

This is being held in abeyance in favor of project No. 8, which is the 24-inch crude line from east Texas to southern Illinois, and a later continuation to the New York-Philadelphia area.

Project No. 12: New products pipe line across Florida.

Progress on this project has been confined to clearing up details regarding the agreement between Defense Plants Corporation and American Liberty Pipe Line Co. PD-200 form covering the relaying of the facilities in Florida is being made up and should be submitted in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. PARTEN,
Director of Transportation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

THE RUBBER QUESTION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, all men are human and we must, therefore, expect that mistakes will be made.

I want to be tolerant, but must confess that worse bungling has never come to my attention than the manner of handling our rubber problem.

I shall not review the mistakes made and the unnecessary time lost in getting production of synthetic rubber under way. Neither shall I discuss the error of neglecting for 6 months the matter of securing an inventory of new tires in the hands of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. These subjects have been fully covered by other Members of the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to call attention to certain letters which have recently come to me. One of these letters is from a good friend who owns a gasoline filling station in my district and who says in part:

Our rubber drive ends today. I have bought and paid for 25,872 pounds. If total collections do not come up to expectations, I suggest that the Government should check up on the junk dealers as they are going about buying rubber that has been gathered for the Government. Much of it has been donated and not over 1 cent per pound has been paid for any of it. A local junk dealer offered me 2½ cents and one from Fort Scott, Kans., offered me 3½ cents per pound.

The portion of another letter which I desire to quote reads as follows:

Mr. Bennett, you have no idea of the waste that goes on here at Camp Leonard Wood. It is terrible to be here where you actually see it. Talk about tire saving and see the big trucks here that have 10 great tires on them go across the fort with only a 10-pound package when a little jeep would do as well. You know what I mean, and dozens of other things with waste flying through the air. We will never see another bright day if it continues.

Mr. Speaker, we have just passed and sent to the other body the largest tax bill ever enacted by any Congress. Our people are willing to bear whatever burden may be necessary in order to win the war. It is such information as I have quoted that makes the burden irritating and slows the sale of War Bonds. It is time for a little economy at Army camps as well as in the homes of our country.

And why, I ask, should anybody be permitted to profit on the old rubber which patriotic citizens have gladly delivered to collection points. Mr. Speaker, I shudder when I think of our fine young men, who are fighting on every continent and sea, and am reminded that many among us are thinking only of the money they can make out of the war. If we would turn defeat into victory, if we honestly want to preserve the Republic, we must get on God's side.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Fort Wayne, Ind., News-Sentinel of June 17, 1942.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by the Honorable Edward B. Hitchcock, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 7257.

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

There was no objection.

ALIEN ENEMIES OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a number of members have communicated with me and have asked me how they can bring back House Resolution No. 433, which was defeated by the House on June 18. I have on my desk today hundreds of petitions and letters asking me why Congress voted against House resolution 433, which would in substance give the Committee on Immigration the right to study the alien enemy problem in this country. At the outset let me say that under our constitutional procedure this is the

only committee that is responsible for legislation dealing with all aliens and in chaotic times of war with enemy aliens. I still am at a loss to understand why the power asked of Congress by the committee was voted down. I have not yet received one reason from any Member, and I am willing to yield for that purpose to have any one tell me why he or she voted against the resolution asked for by the committee, which would have granted the committee the power to subpoena and bring in certain aliens that we believe are enemies to the United States. The purpose was to make a study of their status and, based upon that study, submit information necessary to our Government, which information could be used by the Department of Justice, or the Immigration Service.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman asked for any member who voted against this resolution to indicate why he voted as he did.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. I am very glad to comply with the gentleman's request. At the time the resolution was considered I stated on the floor that it was a duplication of effort, that a special committee of Congress, the Tolan committee, had made a report, and that that report was available to the Congress on one of the subjects that was indicated for study by this committee, and that there were other committees of the House doing the same work that was requested by the gentleman's committee. I, for one, believe the gentleman to be most sincere in his belief that his committee could do a better job. That is an honest difference of opinion.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am very glad the gentleman had the courage to stand up here and give that reason. Let us see if we can pick up the threads from the point of view the gentleman has suggested. I assume that other Members voted against the resolution because of the position the gentleman has stated. I am not quarreling with the Congress or with any Member of the House as to how he may have voted. That is his responsibility. I offered this resolution as a war measure. I brought it into the House as a war measure. I did not bring it here to provide for a fishing excursion of for unnecessary duplicating work for the members of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee. I do not think the gentleman has read the resolution. What does it say?

