

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1944

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Strong Son of God, immortal love, bathed in peace divine, bid our souls be hushed and calm; touch our hearts, for out of them are the issues of life with their sustaining affirmation that the right will prevail. O give our anxious and waiting homes songs in the night, beauty for ashes, and the garment of praise for heaviness. In their distracting confusion and silence assure them of that fellowship that hushes lamentation.

We praise Thee for our blessings of happiness and abundance, and allow no plague to come nigh our dwellings. May they be like the hearthstone in Bethany where Jesus was wont to linger and broke the bread of life. Help us to accept our burdens and limitations uncomplainingly, allowing no bitter words to escape our lips and no resentment to sting our hearts. Be Thou the liberator of him whom freedom cannot release, the great physician of him whom medicine cannot cure, and the comforter of all whom time cannot console; blessed Lord God, we thank Thee for this truth that never faileth. We beseech Thee to grant our President, his Cabinet, and all who are associated with him in authority good health and courage to carry on their most arduous duties with the riches of Thy grace. Through Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Shaner, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1973. An act to provide additional pay for enlisted men of the Army assigned to the infantry who are awarded the expert infantryman badge or the combat infantryman badge;

S. 2019. An act to establish the grade of fleet admiral of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt Fund.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1669. An act to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets.

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

H. R. 248. An act for the relief of Louis Council;

H. R. 544. An act for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay;

H. R. 1313. An act for the relief of Delores Lewis;

H. R. 1411. An act for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart;

H. R. 1412. An act for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton;

H. R. 2625. An act for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron; and

H. R. 3538. An act for the relief of the Rev. James T. Denigan.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3646) entitled "An act to amend section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEWART, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. BUSHFIELD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. WHITE and Mr. HOLMAN additional conferees on the bill (H. R. 4443) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes."

DIES COMMITTEE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Westbrook Pegler, in his column, "Unfair Enough," curiously admits he has a pipe line of information directly to the Dies committee. Pegler says the C. I. O. Political Action Committee had telephone communications with members of the White House staff, and with several executive agencies, and that the Dies committee had subpoenaed the phone records. Apparently telephone conversations are no longer private and personal, but why were these conversation records made available to Pegler exclusively, especially before Congress or the public had the information? Is Robert E. Stripling, chief factotum of the Dies committee, an employee of Pegler, or is it just a case of

crowding roosters in the same back yard? Let Stripling and the Dies committee explain.

THE SOUTH MUST CHOOSE ITS OWN WAY

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

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIKES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

POST-WAR HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a telegram.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROBINSON of Utah addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

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. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by myself.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

[Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. KEEFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution relating to the St. Lawrence seaway adopted by the Common Council of the City of Sheboygan, Wis.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course no one would expect me to offer free advice to the Republican National Committee, which now, as Shakespeare says, "stands tiptoe on the misty mountain-tops," looking abroad for a plank on international policies.

If they really want to adopt a same plank, they might read Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address and adopt his language of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

But while they are now looking abroad for political issues they might also look back home and tell the American people what they propose to do to help solve their problems in the years to come.

Four years ago you Republicans were embarrassed by having a mogul of the Power Trust foisted upon you as candidate for President. You will probably escape that calamity this time. But I should like for the Republican National Committee to tell the American people what they are going to do for the 32,000,000 consumers of electric light and power who are being overcharged more than \$1,200,000,000 for electricity every year. The American people want to know. They want to know what your party proposes to do for the relief of the 26,000,000 residential consumers of electricity who paid \$1,029,000,000 for \$580,000,000 worth of electricity last year. Outside of the T. V. A. and the Columbia River areas they were overcharged more than 100 percent.

The 4,000,000 commercial consumers of electricity who were overcharged more than 100 percent for their electricity last year are going to want to know what you propose to do for their relief.

The millions of farmers who are begging for electricity for their homes want to know what you propose to do to help them get it.

The answers to these questions should be written into the platform.

