

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4837. A bill to safeguard the confidential nature of Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia case records in all types of relief cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 4838. A bill to extend the Civil Service Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4839. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 4840. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant and convey to the State of Washington and to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. and Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of the property of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. as their respective interests may appear, fee title to certain lands of the United States in Pierce County, Wash., for highway and railroad purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 4841. A bill to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 218. Resolution creating a Special Committee to Investigate Discrimination in Government Positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4842. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4843. A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Clements; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4844. A bill for the relief of Henry J. McCann; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1:30. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Legislature of California, memorializing Congress to pass H. R. 3570, allocating funds for the building and operation of emergency schools necessitated by reason of national defense; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1:31. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution submitted by J. A. Hunter, Jr., clerk of the House of Representatives of South Carolina, to memorialize the Congress of the United States to remove the Federal tax on gasoline and to leave this source of revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1:32. By Mr. KEOUGH: Petition of the Long Island Association of New York, favoring the quota limitations placed by the Congress in 1937 on the further expansion of subsidized beet-sugar production and tropical refining be maintained; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1:33. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Wenatchee (Wash.) Chapter of the Washington State Music Teachers' Association, opposing the proposed tax on musical instruments in any luxury-tax bill which may be presented, pointing out that music is an important factor in the educational program of our country, that it is distinctly not a luxury, and that music is of great benefit to our people during times of stress, and the people

should not be deprived of its enjoyment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1:34. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry residents of the Fifth Massachusetts Congressional District, opposing the enactment of House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1:35. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the Down Town Association of San Francisco, asking consideration of its resolution to bombproof the Union Square garage for use in time of emergency as an air-raid shelter, and appealing for an appropriation from the United States Government in sufficient amount to finance the additional construction necessary in this connection; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1:36. By Mr. SHAFFER of Michigan: Petition of Rev. F. Brock Wells and approximately 300 other citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852, regulating the practice of barbering in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1:37. Also, petition of 80 citizens of Michigan, protesting against the reduction of draft-age limit under Selective Service Act from 21 to 18 years; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1:38. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Federation of Churchmen's Brotherhoods of St. Louis and Vicinity, St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1:39. Also, petition of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1:40. Also, petition of the Rainbow Division Veterans, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the governmental program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1941

Rev. Robert Lee Bull, rector of Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church, Elizabeth, N. J., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father who art always more ready to hear than we to pray, who knowest our necessities before we ask and our ignorance in asking, grant to us all those things which are needful for our welfare.

In this time of anxiety and confusion may we have the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do; that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices, that in Thy light we may see light, and in Thy straight path may not stumble.

Succor in mercy the suffering and starving victims of the war. Shield from vice and temptation the young men in the service of their country. Unite our people to resist tyranny and to stand steadfast in defense of our liberties. May no sacrifice seem too hard for us to bear, and may the sacrifices asked of us be not in vain.

Help us to create a more brotherly society in America. Pour out Thy Spirit upon all flesh and hasten the coming of Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace.

We pray for our President and all who share the burdens and responsibilities of government. Bless our country. Save our world. Grant peace again in our time, and keep alive in our heart the

hope of a better world tomorrow through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of the legislative program for the day and other special orders that have been entered I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program of the day and the other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the close of the legislative business of the day and the other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONVOYS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today placed on the Clerk's desk a discharge petition in order to bring on the floor of this House for consideration the bill introduced by me known as House Joint Resolution 152. This is an anticonvoyer bill, and I hope that the Members will avail themselves of the opportunity of signing this petition.

My bill would prohibit the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft from transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries. No one has challenged the accuracy of the statement

of the President of the United States when he said, "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." If that be true, then the decision to convoy or not to convoy is the decision that determines our entrance into the war. Under the Constitution that decision should be made by the Congress of the United States.

I appeal to everyone in this House who believes in constitutional representative government to sign this discharge petition so that the question of peace or war can be decided in a constitutional manner by the representatives of the people. I trust that the Members who oppose as well as favor convoys will sign this petition so that the matter can be considered, debated, and determined by this Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, at an I am An American Day meeting in Central Park, New York, on Sunday, May 18, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks twice in the RECORD and to include excerpts from magazines in these two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFER of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in *Il Progreso Italo Americano*, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two original poems written by a citizen of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

LET US KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers now quote Secretary Knox as suggesting that we do away with the Neutrality Act. His desire and ambition evidently is to get this country in the European war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President of the United States and those in authority will do all they can to keep us out of war. I hope they will see that our boys are not sent abroad. We tried the noble experiment in 1918 of making the world safe for democracy, and it was a huge failure. Let us not try this again.

We should not permit men in authority to get this country involved in the war. It should be the duty of every Member of Congress to use every ounce of influence he has with the administration to try to settle the world's differences by peaceful methods. It is our duty to keep America out of war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Oregon Legislature and also a short statement from the National Grange on the gasoline tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include copy of a petition sent to the President of the United States signed by some ladies and gentlemen of Clark County, Mont., respecting the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

THE ROOSEVELT DAM AND OTHERS IN CENTRAL ARIZONA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in 1902 a famous law was passed, the Newlands Reclamation Act, and under it a great project was begun in my State, the building of the Roosevelt Dam, work starting in 1906 and being finished in 1911. Since the completion of the Roosevelt Dam four other great storage dams have been built on that river system.

We have had a dry cycle recently while later dams were being constructed, and not until this year have all five of these reservoirs been full. Now they are filled to overflow, guaranteeing water for that greatest of all our reclamation projects and assuring abundant crop production on those rich acres for an indefinite but long future.

In the auditorium of the new Interior Department building, this afternoon at 3:30, and tomorrow at 3:45 in the Agriculture Department Auditorium, a gentleman from Arizona will show some colored films showing these reservoirs full, the dams overflowing, and the beauty of that desert country now transformed into a fertile and productive garden. I hope that every Member of the House may see this film.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief excerpt from a statement by Mr. Brenckman, national representative of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a sampling of telegrams and letters I received following a radio speech I made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, after speaking here yesterday, I found out that in Philadelphia Colonel Lindbergh had been denied the use of the radio besides the Music Hall. I wonder if these "big shots" in Philadelphia, doing this, are not the descendants of the 400 who wined and dined the officers of the British Army while Washington's Army was wintering at Valley Forge.

While we are talking about intolerance in Pennsylvania, I apologize to my colleagues for the little column that I put in the RECORD every week end. I am doing it just because Ramsey Black, Third Assistant Postmaster General, from

Pennsylvania, said that I could not frank them out. [Applause.]
[Here the gavel fell.]

HERNANDO DE SOTO

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain quotations which I should like to use with reference to the expeditions of Hernando De Soto.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ATTENDANCE AT SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the observation just made by the gentleman from Mississippi relative to the fact that he has not missed a roll call in a long time brings up a rather interesting matter of House decorum.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If the gentleman will yield, the 10 years in which I never missed a roll call were from 1922 to 1932. It is the first time, they tell me, that any Member ever answered every single roll call for 10 consecutive years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have never been particularly squeamish about missing roll calls. I often feel that I can do my people much more good, sometimes, at the other end of the Avenue than I can here answering a quorum call. There are also occasions when one must go home and necessarily miss the roll calls. If there are any new Members in this body within the sound of my voice right now, I say to you out of the experience of 9 years that my people have never taken me to task when I missed a roll call, because I believe they have sufficient trust and confidence in my diligence and devotion to the job to know that if I am not here responding I am still pursuing the people's business. So do not think too much of it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK], I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the press reports that Phil La Follette has been denied the opportunity to speak down in Florida, and that Col. Charles Lindbergh has been denied the opportunity to use the radio in Philadelphia. One would think that both of these gentlemen are foreign Communists in our midst, but they both happen to be distinguished, loyal, and patriotic Americans—one a former Governor of one of our great Commonwealths and son of an illustrious man who served with honor in the United States Senate; the other a calm, courageous, heroic, and patriotic American whose father ably served in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the poorest method I know whereby to promote unity among our people is to deny any man in this country his fundamental right to exercise free speech. Before we start to impose the "four freedoms" upon all the peoples of this earth, God help us to begin to practice some of these freedoms here at home. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

AN ANSWER TO ANNE LINDBERGH

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Judge Brand entitled "An Answer to Anne Lindbergh."

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Northwestern Retail Coal Dealers Association on the coal situation in the Northwest.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan and Mr. SHORT asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on the bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, 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 Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, and 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 21, and 22; and 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: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$794,810"; 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 matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "six hundred and thirty-five inspectors"; 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 "\$2,444,700"; 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 "\$665,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$7,278,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$8,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$57,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$21,486,465, of which amount the sum of \$22,848 shall be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$5,065,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$9,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$637,500"; and the Senate agree to the same

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
ROBERT F. RICH,

Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
PAT McCARRAN,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,

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. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, 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:

Treasury Department

No. 1: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, authority in the appropriation for contingent expenses for "newspaper clippings".

Nos. 2 and 3: Strikes out the appropriation of \$3,000,000, inserted by the Senate, for a Coast Guard training station at Avery Point, Conn.

Post Office Department

No. 4: Appropriates \$794,810 for personal services in the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, instead of \$798,560 as proposed by the Senate and \$791,060 as proposed by the House.

Nos. 5, 6, and 7, relating to postal inspectors: Appropriates \$2,444,700 for 635 inspectors, instead of \$2,405,700 for 620 inspectors as proposed by the House and \$2,496,700 for 655 inspectors as proposed by the Senate; and makes provision for travelling expenses for the additional 15 inspectors.

No. 8: Appropriates \$7,278,000 for compensation to assistant postmasters, instead of \$7,230,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 9: Appropriates \$8,250,000 for clerks at third class post-offices, instead of \$8,400,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$8,050,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 10: Appropriates \$1,475,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House, for carfare and bicycle allowance.

No. 11: Appropriates \$11,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,250,000 as proposed by the House, for the star route service.

No. 12: Appropriates \$112,300,000 for railroad transportation of mail as proposed by the Senate instead of \$112,000,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 13: Appropriates \$57,460,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$57,400,000 as proposed by the House, for salaries, Railway Mail Service.

No. 14: Appropriates \$57,500 for traveling expenses of the Railway Mail Service, instead of \$60,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$55,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 15: Appropriates \$450,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$440,000 as proposed by the House, for miscellaneous expenses, Railway Mail Service.

No. 16: Appropriates \$21,486,465 for domestic air mail and makes \$22,848 of that immediately available, instead of \$21,509,313, as proposed by the Senate and \$21,280,327 as proposed by the House. The additional amount of \$206,138 agreed upon provides \$183,290 for the fiscal year 1942 and \$22,848 for the month of June in the fiscal year 1941 for service on air-mail routes for which certificates of convenience and necessity have been issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, as follows: Route 52 from Great Falls, Mont., via Cut Bank-Shelby, Mont., to Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada; route 53 from Houston, Tex., via Shreveport, La., and Pine Bluff, Ark., to Memphis, Tenn.; and the extension of route 47 to Louisville, Ky., service previously authorized on this route from St. Louis, Mo., via Evansville, Ind., to Nashville, Tenn.

No. 17: Appropriates \$5,065,000 for manufacture of stamps and stamped paper, instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,165,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction of the sum of \$100,000 restores the purpose of the House bill to eliminate the printing of air-mail stamps in more than one color.

No. 18: Appropriates \$9,950,000 for rent, light, fuel, and water for first-, second-, and third-class post offices, instead of \$9,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,975,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 19: Appropriates \$350,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$330,000 as proposed by the House for transportation of postal equipment and supplies.

No. 20: Appropriates \$637,500 for furniture for public buildings, instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House and \$675,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 21 and 22. Inserts a new section, proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of the funds contained in the bill to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. This is an identical section with those which the House has adopted in connection with other appropriation bills.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
ROBERT F. RICH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulated statement which shows a financial picture of this measure from the date of its beginning until the date of its consummation.

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

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, 1942

Amount of bill as passed by the Senate:

Treasury Department	\$307,330,185
Post Office Department	843,826,447

Total	1,151,156,632
-------	---------------

Amount of bill as passed by the House:

Treasury Department	304,330,185
Post Office Department	842,064,311

Total	1,146,394,496
-------	---------------

Amount added by the Senate:

Treasury Department	3,000,000
Post Office Department	1,762,136

Total	4,762,136
-------	-----------

Senate recessions:

Treasury Department	3,000,000
Post Office Department	532,248

Total	3,532,248
-------	-----------

House recessions:

Treasury Department	None
Post Office Department	1,229,888

Total	1,229,888
-------	-----------

Total recessions	4,762,136
------------------	-----------

Bill as agreed upon for 1942:

Treasury Department	304,330,185
Post Office Department	843,294,199

Total	1,147,624,384
-------	---------------

Bill as agreed upon for 1942 is less than the Budget estimates:

Treasury Department	5,031,220
Post Office Department	2,947,374

Total	7,978,594
-------	-----------

Bill is less than comparable 1941 appropriations:

Post Office Department	+27,804,022
Treasury Department	-30,319,950

Total	-2,515,928
-------	------------

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I may state briefly for the information of the House that the Senate added to this bill the aggregate sum of \$4,762,136; the House conferees were able to secure a recession of \$3,532,248 in conference; so that in its final form the bill, as agreed upon, is \$7,978,594 less than the Budget estimates and \$2,515,928 less than the comparable appropriations for 1941.

Mr. Speaker, we bring this report to the House backed by the unanimous judgment of the conferees on both sides, and I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has brought back this report with a saving of three-fourths of the additions that were put on by the Senate. [Applause.] The result has been such that I feel I ought to compliment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] upon the efforts they made in conference. [Applause.] They were such that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFEL], and myself very gladly joined in signing the conference report.

At this time this country is facing a crisis. We are having all sorts of demands made upon the Treasury in the alleged name of national defense, all sorts of things that are not defense, all sorts of demands that just result in waste of the people's money. The country is facing a tax bill of \$3,500,000,000, which I believe is needed if we are to keep the Treasury right side up and meet defense needs. The example that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] have set in the efforts they have made on this bill can well be followed by other Members of this House in their conferences and in their work upon bills that take money out of the Treasury. Let us keep them down far enough so that we can help in the Appropriations Committee and in the House to reduce the demands upon the Treasury, and help as far as we can to land the Treasury right side up. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF POWER TO ESTABLISH PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATE MATERIALS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," in order to extend the power to establish priorities and allocate material, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," in order to extend the power to establish priorities and allocate material, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,

Managers on the part of the House.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
ED C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLER BRIDGES,

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. 4534) to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," in order to extend the power to establish priorities and allocate material, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1

The House bill provided that the President should be entitled to obtain such information from, require such reports by, and make such inspection of the premises of, any person, firm, or corporation as might be necessary or appropriate, in his discretion, to the enforcement or administration of the provisions of the bill.

Senate amendment numbered 1 provided that no such inspection should be made of any private dwelling, occupied as such, without a warrant directing the search issued in accordance with title XI of the Espionage Act of June 15, 1917.

The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3

The House bill provided that the President might exercise any power, authority, or discretion conferred on him by the bill through a Director of Priorities, whom he was authorized to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director was to receive compensation at the rate of \$12,000 per annum, and was authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as were necessary to carry out his powers under the bill. The Director was to exercise his powers with the assistance of industry committees, which he was directed to establish and utilize, and upon the basis of information furnished to him by such industry committees and upon the basis of such other information as he deemed pertinent. Such powers were to be exercised by the Director only after prior approval of such exercise by the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board.

Senate amendment numbered 3 strikes out this provision of the House bill, and Senate amendment numbered 2 authorizes the President to exercise any power, authority, or discretion conferred on him by the bill through such department, agency, or officer of the Government as he may direct and in conformity with any rules and regulations which he may prescribe.

On both Senate amendments numbered 2 and 3 the House recedes.

CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I may state to the House that the effect of the conference report is the rejection of what was known as the Cox amendment when the priorities bill was before the House. As the Members will recall,

my colleague from Georgia offered an amendment seeking to give statutory existence to the Priorities Division of the O. P. M.; also that the Director of the Priorities Division be confirmed by the Senate and that the Priorities Division be subordinated to the jurisdiction of the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board.

I appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, where this bill was sent, and did my level best to convince that committee that the position of the House was well founded. Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Stettinius, and Judge Patterson, of the War Department, as well as representatives of the Navy Department, were very much opposed to the amendment, so the Senate Military Affairs Committee rejected the amendment. When we went to conference yesterday I offered a compromise proposition, and I regret that the conferees on the part of the Senate would not adhere to the House proposition. So there was nothing we could do except recede, as we cannot afford to hold up the bill simply because of this one question involved, as it simmered down to, which question was whether or not the Director should be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Does the conferees agree to some compromise proposition?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no; I stated that the conferees rejected a compromise that I offered and that the bill is just as it was when I introduced it.

Mr. SABATH. But the amendment adopted in the House is eliminated?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Assuming, for instance, where the flow of material is restricted to the point where an existing industry simply cannot control operations, is there any provision under which there may be redress, or at least an appeal?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. From the Director?

Mr. DIRKSEN. From the action of the Director.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The manufacturer could probably appeal to the Director of the O. P. M., which is practically the same thing, of course. There is no other agency to which he could appeal, unless he makes his appeal directly to the President of the United States.