To study the serious alien situation.

Will the gentleman tell me which committee has been studying the alien enemy situation from the standpoint of legislation? Again, there is the further study:

The question of dual allegiance.

We mean by that that there are thousands of Nazis in this country who, since 1933, have in some way been able to secure naturalization papers. I charge that these people are Hitler agents in this country, whose purpose is to fight the Allies from within their own borders. If my good friend from Ohio—and I have

high regard for him, have always admired him—can point out to me what committee, what investigating committee, has been studying these questions, I would be very happy to yield again to the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman to the fact that we have all of the machinery that is needed to take care of all of these cases referred to by the gentleman. As a matter of fact, there is a trial going on in Washington now that the F. B. I. has had a great part in, as a result of their apprehending certain Nazi agents and spies. The departments of government are doing a very excellent job, not only the Immigration Service but the F. B. I. and the Naval Intelligence in apprehending these agents. I am sure the gentleman is sincere and that his intentions are of the best. However, all of the things outlined in this resolution are now covered by other agencies of the Government. At the same time, I want to go on record as heartily approving the gentleman's contribution as well.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for this contribution. Let us pick up the threads from this point. I am grateful to the Department of Justice for its wonderful work, especially to Mr. Edgar Hoover, who has shown his great ability and great leadership of men in the F. B. I. I also compliment the Attorney General for his activity. The gentleman suggests that the reason the committee does not have to go into this subject is because the F. B. I. picked up eight men who are on trial now. You are comparing with these eight men thousands of people in this country that I and the committee charge are holding certificates of citizenship which we believe should be taken away because their owners are agents of the Nazi government. I again call attention to the fact that the people under arrest now have been picked up under the statute we passed where there was definite evidence of a crime. The eight people who are now on trial, if they were eight Americans in Germany, would not be on trial, but would have been hung up in 5 minutes, but we are giving them the trial everyone is entitled to in a democratic nation. Surely you cannot compare the program of our committee with the situation of these eight men who have been picked up. In the last 4 years or so, in the last 7 or 8 years, I have stood in the well of this House and have named almost six or eight thousand persons that I believed, after a check-up, to be saboteurs, spies, and persons who were here for subversive purposes.

The only kick-back I got in the 8 years was when I named the four wrong people. One from Kansas, and I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] claimed that I had named three, and another gentleman claimed I had accused two people unjustly. Outside of that, all of the other people that I have charged on this floor were agents of the Nazi government. In the last year the F. B. I., through information I have given to them, picked up several hundred whom I definitely identified as subversive elements years ago. I presented proof of

their un-American activities right on this floor several years ago.

Now, what did the committee want to do? We did not ask for much money. It was not a question of money. It was a question of getting the power to bring before the committee or subcommittees thereof a number of people that we believed to be dangerous to this country. The resolution was based purely on the committee's belief that such a measure was necessary for the defense of our country, as a war measure. I tell you right now that I do not think any man can justify his vote against it. We are at war, and we must protect our home front. We must protect our soldiers who are fighting and dying and their families at home from saboteurs and spies, whether they are aliens or naturalized citizens. It is our duty under the Constitution to protect our civilian population while our soldiers and sailors are defending us at the front.

Now, it has been argued a number of times, "Well, you bring them in here by going before the Congress and getting the power to bring them in." Well, I am not trying to make a wholesale proposition of this by coming here every day asking for power. It was not the intention of my committee to abuse the power of subpoena.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are attempting to get rid of these folks. Do you think men like the editor of PM are helping the war effort any?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. My dear friend, that is beside the point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I thought you were talking about something to aid in the war effort.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think everybody should do his bit. We should not stop anywhere. If they are good people, we ought to protect them. If they are bad aliens, we ought to get rid of them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are these fellows good people who are calling all the rest of us traitors?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This is a rather general question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the trouble. It is always some general statement.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As far as I am concerned, I think he is an outstanding gentleman and doing a good job with his paper. He served in the last war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who? Ingersoll?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes. He has two dependents, but I do not know all the facts regarding the appeal for his deferment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You think he will help more by slinging ink at the rest of us?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There has been a lot of unnecessary name-calling lately.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Thank you for going that far.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Some people deserve it and other people do not. Sometimes innocent people get it and the right people do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How are you going to find out? Do you think it helps to call everybody else disloyal?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, I do not call everybody disloyal.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not talking about you. I am talking about Ingersoll, who wanted to get into it and now apparently does not want any of it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Maybe his explanation of the situation would differ somewhat from your interpretation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And he may have a weak heart.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, I do not know about that. As I said before, I think he is doing a pretty good job with his paper. It should be up to the War Department to decide where his services would be of greater value to the country.

