn from the ranks of the young and the middle-aged. This complicates the question of manpower.

I want to clear up one or two things that have been said with respect to the Selective Service and General Haislip, and G-1 in charge of personnel. We have in the Army today 1,750,000-odd men. It is the intention of the War Department, I believe, to call back into the service those between the ages of 28 and 36 who are now in reserve and who have had a few months' service, the men who were released pursuant to the act passed by Congress this last summer. This gives us, with volunteers, we will say, 2,000,000 roughly in all in our Army with all selectees among them between the ages of 21 and 36. We have available for the Army now classified as I-A between 21 and 36, 950,000 men. This would give us an army of roughly 2,800,000. It has been stated by General Hershey that more could be obtained from this age group only by lowering the physical requirements, and going into the families and making dependency and more hardship cases. Competent testimony is that if this were done it would furnish at the outside only 1,500,000 men completely between the ages of 21 and 36. This would give us an army of 3,500,000. The testimony given us by those who knew, was to the effect that between the ages of 35 and 45, 400,000 additional men could be obtained.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. DIES. How many men have been deferred on account of occupational reasons?

Mr. ANDREWS. A considerably large proportion. It is estimated that about 50 percent or more of those eligible be-

tween 21 and 36 have been deferred for one reason or another, either vocational, occupational, or physical.

The chairman a few moments ago asked: "Why take men 18 years old?" There is nothing in the proposal making 18 the age of liability for service; there is nothing in that proposal that says we shall take a boy 18 and put him in the armed forces. All that is required is that they shall be registered as being available. There would be only 1,500,000 available in this age group divided roughly as follows: 600,000 19 years of age; 600,000 20 years of age; and 300,000 who have become 21 since the last registration. It is not the intention of the War Department to take the boys of 19, on the whole, any more than it is to take men of 46.

I want to remind you of something else. Anyone who has had any connection with military science knows that we will need an air corps of 2,000,000 men. It will take from 20 to 35, perhaps 50, men to supply one large modern bomber such as we are going to have and must have in large numbers.

To give you some idea of what it is going to mean to have an air corps of 2,000,000 men, we know what the quality of youth is; we know that sprinkled in, on the preparations of our War Department and our General Staff, there must be a reasonable proportion of youth; we know what the proved imagination and determination of youth is in this war already. This plan is merely a framework, a set-up, under which the War Department may for once in its life be able to formulate a sound plan, giving effect to the necessity for having in our Army men of all ages. How can any man definitely say that we are going to be satisfied with an army of 4,000,000 men, even if we could get them between 21 and 45, and it is not clear that we can do that. It is beyond my belief.

We are in the greatest war we have ever been involved in. No man can prophesy what may happen in a week or a month from now. There is no intention of suddenly taking these men who are 19 and 20. It is part of a well-worked-out program. The War Department will take them between 21 and 28 and 18 and 35, then some 36, then maybe some 20, then some 37 or 38, then some 19. I was not willing at the time of the extension of the Selective Act to gamble at that time, and I am not now. How many times must the War Department come to this body for correction? I believe this is the sound action now for every Member of the Congress who voted to declare war and to place our resources at the disposal of the President for its successful conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I would not have voted for this bill on December 6, and I doubt if there is a Member of the House who would have done so. We have not forgotten, however, what happened in Honolulu, on Sunday, December 7. Following that tragic day—perhaps the darkest page in

our whole military history—Congress, by unanimous vote, December 8, passed a resolution including these impressive words:

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government and to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan to bring the conflict to a successful termination all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Pursuant to that declaration of war by every Member of Congress save one, and likewise by the ratification of almost all of the people of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this country, not the President, not Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, but the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, sent a letter here, which the distinguished majority leader read this morning, saying that it is imperative that all of our manpower be marshaled, registered, trained, and prepared for military service.

Like you, I have never in all my life, uneventful as it has been, felt so keenly my responsibility, but I am as certain as I stand here that there has never been in the history of this Nation—and perhaps not in the recorded history of civilization itself—as tragic or as dangerous an hour as this. Read the headlines today about Hong Kong, Singapore, renewed threats at Honolulu, renewed threats in the East, threats in Panama and South America, then tell me that when the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, together with the men who must fight and win this war—meaning the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps—come in here and say, "We must have this legislation," you will not grant it? As for myself personally, I am willing to follow those who are charged with the duty and the responsibility of winning this war. We might just as well face the facts. We are headed for dark days. We are going to pay in "blood, sweat, and tears."

I was impressed with the preamble to this bill, which very properly from a legislative standpoint was stricken from the bill because it is not legislation. It contained in a few words what I conceive to be the tragic situation that exists today:

That (a) the Congress hereby declares that the present concerted world-wide assault upon the free countries of the world gravely threatens the security of the Republic and that the Nation is fighting for its existence and its future life.

(b) The Congress further declares that it is the national policy to accept no result save victory, final and complete, over all the enemies of the United States; and that to this end it is imperative that liability for military service be extended to further age groups and that a complete inventory of the manpower of the Nation be taken by registration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my devotion to the home and home ties, because I have children of my own. I do not want to break up homes, but I would like to know what this country is going to be worth if the Japs or Hitler get over

here. There is one thing nearly as bad as death, and that is slavery. We are going to retain and preserve our liberty regardless of cost. Somebody has to fight this war and somebody has to be prepared for any eventuality, because I fear that there are many of us who have not yet grasped the tragic seriousness of this hour. If you will read the hearings before our committee, you will find that this is not an effort on the part of the War Department to rush in next week or next month, or even in the early part of next year, to have all of these young boys between 19 and 21 taken into the service. This is nothing but a long-range over-all program for an all-out war. The testimony is there from General Hershey, Director of Selective Service and Training, than whom I undertake to say no man in this Government has done a finer or fairer job. He says himself there will not be an attempt even to register these young men before next July. It should not be forgotten, too, that under the system now in vogue no man enters the service, regardless of age, at least is not attached to a unit, for approximately 5 months. We might just as well become war conscious and every man, woman, and child above 16 years of age know he has a part in it and a duty to perform.

The soldier first goes into the reception center. He then goes into a replacement center, to find out where he will fit best. Do not think for one minute that all of these young men are going to be rushed into the service in a brief period of time. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] so well said, the Army has an outfit—I believe the Army has some kind of a big word for it; they call it "cadre" or something of the sort—where they take the older soldiers, they take experienced men, they take experienced noncommissioned officers, they take some men 25, 28, or 30 years old, and then they take in some of these young fellows. That goes to make a well-balanced army. It is true the young man has the daring, courage, and physical health that a man of older years does not have, but when I look at men like the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and many of the members of my own committee who saw service overseas when they were under 21 years of age, I recall that they made very brilliant records that in their modesty you will never hear them say anything about.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman at his discretion discuss some of the figures which I am sure he has?

Mr. THOMASON. Figures are sometimes tiresome and confusing. You must not forget—and I have the record before me—that Germany has an army now of between 6,000,000 and 8,000,000 men in service, with from 280 to 300 divisions. Japan has even more men than we have today, having an army of 1,800,000, with 66 divisions. The United States at present has approximately 1,800,000 men, with about 35 or 36 divisions. Great Britain has from 3,000,000 to 3,500,000

men, with 60 to 70 divisions. Russia has from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 men, with about 150 divisions.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] said, this is a new kind of war. This is a war with airplanes and tanks, mechanical devices, radio, and things like that which require young men.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Did the gentleman find out what would be the attitude of the War Department with reference to men from 25 to 30 who were under training for 6 weeks and then got jobs in the shipyards, and who are deferred from service? Would they be called before boys of 19 or 20?

Mr. THOMASON. All I can say is that General Hershey testified that he could not have predicted 10 days ago what has happened now, and he, likewise, could not undertake to predict what will happen in the future. He did say, however, that as far as he is concerned and as far as the present situation is concerned, it would be his attitude to take, first, men between 21 and 28, then men from 28 to 35, before he would take those from 19 to 21.

Mr. DIES. I am talking about those who are working in industries and are deferred.

Mr. THOMASON. The matter of deferment is largely a matter for the local draft boards. I grant that there have been some serious discriminations and perhaps some injustices, but that has not been the fault of the law or of the administration as such. That is usually the fault or favoritism of local draft boards.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman has stated that Germany has an army of 8,000,000 men. Does this include the 4,000,000 men who are said to have been killed or captured in Russia?

Mr. THOMASON. I cannot answer that. I hope the gentleman's surmise is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is very important to know how many men they have now.

Mr. THOMASON. Judging from the way they have been rushing across the continent of Europe, and are now in the continent of Asia, I would say they have lots of men, because training men to be soldiers and building death machines is all they have been doing for 20 years.

Mr. DOUGHTON. When we are given statistics we want them to be reliable.

Mr. THOMASON. These are from the New York Times, which I believe to be a reliable publication.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We would like to have the figures official.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not want to say these are official figures from the War Department. I do not know if they have them, and I doubt if they would make them public if they did.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Has it been determined whether or not there will be any deferment of boys under 21 years of age who are now receiving technical education in our colleges?

Mr. THOMASON. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that the Association of American Colleges—I am not sure that is the exact name, but it includes the presidents of a great many of the educational institutions of America—has had a conference with General Hershey and agreed to the program as worked out. General Hershey testified before the committee that there is no thought or intention of immediately disturbing a young man's college career. I may say that the gentleman will find that information on page 30. We must place confidence and trust in somebody and I have faith in the War Department doing the right and just thing. One thing is certain, we must win this war. A second-rate army is the same as no army.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman have the approximate figure as to the number of men over 30 years of age?

Mr. THOMASON. Between 28 and 35, I believe those returned home were 135,000. Of course, many of them will be recalled. There are now about 600,000 men between the ages of 21 and 28, and there are about 315,000 eligibles between 28 and 45. One hundred and thirty-five thousand men between 28 and 35 were permitted to go home when we passed the amended Selective Training and Service Act. Many of these men will of course, be recalled.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. Was there anything in the hearings as to married men 21 years of age and over?

Mr. THOMASON. No; the question of a man's dependents is one for the local draft boards to determine.

Mr. STEFAN. Was that question discussed?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; it was discussed. Not only that, but there have been some serious abuses in this matter of dependents. There have been a great many marriages performed for the evident purpose of evading service.

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

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

Mrs. BOLTON. As I understand, 1,200,000 men become 21 years of age each year.

Mr. THOMASON. That is right.

Mrs. BOLTON. Are you also counting those men?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; those are all included. Of course, when it comes to figuring on just how large an army we can have with the number of men avail-

able, it all goes to the question of deferment. The testimony before the committee shows that you can raise an army of between four and a half million and ten million, based upon occupational dependency and physical deferment.

The House having given me permission, I conclude my remarks by giving you the present strength of the Army as furnished me by the War Department, and which I think will be of interest to you. I follow that with a statement from last Sunday's issue of the New York Times giving you the comparative strength of the chief warring powers of the world:

Strength of the Army

Enlisted strength:	
Field forces, including overseas garrisons less air force.....	977, 236
Air force.....	494, 865
Overhead, CASC and WD.....	190, 413
Replacements in training.....	185, 371
Total.....	1, 847, 885
Arms and services:	
Air Corps.....	352, 667
Armored.....	43, 697
Cavalry.....	34, 262
CWS.....	9, 257
Coast Artillery Corps.....	158, 460
Engineers.....	83, 903
Field Artillery.....	166, 492
Infantry.....	365, 868
Medical.....	145, 827
Ordnance.....	42, 549
Quartermaster.....	128, 970
Signal Corps.....	64, 360
Finance.....	4, 358
Replacements in training.....	185, 371
Unassigned.....	61, 844
Total.....	1, 847, 885

Comparative strength of the chief warring powers¹

AREA AND POPULATION

	Area	Population
ALLIES		
United States.....	3, 738, 395	132, 000, 000
Great Britain (Empire).....	13, 539, 113	504, 218, 200
Russia.....	8, 819, 791	192, 695, 710
China (unoccupied).....	4, 060, 992	207, 000, 000
Netherlands Indies.....	738, 267	70, 500, 000
Total.....	30, 896, 558	1, 106, 413, 910
AXIS		
Germany (before September 1939).....	263, 618	93, 000, 000
Japan (before July 1937).....	260, 644	97, 697, 555
Italy.....	119, 800	44, 557, 000
Hungary.....	59, 380	13, 507, 993
Finland.....	131, 588	3, 834, 662
Bulgaria.....	42, 808	6, 549, 664
Rumania.....	72, 525	14, 098, 850
Total.....	950, 363	263, 245, 724

ARMIES

	Men	Divisions
ALLIES		
United States.....	1, 600, 000	33
Great Britain.....	3, 000, 000-3, 500, 000	60-70
Russia.....	3, 000, 000-5, 000, 000	(?)150-250
China.....	2, 000, 000-6, 000, 000	(?)
Netherlands Indies.....	100, 000	(?)
AXIS		
Germany.....	6, 000, 000-8, 000, 000	280-300
Japan.....	1, 800, 000	60-66
Italy.....	1, 500, 000	60
Hungary.....	180, 000-450, 000	10-20
Finland.....	200, 000-250, 000	14
Bulgaria.....	180, 000-450, 000	10-20
Rumania.....	800, 000-1, 200, 000	30-35

¹ Corrected for known losses up until Dec. 12.

Comparative strength of the chief warring powers—Continued

AIR FORCES (COMBAT UNITS)

	Number of planes
ALLIES	
United States.....	3, 000-5, 000
Great Britain.....	4, 500-5, 500
Russia.....	(?)
China.....	100-200
Netherlands Indies.....	500-600
AXIS	
Germany.....	5, 500-8, 500
Japan.....	(?) 5, 000
Italy.....	1, 500-3, 000
Hungary.....	400-600
Finland.....	200-300
Bulgaria.....	100-300
Rumania.....	500-700

ALLIED NAVIES

Country and type	Built	Building	Total
United States:			
Battleships.....	16	15	31
Aircraft carriers.....	7	11	18
Cruisers.....	(?)37	54	91
Destroyers.....	171	191	362
Submarines.....	113	73	186
Great Britain:			
Battleships.....	14	(?)6	(?)20
Aircraft carriers.....	7	3	10
Cruisers.....	62-64	12-14	74-78
Destroyers.....	105-225	(?)	(?)205-225
Submarines.....	45-50	(?)	(?)45-50
Russia:			
Battleships.....	(?)3	2	(?)6
Aircraft carriers.....	1	2	3
Cruisers.....	(?)9	4	(?)13
Destroyers.....	(?)60-65	20-35	(?)90-100
Submarines.....	(?)140-175	(?)	(?)140-175
Netherland Indies:			
Cruisers.....	3		3
Destroyers.....	8		8
Submarines.....	15		15

AXIS NAVIES

Germany:			
Battleships.....	3	2	5
Aircraft carriers.....	(?)1	1	2
Cruisers.....	9	6	15
Destroyers.....	45-50	(?)	(?)45-50
Submarines.....	130-160	(?)	130-160
Japan:			
Battleships.....	(?)10	3-8	14-18
Aircraft carriers.....	7-9	(?)	(?)7-9
Cruisers.....	44-46	(?)10	(?)54-56
Destroyers.....	126	(?)10-15	(?)135-141
Submarines.....	69-70	(?)7-10	(?)76-80
Italy:			
Battleships.....	(?)5	2	(?)7
Aircraft carriers.....			
Cruisers.....	16	14	30
Destroyers.....	(?)90-105	(?)12	(?)102-117
Submarines.....	80-85	15-18	95-100

² In addition there are 2 pocket battleships.

³ Possibly includes 4 pocket battleships, some of which may be in service.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is, perhaps, no one in this House more completely determined than am I to back the administration in its procedures to bring us to a constructive ending of this war. It is a pleasure to be in complete agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee in the matter of this proposal. We should think a very long time before setting up a machinery that will increase the restlessness of the boys who are between the ages of 18 and 21. We should be careful to do nothing to disrupt the newly established unity of our people. We, as a part of the governmental structure upon whose wisdom and judgment the people depend for their sense of security must use our wisdom, if we have any, to improve the solidarity of the Nation, not to disturb it. Our purpose and our

united determination is to win this war, but we must not forget that there will be a life beyond that. Upon women rests a peculiar obligation, that of protecting the future at all times. We women are constantly thinking of what will happen to us as a nation if we do not in some way protect the college-age group of young men from the implications of the suggested lowering of the age limit at this time.

It is difficult enough in normal times to bring college boys to enough serious-mindedness to make their choice of such professions as engineering, chemistry, physics, or, most of all, medicine. We are thinking in terms of a long war, and we cannot fail to look beyond war to the appalling task of rebuilding a sick and exhausted world. To do this, we are going to need doctors as the world has never dreamed of needing them. Even today the medical profession has a difficult time getting enough adequately prepared, intelligent, young men to go into medicine. If we disturb them during their college years and do not do something to point the way to them to medicine as a career, we shall be doing something very dangerous to our whole future and very possibly for the future of the world.

I want to leave with you a very earnest request that you consider these 3 years as exceedingly precious years. We do need an invincible Army. There is no question about that. But until we have exhausted every other age group should we not do all possible to keep our boys at their studies that we may have intelligent, trained leaders ready for the work of reconstruction?

I hope sincerely that whatever the final action on this measure may be, those who administer it will protect the youths of our land as long as they reasonably can from the disruption of life consequent upon conscripted service in our armed forces.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the membership of the House will support the Military Affairs Committee in respect of the age limits we have reported in this bill.

Most of the cardinal points of disagreement among the members of our committee have been presented to you, but I want to present one more thought to the men here representing agricultural districts, and after all the production of food that we may need for ourselves and for our allies in the next couple of years, may be equally as important as the number of trained men we may have in the Army. If you take these youngsters off the farm, with many of the older farmers in such areas having gone into industrial areas, you will materially reduce the agricultural production in America in the next 2 years by losing the services of these youngsters who are below 21 years of age.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think the local draft boards

would take care of fair and just deferments for agricultural purposes?

