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him before America's Town Meeting of the Air in New York on January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.

TIME TO TAKE STOCK—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPY acted and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Time to Take Stock" delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Topkea, Kan., before the annual meeting of the junior chamber of commerce, Ohio, January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. ALBERT L. COX

[Mr. MAYBANK acted and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on compulsory military training delivered by Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox at the Central High School in Washington on January 18, 1945, under the auspices of the Parent-Teachers Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIX FULL DAYS WORK EVERY WEEK—PLAN OF KWANIS CLUB OF WEST POINT, VA.

[Mr. BYRD acted and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address to regulate full-time work in essential industry by every available person, proposed by the Kwans Club of West Point, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR BRICKER, OF OHIO—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH

[Mr. TAPT acted and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "An Outstanding Governor Retires," from the Columbus Dispatch of Sunday, January 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSTMASTER, MOUNT VERNON, MO.

MR. McKELLAR. As in executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I report favorably the nomination of Ruth C. Fossett, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo., in place of Robert Staimson, resigned.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

MR. McKELLAR. As in executive session, I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of this postmaster nomination, in which the President of the Senate is interested.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ruth C. Fossett to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo.

MR. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination be confirmed.

MR. WHITE. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the confirmation of a postmaster nomination?

MR. McKELLAR. Yes, as in executive session.

MR. WHITE. Has the nomination been reported from the committee, and is it on the Executive Calendar?

MR. McKELLAR. Yes.

MR. WHITE. Mr. President, what is the nomination?

MR. McKELLAR. The nomination was just read at the desk. I ask that it be again read for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk again read the nomination.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL POLICY AND PROGRAM FOR CONTINUING FULL EMPLOYMENT

MR. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been advised that the nomination of Ruth C. Fossett, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo., January 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR BRICKER, OF OHIO

[Mr. BYRD acted and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on compulsory military training delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Topkea, Kan., before the annual meeting of the junior chamber of commerce, Ohio, January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]
working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, taxation, social security, the development of natural resources, and such other matters as may directly affect the level of non-Federal investment and expenditure.

If, any, that such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure as may be expected to result from actions taken by the President under subsection (a) of this section are deemed insufficient to provide a full employment volume of production, the President shall transmit a general program for such Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed during the ensuing fiscal year, its findings and recommendations with respect to such National Budget to Congress with respect to actions dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

The joint committee is empowered to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of any witnesses and the production of any documents, information, facilities, and personnel necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget. The cost of stenographic services to accommodate the joint committee shall be charged against the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The statement presented by Mr. Murray is as follows:

1. Does the bill aim at an economic situation where there will be 60,000,000 jobs?

The bill purposely does not offer any pre-conceived figure for the total number of jobs needed to provide full employment. The number of jobs needed for full employment depends on such changing factors as total population, the number of young people in the labor force, the size of our post-war armed forces, the extent to which old people retire from the labor market, the number of women who resume their full-time housekeeping duties, the number of hours worked, technological progress, and other general measures which do not dictate the over-all volume of spending and the distribution of manpower.

2. Does the bill provide for a planned economy?

The bill aims at creating a dynamic approach to the problem of planning for expanded production and consumption, thus creating sufficient job opportunities. The approach attempted is similar to the one taken in the Homestead Act which helped expand our system of free enterprise during the last century.

4. What effect would enactment of the bill have upon the war effort?

By assuring the country that unemployment would not be the aftermath of victory,
The enactment of the bill would mean still greater effort by industry, labor, and agriculture. In particular, it would help avoid the loss of entire industries and, if properly applied, would be a powerful stimulus to the national economy. The bill also aims at eliminating the wild economic fluctuations that have hitherto been so disastrous for the small businessman and the small farmer.

3. Does the bill call for increased expenditures by the Federal Government? The bill is neither a comprehensive measure, nor a revenue measure. It provides a framework within which the administrative and legislative branches of Government working with private enterprise may effectively promote such governmental policies and actions as will bring about maximum activity of all agencies and enterprises. This is the only effective way of keeping Federal expenditures to a minimum.