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

C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. 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. THOMAS of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. RAMSPECK. 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. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the C. I. O. Political Action Committee except what I read in the papers. What I am interested in about the story Mr. Westbrook Pegler published about these telephone calls, and what I am wondering about, is how he got a pipe line into the Dies committee. It seems to me a committee of Congress, set up by this House for the purposes of conducting an investigation, ought not to be furnishing information gathered under its power of subpoena to a newspaperman when it has not held any hearings and has not made any report to this House. So I think instead of the gentleman from New Jersey talking about the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, he ought to tell us where Pegler got this information which is supposed to be in the files of the Dies committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The chances are Mr. Pegler got his information the same way that Pearson gets his information. If Mr. Pearson can get his information from the New Deal administration, perhaps right from either the White House or the State Department, Mr. Pegler has the same right to get the same kind of information, even though it is contrary to the New Deal.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Two wrongs do not make a right, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The reply of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] is not an answer to the question.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Why, of course, not. The House ought to know what the Dies committee has done with its information and whether it gave it to Pegler.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. 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. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, what is involved here is most serious. The transfer of confidential information from the files of a congressional select committee to a columnist is reprehensible conduct on the part of the person or persons responsible for it. In my opinion, it involves the privileges of the House. Such conduct is a flagrant and violent abuse of the prerogatives, privileges, and rules of this House. It warrants a thorough investigation by the membership of the House. The privileges, prerogatives, and rules of the House of Representatives have been violated. I say that this House must take action, irrespective of who is involved,

irrespective of whom it hurts. A select committee of this House is empowered by this House to obtain information. Then this information is surreptitiously put in the hands of a columnist. Such conduct, in my opinion, warrants thorough investigation and action. A select committee should be appointed at once to discover the guilty party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let us have an investigation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think we ought to have a public hearing and let the people know who is or is not guilty of this underhanded activity.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I am in favor of it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. All right; then offer a resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. All right; let us have an investigation by the Dies committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, no. The Dies committee is involved here. The investigation must be conducted by an impartial and disinterested group appointed by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already announced the time of the gentleman from New York has expired. Both gentlemen are out of order.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. 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. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the important thing before the House on this question of what the Dies committee is doing is: What are the facts. The Dies committee seizes files for facts for the protection of the public and for the welfare of the country. That is the main thing. They have no other purpose but that of serving the House. The important thing is that this man, Baldwin, who was the head of the Farm Security for years, a thing set up by the President on an Executive order, and who handled and tried to handle interstate labor for 2 or 3 years, and mused it up, trying to give the C. I. O. labor standards to the farmer, got so unpopular that they took him out of that and sent him to Italy for a little while and then brought him back as an assistant to Sidney Hillman, with a further attempt to C. I. O. the farmers again. The evidence that Pegler gave is only a confirmation of his long-distance talk to Farm Security leaders all over the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

WIDOW CESAIRE DE BLANC

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1593) for the relief of the heirs and assigns of Widow Cesaire De Blanc, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

property acquired or owned by the United States prior to July 2, 1940.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Actual

Amendment No. 3, relating to new admissions into the training program as to medicine (including veterinary) and dentistry.

The House conferees will propose the restoration of the provision proposed by the House with an amendment, the purpose of which will be to insure that there will be no interference with special short training courses and post graduate instruction of non participants in the Army Specialized Training Program.

Pursuant to clause 2, rule XX

The managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses concurrence in the following amendment of the Senate:

Amendment No. 1, providing for payment of traveling expenses of personnel returning from war fronts for recuperation, rehabilitation, and recovery.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4976) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 10, line 5, insert "all necessary expenses of travel to enable military personnel stationed abroad to visit places in the United States, its Territories, and possessions for the purpose of recuperation, rehabilitation, and recovery."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 3: Page 21, line 16, after the colon strike out the word "provided" and strike out all of lines 17 to 22 inclusive.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

"Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

" : Provided, That no appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any expense incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry if any expense on account of their education in such subjects was not being defrayed out of appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 prior to June 7, 1944, except that nothing herein shall interfere with compliance with the provisions of law authorizing the detail of officers and enlisted men of any component of the Army of the United States as students, observers, and investigators as contemplated by Sec. 127 (a) of the National Defense Act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended."

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the chairman if this is the provision agreed upon in the conference this morning.

Mr. SNYDER. Strictly so.

Mr. CASE. I was wondering about the insertion of the phrase "any component of the Army of the United States." Would that permit the detailing of enlisted men in the Reserve?

Mr. SNYDER. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that that phrase was inserted to make certain that it included the Army of the United States as it now stands instead of only the Regular Army.

Mr. CASE. It is not intended in any way to permit the induction or enlistment of personnel which has never been in the Army and assign them immediately to a school?

Mr. SNYDER. Absolutely not; just the reverse.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, a motion to reconsider the various votes by which action was taken on the conference report was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and insert a short newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Governor of Massachusetts.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution from citizens of my district, also an article on servicemen, veterans, and their dependents.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Appendix on two subjects.)