Mr. EDMISTON. I will say to my friend that I do not think they will, no.

Mr. THOMASON. They have that authority and they have been doing it in a very fair way, so far as I know.

Mr. EDMISTON. I will say to my colleague that the Members on our committee who represent agricultural districts have discussed that matter fully and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] brought out that point in the discussion the other day. He does not think they have been deferred in his district.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ARENDS. I would just like to say for the information of the committee on the question of production of agricultural commodities that the Department of Agriculture has sent notices to the various Members of Congress with respect of the effect of our A. A. A. program, and requesting them to do what they can to help put some impetus behind the raising of more food products. The local draft boards are doing as good a job as they can, but they are taking the cream of agricultural labor from their work and this is having a very great effect throughout the country.

Mr. EDMISTON. I want to impress upon you also a fact which has been mentioned, but I do not believe has been emphasized enough. As to 1917, do not let anyone kid you about having drafted any man below the age of 21 in that war.

There never was a man in World War No. 1 who was drafted below the age of 21. That Congress reduced the age from 21 to 18 years, but before the machinery to accomplish that went into effect, to draft a single man below 21, the war was over. No man below 21 years of age was ever drafted in World War No. 1, and we raised an army of more than four and a half million men between the ages of 21 and 31.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Was not that because there were so many fine patriotic young fellows like the gentleman from West Virginia, under 19 years of age, who volunteered?

Mr. EDMISTON. Oh, the young men at that time were no more patriotic than the young men who are living now in America. Another point the gentleman brought out is this. Sixty-five percent of the enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps today are between the ages of 18 and 21. You are getting plenty of them anyway without drafting them. Do not disrupt those who want to continue their education. Then there is this other thought: you not only disrupt the ones in the age limit as proposed by the letter of the President, from 19 to 21, but the boys of 17 who finish high school and have planned to go to college will say, "What is the use of my going to college? I will get 1 year or half a year there, and then they will draft me, so I might as well get in now."

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

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Answering the question propounded by the gentleman from Texas, I call attention to a table on page 64 of the hearings giving the number of persons who volunteered during the last war, and it shows a total of something like 73,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. EDMISTON. In my opinion that many men have enlisted in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps since the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor, and I will bet even money 65 percent of them are between 18 and 21 years of age.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, everyone in this House knows that the present conflict in which we are engaged is not comparable to the first World War. I fear it is going to be a long, cruel, exhausting contest; that it will require every ounce of our energy to win. Most, if not all, Members of Congress realize what terrific sacrifices are ahead, and since we have already pledged all of the resources in this Nation—not only our treasure, our money, but our supplies, our blood and our lives—I have about reached the point where I am willing to grant the War Department anything which approaches reason that it may ask. I am even going to bend over backward at times, to go along with the administration, if for no other reason than to prevent someone getting up and charging me with being an obstructionist. Yet I cannot and will not stultify my conscience or surrender my independence to allay any criticism, however bitter it might be. We are now in the war, and it is going to take the unified, combined, and wholehearted effort of us all to win this conflict. However, a declaration of war should not stop our mental processes. We need to exercise our brains more now than ever before. And we must have courage to speak truth as well as the light to see it. As the great liberal jurist, Mr. Justice Holmes, once said:

By a declaration of war we do not lose our right to condemn both men and measures.

We cannot extend freedom abroad by losing it at home. Parliamentary government must be preserved here.

Certainly, as Representatives of our people, it is not only our right but also our duty to scrutinize and to criticize—always attempting to make that criticism intelligent, constructive, and patriotic—every measure that is brought before the various committees of this body before it is presented here for a vote. The revised bill, as passed by the Senate, provides that all men in this country between the ages of 18 and 65 must register. It provides also that all men from 19 to 44 years of age, inclusive, shall be subject to combat duty. The only difference between this revised bill, as reported by the committee in the House, and the Senate bill is that while we go along with them and require all male citizens in this country between the ages of 18 and 64, inclusive, to register, we limit the number of men

to be called into combat service to those who are between the ages of 21 and 44, inclusive. That is the only difference. The question naturally arises, Is it necessary for us to go below the age of 21 at this time?

As has been said, we have 1,750,000 men in the Army today. By combing that group of men between 21 and 28 now subject to call, we will get another 600,000. By going from 28 to 35 we will get 350,000 more. By jumping from 35 up to the age of 45 we will get 400,000 more. Now, since we are to register these men 18, 19, and 20, could they not be called, if necessary, 600,000 who are 20 and 600,000 who are 19, who perhaps could qualify for A-1 rating, could we not call those men at any later date we might choose? If the Congress of the United States can vote a declaration of war in 15 or 20 minutes—and we did it 3 times last week—certainly after having these boys between 18 and 21 registered we could within a few minutes' time dip down below the age of 21.

However, the compelling reason why I vote for the age of 21 is not so much because it disrupts our educational program and robs our colleges. That is bad enough because it drains the reservoir of our future scientists and technicians. I know this war has proved, if it has proved anything, that some of the most efficient aviators are young men from 18 to 21, because they are daring and reckless. They will take chances that older men would not. Of course, that can be a bad thing as well as a good thing, as the colonel from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] knows. I see no necessity for going below the age of 21 at this time, and for this big reason: We do not have adequate equipment or anything like it, for the 1,750,000 men we have in our Army today. If we pass this bill, as reported by your House committee, we will double the number of men in our Army, and we will still be sadly lacking in equipment.

I want to quote some military authority, and I do it for the benefit of the majority leader. I have talked to some of the officers on General Marshall's staff. Weeks ago they expressed to me great concern about this Nation turning over practically all of its equipment and production to nations abroad. They also expressed as their considered and matured opinion that it would be unwise for us to build up a huge reservoir of men when we do not have the tools with which those men can fight battles. In modern mechanized war men without weapons are helpless.

We know that appropriations are not going to win the war. You have to translate dollars into machines, into tanks, guns, and ships. You can have all the men in this country enlisted in the Army, but unless they have the implements of war with which to fight we are never going to win. So why go below the age of 21 when we can double the number of our present Army? When we have equipment for only half the men who are in the Army now?

These are the big considerations. I plead with you not as a partisan but as a patriot, let us not wreck our whole domestic economy. It will require tireless,

skilled workers in our factories as well as soldiers in the field to win this war. We must gear industrial production to the maximum. Let us not go completely crazy. Let us not be so impotent that we will soon become as the German Reichstag, so indifferent that we will not stand up and speak out in the interest of those men and women we represent. Fireside chats will not win this war. We need more fire and less chat.

I know that all the education in the world is not going to do us any good if we lose this war. But to abandon education is not going to win it. In the light of future events, I think perhaps it will be necessary a little later on to reduce the age down to 18 years. I will be one of the first members of the committee to reduce that age to 18 or 16 or any other age that is necessary in order to win this war in which we are engaged. It is not necessary to do it now. One can go too far too fast. The Germans know that today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] 10 minutes.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious issue that confronts us today. I know by reason of the large number that have remained on the floor during this debate that the Members of the House themselves are conscious of the far-reaching decision that all of us are going to be called upon to make this afternoon.

No matter how we may feel with reference to the age at which these men should be inducted into service, all of us desire a speedy and complete victory for the United States of America. This is an issue we should approach in the most serious, calm, and deliberate manner. Debate today has evidenced this. I think if every Member of this House will read the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee, they will be pretty well convinced of what the actual facts are with reference to the necessity of inducting men into armed service at this time below the age of 21. I am in accord with the provisions of the bill that would register all of those who have become 18 years of age, so that we may have a catalog of the manpower of the Nation. But I believe that the facts absolutely substantiate the position of those who feel that it is unwise to induct men at this time who are under the age of 21.

What are the facts with reference to our armed service at this time?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is no intention to induct at this time.

Mr. HARTER. Well, they will be inducted, all right.

Mr. SHORT. Why register them, then, if they are not going to call them?

Mr. HARTER. The facts are with reference to the Army at the present time that we have in training and service an Army of 1,800,000. We have recently raised that by enactment of Congress to 2,000,000 men. So we will soon have under arms 2,000,000 men. Those

men are housed, most of them, in various camps and cantonments in different parts of the country. Not all of them by any means are supplied with modern equipment.

We have, as shown by the testimony of the Army officers who appeared before the committee, General Hershey, head of the Selective Service System, and General Haislip, of the General Staff, in charge of personnel, in addition to those men who are already in service, some 2,000,000 men who have already been registered and classified in 1-A. One million of those fall into the age group between 21 and 28. The other 1,000,000 fall into the higher age group, between 28 and 35. In addition, we shall have coming up for registration under existing law 1,200,000 men who will be 21 years of age by next July 1. Of this number, about 600,000 will fall into classification 1-A and be subject to call as fast as they can be assimilated into our training program.

Under this bill, when we raise the limit for actual military service to 45, it is thought that in the neighborhood of 400,000 men will be available from that category of ages. This gives us, therefore, ready for training and service, if the registration comes on July 1—and they say they will have to have probably that much time in order to get ready for it—this will give us a reservoir of at least 3,000,000 men for training. What are the facts with reference to the facilities in this country?

Under the testimony offered your committee, the average selectee has had only 6 months of training at this time. You will remember, we passed the original Selective Service Act in September of 1940, but that very few men were inducted under the provisions of that law before early this spring. The principal quotas came in during March, April, and May. These men cannot be, by any stretch of the imagination, today considered fully trained soldiers. We have not the housing, we have not the equipment to supply 3,000,000 additional trainees now, or in the reasonable future. Why ask military service of the 19- and 20-year-olds when they cannot be used now and are better off in schools and colleges?

Mr. Chairman, the parents of the youths of 19 and 20 are looking at our action today. We are going to upset the plans of countless thousands of citizens if we decide at this time that men of these ages must be registered and made subject to military training and service. This war, as has been said, may be of long duration. We are going to denude the colleges and universities of the country of practically all able-bodied students of age 19 and 20 if it is decided to lower the limits below 21. What incentive will a boy have to start a college course after he finishes high school at 18 and knows he must go to the Army at 19?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER. I cannot yield just now. I hope the gentleman will wait until I complete my statement.

The facts are that we are going to upset our whole system of educational development in this country if we take

into the camps of the country those who are 19 and 20 years of age. What is going to become of the country's technical development? Where shall we get our chemists, our doctors, or men to carry on the skills and professions so essential to our country's welfare? If we take these boys of 19 and 20 out of the technical schools, the premedical schools, the professions, we are going to pay for it in years to come. So long as there is no necessity by reason of the fact that we cannot assimilate these men into the training program, it seems very foolish to go down to those ages at this time. We have got to remember that during World War No. 1, when we had a draft law that took men from 21 to 31, we raised an army of over 4,500,000.

We have been promised by these men who appeared before your committee that they were going to reexamine all deferments; they were going to have the local boards check into all deferments whether they were because of minor physical defects, dependency, employment, or what not. All those classifications, of course, were made during a time of peace. It is only reasonable to suppose that the local draft boards were very much more liberal in their decisions than they would be in time of actual war. Such reexamination should mean large additions to class 1-A of those heretofore registered.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HARTER. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. In considering the various age groups above 21 from which we might get additional numbers, does not the gentleman also have in mind the thousands and thousands of boys between 21 and 24 who are in the C. C. C. camps, and the N. Y. A., who are physically eligible to be serving in the country's armed forces? It seems to me that taking such boys would not only give us more manpower but would reduce the expense of maintaining these organizations.

Mr. HARTER. They should be considered as well as all others who have been deferred. It is my understanding, however, that very few boys are now in the C. C. C. camps who are physically fit for military training.

Of those who insist on taking in the 19- and 20-year-olds and talk of the United States fighting in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America, I wonder if they have considered our lack of shipping, our total inability at this time and for a long time in the future to send an expeditionary force to these distant continents, and, even more difficult, keep such a force or forces properly supplied. Do not let us be carried away by our righteous indignation and anger toward Japan and the other Axis Powers.

We all wish to do those things that are for the best interests of the Nation. It behooves us to approach these problems which have such widespread interest and are of the utmost import to the people of the United States with the greatest deliberation and consideration. We cannot afford to decide momentous issues of this kind upon impulse or upon the direction of others. It is the Congress, the direct

Representatives of the people, who should and will make this decision upon its calm, considered, and deliberate judgment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, we have under discussion H. R. 6215, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by extending the ages within which men in the United States shall be registered and liable for military training and service. There is a great diversity of opinion among the Members as to the methods by which and the extent to which these ends should be sought at this time.

Both President Roosevelt and Secretary Stimson have stated in letters to the Congress that the registration provisions of the bill are essential for the orderly planning of our national effort. They further state that our national situation is such that the ages for military service should be changed to the period from 19 to 44 years instead of the present effective period from 21 to 27 years. President Roosevelt wrote that he endorsed without qualification Secretary Stimson's statement which was sent to the chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs. In that letter Mr. Stimson set forth that these objectives should be substantially contained in the proposed legislation upon the ground that they are indispensable to our national effort and will constitute one of the great foundation stones upon which victory will be built. He also urged prompt enactment of the bill. Undoubtedly President Roosevelt and Secretary Stimson have information and data which have not been made available to the House Military Affairs Committee. I respect their considered conclusions and shall vote for the bill in the form in which it is finally adopted by the House this afternoon.

However, I would like to refer to the testimony which was given to the committee by Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and Brig. Gen. Wade H. Haislip, Assistant Chief of Staff for Personnel. These officers rank very high in our Army and should be the men best able today to set forth the requirements of our selective-service program. On the question of registration of all males between the ages of 18 to 64, inclusive, they offered little to support the need for this registration above the age of 45. In fact, nothing was brought out to indicate what kind of information they expected to obtain from such registration which is not now in the possession of the Census Bureau, from which agency they said that the Army now gets the information needed relative to occupation, numbers of men in age groups, and other particulars. In fact, I might add that, while it is not in the testimony, I was told that the registration of the men from 45 to 64 was not sought for any purposes of military service but presumably at the request of some other agency which was not disclosed.

It was brought out, however, that to register these men will require the employment of 8,000 additional clerks on a pay basis, plus the assistance of 120,000 to 140,000 volunteers who are helping registrants to make out their questionnaires. On the evidence, there is real reason to question the advisability of placing this tremendous additional burden, perhaps unnecessarily, on these volunteers who have proved so faithful in their efforts to date.

In addition, 8,000,000 men between the ages of 36 and 45 will be registered under this bill as well as the 10,000,000 between 46 and 64. General Hershey testified that of these 8,000,000 men, probably 5 percent would be eligible for military service, "somewhere between 350,000 or 400,000." He pointed out that more of this class will have dependents and some of them will have a great many dependents. In addition, from 75 percent to 90 percent of this class will be rejects for physical and other reasons. Adding to that testimony, a chairman of a draft board in my district took occasion to telephone to me that, in his opinion, this group of men ought not to be considered. In fact, he stated that the experience of his board indicated that no age groups above 30 years, except in an emergency calling for more men than are now available, should be considered.

One of the 120,000 volunteers mentioned by General Hershey is Attorney Joseph Nowak, of Chicopee, Mass. He has told me that at the time of the first registration in Chicopee he helped 978 registrants out of 3,423 to fill out their questionnaires and at the time of the second registration he aided 64 out of 181. He came to the conclusion that it is a positive waste of time to register those over 30. He told me that he had been glad to serve without compensation and estimated that he had put in 264 hours at his work. If all the other volunteers numbering more than 120,000 have given the same amount of service, it is obvious that the country may be wasting very valuable time if it is insisted that they continue with their work among the 18,000,000 men to be registered above the age of 35 under this bill. On the evidence, scarcely 1 percent of them would ever be used for military service.

In committee I offered an amendment which would have stricken from the provision for military service the men between the ages of 36 and 45. My amendment was defeated and I bow to the decision of the majority. I would like to point out in passing, however, that some of the older men in this group will undoubtedly have been registered at the time of the draft for World War No. 1. Of these men, a leading Springfield physician has stated that if they are brought into the service, their physical stamina will be such that we must expect many of them will be hospitalized.

So much has been said about the young men under 21 years of age that I would only add that, in view of General Hershey's statement as carried throughout the country in the press, there does not seem to be any reason for believing that

anyone under the age of 21 would be drawn into the service by the terms of this bill before 1943. We have, in our 21 to 28 year group, at least a million men who will first be called upon to enter the Army. Perhaps another million can be secured between the ages of 28 and 36 by removing some restrictions. He therefore was of the opinion that 3,000,000 men, plus, can be obtained for the Army out of the 17,500,000 who have been registered. Less than 900,000 have been inducted up to the present time. He has also stated publicly that these groups will be inducted into the service before those under 21 would be taken. Such a large group certainly would not be inducted into the service before 1943. For one thing, we have not, at the present time, and will not have before January, 1943, sufficient equipment to take care of them. By that time, more than a million young men will have reached the age of 21, furnishing a further supply of at least 600,000 who would be physically fit. On the testimony, it does seem to me that we have provided a huge reservoir of men for military service already. None of us desires men to enter the service who have other persons actually dependent upon them for support. In the last war married men were drafted. At that time France and England furnished their equipment after they arrived in Europe for the most part. In this war we must furnish our own equipment as well as helping our Allies. I believe just as much as anyone else that we should always be on the alert and have a program well established which will cover the duration of the war. The President insists that this program should include possible military service for all men between the ages of 19 and 45. The House Military Affairs Committee has limited the period to the ages between 21 and 45. The reservoir of men in the age group from 36 to 45 which has been opened up by this bill is not particularly helpful. I hope that in its final form we will vote on a bill which is in the best interests of our country.

In closing I cannot refrain from referring to General Haislip's testimony, in which he, in effect, states that in the present emergency not only colleges but such famous military schools as Citadel, Norwich University, and Virginia Military Institute, from which our Chief of Staff, General Marshall, was graduated, have little, if any, value. He said—and I quote—that:

The old Student Army Training Corps—I hope it is never revived—I can understand that it was a great failure during the last war.