4. Does the bill provide for "deficit financing?" The bill provides a positive way for bringing about the greatest possible activity on the part of business. This, in turn, would make it possible to reduce Government expenditures for war purposes. As we move toward normal conditions, this proportion will naturally shrink. Consequently, we are entering a period in which Federal expenditures will be declining as expenditures by business and consumers rise, so that the total is maintained at the level necessary to provide full employment.

5. What about the national debt? The enactment of the bill into law, and its sound administration, would have the result of reducing Government expenditures to a minimum. Therefore, except in the most dire emergencies, the Government would not have to step into the breach with a spending program. Furthermore, Government spending does not necessarily mean "deficit financing." It is possible, for example, to finance an adequate program to provide the deficit of 20,000,000 jobs, $100,000,000,000.
House dealing with fiscal matters. This resolution is to be reported to both Houses by March 1, of each year, so that there would be sufficient time to debate the resolution and enact fiscal measures by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

31. What changes does the bill call for in the activities of the various individual congressional committees? There would be no change in the activities of any of the congressional committees, except that the Joint Resolution on the Budget would provide a general policy framework of how it would operate.

32. Does the bill provide for lump-sum appropriations to the President? No; the bill provides for no appropriations at all.

33. How does the philosophy of the bill differ from the "Compensatory economy" philosophy developed during the 1930's? First of all, it places major emphasis upon non-Federal expenditures and that Federal expenditures are only to be used as a last resort. Second, it provides for preventing unemployment by "taking up slack" after men are walking the streets looking for work.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to make an explanation of the bill. I understand the rule is still in the morning hour, but it seems that speeches are to be made at this time. I want the right to make a statement now in support of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough to enable me to make an observation?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for years I have sought to secure the enforcement of the rule which provides that during the morning hour no Senator shall speak longer than 5 minutes. That rule has not always been violated, and I hope the President of the Senate, without his attention having to be called to it, will enforce that rule. The rule was made for a good purpose, in order that Senators may not transact business in the morning hour without waiting to listen to long speeches. If any Senator desires to make a speech, he should obtain unanimous consent, but he should not transgress the rule.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I express my complete concurrence in what the majority leader has just stated. I think the rule should be respected. I believe that it is the rule is respected for "taking up sack" after men are walking the streets looking for work.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I express my complete concurrence in what the majority leader has just stated. I think the rule should be respected. I believe that it is the rule is respected for "taking up sack" after men are walking the streets looking for work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate has already obtained unanimous consent to make his explanation. I made the statement which I did simply for the benefit of the Senator, and for future conduct of business.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the history of the world, the struggle for existence has manifested itself in economic systems that have been constantly changing. At one time western civilization was based upon the feudal manor. Then came the city and the development of handicraft industry. This came the industrial revolution, and with it the system of free enterprise and the political system which we call democracy.

In America private enterprise and political democracy have developed and flourished side by side. They have contributed more to human welfare and human happiness than any previous system. The American people, therefore, want to preserve this system. They want it further strengthened and perfected so as to usher in a still greater future for our country. They know that no economic system exists for all time and today. Times and conditions change, and our lives must change with them.

Our free-enterprise system has been subject to many improvements. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, we have enacted minimum-wage laws, we have reduced working hours, we have created unemployment compensation benefits, we have provided other welfare benefits, we have guaranteed the right of collective bargaining for labor, we have corrected abuses in the securities market and provided protection for investors. We have enabled millions of farmers to cooperate among themselves and with their Government in matters of land use, soil conservation, production, and prices. When these laws were first proposed they were not popular, and it was charged that they would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

While we have been improving and strengthening our economic system of free enterprise, we have as yet been unable to control the violent economic fluctuations which have resulted in periodic mass unemployment.

