

553,000,000 pounds, or 90 percent of the total United States production of American cheese. The grand jury found that the defendants had entered into a conspiracy to unlawfully restrain trade and commerce among the several States of the United States, against the peace and dignity of the United States.

The Big Four—National Dairy Products, Swift's, Armour's, and Borden's—engineered the conspiracy to force the small producers to accept the prices for cheese fixed by the defendants. This is a sample of Mr. Beardslee's thinking and philosophy.

Trust-Buster Thurman Arnold, who has been doing a remarkably fine job, stated that in order to have a political democracy, we must have an industrial democracy, and that in order to have the latter, we must have a free market. I believe that Mr. Arnold's contention is a sound one—I believe that the monopolies and cartels, whose treacherous actions have been brought to light since the advent of the second World War, must be smashed. They are merely an insidious form of thievery, operating under the pious guise of big business.

But to return to our recital of the impending plight of our dairy farmer. When the Big Four, who are engaged in building up complete control of the evaporated milk industry, heard of the plans to expand facilities, they immediately scuttled the program of expansion, regardless of whether or not it was an integral part of our war effort.

Taking an optimistic position, we guess that with what increase of facilities was made, we will be able to produce 525,000,000 pounds of dried separated milk. This is 100,000,000 pounds short of our goal. It is true that facilities have been made available through priority ratings which would increase the production of dried skim 63,000,000 pounds, but none of these with the exception of one plant, will be in production this year. The crew of obstructionists has been successful in holding up the diversion program for almost a half year.

It is interesting to note that as a forerunner of my prediction the Secretary of Agriculture has already had to increase butter prices in order to attract milk from the evaporating plants to the creameries, because such plants have reached the saturation point as far as capacity is concerned.

The point of all this is that the farmer, in good faith, has changed his economic position to his peril. He relied upon the integrity of the men directing our production efforts. I wish that the culpable persons could properly assume the burden of responsibility for this catastrophe, but they cannot. The serious impact upon our agricultural economy and upon the morale of the farmer is not to be lightly reckoned with. I do not know whether Mr. Beardslee is a dollar-a-year man or not. In any event, he is being paid too much. Again we are forced to admit the soundness of the old axiom "One cannot serve two masters"—certainly not two ideals.

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

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will agree with me that bringing to light these monopolies was the result of the action of this House through its Appropriations Committee which made possible funds to be used by the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice for the very purpose of investigating the monopolies. The hearings in the subcommittee on appropriations making appropriations for Mr. Arnold's division are filled with demands on the part of the membership of the House here to bring to light some of these monopolies and eliminate them.

The gentleman will also agree with me that in bringing to light these monopolies the committee and the gentleman himself and others in this House, on both sides of the aisle, felt that doing things like this would bring to the attention of the public the fact that the farmer himself does not receive the price against which many consumers are complaining today, and that the effort on the part of the membership of this House, on both sides of the aisle, was through such action it was thought we could provide a better system of distribution of the farmer's product and, eventually, get for him the cost of production to which he is entitled.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I certainly agree with the gentleman and that is why I supported an amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], to increase the appropriation for Mr. Arnold's trust division \$200,000.

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

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSON. I am very much interested in what my colleague has said, his State and mine being among the leading dairy States of the Union. This morning, and in fact for several days I have been working on a proposition for one of my cooperative milk-producing organizations in Missouri, by which we are attempting to get equipment somewhat along the lines referred to. On Saturday afternoon I was told that until a more complete statement as to need had been supplied nothing could be done. Just before I left my office the same authority called me and said the equipment had been supplied and was there. I am now trying to get the facts in the case and have wired to know what the real situation is. I feel we are indebted to our colleague for calling attention to this important matter.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Thanks, Mr. NELSON, you always have the best interest of the actual farmer at heart. I have worked, of course, in respect of my own section to get more milk-drying plants. I have probably as many creameries as any other section of the State of Wisconsin and that separated milk should be converted into milk powder, but the cooperatives evidently are not given much consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a letter received from Mr. H. E. Trulock, secretary of the Jefferson County Farm Bureau, of Pine Bluff, Ark., under date of March 16, 1942.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects, and in one subject to include an article by A. C. Gauld and in the other subject matter to include an article by Dan West, of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matters referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