Mr. MAAS. The bill gives the power to the President of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I point out to the gentleman from Georgia that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries priorities bill, on the floor this week, provided that it would be possible to issue a warrant under such condition that it would be impossible for a man to refuel or repair his vessel, so that for all purposes they could put an individual entirely out of business? There was a penalty clause there of \$5,000 and no redress whatever.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is no penalty clause in this. The main objective of this is to make it obligatory and

mandatory on the part of the manufacturer to give priority, thereby relieving him of a legal liability for doing so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that Congress ought to be reasonably cautious here in the granting of extraordinary powers, at least to the extent of preserving the right of appeal?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes. I did my level best; and if I had my way the O. P. M. would exist by virtue of statute, but unfortunately I am but one man and cannot do anything else.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no further question, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERTIME RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], called up the bill H. R. 4739, authorizing overtime rates of compensation for certain per annum employees of the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard, whose overtime services are essential to and directly connected with the expeditious prosecution of the overtime work upon which the employees enumerated in section 5 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, and section 1 of the act of October 21, 1940, are engaged: *Provided*, That in determining the overtime compensation of the foregoing per annum employees the pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one three-hundred-and-sixtieth of the respective per annum salaries.

some substantial changes. However, in conference it was agreed to hold to the House's version. I am wondering if in any way this upsets that agreement?

Mr. MAY. As I understand, it does not make any difference in the pay, except that it is an identical provision with the House provision on the subject of leave-of-absence pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That compensation for employment in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek computed at a rate of 1½ times the regular rate is hereby authorized to be paid, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, to those per annum employees in the field service of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard, whose overtime services are essential to and directly connected with the expeditious prosecution of the overtime work upon which the employees enumerated in section 5 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, and section 1 of the act of October 21, 1940, are engaged: *Provided*, That in determining the overtime compensation of the foregoing per annum employees the pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one three-hundred-and-sixtieth of the respective per annum salaries.

SEC. 2. Employees of the field service of the War Department and the Panama Canal Zone may, during the period of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, be employed during the time they would otherwise be on vacation without deprivation of their vacation pay for the time so worked. Employees who forego their vacations in accordance with the provisions of this section may be paid, in addition to their regular pay, the equivalent of the pay they would have drawn during the period of such vacation. The provisions of this section shall be applicable only to employees whose service at the time cannot, in the judgment of the Secretary of War or the Governor of the Panama Canal, as the case may be, be spared without detriment to the national defense.

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 2 of this act and of section 7 of the act of June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671), shall be administered in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be effective during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, and shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 4739, was laid on the table.

RIGHT-OF-WAY ACROSS CAMP WALLACE MILITARY RESERVATION, P. I.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 166) to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as

are deemed advisable by him, to grant to the Asiatic Petroleum Co. (Philippine Islands), Ltd., its successors and/or assigns, an easement for rights-of-way for oil and/or gasoline pipe lines, and appurtenant ramp for rolling drums, over, across, in, and upon the Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.: *Provided*, That such easement shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same shall be in the public interest of the United States in the property affected thereby: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such easement may be annulled and forfeited by the Secretary of War if the property is needed for governmental purposes or for failure to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant hereunder, or for nonuse or for abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof: *And provided further*, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIGHT-OF-WAY ACROSS CAMP WALLACE MILITARY RESERVATION, P. I.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 167) to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I., and I would like to state that it is identical with the other bill except that it relates to a different pipe line. It is reported favorably by the committee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant to the Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., its successors and/or assigns, an easement for rights-of-way for oil and/or gasoline pipe lines over, across, in, and upon the Camp Wallace Military Reservation, Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That such easement shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same will be in the public interest of the United States in the property affected thereby: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such easement may be annulled and forfeited by the Secretary of War if the property is needed for governmental purposes or for failure to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant hereunder, or for nonuse or for abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof: *And provided further*, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLANT PROTECTION FORCE FOR NAVAL SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 202, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state

Mr. MAY. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the appropriation bills dealing with employment in the Canal Zone we have a special paragraph that deals with that employment. Is there anything in this bill that changes the provision in the appropriation bills?

Mr. MAY. No; I think not. It merely provides for payment for vacation time, when they work rather than take a vacation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason I raised the question is because we had very extended consideration of that in the conference on the appropriation for the civil functions of the War Department and the Senate bill did make

of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4671, a bill to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] I will later on yield him 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill H. R. 4671, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to establish and appoint a force for naval shore establishments, of about 330 men, which he claims are absolutely needed to safeguard those establishments.

Unlike other measures, this bill provides that whenever such force is not necessary, by concurrent resolution this force can be eliminated.

We have a great many establishments where we now have about 230,000 civilians employed on important work. In the first district, which is the Boston district, there are 32,000 civilians; in the New York district, 32,000; in the Philadelphia and New Jersey district, 30,000; in the Potomac, Washington-Maryland district, 17,000; in the Norfolk district, 30,000; in the southern district, 14,000; in the Texas district about 3,000; in the south California district, 3,000; in the north California district, 20,000; in the Pacific Northwest, 14,000. You will notice there are none employed in the Middle West, because we have none of those naval establishments. Notwithstanding that fact, this work is being done for the entire country, in which the Middle West is just as much interested and desirous that this work that is being done at great expense to the Government for the defense of our Nation should not be in any way sabotaged or delayed.

I have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, who explains the need of these men. From what he states, it will require about 330 men and about \$3,000,000.

I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who said that we should economize, and I am for economy, but this is absolutely necessary, in view of the tremendous increase in the number of civilian employees in those naval establishments, and, as has been stated to me, it is really insurance and it is protection against sabotage, and also protection for construction that should not be hampered or delayed.

I do not desire to take any more time, because I feel that, being a unanimous report from the Committee on Naval Affairs, after thorough investigation and study, the rule should be adopted. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, and after debate the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule. So it is a liberal rule, giving any Member an opportunity,

if he so desires, to offer any amendment that he may be inclined to offer.

I believe the bill as drafted should receive the unanimous support of the House just as it received the unanimous support and approval of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and reserve the balance of my half hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The gentleman from Illinois consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this rule comes here with a unanimous report from the Rules Committee. It is a fair and open rule. I am not only in favor of the rule but I am also in favor of the bill. I understand the Committee on Naval Affairs reported the bill unanimously. There is, however, some opposition to it which will be heard under the rule by a distinguished Member of this House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], who wants to express his opposition, and he will be afforded ample time under the rule to do it. I am not, however, in accord with the views he will express. The gentleman from Pennsylvania feels that there is a duplication of effort and that this investigation should be done by the F. B. I.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia and Mr. SABATH rose.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That same question was raised, as you will recall, in the Rules Committee. Here is the situation:

By direction of the President on July 1, 1940, responsibility for investigation of subversive activities in the country was divided as follows: The Federal Bureau of Investigation is primarily responsible for investigation of subversive activities among the civilian population of the country, and in this work offers whatever assistance it can to private plant owners. The Army is responsible for civilians employed by the Army and for establishments owned and operated by the Army. The Navy is primarily responsible for the loyalty of its civilian employees and for the safety of the Navy's own commercial establishments. The President has, therefore, delegated by directive instruction to the F. B. I. investigation of subversive activities in private plants, and the F. B. I. is to concentrate its activity there.

This bill does not deal with private plants; it deals merely with Government plants.

I thought I would give the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as well as the House, that observation.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. I appreciate, of course, this unusual recognition that is given to me by, first, the observation of the gentleman from New York, who attempts to present my argument to the House—and I will take that privilege upon myself in due time—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He did it in good spirit.

Mr. DITTER. And then I should like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia that I am well aware of the Executive order that was issued; but that of itself does not lend the merit to this bill which I think should be added to make it the action of the House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will fully present his position, and he will have all the time he requires, all the time he needs, or all the time he asks for in which to present his views in his usually able, honorable, and open way.

The only reason I referred to it was because he was the only one I knew who was opposed to it; and in view of the fact I was speaking first to a unanimous report, I thought I ought to say there would be some opposition. I knew what his position would be, and I wanted to explain why I did not agree with him.

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

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Georgia, as he always does, has very ably presented the facts to the House and backed up his reasons for the bill, and the gentleman from Illinois wants to add other valuable views. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. After the committee acted on the rule, and in compliance with the request of certain Members, I called up Mr. Hoover's office and was informed they were not in position to handle this matter and that they were in full accord with this measure. I also called up the Intelligence Service of the Navy. They informed me they are in no position to take on this work and that they feel this legislation is needed and necessary.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend from New York yield?

Mr. FISH. I always yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder whether my friend could ever suggest any case where any bureau under the present administration would take exception to the possible overreaching and expansion and growth of any of the many, many agencies that have been established? It is only to be supposed that each one of these agencies will be happy to have one more added on to this great pyramid that is being built up. I am not surprised by the observation made by my distinguished friend from Illinois. Certainly it was to be expected they would give that very information and none other.

Mr. FISH. I think the statements the gentlemen have made are logical—both the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not want to take sides between them. The gentleman from Illinois as usual is highly industrious, and telephoned all the different bureaus which might be concerned, and has presented their answers. But I go back a little farther in my support of this bill than other Members of the House.

Way back in 1930, when I was chairman of the committee investigating Communist activities and propaganda in the United States, we found even in those days, 11 years ago, that direct efforts were being made by Communists in America to form their nests or nuclei in the Navy.

and particularly in the naval shipyards. That has been going on for years and with increasing efforts every year. There is no question about it. The Dies committee has furnished all kinds of evidence that Communists are honeycombing our shipyards at the present time. In addition to that, of course, you have the Nazis, the Fascists, and other un-American groups, also operating, if they can, in our shipyards. I understand the opposition perfectly well. I asked some high-ranking naval officers, because I wanted to make sure. I spoke to Admiral Adolphus Andrews, one of our finest naval officers, who is head of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and he said that these agents or investigators must operate under the authority of the Navy in order to obtain the greatest efficiency to run down the spies, the "fifth columnists," the Nazis, Fascists, Communists, and the various other agitators who are spreading propaganda within the navy yards and in the Navy. He said it never would do at all to bring in outsiders who are not under the authority of the Navy. I have a very high regard for Admiral Andrews. He is a fine American citizen, he is a trained naval officer, and I believe he is only interested in getting the best results. He is absolutely convinced that this bill is the best way to make the investigations and to protect the Navy from sabotage.

We need this bill very badly. It is necessary to expose immediately these saboteurs, these "fifth columnists" and other un-American agitators and those engaged in subversive activities. Every day's delay is a handicap to the Navy, our first line of defense. I can understand that the F. B. I. have trained men and that it probably would do a good job. However, the Navy says it can do a better job in its own way under its own authority and it claims that is the best way to handle it and it would be handicapped otherwise. Therefore, as one who has known for years about the Communist activity in our shipyards and in our Navy, which has increased a hundredfold in the last 2 years, since the European war began, I am in favor of this bill. Why? Because we have employed hundreds of thousands of new workers and every Communist, Fascist, and Nazi agitator has been trying to get into the navy yards just to undermine the other workers, spread alien propaganda, and commit acts of sabotage if they have it in their power. I do not know how many there are, but I know the situation is serious and, therefore, the Congress should act and entrust this job to the Navy Department.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Is it not a fact that this bill provides for the employment of a civilian at the head of this Navy outfit who will be paid a salary of \$7,500? And, is it not a fact that the bill also provides for an additional appropriation to carry on this work of the Navy of \$3,000,000? And, is it not a fact that your subcommittee on appropriations for the Navy gave this matter consideration for days, and heard all that the

gentleman has undertaken to tell us and finally in our best judgment we struck out the appropriation? We are now opposed to it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, Republicans and Democrats alike. They are the ones who had the real hearings. The Rules Committee also had a hearing, and that committee brought in a unanimous report.

The gentleman spoke about a civilian head, but he is appointed by the Secretary of the Navy and so is everybody else under the terms of the bill. That is my answer to the gentleman's first question.

The gentleman also referred to \$3,-000,000. I am not prepared to say that \$3,000,000 is either too much or too little. If it were \$30,000,000 and the Navy needed it, I would vote for the \$30,000,000. Why? One battleship costs \$100,000,000, and we have to protect those battleships when they are under repair and when they are in the navy yards. If it costs \$3,000,000 or \$30,000,000, and the Navy can make out a case, I will vote for whatever is needed and necessary. It is up to the Committee on Naval Affairs to say whether \$3,000,000 is too much or too little.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman stated that they appeared before the Appropriations Committee and after hearing the subcommittee rejected the item. Of course, that committee should have rejected it because there was no authorization for it. This bill is the authorization. If that committee had appropriated the money, it would have been subject to a point of order. We are not asking them to appropriate money. We are merely asking for authority so that in time the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee may inquire as to whether or not they will make the money available.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. I think probably my friend from Georgia, since he lays so much stress on the matter of authority, would like to have the House know that the gentleman who is to get the \$7,500 has been appointed and his salary is being paid, not in the future but at the present time, from some source and that somebody apparently did not even consider the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, insofar as providing the place, the job, nor the salary were concerned.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is it not a matter of fact that in the appropriation bill the Subcommittee on Appropriations has in four different places in the bill given carte blanche authority to the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Ordnance, and others, without inquiring of the Naval Affairs Committee or of the Congress, to appoint agents and that some are being paid as high as \$25 a day? And so numerous have they become under the generosity of the gentleman that you

put a limitation of 8,500 as the total number of employees in the Navy Department. Now, who opened the door? It was not the Naval Affairs Committee. It was the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield for me to answer?

Mr. FISH. I want to give the gentleman plenty of time to answer. I have only 6 minutes left.

Mr. DITTER. I would like to answer the gentleman. I hardly imagine that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia would try to use this authority with reference to the \$25 a day for the appointment of this man to a job paying \$7,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the top salary. It may or may not be too much.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman admits he was appointed without authority.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; I will not admit that.

Mr. FISH. In the remaining 5 minutes I should like to discuss a matter that is somewhat connected with this bill—the question of freedom of speech—which is involved in the bill indirectly.

The attempt to suppress freedom of speech in Philadelphia, the birthplace of our independence and constitutional liberties, may have unfavorable repercussions throughout the world.

Freedom of speech is the first and most important of the four freedoms President Roosevelt wants to impose by force on foreign nations. If Colonel Lindbergh, representing the views of over 80 percent of the American people, who want to stay out of war unless attacked and because we are not prepared, is denied the right of free speech and free assembly at Philadelphia, in the name of heaven, why should we try to go to war to enforce it on distant countries? We Americans believe in freedom of speech, of the press, and radio, and if we did not we might just as well join the Nazis instead of leasing \$7,000,000,000 of war materials to the British to help defeat Hitler.

The war makers in Philadelphia have made a serious blunder, and a blunder is often worse than a crime. Such un-American action breeds bitterness, disunity, and civil strife. American citizens who want to stay out of European and Asiatic wars will not be pushed into an undeclared war by subterfuge. They insist on their right as American citizens to be heard, in Philadelphia and elsewhere, and will not tolerate such dictatorial and Nazi tactics in free America.

There is only one issue—war or peace—and that must be decided by one yardstick: What is best for America?

I hope every American citizen of Philadelphia, regardless of party affiliations, who believes in free speech, free assembly, and in our civil liberties, will stage a huge protest demonstration against the politicians and interventionists responsible for undermining the faith of liberty-loving Americans in those principles and ideals of free government proclaimed by our forefathers at Philadelphia.

Colonel Lindbergh has the same right as any other American citizen to express his views publicly in time of peace. He

was invited to appear before both the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in opposition to the lend-lease bill and war. What is good enough for Congress, New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and Minneapolis ought to be good medicine for Philadelphia.

Are we Americans to substitute for our civil liberties the doctrine of passive obedience and nonresistance and destroy every bulwark of freedom?

Have the flames of American liberty burned so low that the free men and women of Philadelphia will not pour out their resentment and indignation at this blow to their own freedom and free institutions?

I still have faith in the purpose and character of American citizens in Philadelphia and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining minutes I shall read from the ticker tape a statement made today by the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson.

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson today charged that the Neutrality Act is a violation of our most sacred and important tradition of foreign policy, freedom of the seas. He said that its repeal should be very carefully considered in connection with delivery of the goods to Great Britain.

Stimson made his statement at a press conference, 24 hours after Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox had urged repeal of the Neutrality Act, which he described as a blunder.

The two statements recall the recent campaign waged by Cabinet members, including Knox and Stimson, for increased naval aid for Britain. It might indicate a possible administration move to seek repeal of the neutrality legislation. If the act were repealed, American ships would be able to carry arms directly to Britain. The act now forbids American vessels to do that or to carry munitions to any nation at war.

Stimson said that the question of actual repeal of the act is for other officers of the Government to decide.

That is, of course, the Congress.

"I've always considered it a violation of our most sacred and important tradition of foreign policy—freedom of the seas," he said. "I always prophesied it would bring us into trouble."

That is, the neutrality law would bring us into trouble. The only thing that has kept us out of trouble, the only thing that has kept us out of war is this prohibition against sending our armed ships or merchant ships or cargo ships or munitions ships to Great Britain and into the war zones.

Mr. Stimson, the Secretary of War, and Mr. Knox, the Secretary of the Navy, are the two greatest arch interventionists in America. They are thinking day and night of means to get us into the war. They know as well as every other American that if you repeal the Neutrality Act and send our cargo ships to Great Britain and into the war zone we will be in the war in a short time. That is exactly what they want. They want to get us into war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to my distinguished colleague and friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two points clear.