SANCTITY OF TELEPHONE RECORDS

The SPEAKER. With the understanding that the gentleman will yield if conference reports are called up, the Chair, pursuant to the special order of the House heretofore entered recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1943, in fulfilling one of your high duties as Speaker of the House of Representatives, you appointed me to be a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. Since my appointment, I have endeavored to discharge my duties as a member of that committee to the best of my ability, although I may say that the meetings of the committee have been rather infrequent. According to my files, the last meeting of the committee was on January 19 of this year.

On Tuesday, June 20, there appeared an article by Mr. Westbrook Pegler, under the caption "Fair enough," in the Washington Daily News. It is well known that this writer's column is syndicated throughout the United States, and it is assumed that the same article appeared in many of the newspapers of this country. Among others, the statement was made in the article that "long-distance telephone records subpoenaed by the Dies committee have revealed a close relationship between the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. and the following: The White House and Mrs. Roosevelt, Vice President HENRY WALLACE."

Mr. Speaker, I am not thoroughly familiar with the ethics of the newspaper profession, and I have no desire to question the right of the columnist to publish information he, himself, believes to be reliable. Perhaps he is to be commended for having made a "scoop" over the regular news-gathering agencies, such as the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service, as well as hundreds of fellow columnists, commentators, and newspaper reporters who pursue their honorable calling in this great Capital of the United States.

But the Constitution of the United States, amendment 4 provides:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

This is one of the most sacred privileges which we here in the United States enjoy. It is a privilege which has always been jealously guarded by the people of the country, and I believe I am not

wrong in saying that the desire of the founding fathers of our Government to be free from abuses of this type and character was one of the compelling causes for the Declaration of Independence and our war for freedom.

Congress has time after time refused to permit legalization of the practice of indiscriminate wire tapping by agents, investigators, and employees of the executive branch of the Government.

You will remember that about 8 years ago a special committee of the other body, popularly called the Black lobby-investigating committee, subpoenaed from the telegraph companies the telegrams which had been sent by various organizations and individuals. Nation-wide furor ensued, and practically every newspaper in the country and every publicist condemned in no uncertain terms this action on the part of that committee as being a violation of a citizen's right to be in violation in his home and business. Not at that time, nor at any time since, have I heard a defense issued for such a practice.

But, Mr. Speaker, this subpoenaing of the records of the telephone company goes much further than the action of the Black committee. You will remember at that time that no person questioned the jurisdiction of the Black lobby-investigating committee to investigate the activities of certain organizations and individuals in behalf of legislation in which they were interested. The marked distinction in this case—between these two cases—is the fact that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee has officially and publicly challenged the jurisdiction of the House special committee to investigate its activities. That challenge has not been met. It is an issue which has not yet been decided either way, and, as far as I know, the House committee has not taken any step or made any move to prepare to meet the challenge or to have the issue determined. The officials of the telephone company involved most certainly have been aware of this challenge. To assert otherwise would be too obvious.

I want it distinctly understood that I am not this afternoon making any defense of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. I am making no finding as to whether that group are guilty or are not guilty of the accusations and charges which have been hurled against them. But the question I propound is: Why did an official or officials of the telephone company cooperate so fully and willingly with the so-called Dies committee, knowing that the accused had challenged jurisdiction and the issue still being in doubt? An explanation is due from the telephone company officials, else they will be charged, which must be met in one way or another, that they do not believe it important to keep confidential the records of their company with respect to the private affairs of the users of their lines. The news of this action on the part of the telephone company will come as a shock to its millions and millions of subscribers. Because of the peculiar nature of its services to the public it has a double duty to protect the private concerns of its consumers.

I want it known that I had no knowledge whatsoever of this nauseating procedure. Are there those who would justify the propriety of releasing to the public the information obtained by such methods? Are there those who care to justify the subpoenaing of telegrams or records of telephone conversations? It has too much of an odor of keyhole peeping to suit my senses.

Mr. Speaker, is the privacy of an occupant of the White House to be violated at the whim of an individual, whether he be a Member of the House, or otherwise?