Now, let us get back to this resolution. Two hundred Members voted "no." Ninety-six voted "aye." This vote was not based upon facts or reason or justification. It was based purely on prejudice, hate, and intolerance, aroused by a few men in this House who told the Congress that we were going to open the door for a lot of aliens.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman has another question like he gave me before.

Mr. BENDER. I want to commend the gentleman for his loyalty and for his efforts in behalf of this country against all saboteurs. He has rendered a great service to all of us. I have admired his courageous stand on all occasions, however, I am sure the gentleman would not want to leave his statement stand that all those who voted on this proposition voted because of prejudice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, no, no. I would not go that far. I said a few men led the fight, and we drifted away from the issues and we drifted away from the facts in the case, just because, as chairman of a committee, under my oath, I was by law compelled to bring the resolution to the floor of this House. I want this country and the Congress to know that it was a great mistake, a very serious mistake to vote down the resolution. I get mail every day tipping me off about subversive elements, alien and native. It is enormous. I got the addresses and turned them over to the F. B. I. We could have done a great deal more if we had the power to subpoena these aliens before the committee or subcommittee, put the aliens under oath and send the material of the completed case to the Department of Justice to act on. That was the purpose of this committee. Believe me when I tell you I was not looking for any work. Since 1933 I have stood in the well of this House and exposed the Nazis and Fascists in this country. From 1933 to 1934 people thought I was crazy, that I was unduly alarmed, and seeing Nazis under my bed, as one Member once put it. In all fairness I must say here that the same Member apologized—in writing—when my warnings were proven correct.

Since 1934 we have been investigating this condition and have disclosed the names of thousands of aliens who do not belong here. We have presented cases of people who have obtained false passports, of others who entered this country

for business purposes but who were in fact nothing more than agents of the Nazi Government, of German consulates filled with so-called diplomats who were nothing but spies.

What I am afraid of, and I say it in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, is that if by chance this country opens up a second front we shall have more saboteurs and spies doing dirty work here as they did in the last war when they blew up the Canadian Car & Foundry Co. and caused the Black Tom explosion and other great disasters. Hundreds of people are parading around as friends of America who, in my opinion, are her enemies. There are certain people, children of naturalized citizens, who are actually working against our country and our Government.

What our committee asked of this Congress was to give them the power to get the facts for the safety of our country. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who usually does not go along with me at all—I do not remember his ever voting for a bill I recommended or that the committee recommended—the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] stood in the well of this House and begged that the committee be given the right to make that study. It was not any effort to let any aliens into this country; we wanted to get rid of some who were here.

Getting back now to the matter I started to speak of when interrupted by the gentleman from Ohio, there was a certain judge in Hoboken who swore in about fifty or more German seamen from German boats, swore them in as citizens, men who had all their relatives, wives, and children in Germany, and who paid taxes in Germany. These people had no intention to take on the duties as well as the privileges of American citizenship. They now have citizenship in this country, granted them by certificate, the same kind of certificate loyal, naturalized citizens secured following the long and precise requirements of the law.

There were a number of societies made up of people of German blood which should have been investigated much more thoroughly than they were. I have nothing against the German people, but when they seek to undermine our Government, whether the people be German, Italian, or some other nationality, I will expose them and stand by my Government; yet my own congressional colleagues refuse to give us that power in time of war. How can you explain your vote? Go ahead and try. Some very distinguished members of my committee right now are sitting in the chamber: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], a Republican, whom I regard as a very fine upstanding American; the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and others. There were no politics involved in the resolution. We faced the facts as we got them and were unanimous in suggesting the remedy. But we were denied the power to take the steps we considered necessary. The argument made to us was "Why do you not turn them over to the Department of Justice?" Certainly; we do a lot of that, but what can the Department of Justice do unless the Department has a definite lead? How do you suppose they got the

8 Nazi spies? How do you suppose they picked up 20 or more relatives and financiers of these saboteurs? Going through my list I found the names of several of these saboteurs placed there years ago.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, by what method Hitler agents for this country have been trained? Citizens of German blood from this country were taken back to Germany, their expenses paid, put through a training school, taught how to destroy factories, disrupt industry, and divide our people, how to bomb railroads, mines, and factories. These are the things I wanted to go into years ago, but the House said: "No; you cannot do it." You remember the morning of the 18th. One of my colleagues who led the fight thought it was a bad thing to do; in fact, when I got on the floor that morning a little propaganda was being spread around first this aisle and then that aisle to the effect that this was an immigration bill that would let in a lot of aliens. How many of us read bills? We are too busy to read all of them. Do you think I can do anything in the Committee on Immigration without the approval of the full committee? Do you think that I or any other member of my committee would do anything that is not for the best interests of this country?