After listening to other generals tell of the absolute necessity for at least 2 years' college training in order for a man to be an Army pilot, it is hard to reconcile such statements. In fact, I cannot believe that the thousands of colleges, with their facilities which have cost literally billions of dollars, scattered throughout the length and breadth of our land, cannot be put to use as a most valuable and potent factor in this great crisis. I believe every boy who can go to college and secure additional scientific and mathematical training will be far more useful

to his country for his college efforts. When I asked General Haislip—

There is no advantage in their going to college, then, other than the possibility that they will be a little better soldiers when they go into the ranks?

He replied—

I think that is a rather fair statement.

Later he added—

After the war is over, we might look back and see where we might have done things differently.

I wonder if during the past 20 years the War Department has looked ahead instead of back in an effort to find how one of the greatest resources ever developed in the world—American colleges and universities—could be used to advantage in wartime. Our leaders in World War No. 1 recognized their worth. Perhaps our present-day leaders are missing a very great opportunity.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of this body I have no other thought in mind and no other interest at heart except the security and welfare of the United States of America. There is not a man in this body who has gone further in voting for all-out defense than I have. Why, I even went so far as to vote for the May bill and the Smith bill, which undertook to so curb our industrial disturbances that we would be able to put arms into the hands of the men we had in the Army before the advent of actual warfare. I am sorry we were not able to do this, but some of us have done our best. So I claim I have gone just as far in all-out defense as it is possible for any man to go.

Mr. Chairman, if I believed today that it is necessary to reach down into the age brackets to any reasonable age below 21, I would be one to stand up in the Well of this House and fight for it, but I do not believe for 1 minute that is necessary or even advisable. I do not think we should go down into the brackets below 21 years of age to induct men into the service today. The reason is this: If we draw as we should draw from within the brackets we are already working in, we will have more men than we can house, clothe, train, arm, and equip for the next year or year and a half. Before we drop into the age brackets below 21, let us be sure that we are going to be able to get the men the equipment and training they are entitled to before they are taken into the Army. I am not willing to disturb the future of this Nation at this time by interrupting the educational career of those below 21 years of age when I do not believe they can be properly received, trained, armed, and equipped. I am not willing to take these boys out of college and put them in the Army when there are those in the higher brackets who have either completed their educational career or have not entered into a career and who have not yet been called.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do we understand the gentleman's position to be that by the time you exhaust the reservoir beginning with 21 years of age, these 18-year-old boys will in the meantime be moving probably up into the 21-year-old reservoir and we can avoid the strain upon the morale of the country by not registering these 18-year-old boys now?

Mr. FADDIS. I am not opposing registering the 18-year-old boys, but I am against calling them into the service at this time, because I am satisfied before we are able to train, arm, and equip men 18 years of age a great deal of time will have passed. At the present time it will be at least 18 months before we begin thinking about dropping down into the age bracket below 21. Why, then, should we place them on the list subject to call?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman gets my question, does he?

Mr. FADDIS. I do, and I answered it. At the present time it will be at least 18 months before we can properly train, arm, and equip all of the eligibles in the age brackets in which we are now working.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What, then, is the reason, may I ask, if suggested by anybody, why we should subject these 18-year-old boys to draft now if we have more people above 21 years old than we can equip between this time and the time when the 18-year-old boys get to 21 years old?

Mr. FADDIS. Some one evidently desires to enlarge the field so that a more liberal deferment in the groups from which we are already drawing can be worked out.

There is another reason I do not desire to draw on this reservoir of men between the ages of 18 and 21. We will get the cream of these boys, the ones who are the best developed mentally and physically by volunteering. If we drop down into those lower-age brackets and draft the boys into the service, I feel sure that by taking many who are as yet immature, we will later on in life have a great many more break-downs among the men chosen from those age groups than we will have from men chosen from the higher-age group. That is another reason why I am unwilling to enter into this program at the present time. I am satisfied from my own investigations along this line that at the present time they have not drawn from those between 21 and 28 as closely as they should. There are a great many who have been deferred because of dependency reasons when those claiming to be dependents are not really such. There are a great many women working in this town who are being used as the reason for deferment of husbands who should be in the service today. There is no reason why any man should be deferred when his family is not dependent in fact upon his salary or his wages for a reasonable livelihood, and if his wife is working and earning a living, and they have no children, he should not be deferred.

Further, there are connected with the Army certain branches of the service, such as the Quartermaster and Ordnance Corps, which do not require men of as high a physical standard as do the combatant branches of the service. Cer-

tainly in an emergency of this kind, when we are resorting to the draft in order to provide manpower, we should make an effort to draw men who are a little bit below par physically and steer them into those branches of the service which do not require men of as high a physical standard as other branches of the service.

At the present time such a plan is not being followed at all. If we are to make economical and efficient use of our manpower in the struggle which confronts us, we must learn how to most efficiently distribute our manpower sooner or later, and we had better learn it sooner than later. There is no time as good as the present to put into effect a system that will grade the manpower of the Nation physically and utilize those men who are not up to the par required for the combatant branches of the service in connection with those branches of the service where such a high physical standard is not required.

We are going to have to face this matter as a Nation and we are going to have to face the whole truth. If we are to win the conflict in which we are engaged, we must make up our minds that as soon as possible we must furnish expeditionary forces and invade the country of the enemy, because we cannot win this war in any other manner. It may be a very long and hard war. At least to be safe, we must make our plans for such. So we must carefully plan our resources not only of material but of manpower. We must have manpower for every purpose, and probably over a range of years. We must have commissioned as well as enlisted personnel, and those who are commissioned must have an education beyond that of high school. Where are they to come from if we at this time start to break down the educational career of every able-bodied boy over the age of 18 or 19? Furthermore, if we interrupt the educational career of all of the physically fit, we will leave the professional and business field to the physically unfit. We must have doctors, chemists, engineers, and so forth, for the Army, and they must be educated and must be physically fit. In connection with this legislation, I do hope the Members will take into consideration that we are only starting in this affair, and that the Congress will be here, and I hope will be exercising its functions in the manner the people intended the Congress to exercise them. I am sure that the Congress in its wisdom and in its desire to win this war will at all times do what its Members believe to be necessary to win it.

I assure you that upon the very best investigation I have been able to make, I have made up my mind beyond the possibility of a doubt, this is not yet the time to begin to draft those of less than 21 years of age into the service. I hope this committee supports the Committee on Military Affairs in its recommendation in this matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, let me say first, about the bill which is pending before the Committee, that with

the exception of one single provision, which appears to be the controversial one, I think it is an excellent measure.

I rejoice especially at the provision for the registration of men between 18 and 65, a measure which I have believed in for a long, long time and which I am glad to see appear in legislation of this kind.

I also rejoice at the degree of elasticity provided in this bill in connection with the handling of the selective draft itself. I think it wise for the Congress to refrain from endeavoring to lay down any rigid schedule governing the calling of men into the service from the several military age groups. In that respect this bill, in my humble judgment, is sound and will prove very valuable to those who must administer it.

I confess to my disappointment at the refusal of the committee to lower the age from 21 to 19, as was proposed originally by the President and his military advisers. I feel very deeply upon that point. I know that the people in the War Department feel very, very deeply about it. Conversations I have had with the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff since the action of the committee demonstrate to me their very deep concern.

However, before touching upon that particular phase of this bill, may I mention one or two things which have been rather prominent in the debate thus far?

It so happened that I was in Congress during the World War and took part in the preparation and enactment of the selective-service law of the spring of 1917. As has been said here, that act provided for the registration of all men between 21 and 31 years of age and for military liability upon that same group. We started in and raised an army of something in excess of 4,000,000 men. By the summer of 1918, however, at a time when it was not then apparent that we would win the war in the autumn of 1918, it became apparent to the Congress and to the administration of that day that the age range was insufficient to carry on a long contest.

True, we did raise an army of 4,000,000 men under that law; but I may remind you, Mr. Chairman, that in doing so we took into the ranks hundreds of thousands of married men, men with wives and one child or two children or three children, with a consequent dislocation of the domestic life of the Nation as well as its industrial life. The result finally was that the Congress decided to change the age range for military duty, and we passed the act sometime in the summer of 1918 making the range 18 to 45; so you see we have good precedent in our own history for such an age range for military service.

True, the mechanism for the registration of that increased number could not get into full operation and into completion before Armistice Day on November 11, 1918, and it is entirely true that no men under 21 were actually drafted.

According to the best of my recollection the principal reason for lowering the age limit at that time from 21 down to 18, or one of the motives, was to avoid continuation of drafting so many thousands of married men. You will remem-

ber also that in drafting those married men the Government made allotments to their families out of the Treasury and also asked the soldier himself—the husband in the ranks—to make an allotment out of his own pay. It was a terrific burden; and it was not especially efficient, militarily, and it also resulted in greatly increasing the pension burden coming out of the World War.

Now, here we are today with a law that we passed in September of 1940, which provided for an age range of 21 to 36 in the matter of military liability. For a short time we authorized a reduction from 36 down to 28, but, of course, it is apparent that we are repairing that immediately.

The bill as reported by the Military Affairs Committee therefore makes but one change, as contrasted with the law which we passed in September of 1940, only one, and that change is reflected in the raising of the military age from 36 to 45. That is all this legislation means in the way of increasing the available military manpower of the United States; and the testimony shows, as has already been said to you, that of all the men between 36 and 45, inclusive, only 400,000 can be counted upon as fit for military duty.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman, who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that there is another very material change in that under this law every boy becoming 21, after he had registered at 18, becomes immediately available for draft, which would give us 100,000 additional available every month?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The present law does that. Every boy becoming 21 years of age, under existing law, is subject to the draft.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; he has to register once a year, while this makes him available immediately.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the total number is not changed. The net increase under this bill is 400,000, and it cannot be figured in any other way.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to remind the Members of the House that when the bill passed the House it was 21 to 45, but it was lowered to 36 in conference.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; in any event the net gain in the available military manpower of the United States as represented by this bill is only 400,000 men, and all of them over 36. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an inadequate performance in view of what we are facing—an inadequate performance.

If we are to raise an army of the size variously estimated here from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 or 6,000,000, true, we can do it from the men between 21 and 45, but we will have to take hundreds and hundreds of thousands of men with dependents and we will go through exactly the same experience we had in the World

War and make the same error. I am hoping we will not make that error, and the way to avoid it is to sprinkle among the older men—we will say between 21 and 28 and 28 and 30, and, indeed, between 36 and 45—a little mixture of younger men, twenty and a half, 20 years, nineteen and a half, if you please, and down to 19. In doing so we will spread the burden more evenly and justly over the whole military population, and we will have a more effective army—far more effective.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. It is my opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to follow the estimable gentleman from New York, who has made a very learned presentation of the one real controversial matter in this bill. The gentleman from New York is not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, but he has had occasion to sit with our committee many times, and I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] will join with me in what I have to say in reference to the serious consideration which this committee has given this legislation and has given the entire defense program over a period of a year and a half. I attended every meeting of this committee which considered the present bill. I sat there long hours with the other members of the committee and I talked with them, and I have yet to hear, Mr. Chairman, one word other than that of serious and conscientious and honest consideration of the merits of the bill that we are considering here today. I think that every member of that committee did his honest and conscientious duty as he saw it in reporting the bill, and did his level best as a patriotic Member of Congress to give what he thought was the very best bill obtainable at the present time.

There are two features of the bill that I desire to mention. The first feature is the one in reference to the registration of all male persons from 18 to 65. I consider that feature, the registration of every male person in the United States between 18 and 65 years of age, a most important part of the bill. Something was said in the course of the discussions before the committee about the matter of registering those above 45, and I thought that this is a very essential part of the bill—that those people above 45 should be registered. I think it is a fine thing for our citizens above 45 years of age, up into the higher age brackets, to 65 years, to register, so that they may receive the idea that they have their part in this program of whipping the Axis Powers in the present war. I think it is a fine thing to register those people and to make them realize that they have a personal responsibility to the United States Government toward the successful completion of this war, and that the registration of those people up to that age will have a very salutary effect.

As to the controversial feature of the bill, the induction into service of those between the ages of 21 and 45, I have in my hand a copy of the hearings which presents the actual testimony given to this committee in the consideration of

this bill. The outstanding witness used at those hearings was Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service. He was the person upon whom we were told we should rely as to the facts in reference to this measure, and he was the one we were told represented truly the attitude of the Selective Service Commission and the attitude of the War Department with reference to the measure. We listened to his testimony. We gave it conscientious and careful consideration. After he had completed his testimony I read a copy of the Washington Post the following morning, a paper published in the city of Washington, and I tore out of it this little excerpt quoting General Hershey, and I read to you as he was quoted:

Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, warning against any hysteria in connection with the draft extension, said there was no way of telling when it might be necessary to tap the reservoir of men outside the 21-35 group.

Further, he said, and I quote him:

We can meet the situation today and tomorrow with the present draft age limits of 21 to 35.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this legislation. I shall support it as it has been written by the Committee on Military Affairs. As a member of this committee I heard all of the testimony presented by representatives of the War Department and I am convinced that this bill meets every requirement for present circumstances.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] stated that officials of the War Department have voiced concern because the committee has refused to permit the induction into military service of boys under the age of 21. That decision, Mr. Chairman, was based on the testimony before the committee, and certainly, nowhere in the hearings can be found any evidence that boys under 21 are now needed, or will be needed in the immediate future. We have not arms to equip those already in service, or housing facilities adequate to care for those who will be inducted in the age grades now provided for. If and when the time comes that the services of boys below 21 are needed, this Congress will be in session and this act can be amended on an hour's notice.

It is difficult for me to reconcile the attitude of the War Department with the statements of General Hershey, statements that were made during the hearings and in newspaper interviews following the hearings. In the Washington Post of December 13 General Hershey said:

We can meet the situation today and tomorrow with the present draft age limits of 21 to 35.

The story in which this quotation by General Hershey appeared led with this statement:

War Department officials made clear yesterday that it would be a long time—perhaps never—before any man outside of the 21 to

35 age group are drafted for the army despite the proposal to require all aged 18 to 64, inclusive, to register.

Now, if that is the case, why should we get all excited and disrupt the lives of students and others below the age of 21? That question was asked by various members of the committee during the hearings and was not satisfactorily answered. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the War Department failed to make a case before the committee.

One reason given by General Hershey during the hearings, was to the effect that the War Department had merely decided to order the full meal rather than order it course by course. Members of the committee were not convinced by such an argument, especially in view of the fact that more men are already available for induction into service than can be equipped and trained. If more are necessary they can be had through a reclassification of the deferred lists.

Politics and sentiment played no part in the decision of our committee to place the draft age from 21 to 45. Every member of our committee weighed the testimony of the War Department officials carefully before reaching this important decision. We do not want to do one single thing to obstruct the War Department. We are all out to win this war. We will be the first to recommend the drafting of boys under 21 years if the War Department justifies such a demand. This has not yet been done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding what happened last week in the Philippines and Hawaii, there is no disposition on the part of anyone in this House to set himself up as a military expert. On the other hand, there is no reason why we should put aside our common sense and our judgment. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], made that appeal to us today, to use our common sense and good judgment.

Let me give you two homely illustrations. This morning a group in the House was told by Mr. Henderson that if all the priority orders which had been issued by the Army and Navy were granted there would not be enough steel to keep the rolling stock of the railroads going, to repair the boilers or the fire-boxes of the locomotives. Now, what is the sense and what do we gain by giving priority to the Army and Navy for all that steel if you cripple transportation so that they cannot get it—so that it cannot be delivered to the shipyards?

I want to call the attention of my farmer friends to this fact, which you all know. Some farmers used to send veal calves to market regardless of their age. I use that comparison with all respect and only to illustrate my contention that boys of less than 21 are immature—not ready for the slaughter. Finally, along came the State and Federal authorities and said, "You cannot send your veal calves until they are so old." Let us protect these young men until they can give their best. It does

not require very much courage on the part of some of us who are 66, as I am, or who are younger but over the draft age, to send these young men off to war and to slaughter. It does require some courage to ask that some other men, politically powerful, and I will not name them, be required to do their bit—serve here at home in safety and at a high wage. The courage to do that seems to be lacking. But what is the sense, and where is the good judgment, in taking these boys, many of whom are farmer boys, many of whom today, regardless of the fact that they have not reached the age of 21, are doing a large part of the work on the farms before and after school hours—taking them from their training and homes, and placing them in the Army? Why not leave those boys at home until they develop and are worth something in the market, which in this case happens to be the war market, where they are going to be sent to slaughter like a bunch of sheep—another Pearl Harbor—unless we here in Congress insist they be kept here at home until properly trained and equipped and until we are able to keep open lines of supply and support?

Those are two illustrations I want to call to your attention. To my mind the argument advanced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] was all decisive, or should be. That argument was, Why should these boys now be taken from their homes, away from the farms, before they have had technical training, when we all know, as was admitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] that we do not have the equipment with which to train them; when we do not have the ships to transport them; when we do not have the bombers to protect them?

I received wires asking me to vote for an A. E. F., and I sent back this message to each of them:

I assume, of course, that you mean an American expeditionary force should go only after the boys are trained; after we have furnished to them the equipment, and after we have gained supremacy in the air or are ready to gain it, and have the bombers with which to do it, and after we have lines of communication and supplies to support them when we get them across.

Is that not a common-sense view, and is that not what we should do? Any other course means another Dunkirk, another Pearl Harbor.

Here is another thought: Not one single day has passed since we sustained this loss across the ocean but that there has come to my office not one but many, many letters from men who are physically and mentally able to serve, not in the armed forces, because they are not physically fit to render that kind of service, but who are equipped mentally and physically to do much of the detail clerical office work, to which the young men who could serve actively are now detailed.