First, I give no aid or comfort to any subversive groups. I want it definitely understood that the objection I presently make is not an objection to the use of those forces necessary to seek out saboteurs. I am in hearty accord with every move that is made by the Federal Government to find those who may be enemies within our midst. If there are "Trojan horses" here, I shall support every move that can be made to discover them.

My concern at the present time is deeper than just this surface question. The easy thing to do, as my distinguished friend from New York has just done, and as my brilliant and versatile friend from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, will undoubtedly do in good time, is to wave a flag and, by the waving of that flag, cover up, as I see it, one of the fundamental difficulties with which we are dealing—that is, the duplication of agencies.

You and I go back to our people and say we are in favor of every move that can save money for the taxpayer. Mark you, I would not in any way let economy stand in the way of the investigation of any forces that may be subversive or that may in any way be antagonistic to our ideals and our institutions. However, I do feel that if the same investigation, if the same endeavor can be accomplished without the duplication of agencies, you and I are charged with a degree of responsibility to see that such duplication does not take place.

What are the facts? I heard my friend from Georgia say that this is under a Presidential order that the Army, the Navy, and the civilian groups be separated as far as investigations go. The mere fact that the President of the United States issued that Executive order does not, as far as I am concerned, place the stamp of approval upon that particular act; in fact, I believe a great deal of our difficulty is the latitude that has been given in the matter of issuing of Executive orders. We have become an administrative rather than a legislative government. So I say, the simple fact that the President says this is the method that shall be used, to my mind does not warrant the expenditure of the additional sum provided here.

Everyone knows this administration has made one great record which probably will never be equalled and God grant that nobody will try to equal it. The one thing this administration knows how to do is to create agencies. It has made a record of just piling them one upon the other; of pyramiding one upon the other; of using the alphabet until there are no more available letters left in it.

They now want to appoint a new agency to cost \$3,000,000. The work that has to be done could be done by the F. B. I. just as well as this newly created agency could do it; in fact, my own impression is the F. B. I. could do it better.

The defensive position of my very distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and I have the highest regard for him—is well known in the House. It is known that over the

sins of omission or commission of this present administration he hovers just like an angel, lest someone may charge this administration with sins of either omission or commission.

My friend comes to the House and says he called F. B. I. and F. B. I. said, "No; we do not want this, we want another agency to do it." Why, that is the natural thing. How could F. B. I. be operating as an administrative agency and as part of the executive branch of the Government if they did not lend their stamp of approval to this thing? That in itself does not merit \$3,000,000 more. This work can be done by an established agency of the Government. I challenge any man here on the floor of the House to say F. B. I. is not a capable, trustworthy, proven agency of investigation. They are skilled men. They are men who have stood the acid test. At the head of that agency is a man who has rendered the best of service in the tasks that have been assigned to him. If this be so—and I hardly believe any man will challenge the statement—why not let F. B. I. take over? Give them 200 additional men or 300 additional men, or whatever may be necessary to carry out this work, and root out the enemies in the places where there are difficulties.

What I am opposed to is not the appointment of investigators. I am opposed to the army of patronage seekers that would come as a result of this measure. You are going to get so many more stenographers, and you are going to get so many more clerks, and you are going to get another agency building itself up for successive \$3,000,000 grabs, and then you say you want economy. If we want economy, if we want to make the dollars do all the work that they should be doing, those dollars ought to be applied to the doing of some serious things right now. If you want the dollars to be doing the things they should be doing, then for goodness sake let us get away from this policy of trying to find every excuse to establish a new agency of government, to set up another establishment, to create some more jobs, to give a new administrator \$7,500 and get a lot more clerks and a lot more stenographers and a lot more of other employees somebody will have to pay for. Your people and my people will have to pay the bills.

I do not stand here today as an individual in my complaint. I appear, I think, as the spokesman of the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee of the House in the objection I am presently registering.

I want to close with the assurance that I am 100 percent back of every well-directed, carefully supervised agency of the Government that seeks to root out those things which may be dangerous or destructive; but, by the same token, and with equal emphasis, I am opposed to the creation of unnecessary agencies which merely provide an excuse for additional jobs—for more pay rollers and pay rollers and pay rollers to be supported by the taxpayers of America.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I could hardly refrain from yielding to my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has stated that he is not only appearing individually in opposition to this measure, but that he is appearing on behalf of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations.

Mr. DITTER. May I correct the gentleman? I said I felt I could be spokesman. I should hardly presume to go further.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman state to the House how the Subcommittee on Appropriations is so involved in this matter, because we would like to know what is behind the scene and what is under the cover with respect to this thing? This is the first time I have heard of the Appropriations Committee thinking that anyone had trespassed on its jurisdiction with reference to this matter.

Mr. DITTER. I should hardly presume to speak for the Appropriations Committee. That, after all, in reply to the interrogation the gentleman now makes, would be the height of presumption; and may I assure the gentleman that the committee in no way is jealous of any transgression of any of its prerogatives, and that I feel the Appropriations Committee, through those words that I may be presently speaking—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 additional minute.

Mr. DITTER. My feeling is that the Appropriations Committee, after all, has the reputation of being the watchdog of the House. The authorizing committees are always infused with the fervor the gentleman from Georgia manifests at all times with regard to the needs of the Navy. Such enthusiasm at times may carry us to points where better judgment and more careful discretion, brought about as a result of the Appropriations Committee's activities, will be helpful, not only to the Government but to the taxpayers as well.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield me 1 minute?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 1 minute.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then the conclusion from the gentleman's argument is that the judgment of 5 men should be followed, instead of the judgment of 31 men on the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. DITTER. Maybe the gentleman is trying to put words into my mouth.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DITTER. My friend is putting words into my mouth. I in no way said that. I tried to compliment my friend the gentleman from Georgia. I meant in no way to be critical of him when I said the fervor and enthusiasm which had at all times been manifest when he brought these naval bills to the House was commendable. I tried to say that at times, in the overreaching of that enthusiasm, he has sought authorizations which probably the checkmating of the Appropriations Committee has made it

helpful to the committee and to the Congress. I have felt that these modifications probably would be acceptable in the better judgment of my friend the gentleman from Georgia. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yielded a few additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] because I know that he is sincere and means well. The gentleman stated that my defensive position of the administration is well known in the House, and that it is his further observation that I hover just like an angel, lest someone may charge it with sins of either omission or commission. Naturally, I appreciate the importance the gentleman places on my activities in support of the administration, but I wish to assure him I would not defend any department, bureau, agency, or any person in the administration or Government service unless I were satisfied that their cause or activity was worthy and entitled to my defense.

May I say to the gentleman that the same question arose in my mind when the application was made for the rule originally on the pending bill, whether the F. B. I. or the Bureau of Naval Intelligence should not be entrusted to do this work? After investigation, because I felt the same as he does, I came to the conclusion that the recommendation of the Naval Affairs Committee should be approved, and why? Because the F. B. I. says that they are not in a position to do this kind of investigation, and I inquired of the Assistant Director of the F. B. I., who informed me that the Bureau is not in a position to do this work, that it is outside of their sphere of activities, and consequently I came to the conclusion that the request of the Secretary of the Navy and the recommendations of the Committee on Naval Affairs should be complied with. Here is what the Secretary has to say:

There is almost a total lack of trained, experienced investigators now employed by the United States Navy, and there is immediately needed a force of at least 330 experienced men to investigate properly the loyalty and patriotism of the 229,000 civilian employees.

I agree with him that it is necessary; and, as I said before, it is a real insurance and protection. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point that there will be so many appointees. So far, I wish to say that I do not know a single Member on this side who has received any appointment from the Secretary of the Navy, whom we all know is a Republican, and who was the Republican nominee in 1936 for the Vice Presidency; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as well as others, should know that politics have been suspended in the interest of national defense. So, when we talk of patronage, I assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he will receive the same consideration as anyone on this side; and, in fact, I think to a greater degree.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Of course I would not dare impute that any of this patronage

would be under the charge or the direction of the majority. I only spoke of patronage in a general way.

Mr. SABATH. I am pleased to hear the gentleman would not think even for a moment that anyone on the majority side would try to utilize this important work from a patronage point of view.

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

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. I was very much impressed by the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and I am wondering if the F. B. I. cannot do this work. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and I will agree that the enlisted personnel of the United States Marine Corps and of the United States Navy include some of the finest young men in America, and I am wondering whether these men, why 300 or 1,000 of the enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps and of the United States Navy, in addition to the F. B. I. investigators, could not be selected to do this work of protecting plants in this country and thereby save the taxpayers of this country \$3,000,000. I have had some applications for jobs of this sort from good Democrats in Ohio and I would like to help place them in employment. I am wondering why the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps cannot do the job and save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. DITTER. May I make this observation, since the gentleman has referred to me? I join and concur wholeheartedly in the observation the gentleman makes. I believe the enlisted personnel of the Navy and the Marine Corps might well fill the need that is presently here.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that I am just as anxious to bring about as much economy as conditions permit, and if I had not been satisfied that it is absolutely necessary for trained investigators to be put in these various establishments, I would not have voted for the rule. In that connection, about 2 years ago I had inserted in the RECORD the number of plants and establishments that had been destroyed during 1914-17, and I believe the enemies of democracy and of our country are now better organized, more dangerous, and more determined than they were in 1917. I feel that it is our duty that we should do everything within our power to protect every defense establishment in the United States. In that connection I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to reinsert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of those different plants to which I called attention 2 years ago that were sabotaged in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I list the disturbances occurring in this country preceding our entry into the World War, dating from August 29, 1914 to April 2, 1917, as follows:

1914

August 29: Pompton, N. J., Du Pont powder storehouse blown up; one killed.

December 23: Picatinny, N. J., Government arsenal mixing house set on fire.

1915

January 18: Trenton, N. J., plant of John A. Roebling Co., making chains for French Army, destroyed by fire believed caused by bomb; damage, \$1,500,000.

February 12, Haskell, N. J., explosion in Du Pont plant; three injured.

March 6: Haskell, N. J., explosion in Du Pont plant; five killed.

April 1: Alton, Ill., explosion in Equitable Powder Co. plant; five killed.

April 30: Carneys Point, N. J., Du Pont plant mixing house destroyed by explosion; six injured.

May 12: Wellington, N. J., Anderson Chemical Co. guncotton storehouse wrecked; three killed.

May 15: Carneys Point, N. J., Du Pont Co. stillhouse destroyed by two explosions.

June 26: Wayne, N. J., Du Pont mill demolished by explosion.

July 13: Jefferstown, Ky., United Safety Powder Co. mixing building wrecked by explosion, three killed; Carneys Point, N. J., two Du Pont Co. buildings wrecked by explosion; one killed, three injured.

August 3: Philadelphia, explosion in Frankford Arsenal; three killed.

August 16: Simamahoning, Pa., explosion in plant of Aetna Explosives Co.; five killed.

August 25: South Bethlehem, Pa., shell explosion in Bethlehem Steel Works; two killed.

August 30: Baltimore, Md., E. J. Dodd shrapnel plant burned.

August 30: Official letter from Constantin T. Dumba, Ambassador of Austria-Hungary to United States, seized and disclosed he planned to "disorganize and hold up for months, if not entirely prevent, manufacture of munitions in Bethlehem, Pa., and Middle West, which, in opinion of German attaché, is of great importance and amply outweighs expenditure of money involved."

September 10: Ambassador Dumba's recall demanded by President Wilson.

October 12: Pompton, N. J., explosion in Du Pont powder plant; seven injured.

October 16: Kane, Pa., explosion in Aetna powder mills; three Germans arrested.

November 10: South Bethlehem, Pa., machine shop of Bethlehem Steel Co. burned; loss, \$5,000,000.

November 12: Trenton, N. J., munitions plant of Roebling & Sons destroyed by incendiary fire; loss, \$1,500,000.

December 1: Wilmington, Del., explosion in Du Pont powder mills; 31 killed.

December 3: United States asked Germany to recall Captain Boy-ed, military attaché, and Captain von Papen for "improper activities in military and naval matters."

December 10: Hopewell, Pa., entire town destroyed and Du Pont powder plant burned with loss of \$2,000,000.

1916

February 15: Brooklyn, N. Y., two British ships burned at docks; loss, \$1,000,000.

March 31: Horst von der Goltz disclosed plot to invade Canada, blow up Welland Canal, and admitted enlisting Germans in Baltimore.

April 19: Government seized papers of Wolf von Igel, former secretary to Captain von Papen, in New York "advertising office." State Department later said they disclosed maintenance of a spy system, financing a bureau to stir up labor troubles in munitions plants, "the bomb industry and other related activities," financing of propaganda and subversion of American writers and lecturers.

July 30: Black Tom, N. J., ammunition trains blown up; four killed; loss, \$45,000,000.

1917

January 11: Franz Bopp, German consul general in San Francisco, and Baron George W. von Brincken convicted of conspiracy to injure American shipping, railroad trains,

bridges, and munitions plants, and sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment.

January 12: Kingsland, N. J., munitions plant of Canadian Car & Foundry Co. destroyed by explosion; loss, \$16,000,000; Haskell, N. J., explosion in Du Pont powder plant blows up 400,000 pounds of powder, shaking four States.

February 21: United States published note from German Foreign Secretary Zimmermann proposing alliance with Mexico, for which Mexico would be paid by annexation of Southwestern American States; New Britain, Conn., set afire by incendiary bombs in 20 places; loss, \$300,000.

March 22: Capt. Franz von Rintelen, of German Navy, and two others convicted in New York of conspiracy to interfere with shipment of munitions.

April 2: Six Germans convicted in New York of conspiracy to destroy munitions ships by bombs; attempt made to burn naval training station at Great Lakes, Ill.

On April 2, 1917, Congress met in special session. On April 4 the Senate passed the war resolution. The House passed the resolution April 6, and it was signed the same day by President Wilson. The formal declaration of war against Germany was issued immediately.

I feel that this record of sabotage during the World War will serve to bring home to the membership the imperative need of increasing our investigative forces without further delay.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Illinois is intent on rendering thorough and efficient public service. But I am wondering why the enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps and of the Navy could not be trained the same as the civilians?

Mr. SABATH. There is nothing in the bill that prevents the Secretary from taking those enlisted men or men from the civil service; but they want experienced men who will do the work. As it is, I am reluctant to admit how few men they have in those plants, which involve billions of our money, to protect the Government against sabotage. If I were not afraid it would be publicized I would tell you how few investigators we have, but I am obliged to refrain from doing so. However, I feel it is vitally necessary that this bill be passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. In conclusion, let me say that though the Secretary of the Navy is a Republican, I have the utmost confidence that he would not urge the passage of this legislation if he were not satisfied that it is absolutely necessary in the interest of protection and safety of our Navy and naval shore establishments.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to observe that the purpose of this bill is to assemble a force of trained investigators and I would like to point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] that his argument defeats itself. First, the gentleman says he wants to summon the F. B. I., because they are equipped to handle it. Then he concurs with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], that

they could take them from the enlisted personnel of the Navy. So one argument defeats the other.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has answered the gentleman from Ohio as well as his colleague from his own State and I feel there is nothing more that I could add to his explanation. I therefore move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YOUNG) there were ayes 52 and noes 1.

So the resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3582.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It is a bill to allocate any deficit in the duty-free sugar quota from the Philippine Islands to the domestic areas.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there any opposition to the bill?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. This request is simply for permission to file a report. There is some opposition to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But is there a minority who would also like to have permission to file a report?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I do not know whether there will be a minority report or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his remarks in the Appendix to the Record and include a short article.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] may be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the regular business of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on the Gallup poll.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Mr. Alfred Calvin Gaunt, president of the Small Business Institute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a short article.

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

There was no objection.

PLANT-PROTECTION FORCE FOR NAVAL SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4671) to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4671, with Mr. KERR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and to maintain and operate the same until June 30, 1943, unless Congress shall have, in the meantime, by concurrent resolution, declared such a force no longer necessary. The duties of this force shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,450,740 to effectuate the purposes of this act, including salaries, travel, clothing, weapons, motor-propelled vehicles and their maintenance, and any other necessary equipment and supplies.

SEC. 3. The civilian in charge of the force herein authorized may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy without regard to civil-service laws, at a salary of \$7,500 per annum.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] who reported the bill on behalf of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is opposing this bill. I know that he is sincere in his desire for economy and I know that he is opposed to anything that would create a field day for the subversive agitators of the United States. I know, too, that as a member of the opposition occasionally it is to be ex-

pected that he will find himself opposed to measures which I advocate. I find no fault with him for that, but I do deplore just a little that he allowed some tinge of politics to enter into the debate on a measure that is not political and that has been reported unanimously by 27 members of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The entire membership of Republicans and Democrats has approved this measure and reported it to the House.

The number of employees in the industrial establishments of the Navy Department has increased in the past 8 or 9 years perhaps over 500 percent. In the Philadelphia Navy Yard, in my home city, there has been an increase of from four to five thousand men, to approximately 25,000 civilian employees. Added to that are approximately 5,000 others employed on W. P. A. projects or by private contractors working in the yard. Throughout the whole United States we have a force of 195,000 men, added to which is another 34,000 employees of contractors working on various projects, making a total of approximately 230,000 men employed, the greater part of them coming in during this period of emergency.

The Secretary of the Navy told us that the number of men employed to check subversive activities was so small that there was real apprehension about their ability to adequately protect the Government's interests.