During the nineteenth century we had the western Wagons westward, we were charged that it would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

While we have been improving and strengthening our economic system of free enterprise, we have as yet been unable to control the violent economic fluctuations which have resulted in periodic mass unemployment.

During the nineteenth century we had the western Wagons westward, we were charged that it would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has to their credit some important statutes that have been enacted to deal with the problem of unemployment. The American people, therefore, want to preserve this system. They want it further strengthened and perfected so as to usher in a still greater future for our country. They know that no economic system exists for all time and today. Times and conditions change, and our lives must change with them.

Our free-enterprise system has been subject to many improvements. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, we have enacted minimum-wage laws, we have reduced working hours, we have created unemployment compensation benefits, we have provided other welfare benefits, we have guaranteed the right of collective bargaining for labor, we have corrected abuses in the securities market and provided protection for investors. We have enabled millions of farmers to cooperate among themselves and with their Government in matters of land use, soil conservation, production, and prices. When these laws were first proposed they were not popular, and it was charged that they would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

While we have been improving and strengthening our economic system of free enterprise, we have as yet been unable to control the violent economic fluctuations which have resulted in periodic mass unemployment.

During the nineteenth century we had the western Wagons westward, we were charged that it would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

While we have been improving and strengthening our economic system of free enterprise, we have as yet been unable to control the violent economic fluctuations which have resulted in periodic mass unemployment.

During the nineteenth century we had the western Wagons westward, we were charged that it would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to make an explanation of the bill. I understand the rule is still in the morning hour, but it seems that speeches are to be made at this time. I want the right to make a statement now in support of the proposed legislation.
Committee in March 1941 he made the following prophetic statement:

"The termination of the war effort, putting to an end, as it may very suddenly, the industrial activity that was now the objective of our economic policy, will bring with it problems more critical and more fraught with danger than those which followed the collapse of 1931. Unless the democratic society of America shall have prepared in advance for this hour there will be no alternative except Government action, which will necessarily be as inconclusive as the action which has here-to-date been the experimental capitalization of post-war depression will be heaped upon the unsolved problems of pre-war depression and it is doubtful how, in these circumstances, democracy can survive unless democracy prepares for peace now."

The distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming concluded his statement by stressing the need of finding "a formula for stimulating economic activity under the impetus of peace rather than war."

My colleagues and I believe that the full-employment bill provides a method of achieving desired, non-war levels of peacetime production within the framework of our democratic political institutions and of our economy of free enterprise.

In the past we have made many attempts to grapple with the problem of unemployment. But we have lacked the essential weapons to deal with this problem effectively. We have never had a consistent and openly arrived at national policy on employment. We have never had a businesslike method of appraising the operations of our economy and our Government. We have never had a real understanding of the economic responsibilities of the President, as Chief of the executive branch, and of the Congress of the United States.

The proposed full-employment bill supplies us the three elements we have had a real understanding of the economic responsibilities of the President, as Chief of the executive branch, and of the Congress of the United States.

These three elements, when added together, provide the opportunity for full and wholehearted cooperation between industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments and the Federal Government—the cooperation which is essential to our hopes and plans for a stronger and better America.

I shall discuss each of these points briefly.

**National Policy on Full Employment**

The bill declares that it is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time home and family responsibilities. The bill recognizes that these Americans are entitled to opportunities for "peaceful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment."

The right to a job does not mean guaranteeing John Jones a given job carrying a set salary and a definite social standing. It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. However, I believe nobody will deny that our economic system of free enterprise must offer opportunities for jobs for all who want to work. Our American system owes no man a living but it does owe every man an opportunity to make a living. That is the purpose of the legislation of the "right to work."

Full employment is not a static condition. It depends upon changing national trends, population growth, changes in school age or retirement age, the number of persons serving in the armed forces, the number of hours worked, and similar factors which change the size of the labor force.