Let us use these older men and so release from desk and clerical work the younger, more physically fit young men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, too little is realized of the great amount of national-defense work that has been done by the younger boys in the Civilian Conservation Corps. I believe that even more can be done, and to that end, I would suggest that the C. C. C. be placed at the disposition of the Corps of Engineers, to complete important projects now under way and to take on an even larger load of essential national-defense jobs.

It seems to me that the country has, thus far, overlooked the tremendous aid the Civilian Conservation Corps can offer in our war effort. In saying this I do not belittle what has previously been done or is now being done by the Corps to aid national defense—but more can and should be done.

Right now I know that C. C. C. companies are at work on close to 70 military reservations. These C. C. C. boys have constructed parachute-training landing fields, tank courses, artillery and rifle ranges, access roads, obstacle courses, and many other badly needed military facilities. I know the record of the corps in protecting and conserving critical natural resource areas such as forests, grazing districts, reclamation and irrigation areas, and high-value agricultural lands. I am aware of the tremendous work which has been done in physically reconditioning more than two and a half million young men.

Because of these very things I feel that the corps offers very large additional national-defense potentialities. It is a very mobile organization. It is well equipped with machinery. It has a self-sufficient supply organization. It has a large number of skilled supervisors and engineers.

This corps is perhaps the best-equipped organization in the country for the large-scale construction of military landing fields, military roads, and the construction of a number of other military facilities. The experience and training also makes it an ideal aid in carrying on disaster relief and rehabilitation which might become necessary in case of enemy attack. I see by the papers that the corps has just concluded an agreement with the American Red Cross to participate in such work if the need arises. This is a step in the right direction.

In addition to using its great resources for military construction a fuller use should be made of the corps in training and rehabilitating men who are now physically unfit for military service due to remediable physical defects and in giving practical work experience and training to young men in order that they can swiftly take their proper places either in the armed forces or in defense industries.

Past medical history of the corps shows conclusively that thousands and thousands of young men who are not acceptable for military service can be brought up to these standards through supervised medical attention, regular living, and hard work in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Best of all is the fact that while being physically rehabilitated such young men could make a distinct contribution to the defense of the Nation

while working on military projects as I have outlined.

Every facility of this tremendous organization originally created for peaceful pursuits should now be checked to see if it is being used to prosecute our war effort most effectively. It will be in the best interest of this Nation to establish the closest possible relationship between the Civilian Conservation Corps and the armed forces of the United States for the duration of the war. We have in the corps a fully fashioned presently operating tool which can be of immediate and powerful benefit in constructing many types of military facilities which are needed at once. There is no other existing organization so well fitted to tackle this job. I hope there will be immediate action in applying every possible facility of the corps to the successful prosecution of our war effort.

For convenient reference in considering the matter I give these statistics on the present status of the corps:

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS BRIEF FIGURES

First. Camps now operating, 900.

Second. Field supervisory, technical, and administrative force at camp, 12 to 15 men per camp.

Third. Total enrollees, 150,000 men.

Fourth. Number of pieces of automotive equipment in immediate operating condition in excess of 35,000.

Fifth. Number of central automotive repair shops now in operation, 50.

Sixth. Trained specialists among enrollees, including cooks, bakers, radiomen, machine operators, mechanics, 110,000.

Seventh. Camps now on military reservations, 67.

Eighth. Many shops now doing Army motor repair work as well as Civilian Conservation Corps work.

These figures suggest the strength of the corps that could be applied to the war effort. They also suggest what the corps is doing and can do in producing trained radiomen, machine operators, cooks, bakers, and so forth. Let us use the corps to the best advantage in winning this war.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I take this floor to voice my opinions on a subject with which I am not very familiar. I do not hold myself out to this House as a military expert.

Three times last week this House went on record in presenting to an embattled world, the aggressors, and our enemies unity, determination, and a resolute will to win this war.

There is no division of opinion in the House this afternoon except on one subject, namely, whether or not we should force the youth of this land below the age of 21 to be inducted into the military service of this Nation. I desire to point out that: Before the laws of the United States and most all the States boys below the age of 21 are not recognized as competent and mature people. They are considered children under well-established standards and rules. They stand before the law as children. They cannot vote,

they cannot sign a legal contract, they cannot collect their own wages in many of the States of the Union, they cannot even appear in court without a guardian, they cannot hold public office, they cannot convey property, they cannot do many other things. By law they are denied the rights of men; yet this afternoon we propose to impose upon them the duties and responsibilities of men and induct them into the armed services of this country. When necessity requires, Congress will be in session and ready to comply with the request of those charged with the responsibility of defending this country, that the young men below the age of 21 are needed for such defense. The Military Affairs Committee of this House has said that it is not necessary; and certainly we ought to follow the advice of the committee.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the legislation proposed by the chairman of the committee is such, by reason of the fact that boys of 18 will be registered under this proposed act, that when it becomes apparent the services of these young boys are necessary to the success of our arms, Congress can make them available by simply passing a resolution, which can be done in 10 minutes?

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

One more thought has occurred to me: Are we not presenting to the enemies of this country some evidence of weakness by extending the strong arm of this Government into every high school and college of the Nation and take out of them the youth of this land below the age of 21 years? Surely the United States Government is not in extremis. The war has just begun and it is a war that ought to be, can be, and will be, fought by mature men of the Nation. When it becomes necessary to reach below the age of 21 Congress will be ready to listen and do the thing the War Department requires.

I hope the amendment which would induct boys below the age of 21 years is defeated. I am in favor of registering them from 18 to 21.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the obvious purposes of this bill which are to locate the manpower and determine its eligibility for military service, there are two other purposes which are not obvious but are, I believe, of profound importance. These are (1) national morale; and (2) a contribution to the war of nerves when applied to the enemy.

I believe we can best aid in insuring the defeat of our enemies if we take a complete inventory of the manpower of the Nation by registration, as well as the manpower. If we are to win this war

we will have to call upon every man and woman. The enemy knows how ineffectual voluntary cooperation for morale purposes can be since it so often resolves itself into tea parties and other social activities. The bulk of the population has no time or energy to indulge in this.

The British learned only after severe bombing that voluntary response, excellent as the intentions of the individual might be, is totally inadequate to meet the fire, famine, and other hazards which attend a bombing attack. If each individual knew that he was subject to call for his specific services at specific times, either for training or to learn new but needed skills, he could then adjust his affairs to be prepared for any eventuality.

We should amend this bill to include registration of man and woman power and to make each adult individual in the United States liable for training and service in the civilian, as well as the land or naval forces.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, to say who shall be called to man the guns, planes, tanks, and ships of a nation at war is a grim and disagreeable task. Yet that is the duty of this Congress today. We will not shirk our responsibility.

Whether we should legislate that the minimum age at which liability for combat service shall be 19 or 21 is difficult for the layman to decide. Naturally, we are hopeful that the flower of our manhood will not be sacrificed unnecessarily. We had hoped all along that we would not have to use our manpower in the bloody conflict that is now spread all over the world, but now that we have been attacked, the people of America, through their duly elected representatives, the Congress of the United States, have declared to the world that America will fight. America will fight to the finish, and because our cause is right, because we are fighting a just war to defend our rights, victory will be ours.

The question of age has been seriously considered by President Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and by the experts in the War and Navy Departments. It is the considered opinion of these men, whose business and duty it is to defend this country, that the age limits for military service should be 19 to 44 years.

I accept their judgment as superior to my own in this matter and will support their recommendation, but while doing so, Mr. Speaker, I offer the suggestion, and I hope it will receive favorable consideration, that every effort will be made to expedite the training of recruits so that none will be called upon to participate in active fighting until he has had sufficient training.

I base this suggestion upon our experience in the war of 1917-18, when thousands of our boys were sent into battle overseas without proper training. Because of the urgent need for troops in that war many young men like myself were sent to France and, in many cases, into action, before they knew one end of a gun from the other. Because of this misfortune many lives were sacrificed

that perhaps would not have been lost had these boys been given proper training before they were rushed to face the enemy.

I trust that the War Department will so arrange its program that men who have had training will be assigned to combat positions while recruits are learning to fight; that as far as possible these recruits will be trained as units and that individual will not be used as replacements to fill the ranks of outfits who have been fully trained or are now in advanced training.

More than 2 years ago, while addressing a group of veterans in my district, I advocated at least 1 year of compulsory service in the National Guard for every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 21, and I was bitterly criticized for it by the newspapers and by many citizens.

It was my opinion then, and it still is today, that if such a program were followed it would provide a reservoir of partially trained men upon which our Government could draw to defend our country when attacked. It would also be a sort of insurance for the men who would be called into service, because their training and experience would enable them to be better equipped to meet the enemy.

This is, as President Roosevelt has told us, and as Congress has declared, an all-out war. We are all in it—all the way. No one can foretell how long the war will last. We must be prepared not only to produce the implements of war, but also to face all kinds of sacrifices. We must be prepared to pay heavier and heavier taxes, to see property destroyed by the enemy, to see the blood of our dear ones spilled, and even their lives snuffed out in the defense of our country.

This is not a local war. It is world wide. It will require every ounce of energy of everyone in the Nation. Let us put everything we have in it so it may be brought to an end at the earliest possible date. That is the American spirit. That is the spirit that will bring victory.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice the same sentiment that has been expressed so frequently this afternoon to the effect that there is no division in this House or in the Committee on Military Affairs or in the country as to the determination of doing whatever becomes necessary to win this war. It is simply a question of what is necessary. I have listened with much interest to all of the arguments on this bill, particularly those advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Right along that line, what would the gentleman say in response to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that this bill would raise only 400,000? I

would like to hear the gentleman discuss that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from New York was, of course, talking literally and exclusively when he made the statement that the age group from 36 to 45 would yield 400,000 available men with class 1-A designation. He was overlooking the fact that we have heretofore dropped the age group 28 to 35 and that the testimony showed this group would yield at least 1,000,000 men. Then, of course, there is the 21-year-old group that comes in every year of 1,200,000. Under the terms of this bill, as I pointed out in my question to the gentleman from New York, we do not have to wait until a July registration or an October registration, or whenever the registration may be held, to bring these 21-year-olds in. They become available the very day they become 21 years of age and can be drafted. No additional legislation will be needed; no additional machinery whatsoever. There will be nothing to do except simply to send out the call for these men to report; and, remember, they are becoming 21 at the rate of 100,000 a month.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to get up here and make general statements or to put up good arguments based on generalities; but I want to say to you that the only thing we have to go by, the only thing upon which to base our argument, is the evidence that was presented to our committee based upon which our report was made.

I challenge any person to take this report, look at the figures that are given in it by General Hershey and the statements that are made by General Haislip, as well as the statistics shown in the various tables, and get up here and say it is necessary now to drop this age down to catch the high-school and college boys below the age of 21, and young boys who perhaps have not had the opportunity to go to high school and college.

Let us see what the figures show. I call your attention to the testimony of General Hershey on page 7 of the hearings. In answer to questions by the ranking democratic member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], General Hershey said that in the registration between 18 and 45 we could hope to get seven and one-half million men physically able and not subject to deferment; in other words, that number of class 1-A men available for the draft. That includes 18 to 45. He told us that of each class 18, 19, and 20 we could count on getting 600,000, which gives a total of 1,800,000. The seven and one-half million includes the 1,800,000 already in. So subtract the total of 1,800,000 already in and the 1,800,000 in the three classes 18 to 21, 3,600,000, from 7,500,000 and you have left 3,900,000. I think that is a pretty fair estimate.

At one time in the hearings I propounded the question to him, "You think we have available in that age group from 21 to 45 about 3,200,000?" He said, "That is a conservative estimate." At one time he used the figures three and one-half million. I quote those three different figures to show that certainly somewhere between the two extremes lies the correct figure, according to General Hershey's

estimate. It probably would be near three and one-half million.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Take that three and one-half million, which excludes those already in the Army, which is 1,800,000. Taking the two together you would have an army of more than 5,000,000 men?

Mr. SPARKMAN. You would have an army of 5,700,000. We propounded questions to him and to General Haislip as to how fast they could take them in. Now, I believe we ought to be practical about this thing.

Let us see what happened during the World War. The greatest number taken in in any one month was approximately 300,000. If you have 3,500,000 men available for draft, and you are able to take them in at the highest rate of induction that was attained during the time we were in the World War, you would still have a reservoir that would take you 12 months to consume. In the meantime, your boys are becoming 21 at the rate of 100,000 a month, to be added to that. The greatest number that we have taken in during the time the present Selective Service Act has been in existence was about 150,000. So you see we are far from attaining the World War peak even yet.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. That does not take into consideration the enlistments that are being made?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all, and I am glad the gentleman mentioned that, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] made some reference to it. If you will look at page 64 of the hearings you will see there a table giving the number of voluntary enlistments during the World War, and it shows them according to age. You can see that there was a relatively small number under 21 who volunteered. I do not believe that at any time during the World War did we experience so great a rush to enlist as we are having today throughout this entire country. We know it is common report in the news items of the day that the recruiting stations absolutely cannot handle the young men who are rushing there to volunteer their services to the country.

We have a real problem, one of supplying these boys, one of giving them clothes, weapons, proper medical attention, hospitalization, and a thousand and one other things, including the necessary training in order that they may not be sent to the battlefield to die on account of lack of training as many boys did during the World War. That all takes time.

We should keep the minimum draft age at 21 until the present, great reservoir of available manpower is used up, or at least until we are shown the necessity of going to a lower-age level. When that time comes, I dare say, no one will oppose such action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I find myself again filled with timidity and fear. I did request these few moments, however, to present to you my thoughts in regard to what I consider one of the most important pieces of legislation we have approached up to now. I do not conceive myself to be able to tell you anything or to give you any new features, but I come here to undertake to have us reason together for a little while in respect to the matter that now engages our attention.

In the first place, I have become afraid that we are about to realize that we have approached—indeed, have entered upon—the most awful war the world has even seen, and that the United States must take the most important part in. Upon us in the largest measure, no doubt, rests the responsibility to deliver the world from tyranny and oppression. Do we realize the state we are in? Are we mindful of how important it is that we be not so careful about seeing whether our boys shall go to school or not, but to be careful, to be sure if we may, that in the years that are to come we shall have schools and colleges and homes?

I am compelled from every consideration to vote for the amendment which I understand will be presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

In doing this, Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of a certain obligation that I owe to any committee that presents to this House with its recommendations any bill that may affect the country. I do not discount the loyalty, the patriotism, or even the wisdom of the committee in arriving at its conclusions in this matter, but I apprehend from an intimation made on the floor of the House that the committee perhaps did not have all the information before it that we have now when it acted upon this bill. There is also a division in the committee, but we are not voting for the committee or against the committee.

I suggest to the Members of the House today that the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of a nation that is now engaged in war. While I think right smart of my ability sometimes, and at other times become dissatisfied with it, I am not willing to put my judgment against that of those who are charged with carrying out the declaration of war that we made a few days ago against three awfully strong, powerful, warlike people who would destroy our institutions and our country.

I cannot find it in myself to presume to take a position that is contrary to the desires of such men as Franklin D. Roosevelt, particularly as President of the United States, of Gen. George C. Marshall, of Secretary Frank Knox, and of Secretary Stimson. They say we have a plan that we are setting on foot to accomplish victory, and I am going to follow that plan in my vote.

On December 8, there was presented to the House of Representatives a resolution reading as follows:

Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That a state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan, which has thus been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

On the 11th day of December, there was presented to the House of Representatives, following the declaration of war by the Government of Germany against the United States, a resolution declaring that

A state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, which has been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Germany; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Following the declaration of war by Italy against the United States, came a similar declaration that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the United States and the people of the United States, the resolution, as in the other two cases, pledging all of the resources of the country to a successful prosecution of the war.

Section 2, article II, of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

The House of Representatives, on the 8th day of December, voted unanimously, except one vote, declaring that a state of war exists with the Imperial Government of Japan and authorized the President of the United States to employ all the resources of the country to bring the war to a successful conclusion. Similar resolutions were likewise adopted on the 11th day of December with respect to the Governments of Germany and Italy. Under the Constitution, the President is Commander in Chief of the armed forces. By the near unanimous vote in the House of Representatives, and by unanimous vote in the Senate, we pledged ourselves to yield to the President and his advisers every resource of the country for the successful prosecution of the war; which is a war to save our country and to save liberty and freedom.

It is surely recognized that this is a war of great proportions. Particularly the Governments of Germany and Japan have for their purpose domination of and dominion over all the countries of the world. Italy is aiding in this unholy purpose. The reasons underlying or furnishing cause for this war are so far reaching that the Government of the United States and the people of the United States have thrust upon them the necessity of a long, hard war. We must win the war. To lose it would be to lose all we have. This means that we must

summon to our aid in actuality every resource of the country. Young men and older men will have to fight.

Considering the far-reaching purposes of the Axis Powers, a young man 19 years of age stands a 2-to-1 chance, at least, that he will have to enter actual combat by the time he is 21 years of age. Is it wise to wait until about 3 months before he is to be inducted into the service to begin his training? We are fighting two nations particularly who make a specialty of military efficiency. Their men are without doubt the best trained and the most efficiently equipped fighters, on sea, on land, and in the air, that the world has ever known. Is it wise to wait and wait and find ourselves from time to time compelled to thrust our young people and our older people into this war wholly unprepared or half-way prepared? Surely, this must be folly. For the protection of the young man, say 19 years of age, and considering that he will in all probability have to engage in actual combat in this war, is it not more humane to him that he be efficiently prepared and equipped to take his place? Are we to say to him that we will risk the time when we may, and probably will, have to send him into the war with 2 or 3 months' preparation? Hardly could he be expected to possess an efficiency that would protect him from the ruthlessness and the dangers attendant upon combat with highly and almost completely trained and equipped forces.