We have billions of dollars of Government money invested in the construction of battleships, and millions of dollars in additional public works we are constructing at naval industrial establishments, and we have had a wholesale increase in the number of employees during the last 8 or 9 years with perhaps 10 or 15 men for the whole Navy Department to check up on the activities and character of these employees. I am astonished that we have had no very serious difficulty so far.

My friend said he would have this force put under the jurisdiction of the F. B. I. I assume he believed Mr. Hoover to be a fearless, courageous man, and for that reason I feel he believes also that when Mr. Hoover tells the chairman of a committee of this House he thinks the Navy Department should have jurisdiction over this force that Mr. Hoover would not be deterred by any fear of reprisals from making a recommendation that was in accordance with his own honest judgment. I believe Mr. Hoover can be relied upon to assert his independence, for I think he has given a greater example of independence in his actions than has any other official of the United States Government during the present administration. If Mr. Hoover says he is satisfied this force belongs under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy, I believe he is qualified to speak on behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Secretary of the Navy appeared before the committee and endorsed this measure. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] introduced the bill at the request of the Secretary of the Navy. It authorizes the expenditure of \$3,000,000 to employ approximately 300 trained agents who will be taken from

fields in private life and from other Government agencies based upon their prior experience as investigators and their prior training in that field. I am sure my good friend from Pennsylvania need have no fear that the Republican who is now Secretary of the Navy will allow any politics to be played in the selection of these men; and the unanimous report from the Committee on Naval Affairs, expressing as it does the view of his own Republican colleagues, indicates they were satisfied on that score.

I am convinced the Navy Department needs this additional force to an extent perhaps greater than we realize. We know what is taking place in various industrial plants throughout the United States. We know that instances of sabotage and destruction occur almost every day in the week; and we are very foolish if we allow the billions of dollars the Government has invested in ship construction and public works in our naval establishments to be endangered because of failure to authorize the appropriation of \$3,000,000, which is a very small insurance premium to pay.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would call to the gentleman's attention the fact that this \$3,000,000 is to be spread over 2 years. It means therefore the authorizing of the expenditure of \$1,500,000 for each of the 2 years constituting the life of the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is quite true and I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution. It really amounts to an authorization for 1 year of \$1,500,000.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. SANDERS. Regarding the suggestion of using enlisted men: The gentleman is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. I should like to have the gentleman's observation as to whether or not there is any economy in training the enlisted personnel of the Navy as specialists in the art of fighting in these highly technical modern wars and then utilizing them as investigators, something for which they were not trained?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Certainly not. As a matter of fact, just this morning I had a conversation with Major General Holcomb, Commandant of the Marine Corps, not on this particular matter but with respect to the assignment of enlisted personnel to other duties. Major General Holcomb told me that the Marine Corps needed the services of every soldier who had been enlisted for military duty and that they could not spare any enlisted or officer personnel for any other duty, and I do not believe they would have the proper training for this work anyway.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As a matter of fact by the assignment of these 330 investigators it will relieve from duty in the navy yards now at least half the marines on duty there, would it not?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I think that is a safe assumption. Quite a large proportion of the marine guards in the navy yards will be relieved from that duty if we have this trained force of investigators.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am very much interested in the comments of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I may say to the gentleman, for the reason that I have been under the impression from the presentation that has been made up to now that this particular proposal was to authorize the services of trained under-cover Secret Service agents. Now if we are going to have such men relieve ordinary marine policemen what economy is there in that?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is not the intent at all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then explain what it is all about.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I explained that with trained investigators in these establishments to check up on subversive activities there would be need for fewer guards than if we did not have this investigation service.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I make a further inquiry of the gentleman?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want the gentleman to understand that I appreciate the significance involved here in the protection of property and life on these particular projects that the Navy is operating, because I had experience in it 24 years ago and I know some of the answers. I would like to ask the gentleman this question, if I may: What in your hearings was brought out, if anything, indicating the type of man who was going to act as director of this program and the man's qualifications, and if he has been chosen as yet?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I do not know whom the Secretary of the Navy might eventually choose for the position, but I have every confidence that the man he selects will be eminently qualified to perform the duties which will be incident to a position of this kind. I think we should give proper credit to the Secretary of the Navy and his conduct of the office during the time he has been Secretary. His record so far as an administrator is a guaranty to the House that he will exercise his usual diligence and place an efficient individual in control of this division.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the gentleman know at this time whether or not he has changed his mind on the original appointment which he set up to justify his appropriation before our committee?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am not in position to say what the Secretary of the Navy might eventually do except I feel with respect to his answers to questions which were put to him by

members of the committee that the entire Committee on Naval Affairs has absolute confidence in his judgment on this particular thing. I am very confident of that.

I hope there will be very little opposition to this measure. It is not a political measure; it is not partisan; it is something which we absolutely need, and the quicker we get it the safer we are going to be able to feel about the activities in our Government-owned and operated shipbuilding establishments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on the minority side.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Committee that the Secretary of the Navy requested a hearing before the Naval Affairs Committee in executive session on this bill. Some months prior thereto, under authority of an appropriation bill, he had delegated a special agent to make a complete survey of the naval plants of the country with reference to sabotage and subversive elements. Here is the confidential report that is the basis for this bill. The Secretary of the Navy brought this report to me, and he and I read it. As a result of this he asked that a bill be prepared covering this subject matter, authorizing that the Secretary be permitted to employ a civilian to head a force of whatever number he deems necessary to protect the shore establishments of the Navy.

The House will just have to take my word. If you could read this report, you would wonder why more accidents and more sabotage have not already occurred. Without calling any names or any places, and without divulging anything confidential, listen to this:

There are 100 suspects, 60 of whom are Communists and 40 of whom are Nazis. At this place there are 400 reported to be affiliated with the Nazi organization.

This confidential report, which I am going to send back to the Navy, justifies the Congress passing this bill without a dissenting vote, and it is upon this report and the confidential information that the Secretary divulged to the Naval Affairs Committee which prompted us to bring this bill before you. You have to trust our judgment about this matter, because I cannot sit quietly by, knowing this to exist, without presenting it to the House and asking that legislation be enacted to curb this activity as much as possible.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Conceding this legislation is necessary, does not the gentleman feel that some representative of the special agents' office or of the Intelligence Service of the Navy Department be put at the head of this, rather than a civilian?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. I think the Secretary of the Navy is charged by law with the preservation of all this shore

activity in the Naval Establishment. I have implicit confidence in Secretary Knox; he is doing a magnificent job, and if the House will go along with him we will all be proud of the great record that he is making. I may not agree with every utterance he makes with reference to foreign affairs and other things, but I say to you that he is running the Navy just like the Navy should be run, with only one objective in view, and that is the general welfare of the country. If the Secretary thinks that some naval officer should be at the head of this, he has authority to designate that individual, and if he thinks he should employ somebody else, he also should have the authority to do so. He should be given full authority to curb this spy system that is growing up in the Naval Establishment.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not going to be overrun with fear of any spy system growing up in the Navy Department or any shore station.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The trouble with the gentleman is that he should be alarmed about it, but he is not conver-

sant with the situation.

Mr. COCHRAN. If I were head of the Navy Department and had a report such as the gentleman says he has in his hand, I would very soon get rid of those people that they are suspicious of. Why, they should not delay a minute if they know someone working in the Navy is not loyal.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. How can we do it unless we have an intelligence force to ferret them out, which is what we are trying to do.

Mr. COCHRAN. We have an intelligence force in the Navy Department right now. I am not saying this is not necessary. I am not saying that an increase in the intelligence force is not necessary. But here you have a bill worded in such a way that you are going to pick up men and put them in charge and, under the wording of the bill, 9 out of 10 of them can be political appointments.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I differ from the gentleman on that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not now.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will yield the gentleman some time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENNER. The gentleman from Missouri has made reference to political appointments. May I suggest to the gentleman that if he has that fear, he can very readily reach the thing he fears by adding to the bill an amendment providing that it shall be unlawful for any Member of the House or the Senate or any man in public life to make any recommendation to the Secretary of the Navy in reference to these appointments.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield so that I may reply to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that there is nothing in the world to prevent him from offering such an amendment, but I will tell the gentleman what I will do. I will support an amendment to this bill to put these guards under civil service and let them be selected from the civil-service register. There is no politics in that, either. I will vote against the committee amendment; and if we vote that down, we accomplish what I desire.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the very reason we broadened this provision. He can select them from the civil service and he can select them from outside of the civil service.

Mr. COCHRAN. But where is he going to select from?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We did not want to confine him to any source from which to get these men to do this job. It is an important job that has to be done. As I have said, I have implicit confidence in the Secretary of the Navy. We have no assurance that the persons in the civil service will qualify to do the particular kind of work he wants done.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Whenever you talk about civil service, my good colleague from Georgia is on the ground. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The President of the United States issued an order months ago giving the Secretary of the Navy the right to exempt anybody he wanted to from the civil service.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Therefore this bill, drafted as it is, could have only one purpose; that is, to make this a politically appointed police force. I do not say the gentleman intended that, but that will be the effect of it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me say this: All of you are disturbed about politics. You are disturbed about patronage. You are disturbed because the Secretary of the Navy is going to make the appointments. The Secretary of the Navy, as I have said, is doing a magnificent job. You have to trust somebody. I do not care whether he is a Democrat or a Republican; I know he is a great American, and he is doing a duty we all can be proud of. I have implicit confidence that neither politics, religion, nor anything else will cut any figure with the Secretary in selecting the men. He will have one objective; that is, can the man deliver the goods?—and that is all he will have.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, we are not in any way trying the Secretary of the Navy or anybody else here, as far as I know, or even criticizing the work of the Secretary of the Navy insofar as his administration of the Navy Department is concerned. There has been a great deal of criticism, as the gentleman

from Georgia intimated a minute ago, in reference to some of Secretary Knox's speeches. I do not agree with some of his speeches. The point I am making is that we are certainly not concerned about politics when we ask the gentleman to consider the advisability of selecting this list from the civil-service register. Surely the gentleman realizes if the merit system prevails in connection with these appointments there will be no politics involved.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman know that the F. B. I. is not confined to civil service?

Mr. COCHRAN. I know the F. B. I. is not confined to civil service, and I will tell the gentleman something. If I had my way, the F. B. I. would be subject to civil service. I am a strong supporter of the F. B. I. but we have other outstanding investigating divisions in this Government that have made wonderful records, and every one of their employees has been selected from civil-service registers. This applies to the Intelligence Service of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Narcotic Service, the Customs Service, post-office inspectors, and others.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then you would not have as efficient an organization as you have today.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh yes, we would. Two laws that I was responsible for—the Kidnapping Act and the Extortion Act put the F. B. I. on the map.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Since the gentleman thinks this bill would permit more political appointments, and since the Secretary of the Navy is a Republican, what kind of appointments does the gentleman believe the Secretary would make—Republicans or Democrats?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Oregon will be pretty well taken care of, because out his way he has some big places that will have to be policed. Being a Republican himself, and a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and the Secretary of the Navy being a Republican, if there is any politics involved the gentleman will get his in, do not worry about that. I am not, understand, saying the Secretary of the Navy will play politics. I want to relieve him of pressure.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in 8 years I have seen the Republicans so keen about exempting Government appointments from civil service. Heretofore, almost unanimously, the Republicans have demanded appointments be made from civil-service registers and have offered amendment after amendment to pending legislation, which I supported. Time and again I have taken the floor in support of legislation to extend the merit system. I have repeatedly stated my constituents have a better opportunity to get a Government position when the merit system prevails than when the spoils system is in effect. I am not going to be mean enough to say you have a purpose in supporting

this amendment but I hope someone on the minority side will rise and explain the change in attitude. Surely there is a reason and we should let the people know what that reason is. It will not be long before this question will come up again on some bill and I will await with interest to see how some of my friends on the minority side vote then.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, if he will answer it. I should like to know whether or not the Navy Department recommended the elimination of civil service in this measure.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the Navy Department brought the bill up, as the bill will show, with all the appointments confined to the civil service, but after we heard the Secretary, after he disclosed briefly what is in this confidential report, the Committee on Naval Affairs felt it would be unfair, if he was to do a good job, to restrict him as to the source from which he would get his police force. We thought in view of the fact that the F. B. I. is not restricted that this force should not be restricted, either.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The point I make to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is that the President of the United States under the general authority of the civil-service law has already given to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War in an Executive order the authority to make such exemptions as are necessary to national defense and, therefore, the language written into this bill can have only one effect, to keep these persons so appointed under the bill from obtaining civil-service status at any time without another act of Congress. It is unnecessary. As a matter of fact, we do not need any legislation to establish these positions. The Navy Department has the authority. The only reason they have not established them is because the Appropriations Committee did not give them the money. Is not that correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the gentleman is clearly in error and is just as wrong as was the gentleman from Missouri. The reason the bill is here is in order to get authority to do what is asked in this measure.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Did they not ask the Appropriations Committee for the money and did they not refuse it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And they properly should have refused it, because they had no authority to do it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; they have.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is confusing this question in his mind with the matter of the guards. This is not the old guard bill that was before the committee some time ago. This force is to be divorced completely from the civilian guards of the Navy. They will have three systems of protection in the navy yards, the Marines, the civilian guards, and if this bill goes through they

will have what might be classified as under-cover men in the Naval Establishment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and to maintain and operate the same until June 30, 1943, unless Congress shall have, in the meantime, by concurrent resolution, declared such a force no longer necessary. The duties of this force shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,450,740 to effectuate the purposes of this act, including salaries, travel, clothing, weapons, motor-propelled vehicles and their maintenance, and any other necessary equipment and supplies.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "\$1,450,740" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. The civilian in charge of the force herein authorized may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy without regard to civil-service laws, at a salary of \$7,500 per annum.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 3 and insert:

"The civilian in charge of the force herein authorized, together with the other personnel thereof, may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy without regard to civil-service laws, the civilian in charge to receive a salary at the rate of \$7,500 per annum, the salaries of the other personnel to be in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That any person appointed to the force who is employed in the civil service at the time of such appointment shall retain his civil-service status for all purposes and shall suffer no reduction in pay by reason of such appointment."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this committee amendment is nothing in the world but an attempt to create a new force of political appointees. As I stated a while ago, the President of the United States, in order to facilitate national defense, has issued a general Executive order giving authority to the Secretary of the Navy, as well as the Secretary of War, to make such exemptions from civil service as may be necessary in the interest of national defense, and if the Secretary of the Navy feels that these people ought to be selected outside of civil service he has that authority now without this committee amendment, and the only purposes this committee amendment could serve are two: First, it would prevent the persons so appointed from being brought under civil service at a later date if they proved satisfactory employees; and, second, it would subject the Navy Department to untold pressure from political sources to make political selections for these positions.

The Navy Department, according to the statement of the chairman, did not

ask for this exemption, and it ought not to be put in the bill. We ought not to play politics with an important protective force such as this bill intends to provide.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman realize the fact that this is a temporary bill and is to have effect no longer than 1943, and can be terminated sooner by joint resolution of Congress?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I recognize that fact, but at the same time I recognize the fact that the Secretary of the Navy now has authority to make such exemptions as are necessary, but you are proposing here to exempt them by law and subject the Secretary of the Navy and the Navy Department to political pressure from every Member of Congress and every United States Senator and every State political machine and subject the Members of Congress themselves to pressure to have political people appointed to these positions without regard to their qualifications, and every one of you will have hundreds of applications and you will have to write letters endorsing them and in many cases they will have to make appointments of people who are not qualified. They ought to be permitted to select these people in accordance with the present law and the present executive order without being subjected to the political pressure which this bill is bound to bring down upon the heads of the Navy Department. As a matter of fact, they started out to select a force like this and notwithstanding what my friend says and notwithstanding the statement of my colleague from Georgia, I know they went to the Appropriations Committee for a guard force of a similar nature and were turned down and did not get the money, and this bill ought not to be enacted in this form.

I hope the House will vote down this committee amendment and leave it under the general law and the executive order of the President, which gives the Secretary of the Navy all the authority he needs, and if he sees fit to make an exemption on that basis, he will then have the right to do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will accept the committee amendment and reject the position taken by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

When this matter was before the committee the Secretary thoroughly endorsed the language proposed here. We must be fair. The Secretary is going to try to administer this law in a proper manner. He is going to try to get the best men in the country for these positions and the best men should be obtained for them. So I hope the committee amendment will be approved by the Committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. This is a matter that should give the Congress some little concern. If you place a civilian in charge of this organization, he is going to come in contact fre-

quently with the naval officers, and no one knows better than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, how naval officers will react to a situation of that kind. You are always going to have a commandant in charge of the naval station with many naval officers at the shore stations where the men will be assigned to duty, and this individual in command is going to be in charge of certain civilian employees. You know Navy officers do not want to have civilians telling them what to do. I suggest the official in charge should be a naval officer. There are plenty of them, not in the line, that can be spared, who are competent to handle this position. They would not be running into trouble with the commanding officer and his assistants. Now, there has been some reference to politics. I come from a big city, and I suppose it seems always strange to some, that, coming from a big city I am always advocating the civil service and the extension of the merit system in the Government. I have supported the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] on every motion he has made with regard to appointments to be made from the civil-service register, and why? Because I know that when a Member of Congress gets one job not subject to civil service, your bureau chiefs, or other outsiders, get nine of them, so I know my constituents have a better opportunity to get work from the Government if they are selected from the civil-service register than if they are selected without regard to civil service. I think the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, is sound, and that this House should vote down this committee amendment. I know positively that recently a civil-service examination was held for guards and an eligible list established. I further know you have eligible lists available for investigators. From these lists you can get men to perform the duties required under the terms of this legislation. For that reason, I propose to support the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a division.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 64, nays 15.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KERR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4671, and, pursuant to House Resolution 202, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment to section 3.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the other amendment.