Mr. Speaker, is the sanctity of the home of the First Lady of the land to be thus lightly thrust aside? Can any Member of this body, himself, feel secure from the prying eyes of an employee of this House itself, who is armed with a subpoena? Can any citizen, be he obscure or renowned, feel secure in the face of such practices as this? The people of the country will have fear, and justifiably so, at this whittling away of the guaranties provided for in our Constitution by the framers of that document. They will resent, and justifiably so, this attempted encroachment upon that sacred instrument known as the Bill of Rights. It is a dangerous practice, and if allowed to go unchallenged, may have a far-reaching effect in creating distrust and disunity. I cannot accept it, and it cannot be shaken off with a shrug of the shoulders.

Let those who will defend the practice, but I for one will never be cast in that role.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COCHRAN. This is not the first time that a member of the Committee on Subversive Activities has taken the floor as an individual member of that committee to advise the House and the country that he had absolutely no participation in connection with some activity of that committee nor did he have any knowledge of the subject matter that may have been released to the press. I have been a chairman of committees of this House for many, many years, and, in my opinion, the chairman of a committee of the House of Representatives is simply a member of that committee, although he is the presiding officer. I cannot bring myself to the point where, if I am a chairman of a committee of this House, I will take the authority without consulting my colleagues on that committee to issue an order and subpoena to get the record of telephone calls. I know nothing in the rules of the House, and I think I know a little bit about the rules, which would give the chairman of a committee the right to take such action without consulting the members of his committee. We all know that in subpoenaing those records the conversation that occurred over the line could not be subpoenaed. It would simply be the fact that Mr. So-and-so called Mr. or Mrs. So-and-so. I think whoever is responsible for issuing that subpoena without the knowledge and consent of a ma-

jority of the committee went beyond his jurisdiction. That is my own opinion.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman that since the appearance of that article I have spoken to two other members of this special committee, each of whom informed me personally that he had no knowledge whatsoever of the subpoena having been issued or of this release being given to the particular columnist I mentioned. To me it seems reprehensible in the highest degree for an employee of the House itself to release information without the members of the special committee themselves knowing anything whatsoever about the matter.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman it is a reflection upon every member of that committee when the information was released, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania had not made this statement today he would have been just as much subject to criticism as any other member of the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely right, and there has for some time been a question in my mind whether I should continue to serve on that committee when practices of this sort are being indulged in.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman resigned from the committee for that reason, he would not be the first Member of this House that resigned from that committee for that reason.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MYERS. Does the gentleman know whether the orders were given to the investigator to release this information to the press or release it to a specific individual?

Mr. EBERHARTER. As to that particular matter, I do not know whether the release was to be made to a particular columnist or to a particular individual. I notice that the date line of the article was marked "New York, June 20," so the columnist evidently wrote that story in New York City.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the added factor which is so serious, is that this information was taken out of the files of this committee and surreptitiously turned over to this columnist.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There would be quite a difference. If it had been released to the press, that would have been wrong in itself, because of the nature of the subject matter involved, but the fact that it was surreptitiously given to a columnist, I believe, involves the privileges and prerogatives and the integrity of the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to say, as far as that is concerned, that I quite agree.

My personal opinion is that this matter goes to the dignity and integrity of the House itself, even of such consequence that it involves the privileges of the House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman that an employee of the committee released the information while the chairman of the committee was absent from Washington, and without any consultation whatever with other members of the committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The employee who released the information certainly had no conversation with me or with two other members of the committee with whom I talked. The latest information I have is that the chairman of the committee is not in Washington, but is now in the State of Texas, and has been for some time.

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

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

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he got in touch with the chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities regarding this article that appeared in the newspaper?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman who is chairman of the special committee, I understand, is in Texas. I did not feel like taking it upon myself to telephone to Texas in order to get the information regarding the subject. The facts speak for themselves, I think.

Mr. BUSBEY. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania take the trouble to get in touch with Mr. Stripling, the chief investigator of the committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say in answer to the question of the gentleman that Mr. Stripling is the one who informed me that he had released the information to Mr. Pegler.

Mr. BUSBEY. Did the gentleman ask him on what authority he released the information?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I had a conversation with him about it. I do not think it was phrased exactly that way. He said, "I gave the information, and Mr. Dies knew that I was giving it out."

Let me ask the gentleman, if he will permit me, this question: Does the gentleman approve of the practice of a member of a committee issuing a subpoena of this sort?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is making a speech. I am asking a question for information.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the gentleman does not approve of the practice, do I understand?