And, too, when we are called upon by the President, advised by the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff, that the plan laid out for the successful prosecution of this war comprises a thorough training and preparation of our men, involves the summoning of every resource and every equipment possible, shall we, after having made our resolutions, run counter to the Commander in Chief and those immediately chargeable with the successful prosecution of this war? It does not seem logical; indeed, it is hardly possible that we could take such a position. We do not yield our several opinions or the pride of our mental attainment by following the judgment and advice of those to whom we have committed this important task. I think we but show a greater judgment in that we see the logic of yielding to those in authority and chargeable with this great undertaking both common sense and humanity, believing that they will do what is wise and what is right. I think they will take care of the boys the very best possible. I think the positions of President, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of War, Chief of Staff, and others comprising what we may refer to as our armed forces, are filled with men of good sense, vision, and all proper considerations of care for our soldiers, as well as all other humanitarian requirements. I think this should be the policy of every Member of the Congress, both the House and the Senate, and that it is a wiser course than to undertake to insist that we ourselves must substitute ourselves and our opinions for the collective judgment of those to whom we have committed this important work.

Is it not our province to authorize and empower, leaving to the President and those immediately responsible for successful execution the matter of building up our Army and Navy and air forces? Cannot we trust the men in these positions as to humanitarianism, as well as genius and judgment? I believe they are worthy of our confidence; that they have love, sympathy, and concern for our men and our boys. They surely do not wish them to face awful duties and responsibilities unprepared. In this I trust them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 302), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every male alien and every noncitizen national of the United States residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 65, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder."

Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien and every noncitizen national of the United States residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 21 and 45 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 21 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That any citizen or subject of a neutral country shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this act if, prior to his induction into the land or naval forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That no citizen or subject of any country who has been or who may hereafter be proclaimed by the President to be an alien enemy of the United States shall be inducted for training and service under this act unless he is acceptable to the land or naval forces."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. This is the amendment which I discussed on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as also offered to section 7. This is the amendment changing the age limit from 21 to 19.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS to the committee amendment:

Page 6, line 5, page 6, line 6, and page 8, line 8, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "19."

Page 8, lines 9 and 10, strike out "twenty-first" and insert in lieu thereof "nineteenth."

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

Page 6, line 5, page 6, line 6, and page 8, line 8, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "20."

Page 8, lines 9 and 10, strike out "twenty-first" and insert in lieu thereof "twentieth."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I accept the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important bills that has been considered by this House in many a day. Like you, I am one of those who understands and appreciates the serious obligation that every man feels to himself and his country in this fateful hour. I do not offer this amendment in an effort to be controversial or argumentative. I am willing to accept any reasonable and fair compromise. I simply want to do honestly and sincerely what I know you want to do; that is, the best and wisest thing to save our beloved country. I do not know what is the best age limit, whether 21, 20, or 19. I just know that the world is on fire, and, as has been said here repeatedly, neither this Nation nor civilization itself has ever faced a more serious problem than that which decent, civilized, liberty-loving people face today.

I am not a military expert. I do not profess to be one. I just try to be a good, patriotic citizen like you. But I think that when tragedy and danger comes, you want the best advice and leadership you can get. You send for the best doctor available when illness strikes at your loved ones. When war comes I am following the heads of our War and Navy Departments. That is their profession. That has been their life work. They know war first-hand. They have studied and planned and I have confidence in them.

I think I am a pretty good judge of the pulse of an audience. I feel that from what has been said here perhaps this House is not ready to accept the 19-year age limit amendment. I have no quarrel with you. That is the reason I have offered this amendment as a substitute and compromise. I want the best bill we can get.

I plead with you, I implore you in the name of our country, that when the President, who is Commander in Chief, sends a personal letter here, when the War Department, through Secretary Stimson, General Marshall, General Haislip, Chief of Personnel, and when the officials of the Navy Department and of the Air Corps, and everybody else who is going to do the fighting say, "Please help us to arrange a long-range over-all program," I think we should follow their advice.

Please do not get excited. If you will read the testimony before the House Committee on Military Affairs you will find there is no effort, there is not even a threat, there is not even the slightest intention of putting all these young men into the Army at once. The men will not even begin registering until next July. Everybody knows that the Army does not

have the equipment, the housing, and the clothing to care for all these young men immediately, and the War Department has not even contemplated such action. This is a preparedness program.

If we are face to face with a World War that is likely to take 4 or 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 years, it is going to be an all-out affair. We have pledged all our resources and it is now a question of fight or surrender. It means all our fighting forces and all our material wealth, if necessary.

This is a serious and a tragic hour. I beg and I plead with you that if we mean what we say when we pledge all our resources, our men, and our material, and when the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy say "Let us register these men, let us induct them as we need them and in the proportions we need them over the days, months, and perhaps years that are to come," I think the least we can do is to follow their leadership. We must lodge authority somewhere and since they have the primary responsibility for winning the war, I think we should take their advice.

As has already been said, if you do not take in more young men, you may just as well be prepared to take in later the more mature men, perhaps those with wives and two or three children, because you cannot fight this war without men. Young men are the best soldiers and have less responsibilities.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Knowing what he does about the Army and Army training, would the gentleman not consider it safe to assert that if men of 20 are inducted into the service, in view of the kind of training they would be compelled to take they would be 21 before they were ever called to combat service?

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the distinguished Speaker for that contribution, because it must not be forgotten that under the present practice when a young man enlists in the service, it is 5 months before he is even attached to a unit. He first goes to his reception center and then he goes into a replacement center, where it is determined the place he will fit best. The speaker is exactly right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. He goes into one of these replacement centers and it is determined where he can render the best service. A lot of people seem to have the mistaken idea that these young and inexperienced boys will be up in the air flying before you know it. Of course, they make the best aviators, and it is going to take these young men to run this modern machinery, these planes, and these tanks. It requires youth, health, energy, and ingenuity. It is going to take young men to do all this parachute jumping. Yes;

they are daring and they are better men physically, but we must not forget in connection with the Air Corps that a man has to develop and has to be trained before he can go up in the air. They are not going to force these young men into such service. That is voluntary service. These people in the War and Navy Departments are patriotic officers and know their business and will do the right and best thing. It is their profession, and they have been making a study of this for months, and even years. General Hershey came up through the ranks, from a country boy in Indiana, to be the outstanding expert on selective military service, and he testified before the committee—

Yes; when I was before the committee last year I said that I thought 21 years was low enough to go, but I have changed my mind about a lot of things in the last week.

So has this House; so have the American people. I know how a lot of fathers and mothers feel. I know how I feel myself, but what good is this country if Hitler or the Japs get over here? Of what value are our colleges and universities if we are slaves to a foreign dictator? We have a job to do. We can take no chances. We are going to remain a free people, but it is no time to count the cost. We have to win first.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the evidence before the gentleman's committee indicate that the Army is now prepared to fully equip an army such as contemplated by the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course not; and no such claim has been made. As a farmer you know you must prepare your ground before you plant your crop.

Mr. COOLEY. Then why should there be such a rush to induct these young men into the service?

Mr. THOMASON. There is no rush to induct these young men into the service at all, but the Army says that if we are about to be engaged in a war for 6 or 8 or 10 years, with Germany having 8,000,000 trained men and other countries having the same percentage of men, why should we wait a year or two to make all our plans or before we have an overall plan for the men to fight the war? They will be inducted and trained only as fast as conditions will permit.

Mr. COOLEY. Why should we induct a large number of men into the Army and after they are inducted we can only drill them with wooden guns?

Mr. THOMASON. I hope the gentleman will not go into that. That is an unfair and exploded story that has gone all over the country.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that on the recent maneuvers in the Carolinas they had wooden guns down there?

Mr. THOMASON. There is a rifle in the War Department for every man in the American Army. They may not all be Garands, but nevertheless the guns are available. It is true we have been sending a good many to brave, old Britain, and to fighting Russia, to hold the line until we could get prepared, but all

the War Department wants to do now is to arrange and plan for an all-out program for an all-out war. There is no thought of inducting these men into the service before we are prepared to receive and train them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman state that we have neither the housing nor the equipment for these men?

Mr. THOMASON. No; they do not have the housing for another two or three million immediately, but the War Department says housing will not be a problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. There is no contention, not the slightest, that they have the housing or the equipment for two or three or four million more men at once. This, I repeat, is a long-range plan to win this war, and I do not see how anybody is hurt by it. It is the best life-insurance policy we can buy. But rather than have a repudiation, in effect, of what the President, who is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy want, if you say that you will not reduce it to 19, I beg and plead with you at least to put it at 20, because there will not be 10 percent of those boys who will not be 21 by the time they are called. This is the time not only to fight but to sacrifice. We must lay aside sentiment. War is a grim, cruel business, but we did not fire the first shot, although we will fire the last one if we do our full duty. Down in Texas our slogan is "Remember the Alamo." I implore this Congress to make our slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I would like to see if there are any gentlemen who want to debate this particular amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; I want to say something about it.

Mr. MAY. I want to get the time settled, if I may. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock and that I be permitted to use the last 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I thought that some things had happened which caused the Nation to be more united than we had been for some time previous. I regret very much that now there seems to be a tendency to again get into a controversial proposition and to disregard the request of those who have been charged with the responsibility of carrying forward our war program. I believe that the American people are able ultimately to win this conflict because of the ultimate ability and capacity which we have to utilize our facilities and

natural resources, and those things which are so necessary to carry on a successful conflict; but I feel at the same time that it is folly for us to attempt to do it with our hands tied behind our backs. I have had enough experience myself with military affairs to know that men 18 to 21 make the best soldiers. I know that we need the best men. I know that the fathers and mothers are willing to make the kind of sacrifices that they are called upon to make, and I know that these young men who are mentioned here today are just as willing to make whatever sacrifices they may be called upon to make. I know that when you go above 20 years you take more who have families, more who are married, and that it is more expensive to the Government to draft these men. I do not mean to infer that cost is the only item, but certainly it is one item, and I know that these young men are just as willing as other men to do their part. I think this is a reasonable suggestion, that at least we give some consideration to the request made in lowering the age limit. I think the least we can do is to adopt the substitute amendment and agree to a proposition of 20 years. I would hate to see this amendment rejected, and I would hate to see this Congress refuse to do the thing that we have been asked to do.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is a most unfortunate situation which we confront in the House today and we confront a very serious situation in America which this sort of controversy will not help. We must try to avoid this in the future if we can. I have been trying for a long time to arouse our people to the consciousness of our danger and to bring to us the solidifying influence of that consciousness. I have watched popular reaction and observed the trends and developments of public opinion and of public attitude during these dangerous, stressful times. I have observed the perfectly ridiculous, self-satisfied attitude of persons in positions of leadership as we have moved unaware and unprepared into direct conflict with the greatest fighting machine of all time. Now we have arrived. At last the people are becoming aroused and solidified, and here we have this proposition, this request to override the almost unanimous judgment of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and far in advance of any practical necessity to decide the matter when the country is in the process of being solidified.

It is even admitted that if this reduction in age limit were made now the registration of these draftees could not begin until next July. It does not make sense. I have listened attentively to this debate and I am convinced that to put this unnecessary and profitless strain upon the morale of the country, and this unnecessary strain upon the accord between the House and the executive branch now, does not make sense. The question at the moment is not whether this age limit may have to be reduced when these younger men can be utilized, but whether at this time when our solidarity is young and not fixed, and a remarkable harmony is developing among all the departments of the Government, that we should adopt

this amendment when it is admitted we cannot begin to operate under its provisions for half a year. The question is whether or not we should at this time put this unnecessary strain upon the morale of America. That is a serious practical question for any people situated as we are. It does not make any difference what your view is with regard to this proposition as a thing which must be done in due time, done as fast as we can induct men and equip them for training.

I remember that in the last war it was suggested by the military authorities to begin drafting men at 17 years of age. I was one of those who thought that was a dangerous thing from the standpoint of the morale of the Nation, aside from all other considerations, to make the first draft largely upon these boys, practically none of whom could claim a recognized exemption. We did not make any noise about it, but we went to those preparing the plans for the draft and had some conversation with them; we told them we could not support the plan and persuaded them that that was not a wise thing to do then, although it might become necessary later on. I wish that had been the procedure here. That ought to be the character of procedure in the future and I hope it will be. It would be a serious mistake if our policy in this great struggle, the struggle of life and death, shall not have in it as its basic, component elements, the best contribution which can be made by our military experts and the best contribution which an earnest, patriotic, self-effacing, wholly dedicated Congress and a great people can make. Let us do together now of the things now needed to be done upon which we can persuade ourselves to an agreed judgment, and if we will, we will be in better condition, better understanding, better teamwork long before next July, the earliest time at which we could begin doing even the first material thing with reference to these young draftees.

I listened to the statement of my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who said that we will not be registering these men until July anyway. We cannot afford to crowd this thing now. I am fully convinced of that fact.

There are too many things connected with our preparedness which we can do which will bring us closer together, for us to turn aside from them and undertake to force this amendment over the almost unanimous protest of our Committee on Military Affairs, and force it on the country before the country is ready to receive it, even though we should feel that by next July, the earliest day we could begin even registering these boys, we might have to lower the age limit. We can pass a bill in 2 days. As we get nearer to July, we will know more clearly what we ought to do, and if we have to do it then, the country will be better prepared to have us do it.

We will be here from now until July. The point I make, and it is the thing that is determining me—of course, we want to go along with the Commander in Chief,

but the Commander in Chief wants to go along with us, too. I mean that with all respect. It is essential that the House, the Senate, the President, and the country pull together.

Now, here is a duly authorized committee of the House which has reported out a bill with 21 years' limit for draftees. The opponents of that minimum-age limit admit, even if the limit is reduced, that the registering of those in the lowered age limits could not begin until next July.

What is the horse-sense thing to do? The common-sense thing to do is to wait until nearer July, until the country gets a little more solid and a little more used to this war, and then we can put the age at anywhere that is necessary, and the country will be ready to receive it, if it is necessary to put the limit down. If that is not the sound, practical, common-sense thing from the standpoint of the people who want to win this war, who want to preserve the solidarity of the Nation and accord among the departments, then I cannot figure out anything. That is how I am going to vote. As I see it, it is a dangerous, reckless, unnecessary thing to pass this amendment now, when, if adopted, we could not begin to use the provision of the amendment until next July. It just does not make sense. As I see it, I am doing a better service for the Commander in Chief and for the country than those who are promoting this controversy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is recognized.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am against this hip, hip, hurrah, and go-along spirit as compared with two sound letters I am about to read. I have a letter from a very able chairman of a draft board, Mr. Walt Zoellner, of Tonganoxie, Kans.:

I want to take this opportunity to acquaint you with some facts about our present selective service as it affects Leavenworth County, No. 2 district. The board honored me with the chairmanship, and as I am the only member in Tonganoxie, where our office is located, am very familiar with selective-service operation. Noting the publicity concerning changes to be made in selective service, some real facts should be known to you who are in Congress. Our district has some 940 registrants at this time, and we have so far sent 38 men to the Army. We now have 50 men in class 1-A, physically examined, and 70 men who have not been examined. We have 60 men in class 1-H (over 28 years) who will probably become class 1-A in the near future. That makes a total of 218 men class 1-A out of a total of 940 registrants, or almost 25 percent. Possibly another 50 men who now have class 2-A deferment could be put into class 1-A without serious harm to necessary industry.

Now, the above is a picture of a country district, and I imagine it is probably an average district. With the above percentage of men available, why all the worry about so much more registration? Military training for boys over 18 years of age would be fine and is justified, but why scare and worry every mother or wife in the country just now? Let these present forces get proper training and then mix in the younger lads.

I also have a letter from a leading citizen and the chairman of the Board of

Education of Topeka, Mr. Kelsey H. Petro, from which I will read a portion:

No sacrifice is too great to eliminate our enemies, but we give plenty of thought to actions that affect our school-age youth. This war will not be won by children in diapers nor by old men in their dotage. The paper is mentioning lowering draft age to 18 years, which will catch untold thousands of boys, many of them not out of high school, which, at the present state of this world conflict, is not justified. Let these children finish their school and become adjusted, as they will in the next 3 years, to an adult view of the world and war. Then it is proper, if they are needed, to draft them, but not at the age of 18, unless men from 21 and upward have all been taken, which at present is not the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, if this substitute is adopted we might as well vote now for 19. You do not have a thing in the world to trade on with the conference committee of the Senate. One of these great bodies has to give way to the other, with only 1 year between. I would prefer, of course, 20, if we cannot get 21, but you know and I know that the Senate with 19 and the House with 20, you have divested yourself of everything with which to strike a bargain in conference.

Now, there is some one age that is the right age. Do not tell us that the military authorities have some infallible rule, some absolute cure-all prescription. There are just as many minds among the brass hats on this question as among Members of the House. The only difference is that when an officer who is above the other speaks, they have to hush, and we talk to each other and just talk on. That is the only difference. But, under cover, there is the same difference of opinion.

I know what is the best age for an Army horse. Four to seven years. Anything above or below, you are getting an inferior piece of material. There is some one age best for military age, and when you get above or below you are not taking the best.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] says "Sprinkle them all along from 18 all the way up." I know how the sprinkling will go. Every fellow who is 18 will get sprinkled into the service, and the other fellow goes home. That is the very thing I am objecting to. There is some one best age. Do not let the mill run empty for a minute for men, and when the best age has been exhausted, then take the next best and the next best, whether it be higher or lower. Every time you take an 18-year-old youth into the service, if a 29-year-old man is better you have not only done the individual an injustice, but you have done the country a disservice, because you have let out one that was better. I have no sons or any near relatives that the lower age would affect, but I speak only for the program as to what is best for all.

Stand pat on the 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I can be classified as an isolationist, and certainly not as an interventionist. I have tried to view as realistically as possible each problem as it has been presented to this House. I have listened with interest to this debate. When it is frankly admitted on the floor of this House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] that the Army does not have at the present time the necessary equipment or the necessary housing facilities to train and to house and care for the army which is contemplated by this amendment, it seems to me that it would be very unwise to lower the age for the draft at this time below 21 years.