The other amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 6, strike out the language of section 3 and insert:

"The civilian in charge of the force herein authorized, together with the other personnel thereof, may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy without regard to civil-service laws, the civilian in charge to receive a salary at the rate of \$7,500 per annum, the salaries of the other personnel to be in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That any person appointed to the force who is employed in the civil service at the time of such appointment shall retain his civil-service status for all purposes and shall suffer no reduction in pay by reason of such appointment."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 76, nays 15.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. This is an automatic call. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 270, nays 40, not voting 121, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—270

Allen, Ill.	Cole, N. Y.	Gale
Allen, La.	Colmer	Gathings
Andersen,	Connery	Gavagan
H. Carl	Cooley	Gibson
Anderson, Calif.	Cooper	Gifford
Anderson, N. Mex.	Copeland	Gillie
Andresen,	Costello	Gossett
August H.	Cox	Graham
Andrews	Cravens	Grant, Ala.
Arends	Creal	Grant, Ind.
Arnold	Crowther	Green
Baldwin	Cunningham	Gregory
Barry	Curtis	Guyer, Kans.
Bates, Ky.	D'Alesandro	Gwynne
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Ohio	Haines
Beckworth	Davis, Tenn.	Hall,
Beiter	Day	Edwin Arthur
Bell	Dickstein	Hancock
Bennett	Dirksen	Hare
Bishop	Disney	Harris, Ark.
Blackney	Domeneaux	Harter
Bloom	Dondero	Hartley
Boggs	Doughton	Hebert
Bolton	Downs	Heidinger
Bradley, Pa.	Doxey	Hendricks
Brooks	Drewry	Hess
Brown, Ga.	Durham	Hinshaw
Bryson	Dworshak	Hobbs
Buck	Eaton	Hoffman
Buckley, N. Y.	Eberharter	Holbrook
Bulwinkle	Edelstein	Holmes
Burch	Elliott, Calif.	Hook
Burdick	Ellis	Hope
Burgin	Elston	Howell
Butler	Engel	Hunter
Canfield	Englebright	Imhoff
Capozzoli	Fellows	Izac
Carlson	Fenton	Jenkins, Ohio
Cartwright	Fish	Jennings
Casey, Mass.	Fitzgerald	Jensen
Chenoweth	Fitzpatrick	Johns
Chiperfield	Flaherty	Johnson, Calif.
Claypool	Flanagan	Johnson, Ill.
Clevenger	Flannery	Johnson,
Cluett	Forand	Luther A.
Coffee, Nebr.	Ford, Miss.	Johnson, Okla.
Cole, Md.	Ford, Thomas F. Jones	

Kee	Murray	Sikes
Keefe	Myers, Pa.	Simpson
Kelley, Pa.	Nelson	Smith, Maine
Kennedy,	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Ohio
Martin J.	O'Connor	Smith, Va.
Kennedy,	O'Leary	Smith, W. Va.
Michael J.	O'Neal	Snyder
Keogh	O'Toole	South
Kerr	Pace	Sparkman
Kinzer	Paddock	Spence
Kirwan	Patman	Springer
Kramer	Patterson	Starnes, Ala.
Lambertson	Peterson, Ga.	Steagall
Landis	Pierce	Stratton
Lanham	Pittenger	Summers, Tex.
Larrabee	Plauché	Talle
LeCompte	Ploeser	Tarver
Lesinski	Poage	Taylor
Lewis	Priest	Thill
Lynch	Randolph	Thomas, Tex.
McCormack	Rankin, Miss.	Thomason
McGhee	Rankin, Mont.	Tibbott
McGregor	Reed, Ill.	Van Zandt
McKeough	Richards	Vincent, Ky.
McLaughlin	Rivers	Vinson, Ga.
McLean	Robertson,	Vorys, Ohio
McMillan	N. Dak.	Vreeland
Maas	Robertson, Va.	Ward
MacIora	Robinson, Utah	Wasielewski
Magnuson	Robison, Ky.	Weaver
Mahon	Rockefeller	Welch
Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Okla.	Wheat
Martin, Mass.	Rolph	Whittington
Mason	Russell	Wigglesworth
May	Rutherford	Williams
Merritt	Sanders	Wilson
Meyer, Md.	Satterfield	Wolfenden, Pa.
Michener	Scanlon	Wolverton, N. J.
Mills, Ark.	Schaefer, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Mills, La.	Schulte	Worley
Monrone	Scrugham	Wright
Moser	Shafer, Mich.	Youngdahl
Mott	Shannon	Zimmerman
Mundt	Short	

NAYS—40

Angell	Hill, Wash.	Rees, Kans.
Baumhart	Hull	Sauhoff
Cannon, Mo.	Jackson	Sheppard
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wash.
Cochran	Kean	Stevenson
Coffee, Wash.	Kefauver	Summer, Ill.
Elliot, Mass.	Kunkel	Taber
Fogarty	Ludlow	Tenerowicz
Gearhart	McIntyre	Thom
Gehrmann	Oliver	Tinkham
Geyer, Calif.	Pfeiffer,	Toian
Gilchrist	William T.	Wadsworth
Granger	Plumley	Young
Healey	Ramspeck	

NOT VOTING—121

Barden	Halleck	Ramsay
Barnes	Harness	Reece, Tenn.
Beam	Harrington	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Harris, Va.	Rich
Bland	Heffernan	Rizley
Boehne	Hill, Colo.	Rodgers, Pa.
Boland	Houston	Rogers, Mass.
Boiles	Jacobsen	Romjue
Bonner	Jarman	Sabath
Boren	Jarrett	Sacks
Boykin	Jenks, N. H.	Sasscer
Bradley, Mich.	Johnson,	Schuetz
Brown, Ohio	Lyndon B.	Scott
Buckler, Minn.	Johnson, W. Va.	Secret
Buckley, Minn.	Jonkman	Shanley
Byrne	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Camp	Kilburn	Smith, Conn.
Cannon, Fla.	Kilday	Smith, Pa.
Carter	Kilday	Terry
Celler	Kleberg	Thomas, N. J.
Chapman	Knutson	Traynor
Clark	Kociakowski	Stearns, N. H.
Clason	Kopplemann	Sullivan
Collins	Lea	Suphlin
Courtney	McArdle	Sweeney
Crawford	McGranery	Terry
Crosser	Maciejewski	West
Culklin	Mansfield	White
Delaney	Marcantonio	Wicks
Dewey	Mitchell	Walter
Dies	Murdock	Weiss
Dingell	Nichols	Wene
Ditter	Norrell	West
Douglas	Norton	Whelchel
Duncan	O'Brien, N. Y.	White
Edmiston	O'Day	Wickersham
Faddis	O'Hara	Winter
Ford, Leland M.	Osmers	Wolcott
Fulmer	Patrick	Woodrum, Va.
Gamble	Peterson, Fla.	
Gerlach	Pfeifer,	
Gore	Joseph L.	
Hall,	Powers	
Leonard W.	Rabaut	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Bland with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Bolles.

Mr. West with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Terry with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Collins with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Barnes with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Suphlin with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Hill of Colorado.

Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Sasscer.

Mr. Duncan with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Norton with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Faddis with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Shanley.

Mr. Kociaikowski with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. McArdle with Mr. Houston.

Mr. Smith of Connecticut with Mr. Jacobson.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Secret.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Sullivan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a committee report on the bill S. 1438.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, what bill is that?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is the Senate Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill. A similar bill has been reported by the House. This is merely to take care of the parliamentary situation, so that when the House takes up the measure we will consider the Senate bill, technically.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there any minority report to be filed?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, no.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If there were, I would ask that they have permission also.

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, there is no opposition. I would make such a request if there were.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader if he has proceeded far enough with his plans for next week to tell us what bill will follow that which comes out of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will report out a rule on the bill H. R. 4647, a bill to enlarge the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with reference to certain national-defense activities. If that bill is reported, it will be the next order of business after the bill that is taken up on Monday, the extension of the stabilization fund.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will Calendar Wednesday business be set aside to consider that on Wednesday or will it be taken up on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Without committing myself definitely, the probabilities are that I will ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business next week. To date we have been quite generous with Calendar Wednesday calls, and without definitely committing myself the probabilities are that I will ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it the purpose to have a session on Memorial Day?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.
[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may have permission to extend his own remarks by including in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently made by him.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including therein an editorial

which recently appeared in the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I desire to insert in the Appendix to the RECORD a dispatch appearing in yesterday's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief account of a patriotic meeting in Ardmore, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks with regard to the question of convoys.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business has been disposed of and all special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE NICARAGUAN CANAL—WHY NOT?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a terrible emergency, for never in history has the world been so torn nor the United States faced with a greater apprehension or real danger.

We are hurriedly sending every weapon of war, except actual manpower, to the aid of Great Britain. We are training hundreds of thousands of young men. We are arming for defense. We are building to double, perhaps treble, our great Navy to defend us.

Yet we are strangely and obtusely and stubbornly ignoring one of the most vital needs that would complement this great naval expansion and is absolutely essential.

I suggest, I insist, that construction of the long-mooted Nicaraguan canal is as desperately needed for the efficient maneuvering of our proposed three-ocean navy as are the additional ships that will create that Navy.

It is worse than neglect for this administration, this Congress, to ignore that fact.

The distinguished chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House told the press the other day that he was about ready to introduce a bill to carry out the joint agreement between Canada and the United States to construct the St. Lawrence waterway canal.

Now, I do not propose at this time to discuss the merits or demerits of that proposition. I stand here today to reiterate that from the standpoint of national defense there is a canal that should be built and one that we should have had brains enough to construct long ago. That is the Nicaraguan canal.

The situation is admittedly serious, yet so much rubbish has been dumped and so much dust has been raised in order to bury domestic difficulties and to blind the eyes of the public that it is not surprising that somebody writes me:

What has become of all those proponents of the Nicaraguan Canal project? Everything they ever said in favor of it has long ago been demonstrated to have been true.

It is true that we have tardily discovered that inadequate facilities for either peace or war are afforded by the Panama route. Some of us could say, "I told you so." The need for eventual enlargement, as prophesied, has been demonstrated. There is a terrific responsibility resting upon us and a crushing expense involved in an attempt to police and protect this one, inadequate, improperly defended lane.

A THREE-WAY NAVY AND A TWO-WAY CANAL

So what? Just this, as I see it. If we are to have a three-way Navy—and, generally speaking, I am in favor of it—we should at least have a two-way route; that is to say, one by way of the Panama Canal and the other by way of the Nicaraguan canal. The more and bigger our Navy, the greater our need for two ways.

Expensive program? Yes. Necessarily long time to construct such a canal? Yes. But the construction of this canal would have saved and still will save the wasteful expenditure of millions of dollars in boondoggling and leaf raking and in a thousand other manufactured projects in an attempt to create a prosperity unreal; and the canal could and would be completed before the new Navy is finished.

Let us talk sense, not hysteria. Let us keep at least one foot on the ground. If we are going to take on the job of policing this hemisphere, we had better fix it so that we can get through by land or water to a sea one way when we cannot go by the other.

Let us talk about the Nicaraguan canal, which for some reason or other, and I think I know very well the reason, never until recently has appealed to military and naval strategists. So long as we could rely on the British Navy in the Atlantic, we could keep our fleet in the Pacific. But what a change.

To a layman the Nicaraguan project presents the possibility of the most permanently profitable investment that could be offered for us as one of the two most necessary and satisfactory artificial waterways on the globe; connecting as it would two oceans at or nearby the

center of the habitable and commercial zone of this continent. It would pay, or could have long ago paid, for itself economically. That is one reason why it never has been approved by those in competition to it whose selfish interest has been uppermost. It would be invaluable, defensively and military, and for the use of our three-way navy. Who undertakes to deny this? Let him speak and tell the truth.

It may be that one should not be economically minded in these days of waste of the taxpayers' money. Nevertheless, I still am.

NO EASTERN OR WESTERN MARKETS

Is it true that perhaps there will never again be any eastern or western markets, no exports or imports after the war? I deny that such a prospect confronts us for that means the end of civilization and of expansion and of the United States. It is just too silly to contemplate. But were it so, even then we might justify the expense incident to the construction of the Nicaraguan canal on the ground that we need it for our national defense so long as we have anything to defend.

Now, the United States of America should not be deprived of this canal or be licked as a United States of America, because, to serve some selfish interest and to put dollars into somebody's pocket, the Nicaraguan canal route would cramp the style of the Panama Canal, in that it would save from 1 to 2 days' time for 80 percent of the shipping that would use and does now use the Panama route. Nor should we stand idly by and see ourselves made a whole burnt offering, because, with the larger locks made necessary and to be contemplated, the Nicaraguan canal could and would pass the largest ships that are humanly possible of conception, which the Panama Canal cannot do. Nor should we cease to urge the building of the Nicaraguan canal for any of the reasons that once seemed so important to those who were most interested, selfishly and financially, in building the Panama Canal, the inadequacy of which has been demonstrated even for the normal volume of shipping, to say nothing of military necessities.

It is an incontrovertible fact that the Nicaraguan canal would strengthen us from a military standpoint when in arms, and in peacetimes should stimulate and enlarge our commerce.

DOG-IN-THE-MANGER STUFF

We should even refuse longer to be a dog in the manger, barking at European powers that might seek to build such a canal, and, as we bark, growling that as defenders of the Monroe Doctrine we will not tolerate such interference as foreign powers might contemplate as possible with respect to the construction by them of such a canal as we need but will not build.

I can stand here and say, "I told you so." How much better off we should be today had we believed and listened to those people who years ago prophesied absolutely and actually and substantially what has happened, insisting as they did, that for our own national defense, in such a time as they prophesied, we would

need and ought to have this second waterway? We just will not listen to advice or learn from experience. There are none so blind as those who cannot see, unless it be those who will not. Yet it is not too late.

As we have needed it, we now need and shall in the future need, more than ever, the Nicaraguan canal for the fulfillment of national opportunity and of our destiny; the defense of two continents and the competent discharge of the international duty we have assumed.

Otherwise the Monroe Doctrine means nothing and our brave talk means less. Reduced to its lowest denominator, the construction of this canal is a question of patriotism and of potentiality for the United States as a self-supporting and self-contained territory that has assumed the burden of the defense of a hemisphere.

OUR GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

And again, this proposition with respect to building the Nicaraguan canal is of the essence of our good-neighbor policy as between us and the Central and South American countries, talking about it from the standpoint solely of economic potentiality and the saving of civilization. To get right down to brass tacks, under the threat of having to enforce that very Monroe Doctrine about which we bluster and brag so much, "we'll have either to cut bait or to fish," as they say on the New England fishing banks. And in either event we shall need this Nicaraguan canal.

True, I am more influenced today by what I think is military necessity, perhaps, than by the economic potentiality; yet both are involved. One is present and necessity is something in the line of vision without which a people perishes.

In these days of boondoggling and leaf raking and relief projects, with the cost and factor of our unemployment running into the millions, why have we done nothing about this tremendous project which involves our national life, this interoceanic canal, the advisability of the construction of which has been discussed since 1550?

Do you know that the report of the United States Army engineers, made in connection with the survey completed between the years 1929 and 1931, showed that tremendous advantages would accrue to us out of the construction of this canal? Well, it is a fact. You can find the report and read it for yourself.

That was 10 years ago, or more. What has been done about it? Nothing. And why? Well, the answer is perfectly obvious to those who understand what has been going on.

THE ARMY REPORT WAS FAVORABLE

Do you know the Army report showed that no less than two-thirds of all the traffic then using the Panama Canal would save much time by using the Nicaraguan route? Shortening of sailing time would, of course, have cheapened rates and would have stimulated commerce; and will. You should get a copy of that report and read it, for there are a lot of other good things about this canal which are disclosed by this report

that has been submerged and buried for obvious reasons—but why talk about it?

Let us do something about it. We need this Nicaraguan route now. We have always needed it.

The two canals would supplement each other strategically and commercially, or would have; and still will, strategically. The usefulness of and the necessity for the Panama Canal, from the first standpoint, would and always will be just as great as now. We need two.

The new third set of locks is no equivalent to a second canal. Even a blind man can see that. The reasons are too numerous even to argue about.

We are spending a terrific amount of money to make a Navy second to none, and it is not wise for us to take a chance of getting our fleet balled up at Panama, or of having it sunk or blocked in attempting to negotiate a passage through that Canal to another sea.

We need two canals in order to insure our safe transit. The Nicaraguan canal is vital to our national security and to our adequate defense, or so I, as a layman, see it and have always seen it. Nothing that has happened recently has changed my opinion but, rather, has confirmed my judgment that, as I have often suggested and for reasons too numerous to mention here, the need is great today. It always will be. We need to assure ourselves of the protection such a canal will guarantee for our three-way Navy.