THE DIES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th day of March this year this House passed, by a vote of 331 to 46, a resolution continuing what is commonly known as the Dies committee. From its inception, with but one exception, I opposed the continuation of this committee. I voted for the continuation of this committee the last time. I was 1 of the 331. Under the present happenings, I regret that I cast my vote as I did. If you can believe anything that appears in the newspapers—and sometimes I wonder about it—this House cannot overlook what appeared in the press within the past 24 hours. This House has a responsibility; it has a responsibility that every one of us must bear. We have created a committee that is presumably for the purpose of assisting this country in trying to do just one job, and that is the job that we are up against—that is the job of winning this war.

God knows that I did everything I could in my power to keep us out of the hellish mess that we are in, but we are in it, and our boys are being slaughtered on the seven seas. They are meeting death, and if there is any one thing in this country that we have to have, it is unity of purpose and action, and we cannot have unity when some of our people, with the sanction of this Congress, if you please, are going around over the country and attacking people who are fighting our fight by our side, to whom we are giving arms and money. There is no doubt but

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted at a recent meeting held in the city of Shreveport, La.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD twice and to include in each extension an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

[The matters referred to appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of the Dies committee, and I hope some other matters.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram from the carpenters' union of Baton Rouge.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Worcester Telegram.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

RETAIL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak in behalf of the thousands of retail automobile dealers in the country. They have a great many automobiles they are forced to keep in storage and are forbidden to sell. Many of them have not the facilities to keep these cars in dry places. They are rapidly deteriorating and the time will come when they will have faded upholstery, dead batteries, rusty motors, tire deterioration, and crystallization of parts. This is going to be too much of a burden for them to overcome.

Many of these dealers have not made a retail delivery during the year 1942. In my State of Massachusetts, less than 5 percent of the total allotment has been delivered. If these conditions continue to obtain, they will practically bankrupt every automobile dealer within the next 6 months.

I have taken this matter up with the Automobile Rationing Board. They said that they drew up strict regulations upon the theory that it would be better to be strict at the beginning and to relax later on. When these regulations went out to the 8,000 different rationing boards, the board here in Washington was surprised at the strictness with which these local boards interpreted the regulations. This may be the answer to the fact that less than 5 percent of the total allotment has been delivered. I have been given to understand by the board here in Washington that they are going to relax their regulations and are going to ask the local boards to be less strict in their interpretation of the regulations.

I suggested that wherever the entire quota of automobiles has not been sold within a given period of time that the board allow the dealers to sell the cars to the general public.

It is unthinkable that we should allow this deplorable situation to drift from bad to worse without doing something about it. I intend to press for action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

(Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

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

MILK IN THE GUTTERS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time I have been worried about the dairy farmer and what he would do with his milk this spring—in spite of the fact that we could use every drop of milk they could produce, in spite of the fact that the farmers have certainly done their share in producing not only as much milk as they were requested to produce, they have exceeded that amount. While I am not going to take the 15 minutes allotted to me, I am going to ask for time sometime later to enlarge on this matter; but I want in a short

statement to show who is to blame for this situation and why we have not processing plants that will take care of the milk that is being produced by the loyal, patriotic farmers. In order to do this I had to prepare a written statement, because I might step on the toes of some fellows here, and I want to be sure that I am not misquoted. Therefore I am going to read my prepared statement, and it is entitled "Milk in the Gutters."

I predict that milk will soon flow in the gutters of Wisconsin and other milk-producing States in the Union. Milk—the same precious commodity called for in vastly increased amounts in the Secretary of Agriculture's food-for-victory program.

Soon the flush season will be here and the new flood of milk—for which there is so serious a need—will be dumped on the ground and fed to livestock because there will be no facilities to process it.

Why? Because of the bungling of a vital part of the war program by the Food Section of the Dairy Division of the War Production Board.

The blame must be shouldered by the man directing the Division. In fairness to his splendid chief, Donald Nelson, and to the Nation, Clyde E. Beardslee, head of the Section, should submit his resignation at once.