Furthermore, full employment does not mean that there should be at any time no unemployment at all. Our national economy is not designed to provide full employment; it is designed to provide full employment for those who are willing and able to work.

In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditures. To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such jobs for "peaceful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment."

This policy is in accord with the philosophy recently expressed by an outstanding political leader.

"Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise."

"If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment all over the country, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours."

This statement was made in San Francisco on September 21, 1944, by the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

In the same speech, Governor Dewey emphasized the responsibility of government, in the following words:

"Yet, if there is one thing we are all agreed upon, it is that in the peacetime years in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore it is the business of government."
A FRAMEWORK OF RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility of the President under the bill is to report to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, on the extent to which the economy is providing jobs for all. This report might be regarded as an essential part of the state of the Union message. If he finds that there is unemployment or that there is the danger of unemployment, he will transmit the report for ensuring full employment through stimulating private enterprise and through necessary Government programs, together with recommendations for such additional legislation as he deems desirable.

Congressional responsibilities are also defined.

At the present moment, unfortunately, there is no such response within either House of the Congress which has the responsibility of considering in a comprehensive manner either:

First. The general contents—with respect to our preparations, and borrowings—of the regular Federal Budget; or

Second. The relationship between the regular Federal Budget and the national economy.

For example, both Houses of Congress have just received the President's proposed Budget for the coming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee will study and report upon appropriations for individual agencies. The Finance Committee will study the revenue aspects of the Budget message. But no committee will study the Budget message as a whole, or its relation to our national economy.

The full-employment bill sets up a joint committee to make a detailed study of the national production and employment budget transmitted to Congress by the President. This committee, called the Joint Committee on the Budget, is to be composed of 15 Members of each House in such a manner as to reflect the relative political strength of the major political parties.

By March 1, at the very latest, this committee would be expected to report to both Houses of Congress a joint resolution setting forth a general policy with respect to the National Budget for the next fiscal year. Consideration of the joint resolution would mean an annual debate, in both Houses, on the Budget. This would serve as a general policy framework within which the individual committees of Congress could work on individual appropriation acts, revenue acts, and related measures.

These provisions go a long way toward restoring Congress to its rightful place as the Congress which has the responsibility of determining the course of the Government. And this is done in a way which provides for active interplay between the Congress and the Executive, a way which makes the two branches of the Government really coordinate. The bill avoids both the danger of dependence on the Executive, and the danger of involving Congress in administrative determinations.

I should like to point out that the bill aims at eliminating business uncertainty over the "fiscal policy" of the Government. Business cannot plan effectively for full employment without knowing the Government's plans. This requires advance knowledge and open discussion of the Government's plans, and reasonable consistency and stability in the administration of the Government's program.

For example, revenue measures are often enacted only a few weeks before they are to become effective. This, I submit, gives the business community insufficient time to consider the Government's tax policy in relation to his own plans for future investment. Under this bill, it would be easier for Congress to develop its fiscal policies in a unified manner, and to enact both revenue and appropriation measures before the beginning of each fiscal year.

TYPES OF NATIONAL BUDGET

The full employment bill recognizes that we live in a world of changing conditions and changing requirements in national economic policy. For that reason, it provides for a fixed proportion of the National Budget to be supplied by consumers, business, or Government. In certain circumstances, Congress may find it desirable to modify this proportion.

First. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in consumers' expenditures; or

Second. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in business; or

Third. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in capital outlays of business.

Naturally there could be all degrees of difference between these three general types, as well as combinations of any type.

In other words, the Government's program could aim at balancing the national economy through measures to increase consumers' expenditures, through measures to increase capital outlays of business, through increased Government expenditures, or through a combination of those methods.

There are some who think that the major emphasis in our post-war economy must be upon Government expenditures. There are others who say that this means deficit financing, and that deficit financing is a menace to the stability of our economy or to national bankruptcy. They, in turn, propose that the Government do everything in its power to give a green light to business and heighten the confidence of private investors so that the major emphasis in the post-war period would be upon increased capital outlays of private enterprise.