THE SEA OF DESTINY

And last but not least, it is not to be forgotten that, as W. Adolphe Roberts has said, the Caribbean is "our sea of destiny, the Mediterranean of the west"—a sea around whose shores man has perpetrated some of his most frightful cruelties to his fellow man; a sea upon whose roaring waters some of the most magnificent epics of the past have been staged, a sea of gold and blood and torture and striving, foci of the trade routes of the western world, cradle of what has now flowered into the civilization of the west.

In his review of Roberts' book, H. W. Baldwin speaks of the Caribbean as the "strategic sea of destiny." This book, *The Caribbean*, fills a need which has long existed, since it is the first complete history of that sea. As Baldwin says:

For 448 years since Columbus first crossed the Atlantic in his cockleshells the Caribbean has been the stage setting for the march of empire; upon its waters and its islands and the continents it laves have waxed and waned men and governments and peoples, political systems and dynasties and religions; beneath its flamant sunsets have sailed the conquerors and the conquered, the makers of history and those whom history has passed by. To call the roll of Caribbean characters is to summon from the past all the pomp and pageantry of the days of kings, to sound the trumpet of adventure, to roll the muffled drum of death and disaster.

Columbus, Cortez, Balboa, De Soto, Ponce de Leon in the perpetual quest of man—the search for never-ending life; Sir Francis Drake and Morgan, Nelson and Josephine, Alexander Hamilton, Toussaint l'Ouverture, Dessalines, and King Christophe, the ruined monument to whose cruel glories still molders beneath the tropic suns; Bolivar the Liberator, Raphael Semmes, and Ferdinand

de Lesseps, and Gorgas, and Goethals, and all the thronging ghosts whose deeds—noble, mean, avaricious, or mighty—are written large in the political boundaries, economic status, racial characteristics, and inherited traditions of the polyglot peoples who are the sons and daughters of the Caribbean Sea.

This magnificent pageant of our past has long been crying for an author, a historian, to piece together the great dramas and the great scenes which compose it.

IMPORTANCE OF THE CARIBBEAN

Now the Caribbean is assuming a new importance in the strategic picture of the world.

At the end of the book the author discusses the "issues of 1940," and while perhaps overestimating the importance of Jamaica and Martinique in the defense of the Panama Canal, nevertheless, ends on the true and prophetic note:

If the present war reaches the New World, or totalitarianism dominates the Old, the sea's strategic importance will be greater than at any time in the 448 years since the coming of Columbus.

The Nicaraguan canal, eventually. Why not now?

I am still wondering why somebody does not do something about it. I shall keep hammering away at this subject as I have been hammering for the last 7 years. I do not seem to have gotten very far. One cannot do much alone against such opposition as has been met. What I am wondering is this: Is anybody going to help? And if so, who and when? [Applause.]

THE SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [MR. BURDICK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

IS THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE COURT OF PUBLIC OPINION IN THE UNITED STATES WITH CLEAN HANDS?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it is both interesting and alarming to follow the successive steps in the demands of Great Britain to involve the United States in the present World War. In the first World War, Great Britain mapped out exactly the same course that is now being pursued. Step by step, gradually but certainly, we were rushed into that war. If we are to learn anything from history, we should be intelligent enough to see that Great Britain is again, step by step, gradually but certainly, leading the United States into war.

For some unknown reason the British statesmen seem to have the Indian sign on our own statesmen. It seems that we are acting under the spell cast upon us and that we have no way of thinking for ourselves. Have we in the United States become so dumb mentally that we can be made fools of by men whose intelligence is not superior to our own?

Six months ago all England wanted from the United States was our sympathy; 5 months ago all England wanted was to purchase war supplies in the United States; 4 months ago all England wanted was our sympathy, the right to purchase war supplies in the United States, and a gift of money enough from the people of the United States to purchase war supplies. All this was granted by Congress, and 90 percent of the Congressmen thought that was the end of

the British demands. That, however, was not the end. A month ago Britain demanded that we seize all ships in the United States belonging to Germany and Italy and turn them over to Great Britain. Although these ships had come into our harbors as friends for protection, we followed the demands of Great Britain without a whimper and seized the ships. Everyone knows who ever read a page on international law that we had absolutely no right to take this action. But Congress took it because Great Britain demanded it. The actual seizure of the ships, if we kept possession of them, might have been justified on the ground that as a last resort to our own self-defense it became an extreme necessity. But when we seized the ships and are in the process of turning them over to the enemy of the nations involved, there is no excuse, no justification, no authority, and no right, legal or moral, upon which we can base our action. But we did it because we are evidently too dull mentally to cope with the intelligence of Great Britain.

No sane person would now expect us to go any further. But, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet started to aid Great Britain. The next step in the program of Great Britain is now upon us. The daily papers have it on their front pages this morning. It is just what I personally knew would be the next move. I knew it because Great Britain did the same thing in the first World War. Here it is:

LONDON, May 21 (Wednesday).—In contrast to Prime Minister Churchill's recent appeal to America to "give us the tools and we will finish the job," today's News Chronicle, in a half-page editorial entitled "We Appeal to America," says:

"We, the British people, want you American people in this war on our side. Fighting. Now."

This, of course, is the last step. Great Britain passed over one step to get to the last at the earliest possible moment. Her logical step was to ask us to convoy British shipping. She asked for it, but we have not yet acted upon that matter. We have given in so easily to British mentality that it can be presumed, with every evidence of truth, that Great Britain thought this step would be taken by us for the asking, and, therefore, immediately jumped to the last demand—that of sending our boys overseas to be slaughtered in the defense of the British Empire.

I presume this step will be taken also. It will unless we can pull ourselves together long enough to think for ourselves. We have all along felt secure in one thing—that our boys would not be sent overseas to fight in any war. We felt that security by the speeches of the President when he was a candidate in 1940. On October 20 at Boston, the President said:

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again; your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. Yes, the purpose of our defense is defense.

That was the position the President took then and that position was the great contributing factor to his election. Was the President sincere then? Was he trying to hoodwink the American people and win the election? My answer is that the President was sincere. He honestly believed that we would not be entangled in the net spread to involve us. The President believed that the "Roosevelt luck" would carry us through. But now the situation has changed. As matters have worked out, the "Roosevelt luck" failed to show up, and today I actually believe the President cannot determine what to do.

The successive steps we have taken, all of which had a tendency to involve us, taken together, spells actual war, and the President is fully aware of this. He ought to have foreseen what the results of these separate steps would mean. I think it fair to say that the President has been pushed into this position through the influence of British statesmen.

What I have to say about the President is not political in the least. In the campaign he was opposed by Wendell Willkie, the mouthpiece of J. P. Morgan, who not only wanted to involve us in the war but was determined to do so to save the financial system of Great Britain. Willkie was deliberately forced on the delegates to the Republican National Convention for the very purpose of involving us. My mere statement of this, without proof, would be nothing but a mere opinion, but the facts show this opinion to be right. Here are the facts:

Early in the year 1940—about February—a dinner was held by the Economic Society at the Hotel Astor. Mr. Willkie presided. Other speakers were the Minister from Australia to the United States, Richard G. Casey, captain of the *Flint*, and a professor from Harvard—a refugee from Germany.

This was an adroit meeting to egg us into war, aided and abetted by Wendell Willkie.

Five hundred people were present, and New York businessmen and industrialists predominated.

Thomas W. Lamont engineered the Willkie boom. Lamont, a partner of J. Pierpont Morgan, was very close to Willkie, and the Morgan firm had backed Willkie in the Commonwealth & Southern Utilities Co.

The House of Morgan was and is the financial agent of the British Government, and Willkie was put up by Morgan as a candidate who would protect their interests. Willkie himself was a phony candidate and meant nothing more to the House of Morgan than a mere tool to carry out its design and involve us in the European war.

A few weeks before the Republican convention met in Philadelphia, Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Reid, of New York, gave a private dinner to intimate friends in New York. Among the guests were Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Willkie, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Taft, Dorothy Thompson, Al Williams, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Douglas, and Thomas Lamont.

There may have been others, but at least these people were there. Everyone knows that Lamont is the partner of J. P.

Morgan, that Douglas is president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York and headed the Democrats for Willkie.

Thomas Lamont, turning to Willkie, said:

We are going to nominate an interventionist at the Republican convention, and you are going to be that interventionist.

Mr. Willkie arose and made this reply:

If the Philadelphia convention does not nominate an interventionist, I shall vote for Mr. Roosevelt.

Senator TAFT, then arose and said:

I do not wish my silence to be construed as in agreement with that sentiment.

That, of course, was the end of TAFT as a Presidential candidate and Mr. Lamont, with unlimited resources, ballyhooed in the newspapers, on the radio, and in the galleries of the convention hall for Willkie and before the delegates came to themselves, Willkie had been nominated.

Here is evidence enough that Willkie was forced on the people for the purpose of involving us in the war. Willkie's election would have meant war, and Roosevelt's election seems headed for the same result.

Since the President, evidently, does not know what to do, what can Congress do to keep us out of actual war? Can Congress do anything? My answer is, "Yes"; Congress can prevent our going in if it has the courage to stand up and be counted.

First of all, Congress should turn down the proposition to convoy goods to Great Britain, because the President says, "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

The next thing Congress can do is to force the statesmen of Great Britain to permit the shipping of food to aid starving people in Europe.

Former President Hoover is right for once and I want to rise here in my place and say he is right. He has a plan to feed starving Europe. Germany has agreed to it, but Mr. Churchill says, "No." He advances two reasons: First, that the Germans will get some of the food, and secondly, that if the people under the German yoke begin to starve they will revolt against Hitler. Neither reason is sound and the last one is unworthy of any Christian man.

This attitude of Great Britain has alienated the affections of all people in Europe. It seems strange that Great Britain has not a friend on earth except the United States. It is because of this attitude and other positions equally unworthy of a Christian empire.

We can demand that Great Britain allow this food to pass. We have it in our power. Are we men enough to use the power we have? Are we afraid of anyone when we know we are right and acting under the dictates of Christian humanity?

If Great Britain will not allow this food to pass, we can say to Mr. Churchill, we withdraw further credit. We will vote no more money for the aid of Great Britain. We condemn your action and will have nothing to do with a government which is not only willing but insists upon starving millions of men, women,

and children who are not in the least responsible for their present plight.

Is Great Britain in our court with clean hands? No one can come into a court of equity in the United States whose hands are unclean. Are hands clean that will withhold food from innocent people when that food is supplied without cost to Great Britain? While we are not now in a court of equity, we are still in the greatest court in the world, the court of public opinion in America. England's hands are not clean; they are unclean. That is not only proved but admitted. Shall this court of public opinion longer tolerate the petition of Great Britain for convoys, for money, and, lastly, for the blood of Americans?

If this is the civilization Churchill wants us to save with our lives, it is not the kind of civilization that deserves saving and is not the kind of a civilization that the United States has nurtured and protected. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this House will not longer be led around by the nose by some foreign statesman. I hope we will act on our own volition and that we shall continue to be a Christian nation no matter what happens to Great Britain under the leadership of men who are willing to starve millions of innocent people under the false logic that it will help Great Britain. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from North Dakota gave to the House a quotation from a speech made by the President of the United States last fall wherein he promised we would not go to war. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at the time that promise was made it was expected and the newspapers predicted that England might fall any day. It was the same situation that we face at this time. There has been no change of events that would justify any alteration of that position.

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman is clearly right. I can see no necessity whatever, not the remotest reason for this agitation, step by step, for getting the American people roiled up to a state where they will be willing to send their sons 3,000 miles across the sea to fight for some other country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman well knows from his long experience in this House that in order to get legislation of any kind to the floor of the House we must first get it by these administration-controlled committees, must we not?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How can we hope to get anticonvoy legislation before us under such circumstances?

Mr. BURDICK. We do not need any anticonvoy legislation. They have got to get affirmative legislation to use convoys, and then is the time we want to say "no."

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

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I should like to have the gentleman's opinion concerning the barn-

storming tour of the British Ambassador. It is rather unusual to have an Ambassador from a foreign country make speeches all over this Nation trying to inflame and incense the people to engage in conflicts abroad.

Mr. BURDICK. The learned gentleman from Missouri is familiar with what happened in the last war. The same thing happened then; they barnstormed this country into the war, and after we got into it they said they would pay us but that we got in too late and we had no business there anyhow.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of what has happened in the last few minutes, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by George Washington on embroilment in foreign wars, also a statement made by President Roosevelt, and also three short letters from constituents of mine showing how 95 percent of the people of my State stand on embroilment in foreign wars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, if there are no more questions, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. HOBBES was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, during the recess in April, I visited my home district. While there I took the opportunity to visit Camp Wolters; I stood on the hill and viewed over 10,000 young Americans—the flower of our land. I could see patriotism and Americanism written on their faces. My heart thrilled as I gazed on this sight, and a mist gathered in my eyes as I thought of the cheerful sacrifice they were making in the defense of America, and the support of civilization. The thought came to me how grand it is to be an American.

But a pain of sadness swept through my heart when I saw how poorly they were equipped, and I was informed by the officers that they were unable to secure the necessary equipment to properly train these wonderful Americans.

This morning I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. W. J. Martin, of May, Tex. Mr. Martin has a son in the Army. When he was inducted into the service I wrote his son a letter of appreciation because I appreciate the service of these red-blooded Americans who are going into the Army.

Mr. Martin's letter is as follows:

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: Sometime ago you wrote my son a nice letter in regard to his Army service, for which I want to thank you.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask you some questions. Is this Government too small to handle such men as old John Lewis and these other labor leaders? Is the Government going to handle this labor trouble, or is labor going to handle the Government? Hitler says the United States is an inside job, and it looks to me like he is sure doing a good job of it, for every day it is strike, strike, strike, on the radio and in the daily papers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is a dirty shame for the Government to take these boys away from their homes to train them to defend our country, paying them the small amount they do, and then let the labor unions call strike after strike for more pay, when they are already making more money in 3 days than these soldier boys make in 30 days.

I do not believe these laborers are doing the striking; it is their leaders, and they are doing it to help Hitler.

Why does this Government stand for it?

If this Government can't handle these things here at home, how could we hope to handle Hitler when he sees fit to attack us?

Personally, I believe this United States is big enough to handle the job, but the question in my mind is, Are they going to do it, or are they going to let the things happen to us from the inside that have happened to France and all those other countries? We have often heard it said that Britain is our first line of defense, but I say our first line of defense is right here at home.

I am in favor of aiding Britain in every way we can, if it is necessary, and I am in perfect harmony with our defense program, but there are too many leaders that are being allowed to obstruct and hinder it. You may pass this on to the other Congressmen, if you care to. I would appreciate all to know how we parents of these boys feel about the way some things are going.

Respectfully,

W. J. MARTIN.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to observe that that is a fair sample of the letters that come from my part of the country, too.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it was discussed at the time of the recess that the labor situation would work itself out, and I had hoped that it would, but today it seems that our hopes were in vain, and Mr. Martin may have something when he says our first-line trench is not England but at home, and these un-American strikes may be the workings of Hitler's parachute troops in America. There are many thousands of Americans who believe so.

May America, through its Congress, have the courage to wipe out these parachute troops, if they are such, and do it now.

The longer we wait, the harder the battle will be. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DID YOU KNOW THAT DAIRYING AND NEW DEALING DO NOT MIX?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a table showing the prices of

92-score butter at Chicago from 1915 to 1940, or a period of 26 years:

Yearly average wholesale prices of butter at Chicago, 1915-40—Butter, 92-score creamery, per pound

	Cents
1915.....	28.0
1916.....	31.9
1917.....	41.0
1918.....	49.5
1919.....	57.6
1920.....	58.7
1921.....	41.7
1922.....	39.2
1923.....	46.0
1924.....	41.2
1925.....	44.1
1926.....	42.8
1927.....	45.8
1928.....	46.0
1929.....	43.8
1930.....	35.3
1931.....	27.0
1932.....	20.1
1933.....	20.8
1934.....	24.8
1935.....	28.8
1936.....	32.0
1937.....	33.2
1938.....	27.1
1939.....	25.4
1940.....	28.7

¹Source: Agricultural Marketing Service (table 601, Agricultural Statistics, 1940).

What are the conclusions one necessarily draws from a study of these prices?

First. That butter averaged 31.5 cents per pound the last 4 Republican years.

Second. That butter averaged 38.1 cents per pound the last 8 Republican years.

Third. That butter averaged 42.6 cents per pound the last 10 Republican years before the New Deal controlled the House of Representatives.

Fourth. That butter averaged only 27.6 cents per pound the first 8 years of the New Deal.

Fifth. That butter has averaged only 26.4 cents per pound the 10 years that the New Deal has had control of the House of Representatives.

Sixth. That butter has never averaged a parity price per pound since the New Deal got control of the House of Representatives.

Seventh. That during only 2 years of the New Deal has butter even averaged 30 cents per pound.

Finally, the New Deal has now pegged the butter price at 31 cents per pound when the same Agricultural Department reports show that butter parity price at Chicago was 37.1 cents per pound. The New Deal through the power delegated to it has pegged this price at 31 cents when 20 percent would have to be added to make this price a parity price.

The great bulk of dairy farmers in Wisconsin, as well as other dairy States, should realize the great amounts of public funds that are being borrowed and expended for sectional crops in order to promote the New Deal. The dairymen are continually paying for subsidies for these other groups, but do not get the prices for their own product that existed before the days when the Harvard "hot

dogs" started in their wild schemes to make America over.