When the Secretary of Agriculture announced his plans for the ambitious program of producing food for our Allies at war, the Department did a thorough and splendid job of convincing the farmer that he must increase his milk production at any cost—increasing feeding—increasing herds. The farmers' patriotic response was instant and complete. The plans called for dried separated milk, cheese, and evaporated milk in great quantities. Goals were set at 88,000,000 cases of evaporated milk where we had produced 61,000,000 in 1941. We wanted 619,000,000 pounds of dried separated milk in 1942. Last year we processed 389,000,000. The Surplus Marketing Administration was to purchase this food for export. Now we find the program bogged down. Why?

Perhaps Mr. Beardslee can best explain this. His section knew that plant facilities would have to be rapidly increased. We had to have new evaporating plants and milk-drying equipment. Surplus Marketing Administration, with lease-lend funds, was ready to finance this program. The Agricultural Defense Committee had approved applications by the industries for machinery and the critical materials for the equipment had been allocated.

Why didn't the Food Section, under Mr. Beardslee, see to it that the priorities applications were approved? Was it because so large a share of the applications were from farmers' cooperatives?

Here was one great chance for existing farmer cooperatives to make their plants flexible and open new markets, insuring their existence. Whom was Mr. Beardslee representing in this matter—our Nation, in a great war effort—or the lecherous monopolistic group represented by his firm, the Borden Co., which lists him as vice president?

This is the same Mr. Beardslee indicted by the grand jurors, impeached in the District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, at the December 1941 term of the said court, which was continued to March of this year. He was indicted as an individual officer of the Borden Co.

The indictment, among other things, recites that the defendants, by means of purchases from others and by manufacture in their own factories, handled approximately

that the Dies committee has uncovered a lot of valuable information, and that was one reason why I voted for its continuance, but there is a way of using to advantage information instead of handing it to the public when it is going to hurt rather than help, and that is to hand it to the proper officers to be used at the proper time, instead of putting it broadcast in the newspapers.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not the time at present. I should be glad to yield later if the gentleman can get me further time.

Another reason why I voted for the continuance of this committee is that I have faith in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] himself, but I have also a great deal of faith in the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and when he made the statement which I shall quote, it was the controlling factor in my voting for the continuation of the committee. He said at that time:

In my judgment, the future of the committee should be devoted primarily and with every bit of major emphasis at its command to the doing of a job of exposing and combating the work of people who attempt to create confusion in our country and to build up sympathy with the Nazi philosophy of government.

In addition the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] disclosed some good work the committee had done against Nazi fifth-column work.

That is why I voted for it. What are we doing? The committee is now engaged in ferreting out who are Communists. That is all right; I am no more in sympathy with the communistic philosophy of government than is any Member of this House. I know of only one "ism" which is in my mind and in my heart, and that is Americanism. Remember this, the Communists are fighting our fight today, and they seem to be the only ones who are winning. They are stopping our common enemy, Hitler, and they are the only ones who are stopping him and they are doing it on the field of bloody battle. Of course, we have Communists in this country; they run openly for office as such. Now, are we to deny them the right to live in this country and particularly during these times? I do not like obscene literature or pictures which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] referred to, any more than he does; but what have they got to do with winning the war? Is this the time and is this the place to bring that situation up? I do not criticize the distinguished gentleman who occupies the position as Speaker pro tempore for saying what he did. He has the right to do it—that is free speech—and I have the right to say what I say.

When we attack Communism and when we attack Communists in this country we are really attacking the people that are helping to hold up our right hand and fighting back of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In just a moment. I think it is up to the leadership of this House to take cognizance of what is go-