Mr. BENDER. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the gentleman would do an excellent job if he were a member of the Dies committee because I know the gentleman is vitally interested in this subject. The gentleman mentioned Mr. MASON, of Illinois. Mr. MASON is a member of the gentleman's committee and is also a member of the Dies committee. I am informed that the Dies committee has gone into these subjects very thoroughly and is looking for information such as the gentleman says he has. I would suggest that he turn it over to Mr. MASON or Mr. DIES, and I am sure that the subject will be investigated thoroughly. I am sure that the Bundists were thoroughly investigated by the Dies committee and information relating to that organization was turned over to the F. B. I. and to other agencies of the Government. The industrious gentleman from New York would do a real service by turning such information over to the Dies committee. If the Dies committee will not cooperate, I am certain that the Toland committee will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is correct in the last part of his statement; that is, that I am trying to do a service, but let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that what I am trying to do is not within the province of the Dies committee. The Dies committee was created in 1938, and I drew the resolution creating that committee. It has absolutely nothing to do with this question of dual allegiance or citizenship.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why did the gentleman leave it out of that resolution then?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Because at that time we were not at war. At that time we did not know that what happened in 1917 and 1918 and in the last war would happen in this war. The gentleman asks me why I left it out. I drew the first resolution in 1934 which confined my work to un-American activities and I submit to the House and to the gentleman from Ohio that that work has nothing to do with this. Aside from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and I have the highest regard for him, and aside from the gentleman from Ohio, and aside from his views, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has not even scratched the surface so far as the bundists in this country are concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman is in favor of giving him more authority and more money to go ahead?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; most definitely not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman states he has not even scratched the surface.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If you are going to create a committee, get another committee. There are plenty of good men in this House who would like to do work to protect their country. And, Mr. HOFFMAN, if I may address you, I want to answer your question if I may. You are asking me about the Dies committee, are you not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I said something about that, yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For the last 4 years I have been getting up here on the floor talking about one Count Vonsiatsky.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know him.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman does not know him? It is a good thing you do not. I have requested the Dies committee to serve a subpoena on him and to bring him before that committee as early as possible on the ground that he was a Hitler agent. I requested that a long time ago but could not get any action from DIES or his committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would not the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] who sits here help you out?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] did his best to do lots of things, but he probably could not do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about Mr. THOMAS? Did not Mr. THOMAS offer to help you?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That was a one-man organ-grinding committee; there was just one man running the show. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is an outstanding American, a good lawyer, and I have no quarrel with him. The fact I want to bring home now is that Vonsiatsky was finally indicted about 3 weeks ago as the agent of a foreign government; he pleaded guilty to a conspiracy charge and was sentenced to a term of 5 years in jail and a fine of \$2,000. Yet I could not get DIES to move against Vonsiatsky when I presented evidence of his subversive activities. I can give you a half-dozen more instances similar to that where the Dies committee neglected to follow through important information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you did that, it is a very good job and I want to compliment you on it. What were you going to ask me? You said a while ago you were going to ask me a question.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not say I wanted to ask you anything.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MASON. Just to keep the RECORD clear, when this resolution was before the House I made about as clear an explanation of it as an ex-schoolteacher could, and I think I made it definitely clear that the provisions of this resolution dealing with aliens and dealing with dual citizenship and dealing with citizens and citizenship in particular had nothing to do with the Dies committee. There was no overlapping, there was no duplication, and should not be if the committee was established. I am still of the same opinion. I want that made clear right now.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I do not want to keep the Members here any longer than is necessary. May I say that, however, that whichever way it is done, something must be done to give the committee the right to subpoena witnesses, and to study the various problems created by enemy aliens, dual nationals, and so forth. We are at war, we must protect our home front, as I have pointed out, and we must keep our boys' families protected while they do the actual fighting. As the committee responsible under the Constitution and under the rules of this House for legislation dealing with this subject, we are able, we believe, to do a job for our country. It is not a question of dollars and cents here at all. We are simply asking you for the right to bring in enemy aliens before us to find out their connections, their tie-ups, their relatives, their friends, how they got in here and under what circumstances some of them got their citizenship papers and so forth. Some of them received citizenship papers without even living in this country. It is a big job and we are willing to do it. I repeat, we are at war. My committee is willing to shoulder the added responsibility and work and I think the House ought to be grateful and cooperate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 7419.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND]?