There is not much expression of interest in the producer's viewpoint here in Washington. The consumer seems to be ever in the minds of the people who the dairy farmer thinks are looking after his interests. Otherwise why should butter average 38 percent more the last 8 Republican years than it has the 8 years of the New Deal?

It is a bitter pill for the New Deal price jugglers to swallow when they peg the price of butter below the 4-year average of the Hoover administration. This is especially true when we realize the new dealers always like to refer to low farm prices under Hoover.

The New Deal pays one group of farmers over \$200,000,000 to reduce and control a few farm crops and then it goes out and asks the dairymen of the country to increase their annual production by 10,000,000,000 pounds of milk. The dairy farmers are not given any definite guarantee of what percentage of production cost they can expect to receive for their product if they do increase their production.

The first 3 months of 1941 we imported 5,756,618 pounds of cheese and exported 744,295 pounds of cheese. Whose dairy business are we expanding when our own dairy prices are below parity?

The New Deal has direct control over the markets for all farm products. The farm price juggling by the New Deal is unfair, unjust, and void of common sense. If any farmer is not getting a parity price today, no one is accountable except the New Deal.

Every man that milks a cow should have conclusive evidence that dairying and New Dealing do not mix any more than oil and water.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman, of course, knows that perhaps it is due to the importation of 2,000,000,000 pounds of competing oils and fats in 1940 that our butter price is as low as it is.

Mr. MURRAY. There are many reasons for this low price, and the New Deal has not helped it any. May I say to the gentleman that during this whole year, and I come from a rural section, I have not made any comment about reciprocal trade treaties, for the reason that I personally do not want to be responsible for making matters any worse for the Secretary of State than they now are. I do say to the administration at this time, however, that the wisest, the fairest, and the best thing it can do is to go ahead and give the American farmer parity prices, because if it does we will not hear the complaints that we hear about importations. The American farmer will not indicate much grievance if he is given a parity price for what he himself produces. Let us consider this new trade treaty with Argentina that is coming up. I think the administration should do the right thing and give the American farmers parity

prices for their products, because if it does not, next month when we start hearings on this Argentine treaty I wonder if we are not going to say a lot of things, and I refer to Members on both sides of the aisles, that it should not be necessary to say. The last time we had the Argentine treaty up we had a bad situation, and evidently we will have a more delicate situation to meet this time.

The administration now has complete control of every market for all agricultural products. They have it, first, through the use of the \$235,000,000 provided by appropriation, and otherwise, by Congress for domestic relief purposes; and second, through the use of the millions in the spend-lend bill to buy agricultural products for foreign peoples.

No one can give one fair or just reason why the administration should not give the American farmer producing all farm crops a parity price, as long as the administration has assumed this control of the market. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the country is well aware of the unity that prevails in the Congress. That same unity prevails throughout the country. We all want America to be defended. We do not want any stone left unturned. We do not want the Commander in Chief handicapped in anything that would delay or interfere with the most rapid production of arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare. We want our Commander in Chief to be free to defend the Western Hemisphere to the utmost.

There is no agreement on the question of the United States intervening in wars in Europe or in Asia. Many people doubt if there can be unity on that question. There is no unity in this country on the question of proceeding any further on the road to state socialism, communism, or totalitarianism. There never should be, because that means the destruction not only of our Government but of our way of life entirely.

Under existing law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has very definite powers that they can exercise to assist in our defense program. There is no objection to these. The R. F. C. has power to create corporations to produce and acquire strategic and critical materials. The R. F. C. has power to create corporations, to purchase and lease land, to build and expand plants, to purchase and produce equipment, supplies, and machinery for the manufacture of arms, munitions, and implements of war. The American people want that done and there is no objection to it.

The R. F. C., or a corporation created by it, may lease any such arms or ammunition plants to private concerns. That is all right. These corporations may engage in the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war directly. That, too, is all right.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us consider what authority we are asked to delegate to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in addition to that authority provided under existing law. The proposal now before the Rules Committee—H. R. 4674—has the most unusual language. This proposal provides that the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, can create or organize, corporations any time prior to July 1, 1943, with such powers as they may deem necessary in order to expedite the national-defense program, including but not limited to the powers that I have previously mentioned. This is a blanket authority for the President, through the R. F. C., to create corporations to engage in business without any restriction whatever. The sky is the limit. There is no part of our economy that does not have some such connection with the national-defense program. What kind of corporations can the President create? The answer is obvious, he can create any kind. What powers will these corporations have? They will have such powers as they, meaning the Federal Loan Administrator and the President shall deem necessary. Let us consider what might be included in these broad powers.

Does food have any relation to the national-defense program? It has a very definite relationship. The farmers of America produce this food. Under this broad authority corporations may be created, not only to buy, sell, market, and regulate the flow of agricultural products in this country, but corporations can be created to license producers and thus determine who shall plow, who shall sow, and who shall reap. In this proposal the only restriction that you have is that it must be in order to expedite the defense program, and it shall have such powers as the President shall determine. That is something to think about.

Let us consider how this proposal might affect the petroleum industry. No one can deny that gasoline and oil are very essential items in our defense program. Certain of the warring nations are known to have limited their bombing raids, because of their supply of gasoline. And the need for certain oils is greater. Are you going to grant to the President the power to create corporations to go into the oil business? Are we going to have state socialism take over the refining industry?

Mr. Speaker, we in this House will have something to answer for if we give this blanket approval to state socialism in America.

Consider for a moment the place that drugs and medicines, doctors, hospitals, and nurses play in our defense program. Are we by our votes going to grant to the President authority to create corporations to build and run hospitals, manufacture, distribute, and sell drugs and medicines, and to commandeer the medical and nursing professions of America? In this proposal before the House, we are now asked to grant to the President authority to create corporations with such powers as he may deem necessary in order to expedite the defense program, including the powers that he has already with arms

and ammunitions, but not limited to those. I again say that the authority granted under this bill makes the sky the limit on what the President can do toward creating a Fascist state in America. At the beginning of my remarks I said that there were no activities in America that did not have some relationship to the defense program. I think that is true. Are we going to place our O. K. on state socialism for all activities in America because they may relate to national defense?

Are communication lines essential to national defense? What part do newspapers play in a defense program? Is the radio essential to the defense program? Are you by your vote here going to grant to the President authority to create a corporation to dispense news and information to take the place of the United Press, the Associated Press, the International News Service, the Trans-radio Press, and all the other very fine private news agencies in America? In the interest of news and propaganda in connection with the national-defense program are you going to grant to the President authority to create official state newspapers?

As long as this blanket authority exists, even though it is never used, it will constitute a threat to compel the private agencies engaged in giving to the people the news, to toe the line and obey a bureaucratic Government or their business will be taken over by a competitive organization paid for by public funds. Do we want a situation in America where the newspapers and the radio must give out that information that the bureaucrats want, or they will be forever put out of business and like other Fascist states the government will run the radio and the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, men have fought and died, they have languished in prisons, they have had their tongues torn out by their roots, they have gone through all sorts of sacrifices to give us freedom of speech and freedom of the press. In the name of the founding fathers, are we going to give away that most precious right in this blanket authority?

What is true of our radios and newspapers in connection with national defense is likewise true of our educational system. The schools of America have a great task upon their shoulders. It is twofold. It deals with the ideals and concepts that we want the youth of America to have, and it deals with vocational guidance and training, at this time when we need skilled workers. This proposal which is before us in which we are asked to grant to the President authority to create corporations for any purpose whatever, does not even except educational institutions.

The making of clothing has a very definite relation to national defense. Because of its relation to national defense are we going to take the manufacture of clothing away from the private concerns in America and create corporations which will put the Government in the business of making clothes?

This proposal to give these broad powers to the President in expanding the R. F. C., and affiliated corporations, is a

Fascist move. Once these clothing factories are created and built by our Government, would you be at all surprised if the women of America were mobilized and regimented to work in these factories? Madame President, herself, has said:

I personally believe that if we are going to ask the young men universally to give a year of service to their country, it would do no harm to require the same thing of young women in their own communities.

Let us consider what possibilities there would be for state socialism in the field of finance, banking, or insurance under this proposal. All such institutions have a very definite relationship to national defense. In this proposal we are asked to give to the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, the power and authority to create and organize corporations with such power as they deem necessary in order to expedite the defense program, limited in no way whatever. This authority would extend to the field of finance, banking, and insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of state socialism, communism, and fascism is before us. America has not escaped the threat of this world-wide revolution. As Americans we must resist it. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has very ably said:

There is a lot of talk about whether we are in this war or whether it is our war or not; I would like to put it this way: There is an imperialistic war going on in Europe in which we have no part; at the same time there is a revolution going on which is worldwide, which affects many lands, and which is distorted and prostituted in many places. We are a part of that world-wide revolution. The struggle is not only military but moral; not only with guns, but ideas. The stronghold of the democratic ideal in the world is not Britain, but America, and our strength lies not only in our material resources but in the moral strength of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not necessary. If the President needs the power to create a corporation to assist with any particular phase of the national defense, let us grant that authority specifically. This Congress is united on national defense. We have all seen important national-defense measures pass this Congress in the matter of a few minutes. We can and will do it again. There is no earthly reason why we should grant a broad delegation of power to the President to create all the corporations necessary to make America a Fascist state. It might be well to raise the question as to what will be done with these corporations after the national emergency is over. Did you ever know of a Government business activity that would discontinue and disband, or will they forever be a burden upon the taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, it is when the little things go wrong, in a motor or an airplane that the crash comes. No one would be so brazen as to suggest to the American people that we abandon our American way of life and accept a Fascist state. But those threats come in innocent-appearing bills like this one. Little by little we build the ladder by which we descend to the pits where the Old World has lived in

misery for centuries. I believe with Abraham Lincoln who said:

If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be the author and the maker thereof. As a nation of freemen we will live through all time, or die by suicide.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 25 minutes.

OUR RELATION TO THE WORLD SITUATION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the momentous world events of recent weeks have given me much concern, as doubtless they have other Members of the House. Because of the dangers for the United States, I feel impelled at this time to make a few remarks concerning our relation to the world situation.

One of the greatest tragedies of the present era is that the free peoples of the world have remained too long unaware of the tremendous dangers confronting them. Too long have they pursued complacent ways of life. Too long did they ignore the warnings of a few leaders who saw the approaching storm. Too late did they undertake the production of defensive weapons in quantities sufficient to meet an unparalleled situation.

The free peoples have been hypnotized by the leaders of the totalitarian states. These leaders have given out soothing statements of their high motives and peaceful intent. They have concluded with the free nations nonaggression treaties, and agreements for mutual respect of territorial integrity and political independence. Assuming these statements and treaties and agreements to be protection against attack, the free nations have pursued the peaceful way of life and have given inadequate attention to defense preparations. Meanwhile, the totalitarian leaders have regimented their own peoples; have directed their entire national energies toward preparation for conquest. They have geared their agricultural and industrial facilities for war production. They have built guns and tanks and planes in ever-increasing numbers. They have assembled huge supplies of raw materials. They have hoarded stocks of food. They have been preparing for years for unlimited aggressive warfare.

But the preparations of the leaders of the aggressor nations went even further. At their direction spies, propagandists, secret agents, military men in civilian clothes, and commercial people filtered into the free nations. They sought to soften the people of these nations to prepare the way for and make easy the task of conquest.

Finally, the aggressor nations, convinced of the similarity of their purposes, have banded together in a worldwide movement of aggression.

You are aware of the devastating results of this long-prepared conquest. Free nation after nation, lacking adequate military preparation, has gone down before the crushing advance of the totalitarian hordes. Peoples which only yesterday basked in the sunshine of freedom are today chained in dungeons of

darkness. The totalitarian leaders impose upon these peoples brutal methods reminiscent of the Dark Ages—starvation, forced labor, concentration camps, firing squads, and terrorization through indiscriminate killing of noncombatant men, women, and children.

Many people in America, while aware of what has been going on in other parts of the world, do not sense any real danger for us. The fall of nation after nation, the threatening spread of hostilities, the menacing struggle for the possession of the seas, all these have failed to move the complacent individuals who think that the United States is immune from danger. They do not realize that if the totalitarian hordes overrun the continent of Africa, hostile airplanes will have a base within a few hours' flying time of this hemisphere. They believe that the oceans serve as a barrier against an attack on this country; they do not realize that if the totalitarian states obtain control of the seas, those seas become a highway for, rather than a barrier against, an attack on this hemisphere. Furthermore, these complacent individuals do not realize that totalitarian agents in America have been making and are making every possible effort to soften the American peoples for an attack that some day may reach this hemisphere.

This subject was discussed by President Roosevelt in his address to Congress at the beginning of the present session. He then made the following statement:

I have recently pointed out how quickly the tempo of modern warfare could bring into our very midst the physical attack which we must expect if the dictator nations win this war.

There is much loose talk of our immunity from immediate and direct invasion from across the seas. Obviously, as long as the British Navy retains its power, no such danger exists. Even if there were no British Navy, it is not probable that any enemy would be stupid enough to attack us by landing troops in the United States from across thousands of miles of ocean until it had acquired strategic bases from which to operate.

But we learn much from the lessons of the past years in Europe, particularly the lesson of Norway, whose essential seaports were captured by treachery and surprise built up over a series of years.

The first phase of the invasion of this hemisphere would not be the landing of regular troops. The necessary strategic points would be occupied by secret agents and their dupes—and great numbers of them are already here and in Latin America.

To soothe the American nations the totalitarian leaders proclaim that they have no designs on this hemisphere; that they have every intention of respecting the Monroe Doctrine. But nations at peace have been given assurances repeatedly that their national integrity would be respected. In 1933 Hitler said that the German people had no thought of invading any country. In 1935 Hitler said that Germany had neither the wish nor the intention to annex or unite with Austria. In 1936 Hitler said that Germany had no territorial demands to make in Europe. In 1937 Hitler said that Germany was ready to acknowledge and guarantee Belgium and Holland at all

times as inviolable neutral territory. In 1938 Hitler said that he had assured all immediate neighbors of the integrity of their territory as far as Germany was concerned. A year later Germany and Denmark signed an agreement that they would not resort to war or any other form of violence against each other. Germany gave assurances on April 9, 1940, that she had no intention of infringing upon the territorial integrity or the political independence of Norway.

The record tells for itself how these promises have been broken. At present some 15 nations in Europe are under the domination of Germany. Furthermore, Axis legions have moved into the Near East and into Africa. This is further evidence, if such were necessary, that the dictators' plans for conquest know no bounds.

I hope that we in America can be aroused to the full extent of the danger before it is too late. I hope that we can profit by the experience of the peoples who have been enslaved. If we could fully profit by the experience of these peoples who have been the victims of broken promises, who have lived through the misery and suffering of the war as waged by the totalitarian nations, and who have experienced the terrorization which comes from living in areas under the domination of these nations, I am sure we would lose not a minute's time to take full and adequate steps which would insure that the war shall not reach this hemisphere.

The danger before us is as great as or greater than any we have experienced in our entire history as a Nation. To preserve our national existence, our democratic institutions, our way of life, it is necessary that we unite in a mighty defense effort. Capital must play its part. Labor must play its part. Each citizen must do his task in support of our broad program of national defense, which in reality is a program of self-preservation. As individuals we are prone to take our liberties for granted. Our forefathers sacrificed blood and treasure to obtain them; we should be willing to make equal sacrifices to retain them.

It is clear that our Nation must prepare for every possible contingency. We must prepare to meet a challenge in the Pacific and in the Atlantic. We must continue to increase and perfect our Navy, our Army, our Air Corps. We must produce in greater volume the weapons necessary for self-defense. We must build great numbers of merchant ships. We must produce tanks and planes and guns and ammunition. All these things we must do with the utmost speed.

As a part of our defense effort the people of this country have approved overwhelmingly a policy of assistance to Great Britain, China, and other nations which are endeavoring to turn back the advance of the totalitarians. We realize that Great Britain with her Navy stands between us and the Axis military forces. If Great Britain should fall, we would be left alone to face the totalitarians. Obviously our own interests fully justify the policy of furnishing Great Britain with the weapons necessary for use in the heroic resistance of the British people.

This is but the exercise of our inalienable right of self-defense. We have already furnished Great Britain with war supplies in accordance with the Lend-Lease Act of March 11 of this year. We must continue to send supplies, and in greater quantities. Furthermore, we must insure that these war supplies reach their destination. We are determined that the products of our fields and factories shall reach the Nation for which they are intended. This point was emphasized by Secretary of State Cordell Hull in the following statement from a radio address delivered a few days ago:

We are a practical people. When we set ourselves to a task we finish it. We have set ourselves to the task of arming and supplying those whose successful defense is vital to our security. * * * We will not permit this purpose to be frustrated. We will find a way to insure that the weapons pouring in ever greater volume from our factories will reach the hands which eagerly await them.

We must face the fact that if Great Britain should fall, the task before this country would become greatly increased. Our national security would require the continuous devotion of a very large part of all our work and wealth for defense production, prolonged universal military service, extremely burdensome taxation, unending vigilance against enemies within our borders, and complete involvement in power diplomacy. These would be the necessities of a condition as exposed as ours would be in that contingency.

Another direction in which our defense preparations are being made is by co-operation with the other American nations. An attack by an aggressor power against any nation of this hemisphere obviously would menace the United States. Our national-defense system, therefore, is part of a hemisphere defense system in which we are cooperating with the other American nations. We are keeping these nations fully advised of our defense preparations. We have welcomed military missions from them and, in turn, our military experts have been welcomed by those nations. We encourage a frank interchange of information and plans. The eight naval bases which we have acquired from Great Britain were acquired for the protection of the entire Western Hemisphere. The unity of the nations of this hemisphere was proven when these naval bases were promptly opened by the United States to the other American republics for cooperative use.