ing on. That committee is a committee of this House. It is not alone Mr. Dies. It is a committee of this House.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to say to the gentleman that I propose to discuss these matters a little later on today. I have been granted time to do it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope the gentleman does. I quoted the gentleman a while ago and I will say to the gentleman right now that there is no Member of this House that I have more faith in or respect for than the gentleman from California. It was because of the statement the gentleman made to this House that he would see what that committee did, that I voted for its continuance, together with the fact that it has assembled a lot of valuable information. But there is a way of using information. If you are going to use it to the point of scuttling the thing we are trying to save, then it not only becomes useless but dangerous. We are trying to save this country. There are boys from my State who have enlisted and have been drafted, both Indians and white boys, who are being sunk to the bottom of the ocean today, in the seven seas, if you please. They come from all over America. I have a grandson who has enlisted in the Army Air Corps. We must protect those boys. You cannot protect them by fighting an element of people that is helping us, whether you agree with their philosophy or not. We cannot protect our boys by fighting a country that is fighting by our side. We have a responsibility here. I think there are 40 or 50 Members of this House who have the courage to go ahead and act, if action cannot otherwise be had.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Our colleague from Montana is making a valuable contribution to a most important subject. Is it not a fact that the resolution appropriating funds for the Dies committee has not as yet come before the House? We merely passed a resolution to continue the committee, but the Committee on Accounts has not as yet presented to the House a resolution to provide funds.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is true. I will tell you right now if the business of this committee is carried on as is shown by the press today, if we can believe it, a resolution for funds will not receive my support. I do not fully agree with Vice President WALLACE in saying all he did in the press regarding this Dies matter. In order to save this country we must work in harmony with those people who are fighting for our side, whether we like them or not.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman is thoroughly patriotic and I want to congratulate him on his vote for the continuation of the Dies committee.

I think he voted properly. The Dies committee is doing everything it can to try to preserve Americanism in this country. We do not want to stir up any fight or any friction in our joint efforts with Russia to crush the common enemy. Nevertheless, we have the job of preserving Americanism in this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am glad the gentleman brought that out. As usual, the gentleman is nearly right. The gentleman and I agree on a lot of things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, some of us seem to forget that we are not at war with Russia. Russia is our ally, and it is incumbent upon us to do just as we are doing, that is, to lend them every aid to help defeat a common enemy, Germany and Japan.

The situation that prevailed before we became a party to this war must not and cannot be taken as a situation prevailing now. At this time and until the final peace is had, we must distinguish between our friends and foes. After the war is over, none of us can predict what the situation will be, but all of us will be just as determined to preserve the American way and the American system then as we are to die for it now.

The Dies committee could render the country an inestimable service by helping track down the friends of Germany and Japan who are within our borders at this time. That is what I thought they were going to do when I supported the resolution. Otherwise, I would never have voted for it.

I will sacrifice every life in this country to protect this country, but by the gods, at the present time we have but one job to do, and that is to lick Japan and to lick Germany.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I have great admiration for the gentleman from Montana. We all know he is highly patriotic. But would the gentleman state specifically what objection he has to a continuation of the Dies committee?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no objection at all to the continuation of it if they will go on and do their job. The exposé of Teapot Dome would never have occurred if it had not been for Walsh's congressional committee. Harry Daugherty would never have been driven out of President Harding's Cabinet if it had not been for BURT WHEELER's congressional committee that exposed his rottenness. Congressional committees can do a world of good if they will confine themselves to what they are supposed to do. There is no argument about that; but when they do more harm than good—then, I balk.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman will recall that when this resolution came before the House I was one of the 331 who voted the same way the gentleman from Montana voted. It was following the presentation of the exposé of Japanese subversive and fifth-column activities in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. And we were given to understand that the committee would continue that investigation, in which our people in the West are vitally interested.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. In view of that fact, the members of the congressional delegations from the Pacific Northwest States met, and the gentleman was present, I believe, and we adopted a resolution expressing the desire and the hope that the Dies committee, in collaboration with the military authorities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and other responsible law-enforcement agencies of the Government, would continue that investigation of Nazi and Axis activities in this country. I was a member of the committee which drafted the resolution in line with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], as quoted by the gentleman from Montana, we had every reason to expect that the conduct of the Dies committee would be judicious and cooperative.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; the gentleman from Washington is correct.

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

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

(Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the American people, including ourselves, are too readily inclined to accept an indictment as a conviction. Thurman Arnold is a very able and energetic trust buster. We all admire him for the outspokenness of his statements, even when he may be wrong, but there are occasions when Thurman Arnold does not tell the whole truth, doubtless because he does not know it; that is, he makes a misstatement because he knows only half of the truth. Last week he made two statements, one concerning labor and the other accusing the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey of certain practices, including that of selling high-octane gasoline to foreign air lines in South America. It is not my place to defend the Standard Oil Co.—they can do that themselves—but I have a passion for truth.

As a member of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents, and having gone with that committee to South America to investigate aviation there, I know some-

thing of the truth concerning that last statement of Mr. Arnold's.