I have never heard a more desperate appeal than the gentleman made in behalf of his amendment. He begged us to follow the great President, our Commander in Chief, and yet he admitted that his amendment was not the amendment that was advocated by the Commander in Chief or the Chief of Staff. It is only a compromise. He is apparently engaging in horse trading. We are here dealing with the lives of the youth of America and it ought not to be put on the basis of horse trading. The young men of this country are patriotic, of course. The young men of this country have fought all the wars in the past and are willing to fight this one; but to take the position now that we are going to take them from their vocations and avocations of private life and bring them into the Army and equip them with only wooden guns seems to me to be the height of absurdity. When we have the equipment, when we have the facilities, when we have a Medical Corps sufficient to take care of these young men, and when the hour comes that their services are needed to defend the institutions of this country you will find them flocking into the armed forces of the Nation and to the defense of their country.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Has the gentleman any idea of the percentage of volunteers that are under 21?

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry; I do not.

Mr. HEALEY. I wish some member of the committee would give us that information.

Mr. COOLEY. I assume that the Military Affairs Committee of the House has given this matter careful consideration, and I am going to vote to stand by the committee and keep the age at 21.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] this afternoon in holding up the scare-headline proposition that married men and men with, one, two, or three dependents would be drafted if we did not watch out. I was also interested in noting that the gentleman completely overlooked mentioning

the fact that we have had some increase in population since 1917 to draw on. That point has not been mentioned at any time very audibly by those advocating taking in the 18-year olds.

There is one other point I should like to call to your attention. It has been mentioned several times here today, but it is worth rechecking and reemphasizing. That is that the number of volunteers entering our armed forces exceeds anything in the country's experience in bygone years, because the attack upon us has drawn the Nation together as we have never been united before.

Another matter has been mentioned here many times today, and I think I can speak of this point better than many others; that is the matter of equipment and ammunition. I know the War Department does not want me nor any member of this committee, nor any member of the War Department, to tell you exactly how much ammunition we have on hand, and I will not tell you. But I do know from actual experience how long it takes to train a marksman. I have spent several years in that business myself and think I know what it takes to train a good marksman. I will say that the American soldier is the best natural marksman in the world, but he cannot be made such on his per capita share of the present ammunition on hand and leave anything in reserve.

If and when War Department officials come up here and tell us they have adequate equipment to train all the older boys as rapidly as they indicate may be necessary and that they also can offer adequate training and rifle practice to the boys under 21, I think I can go a long way toward helping them out by lowering the age limit. I am not opposed to a boy under 21 getting training. My own son joined the C. M. T. C. with my consent when he was 17, joined the National Guard with my consent when he was 18, and today at age 20 he is down in Texas in service in the cavalry. It is not that I am opposed to training these youngsters, it is that I am everlastingly opposed to drawing them in there to mark time until we wake up and get them enough equipment, and I am opposed to sending them into combat so young and so untrained.

I hardly need call your attention to some water that has gone over the dam. Our Committee on Military Affairs was not permitted to meet once all during the special session of Congress 2 years ago this fall. The President and Congress woke up to an augmentation program if you please only when the Lowlands were invaded in 1940. Then everybody started getting excited and reaching for the gun that was not there, reaching for ammunition that was not there.

Now, let us just keep our shirts on in this matter. Let us give them what they need, but let us not have our heads turned by false arguments. We should not become hysterical about the matter and draw the 18-year-olds and the 19-year-olds and the 20-year-olds into active military combat service when we cannot offer them a decent training program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I got here the day the Neutrality Act was voted on. As some folks said, I picked a mighty bad time to come to Congress. May I say, in regard to this amendment, that I do not want to send the high-school boys of this country to the Army or to the war. At the same time I do not want to say to our President that those boys are not available in case they are needed. I have sent to the desk an amendment, which will be offered shortly, which I think takes care of the opinion of every Member of the House. The amendment leaves the 21 age in. This Congress is not going to send boys under 21 years of age to war. My amendment provides further, however, that if the President of the United States finds it necessary to the end of defending this country and believes that the limit should be reduced to 19, he is given that authority. I think that takes care of what each of you Members want to do.

You do not want to say that you will send the boys of this country to the Army when they are not old enough to be out of high school. At the same time you do not want to say to the Commander in Chief of our Army, "Mr. President, they are not available to you." I say that that gives ample authority to our Commander in Chief to call out those boys if and when they are needed, whenever we have the ammunition, as the gentleman suggests; at the same time it makes our President pass on that in an official capacity. It says, "By Presidential order he shall do those things," and not, Mr. Chairman, by letter to the majority leader of this House.

The bill that we are now considering provides that the President may eliminate the boys under 21. You should vote against the pending amendment, leaving the age at 21; then I certainly shall present and try to get you to adopt the amendment which is on the Clerk's desk providing that the President may reduce that age limit in case the emergency warrants it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why should we make these young boys available to the Army when we emphatically state that they are not prepared to house and train them?

Mr. WHITTEN. The point of the gentleman is well taken. In addition to that, you know these boys who are under 21 cannot vote against us Members of Congress. They have not anything to say about whether we come back here or not and there are other disabilities which these boys have. At the same time, I want to say to the President, to our Commander in Chief, "They are available, this Congress says they are available, but we ask you in the consideration that you give to these matters to determine that based on the emergency. Do not ask us to do it by letters to the majority leader."

I am sure the members of the Military Affairs Committee gave this matter due consideration and they did act in an official capacity. The pending amendment should be defeated; then in turn we can take care of the true thought of the Members, that is, make the youth available to our Commander in Chief, and at the same time we will not say they must be put in the Army when we are not equipped to take care of them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes you had better keep the boys at their mothers' apron strings just as long as you can in times like this. This is not the same old type of warfare that we knew 25 years ago. It is a whole lot harder. It is harder on the nerves, it is harder on the morale, especially of those boys who are subjected to the terrific overhead bombing that we did not have in the World War. I would be willing on a long-range program to start the training of the youth of America at the end of their high-school education, whenever that might be, but certainly not to send them into combat, because they are not ready.

They are not ready for three reasons. Physically they are not capable, they do not have the stamina, and, while a few might develop at the age of 14, 15, or 16, the great number do not until they are very close to the age of 21. That was our experience in the last World War. Certainly the youth of today are not supermen over those of 25 years ago. That is the first reason.

The second reason is the mental attitude of the boys. The mind cannot stand up under this modern barrage. Do you know that we have more men in the hospitals today who have brain and mind diseases than for any other reason as the result of service in the World War? And that cannot hold a candle to what we will witness henceforth. I say the brain cannot stand it when the brain is immature. Let us give them all the years we can.

Then there is the third reason, the moral stamina of the youth of today. Do not throw them in with the older men until you have to. I am not going to say any more about that. You know what I mean. Keep them tied to their mothers' apron strings as long as you can.

Here is another thing. The Navy is getting volunteers and it has been getting them right along under the age of 21. The Navy looks them over. They accept only one out of every six who apply. If you blanket them all in, you cannot pick and choose. I do not want the little fellow who is just growing. I want the big, stalwart fellow, even if he is only 18, 19, or 20. The Navy will take him if he is physically and mentally mature. He will volunteer. You do not have to draft him. To blanket all above a certain age, you get the little and the big, the undeveloped as well as the developed.

One other thing. If you accept the 21-year age limit, as the gentleman from

Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] said, you can go to conference and iron it out by compromising on 20, and God knows that is young enough; but if you set 20 here today, you will have 19½ or 19, and do not forget that is the best you will be able to get. For combat service do not send immature boys into the kind of combat that we have in modern warfare.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that the State constitution of Arizona places a liability for military service in my State on all able-bodied male citizens between the ages of 18 and 45, which fact does have some influence upon my thinking in this matter, I agree with the gentleman from California who just preceded me, and with several other gentlemen, that we ought not at this time go below the age of 21 in drafting men into military service. I shall, therefore, oppose the amendment before us now and stand by the committee proposal in that respect. It seems quite likely in the final outcome of this legislation that there will be a compromise between the two bodies and an age limit lower than 21 reached, if we today maintain the present lower limit of 21 in passing the bill.

As a schoolman, I feel it to be very important that we keep our young men in high school until they have been graduated. As a college man, I should like to say as much for complete college training for all young men, but of course that is impossible. A few young men get out of high school at 18 and more at 19. As the gentleman from California has just said, I believe the country will be far safer if we make the very minimum age limit 20, and I would prefer it to be 21. If they are needed in our armed forces after graduation, be assured their years in high school will not be void of essential military training.

The Congress will be in continuous session here. If we later find it imperatively necessary to take into training those under the age of 21, the law can be changed at any time.

Let me stress this particularly: We ought to distinguish between registering men and inducting them into military training, and certainly into service. I would be far more ready to vote to register men under 21 in order that they might be ultimately called to training when needed, or on reaching a proper age, than I would be to throw them into a hodge-podge mixture now for immediate military training and possibly combat service. We are told that men below the age of 21 are enlisting now in great numbers and that is as it should be. It may be that as many will enlist as can be taken care of with our facilities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to hear suggestions made in this Committee that anyone is going to vote for this, that, or the other age limit in order that we may have a ground for com-

promise with another body. After all, right is right. We do not want to work for a compromise, we want to work for what we believe to be right.

I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that no claim has been made, even by the most enthusiastic supporters of this amendment, that we shall within the next year or year and a half or perhaps 2 years be able properly to receive, train, arm, and equip the men we can yet draw from the brackets in which we are now working. That fact is very significant in connection with this debate.

It has been only a very short time since the Selective Service Board itself asked this body to allow them to reduce the age limit from 36 to 28, so as to be allowed to take the men they were selecting into the service between the ages of 21 and 28. At that time I told them, "This is nothing but an entering wedge. You will come back here within a short time and ask to be allowed to take the boys below the age of 21." I firmly believe this request would have been made, perhaps not this early, but certainly within no long period of time, whether or not we had actually become engaged in hostilities.

I say again that if I believed we would be able to receive, train, arm, and equip the boys below 21 in addition to those in the higher-age brackets, I would not be here opposing this amendment, but I do not believe there is a single man on the Committee on Military Affairs who believes that within at least the next year and a half we shall be able properly to take care of all of the eligibles in the age brackets in which we are now working.

As we go further into this program, as we know better what we shall have to do, as our industrial system functions more efficiently, and our production meets the demands which will be made on it we will be in much better position to judge how severely we shall have to draw upon the manpower of this Nation. Until we have to do that, until we know that in order to furnish the forces we shall have to furnish, until we know that we shall be taking care of them as they should be taken care of, let us not reach down into the lower age brackets to get these men. They will be coming of age at the rate of 1,200,000 each year, and they will be a reservoir and a reserve we can draw on in the future.

One thing we do not want to do in the contest into which we are entering is to commit all of our resources early in the game. That is not good strategy at any time. All the contests throughout history have gone in the final analysis to those nations which at the proper time had a proper reserve to put into the conflict. Therefore, let us not be stampeded at this time by any demands of this kind. Let us not be influenced at this time by any arguments that we must follow blindly any requests sent up to us by any department of this Government. Now, of all times, the House of Representatives should prove to this Nation that although we are willing to go along with the Commander in Chief in everything necessary to win this war, we are still going to preserve as far as possible the equality between our three branches of Government. Therefore, let us make

up our minds as Members of the House of Representatives what we believe we should do. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that by dropping the age limit to 20 you do not create any larger reserve in the long run, you simply make 600,000 men available at an earlier date, and that is all.

May I say also that General Hershey has repeatedly said that it is not their intention to draft this younger group of men until the other age group is exhausted. Two members of the committee have read newspaper articles to the Members here this afternoon quoting his exact words. I call your attention to a similar article taken from the Christian Science Monitor quoting him on December 15 as giving the number of men he could get from the various age groups and saying this:

The present program of induction contemplates the drawing first of remaining men immediately available in the 21 to 27 age bracket. Next to be called would be those from 28 to 35, and then those reaching the age of 21.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If this amendment is adopted, how long will it be before they can begin to register these men between 18 and 21?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is planned to register all between 18 and 65 about July 1, but, of course, if what he states here is correct, not a single one of these men would be drafted for at least 2 years, because we cannot possibly use up the age groups above that within a shorter time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You cannot even begin to register them until July; is that the gentleman's statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is planned to register them July 1.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is, to begin then?

Mr. SPARKMAN. To register them; and I assume they will register the whole group, but I do not know about that. However, the point I want to make is that even if this amendment were adopted, not a one of these men could reasonably be expected to be drafted, under this statement, for at least 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, this problem of calling men into service, getting them to camp, putting clothes on them and arms in their hands, and giving them food and shelter is no small problem within itself. Just so many of them can be taken in every month, and no more; and our testimony is to the effect that the very most that were taken in during the World War were approximately 300,000 a month.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. This is one thing I do not believe the gentleman will dispute. The gentleman must admit that the War

Department solely is charged with the planning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and I am glad the gentleman has mentioned that. There is no reason under the sun why every plan cannot be made because these men will be registered, we will know everything about them, they can be classified and the day they become 21 they can be drafted, and if it ever becomes necessary to drop the age below 21, a simple amendment of one word contained in a joint resolution of the two Houses can do it. This would simply be changing the figure "21" to "19" or "18" or whatever age you want to make it, and it can go through the two Houses of Congress just as quickly as the declaration of war went through, and the Congress will be in session.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can the War Department make such plans today unless we make it certain?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly, they can plan and they say they are not going to draft them until the others are used.

Mr. ANDREWS. They cannot plan it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They can lay their plans on the assumption that they will be available when they become 21 years of age. I just want to appeal to you to hold this to the age that the committee has decided it ought to be held to and let these boys under 21 know that they are not to be drafted unless it becomes absolutely necessary for the adequate defense of this country.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to apologize for the vote I am going to cast, because I am going to vote against this amendment, and someone is going to say that I offered the very same amendment in the committee. That is true. However, I am most sincere when I say that I want it to be at the age of 20. Perhaps my strategy is bad, but I think many Members of this House are also using the same strategy that I am, and that is to vote down this amendment, stay with the committee at 21, and when they do go to conference, after the Senate has passed its bill at 19, we will be able to bring out this bill at 20.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can the gentleman tell us what the Senate is going to do?

Mr. MERRITT. I do not think anybody has any doubt about what they are going to do. I am sure if we do let this get by at 20 at this time, as someone who preceded me has said, and the Senate does pass a bill for 19, we will probably compromise at 19½ or 19.

I was very much impressed by what the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] said, because of the long experience he has had in the Navy and because of the distinguished record he has made, having been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. I am sure the very point he brought out of keeping these boys at their mothers' apron strings is a good one if for no other reason than because of morals. I say that in itself is one of the finest things we can think of in making these boys stay home until at least they are 20, and I hope it does remain at 21.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman from New York ask the gentleman from California, in view of his observation, why it is the Navy is so glad today to get men between 18 and 21?

Mr. MERRITT. I think I can answer that. I think it is because of the daring attitude of boys when they reach an age between 18 and 21.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a little earlier in the afternoon, as a result of some of the statements made by some of my friends, I felt a little bit concerned because of their statements that something I said had constituted a criticism. I have looked over my remarks, and instead of being concerned I am rather amused at the fact that they were so thin skinned, if I might in an off-handed and friendly way, say so with reference to their little mental discomfort. I said at that time that "I cannot accept their judgment," and that means the Committee on Military Affairs, "in preference to the judgment of the President and his military advisers." I would never consider that to be a criticism. That is the expression of an opinion that I am entitled to entertain. I further said:

In this crisis we must all be good soldiers. That applies particularly to the membership of the House Military Affairs Committee, who challenged the statement of the President and General Marshall in this matter.

Of course, that means the majority of the committee. That is a statement of a fact. There is nothing uncommon about that. If stating a fact constitutes a criticism, of course, it is a criticism; but I never felt that stating a fact was a criticism. I do not retract a word I said.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. EDMISTON. There certainly has never been any statement made on the part of General Marshall, about this age limit, to the committee, or by the President or anybody else.

Mr. McCORMACK. I read a letter to the Committee this afternoon which I received from the President of the United States and which others received.

Mr. EDMISTON. But that is the President of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it is fair to assume that on military matters the President acts on the advice of General Marshall.

Mr. EDMISTON. That, again, is an assumption.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Secretary of War, representing the General Staff, himself addressed the committee as the initial process in the hearings, over his own signature.

Mr. McCORMACK. When I referred to the Military Affairs Committee I was talking extemporaneously, because the bill before the House comes from that committee. I just want to disabuse from the minds of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members any feeling on their part of criticism, and

convey to them the fact that I was stating a few facts. Certainly the record shows that any Member who disagrees with the majority of the members of the Military Affairs Committee is justified in entertaining that opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the age 19, but I recognize in the present situation that the same cannot be obtained. The compromise amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas seems to be one that the House should accept. It seems to me a happy solution. We have one question in controversy, and the acceptance of that amendment should be an agreeable one. The Speaker asked a question of one of the Members who had the floor, indicating that that amendment was acceptable to him. It seems to me, in the light of that situation, that at the end of this debate happiness and pleasantness of mind can exist, if the Committee of the Whole and the House adopts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

I do not think we should be influenced by a statement that Congress is in continuous session, and that by changing one word we can bring about a certain result later on. You know as well as I do when that time comes we will have this fight over again. The change of one word later on, as advanced by some Members, is not an answer to the amendment pending before the House. It should not be brushed aside by an observation of that nature. Furthermore, it has been said that General Hershey has stated that it is not the intention to draft these young men until others have been drafted. It seems to me that that is an argument in favor of this amendment rather than against it. We are in the war. We have been in the war a little over a week. Unanimity exists throughout the country. Whatever differences existed prior to December 7 were removed by the dastardly and vicious attack made by the Japanese. This House has shown to date that it reflects the unanimity of the country by the action of last week. Let us adopt this compromise amendment. It is satisfactory to the leadership and it should be satisfactory to all Members of the House. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for the remaining time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not conscious of anything I could add to the debate, but I do want to call the attention of the Committee to one or two statements I have seen in the press recently. First, one from Winston Churchill a few days ago, in which he told the British Parliament that if England won the war she would do it with American munitions and supplies and American foodstuffs.