In conclusion let me urge that we be not discouraged when the tide of events is temporarily unfavorable to our interests. There will, of course, be ups and downs during the days and weeks and months ahead. Powerful propaganda agencies will endeavor to weaken our will to carry on. But it is our tradition that we carry on with increased and renewed vigor when the difficulties seem particularly great.

The world today is passing through a great crisis, a crisis in which the finest ideals of humanity, which have seen their fullest realization in our own country, are passing through an ordeal of fire and sword. If we have the faith, if we have the resolution, these ideals, the very life-blood of democracy, will prevail.

I should like to close by quoting the final paragraph of an address delivered a month ago by Secretary Hull:

Although the task is huge, though time is pressing, and though the struggle may continue for a long time, I am confident that at the end there will come a better day. We are at work not only at the task of insuring our own safety but also at the task of creating ultimate conditions of peace with justice. We can help to lay a firm foundation for the independence, the security, and the returning prosperity of the members of the family of nations. I have absolute faith in the ultimate triumph of the principles of humanity, translated into law and order, by which freedom and justice and security will again prevail.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

GASOLINE TAXES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my endorsement of a bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], being H. R. 4549. This bill proposes to increase the tax on gasoline in the District of Columbia from 2 cents per gallon to 4 cents. The bill was introduced in the House April 28, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I think, that in view of circumstances that I shall relate, the committee should proceed to hold hearings on this bill.

The thing that calls my attention more forcefully to this matter is some publicity that has appeared in the Washington newspapers during the last 2 or 3 days regarding this problem. Here is a headline that reads "2 cents too much, gas tax fought at D. C. highway hearings." Here is another that says, "Gas tax rise for highway fought."

Now, let us look at the situation briefly for a minute. The gas tax in the District of Columbia—for the District—is 2 cents per gallon. Every State in the union has a higher tax except one which also has a 2-cent tax. That State—Missouri—I am informed, is making an effort to increase its tax because of its needs. Think for a moment. The rate is lower than 46 States. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the average tax in all the States is 4.4 cents per gallon. The tax here is less than half that amount.

Mr. Speaker, that situation might not be criticized so much if it were not for the fact that through the years the general fund of the District has made large contributions for the improvement of highways and building bridges for the District of Columbia.

Only recently a plan was submitted by Highway Director H. C. Whitehurst that provided for improvements over a period of years, to cost about \$40,000,000, to lift the traffic face of the Nation's Capital. The plan was applauded by the newspapers and by many leading citizens of the District. Now we find that plan assailed because it includes a recommendation that the tax on gasoline be increased from 2 to 4 cents to help finance the proposition. Mr. Speaker, if there were no need for the improvement and for the tax increase, I would not favor the bill.

It seems to me that the need is obvious. If a hearing on the bill does not disclose the need for improvements, at least, in line with this plan, then it is a different matter. On that subject I want to direct your attention to a careful investigation that was made by a special committee recently, headed by the Honorable W. A. POAGE, of Texas. That report is on file and should be carefully studied by the membership of this Congress. I shall not have time to discuss this report, but I do call your attention to a statement that from 1925 to and including 1937 about \$23,000,000 was used from the Federal Treasury to help the street and road funds of the District. The report also discloses that the Federal Government during that period spent approximately \$18,000,000 for bridges in the District.

Mr. Speaker, I think it could be said that there has been an expenditure of the equivalent of 4 cents per gallon on the roads and streets and bridges but that only 2 cents tax has been collected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my criticism lies in the fact that the people in the District are being favored with a low tax on gasoline, and the taxpayers in your State and mine are required to make up the deficit. I just do not believe it is fair. I do not think you do, either.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want the people of Washington to pay more than their share of taxes. I think they should do their part. That is all I ask. They are already favored with a real-estate tax rate of only \$1.75 per hundred dollars. The average is about \$3 in most places this size.

I know the need for improvements in this great city is great. But before the people of your States and mine should be asked to help contribute between \$5,000,000 and \$10,000,000 per year, the people of the District should be willing to boost their rates on a par with ours.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, a great part of the gas tax would be paid by people who do not permanently reside in this city and who pay very little other direct taxes.

I have noticed through the columns of the newspapers that certain big users of gasoline have appeared before the "citizens committees" protesting against the tax raise. These same users are the ones who use and wear the streets the most and who also profit most by the use of the streets and highways. Here we are, in the finest city in the United States, the most prosperous city in the whole country the last 10 years, and their people unwilling to pay as much gasoline tax as people pay in other parts of the country. I just cannot believe it.

Mr. Speaker, why not have a meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia within the very near future and have a hearing on H. R. 4549? I really believe that when all the facts are presented the committee will support it. I think, too, that when the people of the District are familiar with all of the facts the great majority of them will favor this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a statement of gasoline taxes levied upon the sale of gasoline in the various States and

the District of Columbia, as of this date, May 22, 1941:

There is a Federal tax on gasoline now of 1½ cents per gallon, which is in addition to the amounts set opposite the various States; that is to say where the State tax is cataloged at 4 cents there is an additional Federal tax of 1½ cents which makes the total in that particular jurisdiction 5½ cents.

	Cents
Alabama	6
Arizona	5
Arkansas	6½
California	3
Colorado	4
Connecticut	3
Delaware	4
District of Columbia	2
Florida	7
Georgia	6
Idaho	5
Illinois	3
Indiana	4
Iowa	3
Kansas	3
Kentucky	5
Louisiana	7
Maine	4
Maryland	4
Massachusetts	3
Michigan	3
Minnesota	4
Mississippi	6
Missouri	2
Montana	5
Nebraska	5
Nevada	5
New Hampshire	4
New Jersey	3
New Mexico	5
New York	4
North Carolina	6
North Dakota	4
Ohio	4
Oklahoma	4
Oregon	5
Pennsylvania	3
Rhode Island	3
South Carolina	6
South Dakota	4
Tennessee	7
Texas	4
Utah	4
Vermont	4
Virginia	5
Washington	5
West Virginia	5
Wisconsin	4
Wyoming	4

SUMMARY

One State has a State tax of 2 cents, that is Missouri, which now has a bill and constitutional amendment pending to raise the tax to 3 or 4 cents. The District of Columbia has a tax of 2 cents.

There are 10 States with a State tax of 3 cents.

There are 17 with a State tax of 4 cents. There are 11 with a State tax of 5 cents.

There are five with a State tax of 6 cents. There is one State with a State tax of 6½ cents.

There are three with a State tax of 7 cents. Two jurisdictions have a tax of 2 cents—District of Columbia and Missouri.

The average for the States is now 4.4 cents.

The Federal Government now has a tax of 1½ cents per gallon which applies to all jurisdictions. There are other hidden gasoline taxes, such as production taxes, storage taxes, etc.

TAXES

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, is rather busy forenoons and afternoons in having hearings on tax legislation. Invariably those who have come before us—and we have had from 200 to 300 persons appear before us—make two statements. The first is that they are 100-percent patriotic and for the defense program. In the next paragraph they all say that if we tax them any more than we are taxing them now they will have to go out of business, or that we will reach the point of diminishing returns and the revenues will be so decreased that it would not be worth while taxing them at all.

My contention is that if they are 100-percent Americans they ought to be willing to pay the taxes. I know in my own case the tax is going to be trebled on my income. I certainly will pay that and not say a word against it. I have supported all the appropriations for defense, believing they were for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. I voted against the conscription bill and I voted against the lease-lend bill. But we are in it now, and if we are going to have the fiddler we are going to "pay the fiddler."

Mr. Lovell H. Parker, tax consultant and former chief of staff, Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, came before the committee this morning, and he wanted to reduce the amount raised from three and one-half billion to two and one-half billion. One of the ways he wanted to diminish it was to not have anything done with reference to excess profits. I asked him if he was satisfied with the present law regarding excess-profits taxes. He said he was not entirely so; but he said that he wanted that law to remain on the statute books for at least a year more, so as to give it a fair trial. So I read to him from a statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HILL of Washington. I ask permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. I read to him from a statement by Mr. John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before our committee on Monday, May 19, from page 7 of that statement. I want to read this for you and for the country at large. It shocked me when he made this statement:

One company whose profits in 1940 were more than 3,000 percent larger than in 1939 is subject to no excess-profits tax whatever on 1940 earnings and this is a company which has thus far received over \$70,000,000 of defense contracts. A large industrial company which has received over \$250,000,000 of defense contracts and had earnings in 1940 of nearly 200 percent larger than in 1939 will pay no excess-profits tax. It appears that only 5 out of 12 large, integrated steel companies will be subject to excess-profits tax on the income of 1940, although steel companies have in general received huge amounts of defense orders.

These companies pay little or no excess-profits tax because they are allowed a minimum credit of 8 percent of invested capital.

I asked him if he was in favor of that kind of legislation remaining on the stat-

ute books, and he said he was. I replied by saying that we have drafted our young men, have taken them out of good positions where they were getting good salaries, to serve their country at \$21 a month. Therefore I, for my part, am in favor of taxing excess profits 100 percent.

My friends, this 3,000-percent increase sounds a great deal to me like the first World War of 1917 and 1918, when 22,000 new millionaires were made. It is time that the American people and the American Congress realize that we must reach these excess profits before it is too late. We must be fair to little business, small industries, to all—but let there be no profits at the expense of service and suffering and possibly lifeblood. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to have 1 additional minute to answer a question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My question, Mr. Speaker, is more in line of a reflection on the gentleman's speech on taxation. I think it is one of the best we have heard on that subject for some time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, first I am going to talk for the RECORD and then in a moment I shall have some comment to make of interest to the visitors.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the relief bill, the Work Projects Administration, is in session this week. I believe the committee is meeting now in one of the committee rooms hearing witnesses. It is vitally important to those sections of the country that have not received national-defense contracts that this appropriation for W. P. A. be continued. I regret that the President recommended a cut. I believe the W. P. A. officials ought to be allowed to carry on the projects in those communities where there is high unemployment until such time as private industry can absorb the unemployed. Now just a word to our visitors.

Our visitors wonder why we are still in session and yet practically all of the Members not here. Once in a while a visitor goes away and says, "I am disgusted with Congress." He goes away with this feeling because they do not understand the situation. The Members of Congress work under a heavy schedule. They are at their offices as a rule at 9 o'clock in the morning and together with their office employees proceed to answer the mail and take care of the departmental requests, and make trips downtown to the various departments in connection with matters in which the people from whose districts they come are interested. At 12 o'clock noon the House goes into session. We function through

committees. After the House goes into session they take up legislation. All of the bills that come here have been carefully considered in committees where witnesses have appeared and testified and where the committee has reported them out on what we call a calendar for action. You will find most of the Members in their seats during the consideration of this legislative program.

The reason I am talking now and the reason there have been several other speeches is because we are on what is known as special orders, after the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table and the legislative program for the day. Members get permission in advance by unanimous consent to talk for 10 or 20 minutes, and those are the speeches to which you have been listening this afternoon.

The other Members of the House, aside from the small number here listening to the special orders, are undoubtedly in their offices attending to the work of their districts and to their duties. So when you go back and tell your friends how many you saw here on the floor, tell them also that you did not visit the various offices and did not see the great activity that is going on in those offices at this time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LARRABEE, for 2 weeks, on account of important business.

Senate Bill Referred

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1438. An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3783. An act authorizing the acquisition or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4669. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 26, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Friday, May 23, 1941, in

room 1304, House Office Building, for consideration of H. R. 1108.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold public hearings on H. R. 1038, entitled "A bill to amend Public Law No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 4, 1939, so as to provide pensions to peacetime veterans of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffering from arrested tuberculosis contracted while in the service." The hearings will be held Tuesday, May 27, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, May 28, 1941, for the consideration of private bills.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments Wednesday, May 28, 1941, room 304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary will hold public hearings on H. R. 4394, to amend the Bankruptcy Act (respecting referees), on Monday, June 2, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 346, House Office Building, before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, June 3, 1941. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 4454, H. R. 106, and H. R. 3366, regarding engineering experiment stations and physical-science research.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4473. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 1420. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration Facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 1421. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration Facility, Roanoke, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4692. A bill relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4660. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 774. An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE, to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial side tracks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services; with amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 4784. A bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3582. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1937 by authorizing the proration of certain additional amounts of sugar among domestic areas; with amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1438. An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LELAND M. FORD: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3308. A bill for the relief of George M. Louie; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4845. A bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$30 to \$40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4846. A bill to provide adequate markets and fair prices for agricultural commodities produced in the United States; to eliminate the necessity for mandatory re-

ductions in crop production; to provide a method for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities for products of foreign countries on a basis mutually advantageous to agricultural and manufacturing interests in the United States, and to such foreign countries; to promote foreign trade in the interest of friendly and peaceful relations among nations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 4847. A bill to permit courts of bankruptcy to appoint as conciliation commissioners persons who are not lawyers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4848. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Ludlow, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4849. A bill to provide for regulating, inspecting, cleaning, and when necessary disinfecting railway cars, other vehicles and other materials entering the United States from Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 4850. A bill to amend section 14 of the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4851. A bill to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4852. A bill to consolidate the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4853. A bill to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans, in Veterans' Administration facilities under contract on parity with other war veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4854. A bill to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, with reference to House bill 597, relative to statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to the cane sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 37 and 40, with reference to designating December 15, 1941, as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their house concurrent resolution No. 10, with reference to section 55 of

the Organic Act of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their senate resolution No. 100 with reference to a reapportionment in the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4855. A bill for the relief of Ralph Lightell, as guardian of Virginia Lightell, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4856. A bill for the relief of Teofilo Dauda, a merchant of Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Louis McCoy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 4858. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4859. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.), against the United States for the amount of such actual losses or damages as shall appear to be due him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1141. By Mr. BOLLES: Resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, representing 85 congregations in southern Wisconsin with a total membership of 18,000 persons, opposing the United States entering the European war or sending our boys to foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1142. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition from various citizens of Morganton, N. C., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1143. By Mr. COCHRAN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, endorsing aid to the suffering, starving, helpless victims of war's brutalities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1144. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the emergency committee of Rhode Island to the President and the Congress of the United States, expressing the belief that the security of the United States demands that we deliver the goods to Britain now; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1145. By Mr. HART: Petition of 54 residents of Hudson County, N. J., opposing the convoying of ships to Great Britain by the American Navy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1146. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petition signed by 58 residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1147. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Frank W. Moon, manager, Corsicana Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Corsicana, Tex., opposing 1-cent-a-bottle tax on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1148. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of members of Local 325, affiliated with System Federation, No. 78, Railway Employees

Department, American Federation of Labor, opposing the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1149. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts, opposing legislation curtailing the American cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1150. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of assembly resolution relative to the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1151. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, to protect our conscripted soldiers and sailors as far as possible from the liquor and vice traffic; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 23, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who art of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, but who knowest the weakness and corruption of our nature, and the manifold temptations which we daily meet with: We humbly beseech Thee to have compassion on our infirmities, and to give us the constant assistance of Thy Holy Spirit, lest through our own frailty, or the trials which encompass us, we be drawn again into sin.

Yet we pray not only for ourselves but for all men, for Thou dost feel the world's pain, and lookest upon all sick and suffering persons, enfolding them in the arms of Thy love.

Protect and assist, we pray Thee, all those who at home or abroad, by land, by sea, or in the air are serving their country, that they, being armed with Thy defense, may be preserved in all perils. Fill them with wisdom and gird them with strength that they may do their duty to Thy honor and glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary—Edwin A. Halsey—read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1941.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

PAT HARRISON,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon, Mr. GLASS took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, May 20, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the

Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 166. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.:

S. 167. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.:

S. 840. An act to create the grade of aviation cadet in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and to prescribe the pay and allowances therefor, and for other purposes;

S. 1063. An act to provide increased pay for certain military personnel while engaged on parachute duty;

S. 1371. An act to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students; and

S. 1541. An act authorizing overtime rates of compensation for certain per annum employees of the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard, and providing additional pay for employees who forego their vacations.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4669) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3205) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," in order to extend the power to establish priorities and allocate material.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'LEARY, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. GIFFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2670. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes;

H. R. 4258. An act to supplement the navigation laws and facilitate the maintenance of discipline on board vessels of the United States;

H. R. 4293. An act to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act re-

lating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment" (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 30), as amended June 2, 1939 (Public, No. 109, 76th Cong.), so as to provide compensation for donors of blood for persons entitled to treatment at Government expense whether or not the donors are in the Government service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4443. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States;

H. R. 4658. An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4671. An act to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4700. An act to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to repeal section 3716 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to provide suitable vessels for the use of certain State nautical schools, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 15. An act to provide for the completion and delivery of the Boca Dam, in the Little Truckee River, in accordance with the contract between the United States and the Washoe County Water Conservation District;

S. 994. An act to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other dispositions of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to prevent depletion of the stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes;

S. 1089. An act to extend the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects;

S. 1296. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor";

H. R. 3783. An act authorizing the acquisition or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4669. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution extending the application of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), to all Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think it was understood that we would consider the calendar today, following, of course, the routine morning business. That is the understanding which was had a few days ago.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair so understands.

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