It is my own personal opinion—and I have stated this before on the floor of the Senate—that the royal road to prosperity is high wages, low prices, and a tax system that is based upon the ability to pay and the encouragement to produce. It is my belief that in this way, with only moderate Government expenditures for desirable Government services, we could achieve a more equitable distribution of the national income. It is my conviction that this improved distribution of the national income would give us an unprecedented expansion in consumers' expenditures and a vigorous, though not excessive, expansion in the capital outlays of business.

But my personal opinion on how the national economy might be best balanced is not relevant to the question of how it would be balanced under this bill. The specific National Budget that would result in any given period would be determined, not by the operations of any one individual or any one group, but on the basis of the agreement and interplay, perhaps conflict, of all our political leaders which is the very essence of the democratic process in our democratic America.

NEED FOR ACTION

A few weeks ago, Dr. Gallup's inter-

view program asked the country asking people whether they thought that there would be enough jobs after the war. Sixty-eight percent thought that there would not be enough jobs. The younger people of the country were even more pessimistic than their elders; 73 percent of those between 20 and 30 years of age thought that the outlook was black.

What Senator would stand up and say that the people of this country are mistaken in their beliefs? Who is there who, on the basis of what has thus far been done in the field of post-war planning, would be willing to believe that there will be jobs for all after this war?

We all know that during the war we have transformed our economy into an economic skyscraper of breath-taking magnitude.

We all know that when war-production contracts are withdrawn, the danger will be that the entire edifice will topple over.

We all know that while the end of the war may bring with it 6 to 18 months of an inflationary boom, the long-term threat is a deflationary collapse.

Unless an economic substitute is found for war contracts, we face mass unemployment in this country of a magnitude which could easily surpass anything that was dreamed of during the last depression. Thus far, we have not found that substitute.

This country cannot afford again to go into a depression such as we experienced in the 1930's. It would be extremely dangerous to do so. Mass unemployment would mean an irreparable loss to our Nation in terms of both physical wealth and moral well-being.

Still more appalling, an unemployment crisis in America would spread like wildfire throughout the world. It would give us dumping, higher tariffs, export subsidies, blocked currencies, and every other new and old type of economic warfare.

And this, Senator, would inevitably wreck our plans for an effective international security organization, turn back the clock of progress, and plunge us into another depression of blood and grass.

We here in Congress have it in our power to take effective action now to reassure the people of America that mass unemployment shall not happen again.

We have it in our power to make full employment the cardinal principle in our domestic economic policy.

We have it in our power to make full employment in America the keynote of our economic relations with the other countries of the world.

Both political parties for full employment

In principle, both of our major political parties are agreed that this must be provided.
In Chicago, on October 28, 1944, President Roosevelt stated that "every American, able to work and willing to work, has the right to a useful and remunerative job." To make this right effective he promised America 60,000,000 post-war jobs.

In Seattle, on September 18, 1944, Governor Dewey, the Republican nominee for President, made the following statement:

"We must have full employment, * * * Those who come home from the war and those who have produced for war—all our people—have earned a future with jobs for all.

The full-employment bill, I submit, provides the instrument whereby the political parties can make good on their common aspirations for post-war full employment.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE DEBATE

Of course, some Members of Congress may disagree with the sponsors of this bill. That is how it should be in a democracy. Deliberation can be developed only by clarifying the differences between conflicting schools of thought. The sponsors of this bill, therefore, welcome criticism. We welcome debate on alternative methods of assuring post-war full employment.

But let it be constructive debate. Let it not be like the writings of some editorialists and columnists who, in their pontifical infallibility, have thrown up their hands in horror at the full-employment bill—and have offered no constructive proposals of their own.

The United States Senate has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. On this issue of full employment, at a time when democratic institutions are under attack in one country after another, the opportunity exists for the Members of the Senate during the Seventy-ninth Congress to demonstrate that we really are the greatest deliberative body of the world. And that is the capacity to bring forth constructive legislation fully commensurate with the needs of our country.