The Secretary of Agriculture, last week, issued a statement to the effect that there was going to be a vast shortage of farm labor in this country for the coming crop season. I have always believed since I was a boy 18 to 21 years of age, on the farm, that there was a pretty good place for boys.

I ask that both the original and the substitute amendments be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement all time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRIEST. If I understand the situation now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] accepted the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas, and that is the only amendment now before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments pending, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], as a substitute.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMASON) there were ayes 102 and noes 152.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. THOMASON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were ayes 113 and noes 173.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may we again have that amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FADDIS and Mr. LAMBERTSON objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAMBERTSON and Mr. FADDIS) there were ayes 53 and noes 175.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Mr. EDMISTON: Page 6, line 5, after the word "and", strike out "45" and insert "35."

LXXXVII—627

Page 8, line 9, strike out "45" and insert "35."

Page 9, strike out section 9.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to offer this amendment without much idea of its success, but I do think you should give this matter some thought.

It seems to me that in such times as we are facing the least we disturb our country in an economic way the better off our country will be.

We will get so few men in the classification of 35 to 45 under this bill that they will add nothing to the armed strength. Most of them have dependents. Most of them are experts or technicians in some line. A great many more of them cannot pass the physical qualifications. We will get so few of those men that it is not worth the effort to get them.

Another thought I want to leave with you is that most men over 35 years of age, whether they have dependents or not, are more or less settled. They are on a small farm, in a small store, or filling station. Most likely they are going to do what they are now doing for the rest of their lives. To take them out of whatever they may be doing for a year or two is not going to add anything to the armed forces of our country, and greatly disrupt their lives.

Another thought I want to impress upon you is that they are going to be the most expensive soldiers that you will have in this army, because when their service is over they will come out with a physical disability and you will be paying them pensions as long as they live, and they will be worth very little to you while they are in the service. Let us be sensible about this army we are raising this afternoon.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman believe there is a little fight still left in some men at 45?

Mr. EDMISTON. I am trying to reduce it to 35.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I ask the gentleman if he does not believe that some men over 35 still have a pretty good fight left in them?

Mr. EDMISTON. I say we do not need them now under present conditions to start this war. I hope we do not have to come to them at any time. I think we shall never need them. We raised 4,500,000 between 21 and 31 in the first World War and I am trying to reduce it not to 31 but to 35.

We have no use for a large army at the present time. We will have 2,000,000 men in the Army by January 1. It will take us 6 months to equip them properly. Let us see where this war is in 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 9, after the colon, insert the following:

"Provided, That the President may upon finding that it is necessary in the national interest lower the minimum age fixed in

section 3, subsection (a) from 21 years to 19 years."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the President has sent a letter to Congress saying he needs them today.

Mr. WHITTEN. Did the gentleman from New York receive the note?

Mr. ANDREWS. It was read by the majority leader on the floor.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered with the thought in my mind that it meets the desires of members of this committee. This committee has just voted to fix the minimum limit at 21 years. I think the House never intended to say that no man from 19 to 21 could be called by the Commander in Chief in case of necessity, nor do I believe that the mothers of this country are not willing in the interest of necessity and in the interest of public defense that the young men from 19 to 21 be called out.

The committee having voted to fix the minimum limit at 21 years, my amendment provides that the Commander in Chief may have them available when he determines that they are needed. I do not feel that any mother in this country could find fault with that. I do not think any man in this House could find fault with saying that, if the public interest demands it and public defense requires it, the Commander in Chief of the Army could call out young men from 19 to 21. Let us see where these young men are. Under the provisions of this bill, the young men from 19 to 21 are registered. They are not going anywhere; they will be in this country going to school, many of them to technical schools, learning things that will be helpful. They are going to be here. The committee, having refused to fix the minimum limit at 19, but raising it to 21, should say to the Commander in Chief of our Army that when he determines that these young men must be called in the interest of defending this country we will let him call them. The distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, has quoted the President as saying he needs them today. If this be true, if the letter he wrote is decisive of his official judgment in the matter, then, if this amendment is adopted, the President can, the very day the bill becomes law, call these men up for training.

Let us consider this thing a little further. The original draft of the present bill provides that the President, by Executive order, can eliminate certain age groups. This amendment changes that and provides that, although we have eliminated men from 19 to 21, yet he may include men of those ages in case the public interest requires it or public defense necessitates it.

As I stated a while ago, I have been here since the Neutrality Act amendments were passed on. I know a whole lot more about defense back home than I do about running the Congress of the United States. I am frank to admit that. It has been said, however, that although

the age limit is lowered there is no intention of calling the men in the lower brackets. I do not know about that, but I do know that when orders come to the selective service board back home they say they want so many men. They do not say they want so many men 21 years of age, 22 years of age, or 23; they say within the limitations, between the ages fixed last year, the lower limit being fixed at 21. We have passed an act here that fixes the limit at 21, but we say to the head of the Army, the Commander in Chief of our Nation, if my amendment is agreed to, "Mr. President, as head of the Army if you think we need these young men, you determine it in an official way, and if you so determine it, you may call them." I believe the mothers of this Nation would be glad to have them called into the Army if the Commander in Chief determines it to be necessary for national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in rising in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the only thing I desire to say is that the House has just gone on record by an overwhelming majority fixing the age of the military personnel of this country. The Congress is the body which, under the Constitution, is required to say who shall be soldiers and, having fixed it, the object, the purpose, and the effect of the amendment which has just been offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] would be to take back what we said and leave it to the President to call those boys down to the age of 19 whenever he got ready.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MAY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Page 6, line 21, after the word "forces", insert: "Provided further, That no person shall be barred or prevented from entering or serving in the land or naval forces of the United States because of having been previously dishonorably discharged therefrom on the ground of misconduct in the nature of a misdemeanor, provided at least 5 years shall have elapsed since such discharge and the person so discharged has not been charged with, or convicted of, any crime in such period of time: *Provided further*, That no person shall be barred or prevented from entering or serving in the land or naval forces of the United States because of having been committed or convicted of a felony, if such person has been pardoned by the President, or by the Governor of a State for such felony."

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has nothing whatever to do with the matter of age limitations. That is all water under the bridge now. We have decided that issue. This amendment I have offered is of vital importance, in my judgment, to every Member of the House because the problems it will solve, and the inequities it

will rectify, are common to every congressional district. Speaking subjectively, at least a half dozen relevant cases have come to me from my district, and I feel sure that all of my colleagues here have also been asked questions like, "How are we going to get back into the Army or Navy? We fervently want to serve our country, but many, many years ago when we were just lads in our teens we committed some indiscretion. It is called misconduct, but it sprung from boyish exuberance. We happened to be caught. Others were not caught. As a consequence we were dishonorably discharged from the Army or the Navy."

I am really very much surprised and keenly disappointed that this amendment has not been readily agreed to by the Committee on Military Affairs. I judge from the fact that the distinguished chairman of that committee has reserved a point of order to my amendment that he is perhaps going to raise the question as to its germaneness. Let me point out that no amendment could be more germane, nor could any amendment be more appropriate for marshaling our manpower against the foes of our country.

Mr. NICHOLS. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs did not make a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. No. He reserved a point of order against it.

Mr. NICHOLS. No; not on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to hear that the chairman did not reserve a point of order.

The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that we have these lads, many of whom have developed into stalwart and capable men, who want to get back into the Army and the Navy and in many instances the Army and the Navy want them back because they are excellent timber. In most instances they have atoned for any misconduct of which they may have been guilty, but under military law there is no distinction between a felony and a misdemeanor. All dishonorable discharges look the same and all dishonorable discharges are indelible stains on the records of the recipients and, as such, they are insurmountable hurdles to reentry into the armed forces of the United States. I call your attention to a case which is the subject of current newspaper comment and which strikingly illustrates the situation. You will recall that last January four of our young sailors climbed up the side of a building in San Francisco and cut down the swastika flag of the German consulate. Young Harold Sturtevant, who was the bellwether of that group of impetuous, but courageous lads attempted to reenlist in the Navy last week after the treacherous attack on our shores by Japan. In order for him to reenlist it was necessary to obtain a special ruling from the Navy Department at Washington, which required about 1 week's time. At first, it seemed doubtful that he would be able to reenlist because he was discharged from the Navy as a result of the swastika escapade.

Now, in this bill we have the positive wording that every male citizen, and I

labor the word "every"—that means every man between the ages of 21 and 45—shall be liable for training and service. It occurs to me that it is patently inconsistent to make such a provision in this draft act when we are confronted by a condition, not a theory, which prevents the Army and the Navy from accepting certain of these very men who can so well serve, and are so eager to serve, their country. Certainly there is no disposition on my part to open the doors of the Army and the Navy to jail birds and hardened criminals. I am simply trying to give absolution to those former soldiers and sailors who, as the result of the committing of misdemeanors only while serving their enlistments are now barred from reenlisting. Why, the offenses of some of them were of such minor nature as would have subjected them only to trial in a magistrate's court, or a police court, had they been civilians. A great many of these men have amply proved their worth in civilian pursuits. Many of them have become highly skilled in mechanical trades and as technicians. They can, and they will, if given the opportunity, be of invaluable service to our armed forces in the grim, total warfare in which we are now engaged. In justice to these men, and in justice to the Nation, we should make it possible for them to again take up arms in defense of their country.

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

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How many persons would this amendment affect?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am unable to give that information to the gentlemen, but merely as an estimate I would say they run into the thousands, just judging from the inquiries I have had from my own district.

Mr. Chairman, that portion of my amendment which seeks to take down the bars with respect to those men who, under civil law, have been convicted of a felony but who have been pardoned by the President, or by the Governor of a State, closely parallels the provisions of S. 1989 recently introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I cannot conceive of any valid objection being offered to that portion of my amendment, or to the amendment as a whole, in these crucial days when no man should be prevented by mere technicalities from standing in the front rank of the Nation's defenders and, if need be, offering his life on the altar of his country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from saying that it is my impression—I should like to be corrected if I am incorrect—that the President of the United States has vetoed every private bill that has been passed pertaining to the correction of the military record of a soldier. I am in perfect accord on this with the President of the United States; you may be surprised that I am for once. I think it would be a bad thing for the discipline of the Army to agree to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 4 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations."

SEC. 4. Section 5 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "foreign countries" a comma and the following: "and persons in other categories to be specified by the President."

SEC. 5. The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after "(1)" and after "(2)" the words "of any or all."

SEC. 6. Paragraph (2) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States, of those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the men so deferred."

SEC. 7. Section 15 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The term 'between the ages of 21 and 45' shall refer to men who have attained the twenty-first anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the forty-fifth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner."

SEC. 8. Persons inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 who are inducted into or assigned to the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, shall be members of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be; and in time of war their periods of service or training and service may be extended by the President for such additional time as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided*, That the periods of service or training and service under section 3 (b) of such act of men who are detained under this section shall be terminated not later than 6 months after the termination of the war which authorized their detention, unless such men voluntarily extend their periods of service or training and service.

SEC. 9. The first proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the word "forty-five" in lieu of the word "thirty-six."

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding the limitation in section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 upon the time within which applications for national service life insurance may be made, all personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps,

and Coast Guard shall be granted insurance under such section without further medical examination if application therefor is filed prior to the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That after the expiration of this 120-day period such personnel may be granted national service life insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute for the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 390, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report from the Committee on Rules on the bill H. R. 6250.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Boston Herald.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6250.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON] may be granted an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1941, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, a column written by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, said in part:

Interesting inside fact apropos of the Chicago Tribune's exposé of the "secret war plan of 10,000,000 men" was that Congressman PHILIP A. BENNETT, of Missouri, paid \$400 for similar information, which he used in a speech exposing the Army's giant plan. Congressman BENNETT's source, presumably inside the War Department, is reported also to have spilled similar information to the Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I want it recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the article I have just referred to is a bare-faced falsehood. I have never paid or bribed anyone to steal from or betray his country. The Members of this House know me better than that. This attempted smear by the two character assassins, Pearson and Allen, would reach the level of truth. I hesitate to take time of the House in this critical period, but on the other hand, silence upon my part might be interpreted by political demagogues as giving them license to repeat libelous words.

On November 19, 1941, I presented to this House the results of a study conducted by me and the secretaries in my office working under my personal supervision, disclosing either waste and extravagance in purchase of certain items of personal military equipment or administration plans for an army many

times greater than necessary just to defend the Western Hemisphere. This latter alternative was not and could not be denied. It has, in fact, been confirmed by subsequent events. At that time our Nation was not at war. The information I revealed had no military value. However, it cast much light on the course we are now following but concerning which, until November 19, 1941, we were much in the dark.

As soon as the libel by Pearson and Allen was called to my attention, I at once wrote the Secretary of War a letter, which reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1941.
HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STIMSON: I was greatly surprised and disappointed yesterday when a newspaper clipping entitled, "Secret Army News," was called to my attention. The article in question was written by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen. I am informed that the article appeared in several daily newspapers on December 9, 1941. The article, which is a pure fabrication, casts reflections upon my integrity and that of the officers and employees of the War Department.

I am calling your attention to the article because of the phrase, "Congressman BENNETT's source, presumably inside the War Department," might lead someone to believe that among your employees there is a disloyal one. Further, this phrase would indicate that I made a deal with a disloyal employee. If I knew of any disloyal Government worker, I would lose no time in turning in such information to the proper officials. I think that every person in the War Department, as well as myself, has just grounds for resenting this untruthful statement by Pearson and Allen.

Pearson and Allen had reference, I suppose, to an address I made in the House of Representatives November 19, 1941. The essential facts and conclusions presented in that speech have not been denied but rather confirmed by subsequent events. The facts in question were not bought from anyone. They were compiled by me and by the clerks in my office under my personal supervision. Information presented was obtained only from official sources available to all Members of Congress, viz: Official War Department press releases, the weekly bulletin, Defense, released by the Office of Emergency Management; Contract Award Listings, as compiled by the Office of Government Reports, and those compiled by the Office of Production Management. All of these reports are still in my possession.

If, as a result of the remarks I made, more care and economy is practiced in the future with respect to purchases of certain items for the Army, I will have served the taxpayers well. It was through the desire to render such service that I was prompted to deliver the speech in question.

Insofar as Pearson and Allen are concerned, Mr. Secretary, I am giving them opportunity to retract their libelous statement. If they fail to do so, I shall then determine what steps to take.

It is to be regretted that irresponsible sources often attempt to smear those trying to perform worth-while public service. As the owner and editor of a newspaper for many years, I realize that editors are sometimes imposed upon. If Pearson and Allen have any honor, they will make a retraction of their libelous article. As for myself, I have confidence to believe that no person who is familiar with my record will be influenced in any way by this fabrication. So far as others

are concerned, the article is libelous and damaging to me.

If I have failed in any way to do all in my power for the defense of our own country and to keep out of foreign wars, I do not know wherein I have been amiss. Now that we are at war, I am pleading for unity and will do everything in my power to make victory complete, speedy, and with minimum expenditure of life and treasure.

Respectfully yours,

PHIL A. BENNETT,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on the same date that I wrote to the Secretary of War I wrote to Pearson and Allen, advising them of the facts, and giving them opportunity to correct their error. That letter reads as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1941.

DREW PEARSON AND ROBERT S. ALLEN,
Care of the Washington Times-Herald,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am sending you a copy of letter just mailed to Secretary Stimson of the War Department. I am giving you opportunity to retract your libelous statements. What will you do about it?

Respectfully yours,

PHIL A. BENNETT.

Mr. Speaker, Pearson and Allen have not answered that letter, although given many days in which to do so. They do not have the manhood or honor to admit their mistake. I have ascertained that they are execution proof and that a libel suit against them would be a waste of time and money, a judgment as worthless as their word. These two columnists, have prevaricated about many other Members of Congress. They are well known in informed circles because of their utter lack of regard for the truth and for being two of the most dishonest, unreliable, and vicious character assassins in America. They are a disgrace to the great newspaper profession. They apparently seldom take the trouble to ascertain their facts or to commend a public official for doing a good job. They make their living in the half light of minds diseased by the filth they alone can imagine. The people of my congressional district will not be influenced by their perverted activities.

Only yesterday these smear artists, in their column, misrepresented facts about my honored colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. A statement of the true facts in answer to these latest untruths was put in the RECORD today by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The people of the United States know how they attacked that outstanding statesman, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland. Their attempts to defeat him with distortions of the truth were not effective. Members of this House know how once Pearson and Allen fled to Europe to escape the wrath of a respectable citizen outraged by their fabrications. My honored Democratic colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] was also prevaricated about by these same writers. I am advised he has obtained many judgments against newspapers, which, not knowing of the true character of these men, carry their articles, thinking they are giving their readers accurate

and inside information about activities in the Nation's Capital. Former President Hoover was persecuted by their disregard for the truth. Mr. Allen was discharged from the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. Pearson was discharged from the Baltimore Sun. Yes; there is a great deal I might reveal about these characters. But the record is made. I know that by this statement, Mr. Speaker, these low characters will hound me without end in their column. But I am willing to stand on my record. I have nothing to conceal. Let those who print, or repeat in any fashion, the untruths of Pearson and Allen about the gentleman from Missouri, PHIL BENNETT, beware of the legal consequences.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Hon. David W. Harris.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, and in one to include a portion of the correspondence I have had in regard to the bill passed today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Wayne Coy. The address exceeded the limit. I have an estimate from the Public Printer and I ask permission to have the address inserted in the RECORD notwithstanding.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his remarks and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CODE FOR THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5822) to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky just what this bill does with respect to the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] to explain the measure, because he knows more about it than I do.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as indicated by its title, is a bill to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska. There is no similar legislation on the subject at the present time passed either by the Congress or the Territorial

legislature. It is impossible to now secure the legislation from the Territorial legislature, because that body will not meet in regular session until January of 1943. The bill was written in the War Department and it is favored by the Secretary of War and is urgently asked for by the Governor of Alaska, as well as by myself.