Mr. BUSBEY. I would just like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is a member of the special committee. Does he not like to be informed as to what is going on?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman makes a reflection on the chief investigator that

he or another employee of the committee did this without authority of somebody on the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am wondering whether the gentleman, who is a member of the special committee is satisfied with that type of practice and procedure. Can the gentleman answer that question? Is he satisfied with that procedure as a member of the committee?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not know all the details about the practice and procedure, but I did take the trouble to find out all about it when I read it in the paper, and I think that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania had taken the same trouble, he could have informed the House without reflecting on any employee of the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman will inform me, what was the reason for giving this very confidential information to one particular newspaperman, if he has made inquiry?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he seems to be an authority, from the speech he made on the floor of the House this afternoon. Let him find out the information himself the same way I did.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is not very helpful to the members of the House.

Mr. MURPHY. If the gentleman will yield, I might say to the gentleman that it is an obligation on the part of the gentleman who says he has the information to give it to the press of the Nation. If it is no secret, let the press of the Nation have it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think that it would come within the purview of his duties to inform the Members of the House as to why this information was given to one particular member of the newspaper profession.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to make this observation. As I understand, the gentleman from Illinois is a member of the Dies special committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Then it is a sorry confession from him when he has to state on the floor of the House that he first learned of the procedure of his own committee by reading it in a newspaper.

SAVE THE JEWISH PEOPLE OF EUROPE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, last night I witnessed the showing of the film entitled "None Shall Escape," at the invitation of the Washington Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, of which Mrs. Guy Gillette is chairman. This film deals with the post-war topic, namely, the punishment of the Nazi criminals.

Needless to say, I have yet to recuperate from the basically true account as de-

picted on the screen, a sad, grim, heroic tale. I saw a trainload of Jews—men, women, and children—marked for annihilation. Driven to desperation by the agony of persecution and death, the passengers turned on their oppressors. Although they had no weapon beyond bare hands, they battled the master race on the streets of a Polish village.

The battle raged only a few minutes. Of course, the inevitable happened. As life took leave from his body, the rabbi concluded, "We shall never die."

Next to me was seated my esteemed friend, the leading exponent in the field of rescue, Rabbi Baruch Korff, who accompanied me at my invitation. Touched by this massacre which to his knowledge is only a trickle of what takes place now, he sadly but courageously remarked, "I, as a Jew, am armed with more than complete steel, the justice of my quarrel—this is why we are destined to survive."

-How right and just you are, my dear rabbi.

The fear that now besets the American people is not that we shall be overrun by the vanishing might of the Nazi and the Jap but that we shall defeat them and still lose the things for which we fought. We want no termination of this greatest of all wars in a peace that is nothing but an armistice during which time a still greater war will be prepared. None shall escape, none must escape, the guilty must be punished. The President has assured us and his assurance has been confirmed by the leaders of the other great United Nations that our arms will not be laid down until the enemy has surrendered unconditionally. That, however, is not enough. A lasting peace is not guaranteed by the complete and abject surrender of an enemy.

The game of the Nazis is devious, subtle, and clever. In the same manner as the Nazis in renegeing from Russia have destroyed everything of value that they could within the territory they abandoned, so now they are seeking to destroy another asset of the United Nations more priceless than the material things that they have fired and dynamited. They are seeking to destroy and are destroying the lives of human beings with whom at least in large part lies the hope of constructing a lasting peace among the nations.

Deliberately and with foul and malevolent purpose the Nazis, as they see their last hours approaching, are accelerating and intensifying their campaign to destroy the leaders of liberal and democratic outlook that are found within the territories that they hold. Since the beginning of their conquest the Germans have pursued this policy with the end in mind of keeping crushed peoples leaderless and in subjugation. Now they pursue it with renewed fanaticism in the knowledge that if they can succeed the way lies open to a new revival of nazism, years hence, in a Europe drained of its best mentalities and most independent spirits. All this has been part of the same program whereby political, religious and educational leaders have been shot, professional people have been deported to slave labor and death, and the Jews have been massacred with less pity

than that shown by any barbarians in the records of history.

Our duty in the face of this situation is clear. We must save the remnants of the intended victims from the fate that the Nazis have chosen for them. The duty is not one to the peoples of Europe or to those who otherwise would perish, it is rather a duty which we owe to ourselves and to our posterity. I avow frankly that our ends in this matter are selfish. We must save the Jews from the slaughter camps, the men of good will from massacre, the religious leaders from death, not because they need us but because we need them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein several letters.

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.]

RECESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6:30 p. m.