I have talked to some Members of this body. I know that they will take advantage of this opportunity. I know that if any Senators arise to take issue with the principles set forth in the full-employment bill, they will realize that, as Members of this great deliberative body, and as influential leaders of public opinion, they are under obligation to offer alternative proposals of their own. If such proposals indicate the need for changes which are practical and realistic, they will undoubtedly win the support of this body.

Every two decades, for the past 100 years, we have been plagued by a boom and a major depression; and every decade has brought forth new explanations as to the causes of the business cycle and new remedies. But there is one fact upon which all are agreed, namely, that fear of a depression tends to lead us inevitably into a depression. When business activity and labor fear unemployment, they make plans to adjust themselves to unemployment. When their daily actions are based upon such plans, then we are doomed to have unemployment.

Whatever program we adopt, therefore, let us act without delay.

Let us have courage and be decisive in our efforts. Let us not be swayed by fear of our inability to determine our own destiny.

Let us not wait until millions of men are walking the streets looking for work before we do something about post-war employment.

Let us act now, through the regular legislative processes as set forth in our Constitution, to provide our businesspeople, our farmers, and workers, and, above all, our 11,000,000 soldiers and sailors, with confidence in the future of American enterprise and American democracy.

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

The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the bill which the Senator introduces substantially the same as that which was printed in the New York Times last Saturday?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it has been greatly improved as the result of constant study and contact with the experts of the Treasury Department and experts of the Federal Reserve Board and of various other Federal agencies.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend that the bill shall be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I shall ask that it go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I might say that if the bill is as I have understood it to be described its philosophy is so completely at variance with my whole idea of the American system that I made a brief address analyzing the bill on Thursday night, which was inserted by me in the Record today, and I hope that those who read the speech made by the Senator from Montana today will do me the favor of reading the speech which I made on the bill. I think we have here a fundamental difference. I agree fully with the Senator from Montana on the importance of the subject, but I believe very strongly that the remedy which he has suggested is absolutely dangerous and incorrect.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Montana if he has suggested that the bill which he has just introduced be referred also to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning.

Mr. MURRAY. It is my intention, and I am now in the process of preparing a copy of the bill, with an explanation of it, and I will ask the Chairman to have it sent to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning.

The President pro tempore. The Chair will state that that committee has no power to report the bill. It could be referred to that committee for the information of the committee, of course, but not for the purpose of having a report submitted.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that I am very happy the Senator has done that. As I understood him, he asked that the bill be referred to the legislative Committee on Banking and Currency. In view of the fact, however, that this measure deals with a fundamental policy of greatest importance, and in view of the further fact that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. Goode) is the head has been set up by the Senate to study post-war economic policy and planning, it is of the utmost importance, I think, that that committee should participate in the study. The cooperative action of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee with the legislative committee on matters of such far-reaching importance could not fail to be beneficial to all concerned. The Senator from Montana has, on numerous occasions, consulted me—and I feel grateful to him for so doing—with respect to the underlying plan of this bill. I feel that the study which can be brought to it by these two committees cannot fail to be helpful.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER IN GOVERNMENT PLANTS—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFEENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from time to time the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and later the war program has made reports to the Senate, and particularly on occasions when it was apparent that some major problem was holding up the war effort. It will be recalled that the committee reported to this body on the necessity for completing the war program. We reported on the matter of the recruitment and training of personnel for the war effort. We reported to the Senate what I believe to be an alarming condition. A subcommittee of the war investigating committee last week visited the Norfolk Yard. I might say we visited several other navy yards as well, and reports on them will be forthcoming shortly. What we learned in Norfolk is, I believe, disturbing and most significant.

The armed forces have long painted a gloomy picture of their civilian labor needs. Program after program on the "must" list is described as short of labor,
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