The bill sets up a short, simple, military code for the Territory of Alaska, covering the militia and the National Guard. Incidentally, I pause here to say that all of the Alaska National Guard has now been brought into active service. The most important feature of the measure is contained in the last section which will authorize the establishment of a Territorial Guard. Alaska, as you know, is one of our frontiers and may be attacked any day, and the establishment of a Territorial Guard immediately is vital to our safety, because such a guard can aid in the protection of public utilities and public and private property, and in other ways defend the Territory and thus help to defend the United States.

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

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. MAY. In other words, the Territory of Alaska is in exactly the same position now that the States were in after we called out the National Guard, and the States were permitted to set up a home guard.

Mr. DIMOND. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Have you a National Guard in Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. We have a National Guard in Alaska, but it has already been brought into active Federal service and it is not available for local use and therefore we want this bill passed. The most important feature of the bill is to establish a Territorial Guard, and while some units of such a Guard have already been organized, at the present time they have not the protection of any such legislation. The immediate passage of this bill is of high importance to the safety and more adequate protection of the citizens of Alaska. The bill is more completely explained in the House report thereon which I ask to have here inserted in the RECORD.

REPORT [TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 5822]

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5822) to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass without amendment.

The purpose of the bill, as expressed in the title, is to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska. Nothing of the nature has heretofore been enacted either by Congress or by the Alaska Territorial Legislature, except for the provision contained in the act of June 6, 1900 (title 48, sec. 61, U. S. Code), with respect to the power and authority of the Governor of Alaska, reading as follows:

"He [the Governor] shall be ex officio commander in chief of the militia of the Territory, and shall have power to call out the same when necessary to the due execution of the laws and to preserve the peace, and to cause all able-bodied citizens of the United States in the Territory to enroll and serve as such when the public exigency demands; * * *"

The first six sections of the bill make provision with respect to the militia of the Ter-

ritory of Alaska and the Alaska National Guard.

Section 1, which defines the militia of the Territory, is in complete harmony with similar provisions of Federal law (title 32, sec. 1, U. S. Code) defining the militia of the United States.

Section 2 exempts from militia service all persons exempted by the laws of the United States (see title 32, sec. 3, U. S. Code) and in addition thereto "judges of the several courts of the Territory and members and officers of the Alaska Territorial Legislature."

Section 3 defines the Alaska National Guard, a definition in complete harmony with Federal law (title 32, sec. 4, U. S. Code).

Section 4 makes the Governor of the Territory of Alaska as ex officio commander of the militia of the Territory, like commander of the Alaska National Guard when not in active Federal service, and provides that the Alaska National Guard and its members shall be subject to all Federal laws and regulations relating to the National Guard of the several States and Territories and of the United States.

Section 5 authorizes the President to appoint an adjutant general of the Territory who must be a citizen of the Territory.

Section 6 ratifies and confirms the organization of the existing Alaska National Guard in the Territory which has heretofore been inducted into active Federal service.

Section 7 is of special importance at this time because it authorizes the organization of a Territorial Guard in Alaska under such regulations as to discipline as the Secretary of War may prescribe; and further authorizes the Secretary of War to issue for the use of such Territorial Guard upon requisition of the Governor of the Territory such arms and equipment as can be spared by the War Department.

There is no existing legislation authorizing the organization of a Territorial Guard. It is of vital importance that such authority should be given at the earliest practicable moment. In fact, units of such a Territorial Guard have already been organized in the several cities of Alaska to be prepared in case of emergency to aid in the protection of the public utilities, in policing the cities, to act as auxiliary fire wardens and firemen, and, generally, to take whatever emergency action may be necessary in case of attack or sabotage to protect the local inhabitants and property. The Territorial Guard should be furnished whatever arms and equipment can readily be spared by the War Department in order to more effectively perform its duties.

While it is possible that most, if not all, the provisions of the bill could be validly enacted by the Alaska Territorial Legislature, that legislature will not meet again in regular session until January 1943. To call the legislature into extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting such legislation would involve delay and very considerable expense to the Federal Government, because all legislative expenses are paid out of the United States Treasury. Hence it is advisable that Congress should take prompt action on the subject.

No objection to the bill from any source has been brought to the attention of the committee. Its enactment is urgently requested by the Delegate from Alaska and by the Governor of Alaska and favored by the Secretary of War, with clearance from the Bureau of the Budget.

The original legislation on the subject was H. R. 5050 of the same title, which, upon introduction, was referred to the Secretary of War for an expression of his views in relation thereto. The Secretary replied by letter dated October 11, 1941, addressed to the chairman of the committee, reporting adversely upon H. R. 5050, but recommending the enactment of legislation on the subject and submitting a draft of such recommended legislation. The bill, H. R. 5822, now under consideration is an exact copy of the draft so submitted by the

Secretary of War when reporting upon H. R. 5050.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the militia of the Territory of Alaska shall consist of all able-bodied male citizens of the United States and all other able-bodied males who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, residing within the Territory, who shall be more than 18 years of age and, except as hereinafter provided, not more than 45 years of age, and said militia shall be divided into two classes: The Organized Militia, to be known as the Alaska National Guard, and the Unorganized Militia.

SEC. 2. The following persons shall be exempt from militia service: Persons exempted by the laws of the United States, judges of the several courts of the Territory, and members and officers of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

SEC. 3. The Alaska National Guard shall consist of members of the militia voluntarily enlisted therein, who, upon original enlistment, shall be not less than 18 nor more than 45 years of age, or who, in subsequent enlistment, shall be not more than 64 years of age, organized, armed, equipped, and federally recognized according to the laws of the United States, and of commissioned officers and warrant officers who are citizens of the United States between the ages of 21 and 64 years and who shall be appointed and commissioned or warranted by the Governor of the Territory: *Provided*, That former members of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps under 64 years of age may enlist in said Alaska National Guard.

SEC. 4. The Governor of the Territory of Alaska, as ex officio commander of the militia of the Territory, shall have like command of the Alaska National Guard while not in active Federal service, and is empowered to promulgate all necessary regulations therefor not inconsistent with this act. Except as otherwise prescribed by this act, the Alaska National Guard and its members shall be subject to all Federal laws and regulations relating to the National Guard of the several States and Territories, and of the United States.

SEC. 5. The Adjutant General of the Territory of Alaska shall be appointed by the President with such rank and qualifications as he may prescribe. He shall be a citizen of the Territory and shall make such returns and reports to the Secretary of War and to the Governor of the Territory of Alaska or to such officers as each of them may designate, at such times and in such form as may be prescribed.

SEC. 6. The terms and provisions of this act pertaining to the Alaska National Guard are hereby made applicable to the existing units and individuals of the military forces in the Territory of Alaska, heretofore organized and known as the Alaska National Guard, and such organization is hereby ratified and confirmed.

SEC. 7. During such time as the Alaska National Guard, or any part thereof, is in active Federal service, the Governor of Alaska, through voluntary enlistments, may organize a Territorial Guard under such regulations as to discipline in training as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to issue for the use of such Territorial Guard, upon requisition of the Governor of the Territory, such arms and equipment as may be in possession of and can be spared by the War Department.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXPEDITE THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6233, to expedite the prosecution of the war effort, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to H. R. 6233 and especially with regard to paragraph (1) of section 301 of title III, Trading With the Enemy, in view of the discussion on the floor of the House during the consideration of H. R. 6233 on yesterday, I would like to make it clear that there was no intention on my part and so far as I know there was no intention on the part of any member of the Committee on the Judiciary to propose or support any legislation reducing the powers of the President under existing law, nor to reduce in any degree existing law relative to domestic transactions.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"TITLE I—COORDINATION OF EXECUTIVE BUREAUS IN THE INTEREST OF THE MORE EFFICIENT CONCENTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

"SECTION 1. That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this title, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary, which regulations and orders shall be in writing and shall be published in accordance with the Federal Register Act of 1935: *Provided*, That the termination of this title shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this title and during the time that this title is in force: *Provided further*, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war: *Provided further*, That no redistribution of functions shall provide for the transfer, consolidation, or abolition of the whole or any part of the General Accounting Office or of all or any part of its functions.

"Sec. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this title the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, governmental corporations, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

"Sec. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, any moneys heretofore and hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive department, commission,

bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said functions, except to the extent hereafter authorized by the Congress in appropriation acts or otherwise.

"Sec. 4. That should the President, in redistributing the functions among the executive agencies as provided in this title, conclude that any bureau should be abolished and its or their duties and functions conferred upon some other department or bureau or eliminated entirely, he shall report his conclusions to Congress with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

"Sec. 5. That all laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this title are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this title is in force.

"Upon the termination of this title all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this title to the contrary notwithstanding.

"TITLE II—CONTRACTS

"Sec. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any contracts in violation of existing law relating to limitation of profits: *Provided further*, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record under regulations prescribed by the President and when deemed by him not to be incompatible with the public interest.

"TITLE III—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

"Sec. 301. The first sentence of subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of instructions, licenses, or otherwise—

"(A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency or securities, and

"(B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest, by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and any property or interest of any foreign country or national

thereof shall vest, when, as, and upon the terms, directed by the President, in such agency or person as may be designated from time to time by the President, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe such interest or property shall be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States, and such designated agency or person may perform any and all acts incident to the accomplishment or furtherance of these purposes; and the President shall, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision either before, during, or after the completion thereof, or relative to any interest in foreign property, or relative to any property in which any foreign country or any national thereof has or has had any interest, or as may be otherwise necessary to enforce the provisions of this subdivision, and in any case in which a report could be required, the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, require the production, or if necessary to the national security or defense, the seizure, of any books of account, records, contracts, letters, memoranda, or other papers, in the custody or control of such person; and the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, take other and further measures not inconsistent herewith for the enforcement of this subdivision.

"(2) Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same; and no person shall be held liable in any court for or in respect to anything done or omitted in good faith in connection with the administration of, or in pursuance of and in reliance on, this subdivision, or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder.

"(3) As used in this subdivision the term "United States" means the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction in all cases, civil or criminal, arising under this subdivision in the Philippine Islands and concurrent jurisdiction with the district courts of the United States of all cases, civil or criminal, arising upon the high seas: *Provided, however*, That the foregoing shall not be construed as a limitation upon the power of the President, which is hereby conferred, to prescribe from time to time, definitions, not inconsistent with the purposes of this subdivision, for any or all of the terms used in this subdivision.

"Sec. 302. All acts, actions, regulations, rules, orders, and proclamations heretofore taken, promulgated, made, or issued by, or pursuant to the direction of, the President or the Secretary of the Treasury under the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, which would have been authorized if the provisions of this act and the amendments made by it had been in effect, are hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed.

"Sec. 303. Whenever, during the present war, the President shall deem that the public safety demands it, he may cause to be censored under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time establish, communications by mail, cable, radio, or other means of transmission passing between the United States and any foreign country he may from time to time specify, or which may be carried by any vessel or other means of trans-

portation touching at any port, place, or Territory of the United States and bound to or from any foreign country. Any person who willfully evades or attempts to evade the submission of any such communication to such censorship or willfully uses or attempts to use any code or other device for the purpose of concealing from such censorship the intended meaning of such communication shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

"TITLE IV—TIME LIMIT AND SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 401. Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

"Sec. 402. This act may be cited as the 'First War Powers Act, 1941'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have looked over the amendment, and the committee is unanimously in favor of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was agreed to was laid on the table.

The bill S. 2129 was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of obtaining information from the majority leader in respect to the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider H. R. 6250, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940. That bill comes out of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and, I understand, is recommended by the State Department and the Department of Justice.

Mr. SABATH. And it was reported out by unanimous vote of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all for tomorrow that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all, except whatever can be taken up by unanimous consent, and I know of nothing now. Friday, we will have the supplemental appropriation bill, and then, if a rule comes out of the Committee on Rules, which I expect, making in order a bill that was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, similar to a bill which I introduced some years ago, known as the McCormack bill, compelling agents of foreign countries and agencies engaged in propaganda to register, it will be considered. That bill has the unanimous

support of the Committee on the Judiciary. I doubt if there will be any opposition to it, although it should be debated and will be. That will be brought up on Friday, if the rule comes in.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And then we have the deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are there any plans for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing I know of for Saturday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not want to press the gentleman now if he is not ready to tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as I know, that concludes any legislation upon which action would be required for the following week. I know of nothing that is coming up the following week.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman will be able, will he not, before we adjourn on Friday, to make some quite definite statement about next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is hopeful to make it tomorrow, because the gentleman is hoping to be away himself on Friday.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course, we are going to complete the legislation that was passed today and, as far as I understand it, the report from the Senate committee is in disagreement with the legislation passed here. If the Senate passes the bill as reported by the Senate committee, it naturally will have to go to conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. COCHRAN. That bill is important and Members should not leave here until we have finished with it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is hoped that that bill will be disposed of even in conference before Friday. We hope it will.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Columbus Ledger.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made today on the bill H. R. 5822 and to include therein the report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement with regard to some features of the bill H. R. 6233, just disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

DECEMBER 14, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees of the House: Mines and Mining, Claims, and Enrolled Bills.

Respectfully yours,
IVOR D. FENTON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 392) and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WILSON D. GILLETTE, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the following committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Claims, Committee on Indian Affairs, and Committee on Enrolled Bills.

The resolution was agreed to.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1544. An act to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the Government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 547. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River;

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 4692. An act relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities;

H. R. 4853. An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans;

H. R. 4905. An act to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition;

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii;

H. R. 5305. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926;

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal producing regions of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 18, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1171. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a reexamination of Oakland Harbor and San Leandro Bay, Calif., to determine if the existing project should be modified in any way, and particularly with a view to providing improvements in San Leandro Bay, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 6, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 466); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1172. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1942, as well as for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 461); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1173. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a reexamination of Calcasieu River, La., with a view to providing deep water to the industrial plants and terminals at and near the Port of Lake Charles, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 28, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 465); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1174. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report from the joint board to investigate the need for constructing a bridge between Hunters Point and Bay Farm Island, Calif., as requested in House Resolution 158; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1175. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of \$150,000,000 for community facilities (H. Doc. No. 462); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1176. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an emergency supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until expended, for the War Department, making available, for public relief and civilian defense in the Philippine Islands, the moneys authorized to be appropriated in accordance with section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937 (H. Doc. No. 463); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1177. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, in the amount of \$15,000,000, for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 464); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1178. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for performance of the duties of chiefs of bureau and the Judge Advocate General in the Navy Department, and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to adjust certain obligations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on the Territories. S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 1514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1515. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Navy Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1516. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Navy Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1517. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Treasury Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1518. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1519. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1520. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House

Report No. 1521. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1522. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1523. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1524. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1525. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1526. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1527. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1528. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Commerce. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1529. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the United States Board of Tax Appeals. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1530. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the United States Civil Service Commission. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1531. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the United States Civil Service Commission. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1532. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1533. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Federal Security Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1534. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1535. Report on the disposition of executive papers by Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1536. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Public Roads Administration, Federal Works Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1537. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of the Treasury. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1538. Report on the disposition

of executive papers by the Office of Production Management, executive office of the President. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1539. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of the Navy. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'LEARY: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 6220. A bill to amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'LEARY: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6251. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Neutralization. H. R. 6250. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 393. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6250, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 6256. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6257. A bill to amend section 826 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 6258. A bill to require certain persons within the United States and its territories and insular possessions to carry identification cards and to be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6259. A bill making an appropriation to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to begin construction of the Douglas Dam on the French Broad River near Dandridge, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 6260. A bill suspending collections of certain seed and feed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6261. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6262. A bill to provide for the planting of 45,000 acres of guayule in order to

make available a domestic source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6263. A bill to amend section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the purpose of granting to the President, in time of war, or threatened war, certain powers with respect to communications by wire; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6269. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code to simplify the procedure in connection with amortization of certain facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 6264. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Boyd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 6265. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 6266. A bill for the relief of Mack Skaggs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 6267. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Kimble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 6268. A bill for the relief of Arthur Seaver, Jr., D. F. Broderick, Inc.; 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:

2184. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Resolution of the common council of the city of Niles, Mich., pledging the whole-hearted cooperation and support of the citizens of Niles to their Government and its duly elected and appointed representatives to the end that our form of government shall not perish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2185. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Brooklyn Concourse Association of Homing Pigeon Flyers, favoring the Pfeifer bill, safeguarding of the valuable homing pigeons, signed by 120 members of the association; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2186. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles County District Council of Carpenters in meeting, most vigorously opposing any further taxes on pay rolls or otherwise, feeling that they would lower the standard of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2187. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the first district conference, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, assembled in the city of Kenosha, Wis., pledging their support whether it be physical, moral, or financial, to the Congress and to the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 16, 1941)

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

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom we spring and to whom we tend, help us this day that we may endeavor to be that which Thou wouldst have us to be, and to do that which Thou commandest, for Thou, O God, art the way, the motive, the guide, the beginning and end of all conduct. And so we ask Thee to bring us into Thine eternal and abiding order where right is right because it is Thy nature, the secret and method of the universe, where righteousness becomes imperative as it lays hold of our inmost nature and binds us to duty by every law of our being.

And, as we dedicate ourselves and our country which Thou hast given us to this solemn task which now is ours, may we leave no unrepented fault, no uncleaned spot, sparing least of all that sin which doth so easily beset us, that, as we offer Thee a pure life, a more unselfish patriotism, and a deeper loyalty to the Kingship of Thy Son, we may never cast a backward glance, nor lean on mortal man but only on the Rock of Ages who standeth fast forever and will make all things work together for good, for the everlasting good of all the children of men, who trust in Thee as their Lord, their Father, and their God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the calendar day Wednesday, December 17, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 17, 1941, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6233) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

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

H. R. 5822. An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.