LEND-LEASE, U. N. R. R. A., AND F. E. A. CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4937) making appropriations for defense aid (lend-lease), for the participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and for the Foreign Economic Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4937) making appropriations for defense aid (lend-lease), for the participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and for the Foreign Economic Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert before the sum "\$43,200,000" the following: "not to exceed"

and in the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment before the word "owned" strike out the word "now"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 7 of the bill, in line 10, after the words "per annum", and before the comma, insert the following: "during the incumbency of the present Administrator"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$19,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$340,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee report in disagreement amendment numbered 2.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JED JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4937), making appropriations for defense aid (lend-lease), for the participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and for the Foreign Economic Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of "domestic" raw wool and "domestic" cotton from Government stock piles and makes minor textual clarifications in the amendment.

No. 2: Corrects a section number.

Nos. 4, 5, and 6, relating to the Foreign Economic Administration: Fixes the salary of the Administrator, so long as the office is held by the present incumbent, at \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,000 as proposed by the House; appropriates \$19,750,000, instead of \$20,000,000, as proposed by the Senate and \$19,500,000 as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses; and limits the amount which may be used for emergency or extraordinary expenses in connection with operations in foreign countries to \$75,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate, and \$50,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 7: Makes \$340,000 of the funds of the Export-Import Bank of Washington available for administrative expenses, instead of \$325,000 as proposed by the House and \$357,200 as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference reports in disagreement the following amendment of the Senate:

No. 2: Making not to exceed \$350,000,000 of lend-lease funds, supplies, and services, available to be applied on the United States contribution to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration when the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff certify that the state of the war will permit the utilization of such supplies, services, or funds for such contribution. The House managers will recommend that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JED JOHNSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4937) making appropriations for defense aid (lend-lease), for the participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and for the Foreign Economic Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the conference report has been agreed to by the conferees of both the House and Senate. When it is disposed of there is one separate amendment to be submitted to the House.

Does the gentleman from New York desire any time on the conference report?

Mr. TABER. Not on the conference report, but I should like some time on the amendment in disagreement. Is that No. 2?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; No. 2.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 7, line 9: "Sec. 202. In addition to the sum appropriated by section 201 of this title, any supplies, services, or funds available for disposition or expenditure by the President under the Act of March 11, 1941, as amended (22 U. S. C. 411-419), and acts supplementary thereto, may be disposed of or expended by the President to carry out the provisions of the Act of March 28, 1944, without reimbursement of the appropriations from which such supplies or services were procured or such funds were provided: *Provided*, That the supplies, services, and funds disposed of or expended under the authority of this section shall not exceed a total value, as determined under regulations to be approved by the President of \$350,000,000 and shall be charged to the amount authorized to be appropriated by said Act of March 28, 1944: *Provided further*, That the authority granted by this section shall not become effective un-

amendment limiting the WASP program to 1,500 trainees. I have taken the trouble to talk with men in the War Department who have assured me, and proven to me, that they have a real need for these WASPS. They are doing a good job; they have demonstrated that they can do a good job. There is testimony that these women, apparently, are perfectly well satisfied to serve as ferry pilots. They have no desire to get away from that assignment and get transferred to something else, as many of the young men who were doing ferry piloting always seemed to want to do.

It seems to me that the House is in a bargaining mood today. We are saying to the Chief of the Air Corps: "If you want 5,000 WASPS, we will let you have them, but if you get them you have to take this other group of students and instructors that you say you do not want at this time."

I agree with those who say that a promise should be kept, but above all, a promise that may be made to any particular group about what commission they would get when they completed a certain course of training is subordinate to our over-all promise of 100 percent support of the war effort. It was unfortunate for the thousands of young men who were taking the college training program, recently cut down, that the war situation was such that they had to have young men in the infantry, that they needed them in the infantry right at that time more than they needed them in the Air Corps. So the War Department had to say to these men in the schools and colleges: "We are sorry, but our job is to win the war and the greatest contribution you can make toward winning the war is to now go into the Infantry." Most of them went in willingly.

I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorvys] when he stated that it would be a tragic mistake if we here in the House tried to legislate or to change the Air Corps physical standards. If there is need for these men in the Air Corps, I have confidence enough to believe that General Arnold will take them in the Air Corps but, if in the opinion of medical authorities, and it is really a medical question, these men are not fit for the Army Air Corps, then I do not want to take the responsibility of ordering the Air Corps to commission men who do not measure up to required standards.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. What is there in the war effort that these WASPS can do which boys past 26, who have already been trained under the War Training Service program, cannot do?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Those men can go into various other services where they are more needed today.