It is perfectly true that a subsidiary, perhaps two or three subsidiaries, of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey in the Latin-American countries did sell high-octane gasoline to foreign air lines in South America within a few months prior to the declaration of war, but that is only half of the story. It is also true that those companies are incorporated under the laws of the country in which they are domiciled, and they must carry out the dictates of the governments of those countries. One of those dictates has been that their connection by air with Europe via the Lati, an Italian air line, must be maintained. That was their only connection by air with Europe until, I believe, November of 1941. Therefore the oil companies were required to continue furnishing Lati with aviation gasoline.

The committee in the course of its investigations had the same idea that everyone else here has: Why could not the oil companies just stop that Italian airline by refusing to sell it gasoline? I am quite confident from the discussion the committee had with persons there that the oil companies would like to have done just that, but the governments in South America desired to maintain the connection until it was replaced by an American air line covering the same routes, or similar routes, to Europe. So the oil companies therefore had to continue selling the gas. It was the major oil companies' subsidiaries in South America, however, who discovered the fact that the Italian and Nazi dominated air lines in Latin America had been collecting huge supplies of aviation gasoline far and beyond any normal quantities which were necessary for the ordinary operation of those air lines. They brought this matter to the attention of the several governments concerned, and in cooperation with those governments they made it necessary for those stocks of gasoline to be reduced to such a point as could be considered adequate for the current use of those lines; and it was through the cooperation of those four oil companies more or less jointly and their subsidiaries in Latin America that the Italian air line Lati was finally grounded by refusal to sell them any more oil or gasoline. I, myself, with the members of the committee, saw one of the Lati line airplanes which had come from Europe by the way of Dakar, Natal, and Rio de Janeiro, grounded at Porto Alegre, Brazil, en route to Buenos Aires, because they could not get any of the local people to sell them gasoline. That was early in October of 1941. Where they finally got the gasoline to go on to Buenos Aires I do not know. It had been habitual on the part of the Lati line to take off from a place such as Rio de Janeiro with enough gasoline to go to Buenos Aires nonstop, then come in several hours overdue. It is assumed, although it cannot of course be known, that in that interval of 4 or 5 hours they were out to sea spotting ships and radioing their location, perhaps to submarines. The Standard and other oil companies

did a pretty neat job of aiding our own Government in putting a stop to Nazi and Italian air line operation in South America, I can assure you. Thurman Arnold was only half right, and thereby convicted by indictment, without hearing witnesses.

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the deplorable situation with respect to the sale and use of intoxicating liquors in and near our training camps is becoming a national disgrace. When legislation was demanded several months ago to protect our service men against the use of intoxicating liquors of all kinds we were told no legislation was necessary. It was said it would be so much more practical for the administration to handle the problem. Unfortunately, little has been done to control the use and sale of liquor around our camps and to the men in uniform. Alcoholic beverages flow freely in and near the great majority of our training camps. Cases have been cited where beer of high alcoholic content was served free to men on certain occasions.

Mr. Speaker, we are using every effort to build and equip the finest and best-trained army in all the world. We have the kind of men with which to do it. The most important factor in such training is that these men are physically and mentally alert. This is so essential because modern warfare requires, for the most part, men who are highly skilled in the use of technical instruments and equipment. Men who use these instruments, these weapons, must be as mentally and physically trained as can be done. These boys are being trained to do a job where they will risk their lives and the lives of others in a most cruel combat at arms.

No one will contend, I am sure, that the use of alcoholic beverages contributes to the mental alertness or the physical well-being of the young men who are training for service. You and I well know even our outstanding athletic coaches of the country require their athletes to refrain from the use of liquor.

Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary for me to discuss the effect of excessive use of intoxicating liquor on the morals, as well as the morale, of our men, nor the complications to which excessive drinking leads. Furthermore, the adjustment from home life and environment to military rules is not an easy one. It will be said that only comparatively few yield to excessive use of liquor. I grant they are far in the minority, still there are too many of them. Whatever the number, there can be no excuse for permitting it.

There is an economic side that should not be overlooked. Spending for liquor leads to the use of money for other worthless purposes.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have the best trained and best equipped forces our country can provide, it is essential that