There was no objection.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the average American woman is a homemaker. Vast numbers of American women are busy rearing the citizens of

tomorrow. There could be no more constructive employment than this. There are many women, however, who are not engaged in these fundamental activities who would like to enter lucrative occupations and would do so were it not for the laws in their States which prevent their owning the wages they earn.

In my own State, Illinois, women have full rights of citizenship. In Illinois we have women who are actively engaged in business, industry, the professions, and in public office. The same is true in many States. There are still States in the Union, however, which have neglected to repeal the ancient laws which keep women under a disability.

The other day, for instance, I talked to a highly intelligent young woman who told me that she practices law under her husband's name in the State in which she lives. She cannot legally sign a mortgage there. She cannot own the legal fees she earns, nor even inherit the property she has accumulated if her husband should die.

Her husband is within the draft age. If and when he enters the armed services she will not be able to carry on in his absence the business which they have built up through their joint efforts. The State laws there treat her as if she were an incompetent child.

There are doubtless many women of ability in the country in a similar predicament. Deprived of their husbands by Federal conscription and necessity, they are at the same time unnecessarily deprived by local statutes of the opportunity they would otherwise have to earn their own bread. A permanent loss in the event the husband is killed or maimed in war.

Surely it cannot be called chivalrous to leave such statutes upon the books. Soon one may suppose there will be an attempt by America to invade Europe. The war will then, presumably, enter a bloodier stage. Our soldiers, we know, cannot all return. War is the creator of widows and orphans. Of spinsters, some of them casualties of war without knowing it, because they never even meet the men who, had they survived the war, might have supported them. These women might enjoy some sense of fulfillment in the future could they but broaden their activities, mingling with their fellow citizens in work outside their homes. The statutes in far too many States deny them this meager substitute for happiness.

It seems too much, moreover, to ask the men who do survive this war, some returning handicapped by injuries, to support not only their own dependents but also to support, through taxes, women who might support themselves and their families and would prefer to do it if given a fair chance under the law.

To diminish the gargantuan debt which we shall have accumulated before the war ends, we need a vastly augmented national income. With a mighty united effort we must whittle down this monster debt, billion by billion. Keep it from growing. Else it will throttle private enterprise, dip deep into every lunch basket and worry our citizens beyond endurance.

To avert this disastrous aftermath of war, we need to double, treble, perhaps even quadruple any sum of annual national income the Nation has ever earned before.

At the end of the war there will be plenty of wants to supply: radios, automobiles, stoves and iceboxes and all the many comforts which the people are denying themselves in order to save lives by winning the war as quickly as possible. There are groups of citizens old and young who can, if trained, earn more money. There are these women, countless numbers of them, who, if their legalistic bonds were severed, might enlist in the work of production for war. Some of them to continue on in the ranks during the post-war battle of production through which we may regain normal living. Through that peacetime battle of production we can build the "brave new world" which, we hope, will rise like a phoenix from the ashes of the old.

We can lift this yoke of laws hanging about the necks of American women. We can repeal them automatically by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

There is an organization of American women who call themselves the National Women's Party. They have worked ardently and indefatigably through the years for the passage of the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

That amendment reads:

Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

In 1940 the platforms of both Republican and Democratic Parties advocated, in more or less specific terms, the passage of such an amendment. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee has favorably reported the equal-rights amendment. The Senate Judiciary Committee also reported it favorably not long ago.

I am told, however, that leaders hesitate to proceed further with this legislation because of the division of opinion with respect to its effect existing among women themselves. Chief objection to it seems to be that it might result in the repeal of so-called protective legislation affecting women.

Many feminists argue, on the one hand, that women need only such protective legislation as might better be applied to men also. That if the law gives wives alimony it should also give husbands alimony. They maintain incontrovertibly that legislation which is unfair to women is frequently passed under the guise of protective legislation.

Equally distinguished women leaders who are opposed to the equal-rights amendment argue, on the other hand, that there are many truly protective laws such as widows' pension laws which women alone need, and which should remain the law without being extended to include men.

Some time ago I was requested by a committee of the Women's Bar Association of Illinois to introduce and bring to the attention of this House the proposed