Mr. WILSON. These men have already been trained as pilots. They did not want them in the Infantry. They are past 26 and some of them past 30.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Some are and some are not. If they cannot pass the Regular Army physical requirement we do not want them to fly.

Mr. WILSON. I know there are some past that age.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There are plenty of them that could go into other branches of the service. They all had the opportunity to go into military service long ago if they wanted to accept it. If the gentleman from Indiana wants to take the responsibility of saying to the Air Corps: "You have got to take these men and use them as pilots," he may as one Member take that responsibility, but I do not want it, and I know a little bit about aviation physical standards and why they are kept high.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. On what authority does the gentleman make the statement that all these men had the opportunity to go into the Army?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They had the same opportunity that any American citizen of military age had to go into the Army.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. Does not the gentleman realize every single one of these trainees and instructors we are talking about here enlisted? They enlisted in a program set up by the War Department.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely, and the Air Corps does not want them. The Air Corps does not need them today.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. They have had hour after hour of flying, some of them thousands of hours; now the War Department does not want to utilize their services.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Would the gentleman vote for an amendment that would say to the Air Corps, "You must now, because you need pilots, take into the Army and commission every licensed pilot in the United States"?

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. Of course not, nor does anybody here contend that they should do that, nor do we try to legislate any kind of physical standards. We are not trying to do that.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You are proposing to change the physical standards set up by competent Air Corps flight surgeons.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. No.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Then I cannot read English.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. We propose to maintain the same physical standards that existed when these men enlisted.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The standards that those men enlisted under are not the flying-cadet standards of the Army Air Corps today.

Mr. HARNESSE of Indiana. They say it is.

C. I. O. Political Action Committee

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is evidence in the files of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities which clearly shows that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is, in fact, the political arm of the New Deal administration and that the activities of the organization are directed from the White House by the New Deal political strategists, David K. Niles and Jonathan Daniels. But what is more important, Mr. Speaker, there is evidence to show that the Farm Security Administration, an agency of the Federal Government, is being used as a political weapon by the New Deal and the P. A. C. to defeat certain Members of this body and the Senate.

The House committee evidence includes, among other things, records from the telephone company, showing long-distance telephone calls between prominent C. I. O. political action leaders to the White House and to Government agents in States where political upsets recently took place.

The assistant director of the political action committee, C. B. Baldwin, a few months ago resigned as head of the Farm Security Administration to direct the C. I. O.'s campaign for the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt and for the defeat of Members of Congress to whom they were opposed. Mr. Baldwin, who headed the Farm Security for a long while is now using that organization for political purposes. The evidence shows that Mr. Baldwin has been in direct communication with the officials of the F. S. A. throughout the country and at the height of certain primary campaigns where distinguished Members of this body were defeated, Mr. Baldwin was in daily telephonic communication with the regional directors of the Farm Security Administration.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee, in its campaign for vengeance against those Members of Congress who refused to be led by them is working in collusion with many high officials of this Government, and there is ample evidence to prove it. Most of us have become hardened to New Deal scandals. But I, for one, confess myself shocked and astounded at this latest manifestation of contempt for the laws intended to keep political campaigns clean. Here is a Communist-dominated group, wielding a \$4,000,000 slush fund aimed at the political death of every Congressman who will not take its orders, stretching its tentacles into the White House itself, constantly in communication with the President's closest intimates, undoubtedly

with his full knowledge and approval. It would not have been credible under former administrations, either Democratic or Republican, but it agrees with the pattern adopted by this regime, which has for its purpose the destruction of constitutional government.

Speaking as one member of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, I purpose to see that the Congress and the people have the full facts based upon this amazing evidence which has just been obtained by our committee investigators.

Extension of Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts of 1942

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that for the first time in this price-control consideration in all the weeks that we have had it here politics has been brought into our discussions. May I say for the benefit of every Member of the House that there was no suggestion in the conference in any way as to the effect of this price-control bill on the campaign in November. Everyone of the 14 conferees that were there and that had studied the bill recognized the simple fact that inflation does not just ruin the Democrats, it just does not ruin the Republicans; it ruins everybody. It will ruin the country.

I think we made a good compromise in adopting the Brown amendment. You will remember the Bankhead amendment which, in my opinion, was disastrously inflationary. The House voted it down. The Senate conferees at 1:15 in the morning were still insisting on the Bankhead amendment. We told them to take it back to the Senate and see what they could do with it. We expected them to do that. They met the next morning, still wanting to compromise, still hoping we could find some ground where reasonable, honest men could work out something that would not be inflationary, something that would still help the farmers, not only the cotton farmers of this Nation but the other farmers.

The Brown amendment had been brought in about 4 o'clock. It does not help only the cotton farmers but other farmers as well. The cotton farmers in this country do not get more than one-fiftieth of the advantage that will accrue to the general level of farming under the Brown amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PLOESER. Is the report in the press of today true, that the O. P. A. has agreed to do everything administratively

that would be required legislatively by the Brown and Bankhead amendments?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman reads the newspapers, does he not?

Mr. MONRONEY. No price increases are ordered in the law, and it was not intended so by the conferees.

Mr. PLOESER. It is true that the O. P. A. said they would protect the price ceiling?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe the press is writing the laws of this country. The House of Representatives and the Senate are writing the laws.

Mr. PLOESER. The press was quoting, I think, the Honorable James Byrnes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure that is not the intent of the committee, because the Honorable James Byrnes was never quoted to the conferees in any way.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman thought that that kind of a trade had been made, would he agree?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that kind of a trade is made because I know where the amendment originated. I know the efforts that were made to compromise this thing to give you a price-control bill that would not cause inflation and yet loosen up some the restraints that exist on normal business transactions. The bill is not perfect. This bill is a long way from being perfect, but I believe it is the best possible compromise that can be reached by the two Houses of Congress and by the public.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman state to us how the modification in the compromise amendment would work?

Mr. MONRONEY. The modification in the compromise amendment will work so that in major categories you can take the specific price of cotton yarns and cotton goods, for example, and adjust them to cotton parity but not on every item in the cotton category.

The gentleman who proposed that amendment is going to speak later and I think he will go into that fully. The last half of the amendment is the part that gives the greatest relief to the farmers. That was not proposed by the White House, it never originated in the White House, but was brought to the conference by friends of agriculture who are Members of the House and was improved on by Members of the Senate.

Mr. PLOESER. My criticism, understand me, is not of the committee. I think the conferees have done a good job. I was against the Brown amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was, too, against the original one.

Mr. PLOESER. I think you have done a good job, but I think it is cheap politics on the part of the O. P. A. and the administration to make such a trade.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the gentleman think this committee would make such a trade?

Mr. PLOESER. I did not accuse the committee of it. The report of the

press shows plainly that the White House interest in price control is only secondary to vote control.

Mr. MONRONEY. This compromise is approved by the committee representing the House and by the committee representing the Senate. It was the best possible compromise that could be reached and politics had no part in it.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Is there anything in this so-called Brown amendment that compels the ceiling prices to be raised?

Mr. MONRONEY. Decidedly not.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASE. Did the conferees conclude that the 92½-percent loan rate on cotton would be better than the 95-percent loan rate?

Mr. MONRONEY. We concluded it would be less disruptive of the marketing of all farm commodities and less apt to freeze farm commodities of all kinds under the loan. The 95-percent-of-parity loan was in the Senate bill on all basic commodities. This 92½ percent is on cotton only. The House conferees worked out a pretty good deal on that, because cotton is at the lowest ebb, and I believe it will help reach parity for cotton or help by starting along that way.

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

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

Mr. RIVERS. I want to get the gentleman's definite opinion as to whether or not the O. P. A. can bypass the intention of Congress, namely, to force the O. P. A. to tell the farmers what is on their mind before they plant seed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed, they cannot bypass this intent.

Mr. RIVERS. There has been a question raised on that point.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not see how the language can be made any clearer. We had to change the gentleman's language, as he knows, for tree crops which were planted long before price ceilings were ever thought of but, so far as the idea that the gentleman had in mind, this is as tight as we could make it.

Mr. RIVERS. Under the intention of the O. P. A. as the gentleman has brought it to me, they cannot bypass the Congress by that word "intention" can they?

Mr. MONRONEY. No.

Mr. RIVERS. One other question. Some crops require the planting of seeds, for instance, tobacco, tomatoes, and other crops. Then they transplant the plant.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. My intention was to make the O. P. A. start from the very day the seed is put in the ground.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is right. We have put a limit of 12 months on that, which is as far back as we could go in the planting season.

Mr. RIVERS. They cannot take the transplanting part of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.