

the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Ferd W. Meile; to the Committee on Claims.

By Miss RANKIN of Montana:

H. R. 4910. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Murray, Jr., a patent to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1215. By Mr. BOLLES: Resolution of the Association of Lithuanian Workers, Inc., district No. 7, opposing passage of the Hobbs and Russell concentration camps bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1216. Also, resolution of the Association of Lithuanian Workers, Inc., district 7, opposing United States involvement in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1217. Also, resolution of the Association of Lithuanian Workers, Inc., district No. 7, opposing the Vinson Bill as antilabor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1218. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of Fred C. Williams, of Pottsville, Pa., and other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 3852, which would authorize the District of Columbia Board of Barber Examiners to establish opening and closing hours, and a day on which barber shops shall remain closed after an investigation as to the preference of a majority of the licensed barbers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1219. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the emergency committee of Rhode Island to the President and the Congress of the United States, urging full utilization of the industrial, economic, and moral power in this country for production of war materials, including some method of preventing strikes and lock-outs in defense industries and use of naval forces for police, convoy, or whatever way is most effective to insure delivery of these materials to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1220. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution by the Sumter (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce, requesting that consideration of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes navigation and power project be deferred for the time being, or at least until such time as peacetime economy is once more restored and the program can then be calmly studied from the standpoint of its actual advantages and disadvantages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1221. By Mr. HART: Petition of the National Council of State Liquor Dealers' Associations, Camden, N. J., opposing Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1222. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of the American Temperance Society of Seventh-Day Adventists of Richland, Wash., urging the passage of House bill 4000, a bill to stop the sale of alcoholic beverages in or near Army and Navy camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1223. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of 71 residents of Potwin, Kans., objecting to the United States of America convoying ships to or through the war zones; to American soldiers fighting on foreign soil; and to American soldiers delivering or convoying materials to nations at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1224. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition protesting against House bill 3821, a bill to repeal the Tydings-Miller National Trade Enabling Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1225. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the American Museum of Natural History opposing House bill 2675; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1226. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of

California, memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize an investigation of the feasibility of growing guayule rubber in California, and if such investigation discloses that it is feasible, that Congress provide a subsidy to the farmers of California to enable them to grow the product at a fair profit for their work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1227. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Petition memorializing the United States Price Control Administrator Leon Henderson, head of purchasing department for the Army, Colonel Logan, and Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, all of Washington, D. C., to require purchasing departments of Army, Navy, and other Federal agencies to purchase more weighty steers and fewer hand-weight steers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1228. By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Petition of the Polish Army Veterans Association of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1229. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry residents of the Fifth Massachusetts Congressional District, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1230. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the California Highway Commission, asking consideration of its resolution relative to highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

1231. By Mr. WHEAT: Resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Shelbyville, Ill., relative to reservoir project No. 33 of the Illinois State Planning Commission; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1232. By Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Petition of sundry citizens of the city of Minneapolis and various surrounding towns, protesting against the enactment of House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1233. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Rayon Textile Workers Union, Local 202, Covington, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4139, the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, May 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, God of our Fathers, praised and exalted above all forever; early in the morning do we seek Thee and direct our prayers unto Thee, as we wait for Thy blessing at the threshold of Thy sanctuary. Send us, O Lord, help from above and quicken us with Thy free spirit, that we may be enabled to respond to each opportunity for service as we strive to prepare ourselves in body, soul, and spirit, for the work of the exacting days that lie ahead.

Bless, in superabundant measure, our President. Give him insight to discern, wisdom to know, courage to fulfill Thy will for America; and we pray Thee so to unify the hearts, minds and wills of our people that they may strive with one holy purpose to keep our beloved country true to the ideals of our fathers—devotion to duty, to honor, and to the leadership of a divine beneficent Providence.

Bless especially those members of the Senate, who, by reason of sickness, are absent from its deliberations, and at this hour we ask that Thou wilt touch with Thy hands of healing the beloved leader of this body. Restore him speedily to health and strength, and to an ever-increasing sense of devotion to duty and to the service of his country.

We ask these blessings not because we are worthy to ask them, but for the sake of Him, the glorious Leader and Companion of our way, Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, May 26, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 28, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

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"; 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McGill, one of its clerks, 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. 4466) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1438) 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 an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1801) amending the act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144).

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4368) authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

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 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;

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;

H. R. 179. An act for the relief of Frank E. Nichols;

H. R. 250. An act for the relief of Otto Meyer and Leigh Kelly;

H. R. 713. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman;

H. R. 816. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain members or former members of the United States Coast Guard (formerly the Bureau of Lighthouses) for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at several light stations on the coast of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Hazen G. Chamberlain, M. D., and Cuba Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Charles E. Allison;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Herman E. Schorr;

H. R. 1731. An act for the relief of Beulah Bell Nolte and George C. Nolte;

H. R. 1732. An act for the relief of Floyd Wilday, Vera Wilday, and James M. Wells;

H. R. 1771. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1801. An act amending the act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144);

H. R. 2054. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, A. J. McLaren, A. D. Barkeley, Oscar Clayton, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, the estate of C. E. Wells, and the estate of Theodore Bowen;

H. R. 2107. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell equipment and sup-

plies to and perform work for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 2426. An act for the relief of H. B. Wilson;

H. R. 2569. An act for the relief of Charles R. Woods;

H. R. 2828. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa., and to authorize its construction by the Dauphin County, Pa., authority;

H. R. 3084. An act for the relief of Hugh C. Russell;

H. R. 3205. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3309. An act for the relief of Louis J. Banderet;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Irene Trauernicht;

H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams;

H. R. 4105. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character;

H. R. 4305. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the diamond anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Columbus, Ohio, September 14 to 19, inclusive, 1941;

H. R. 4368. An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy;

H. R. 4534. An act 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

H. R. 4632. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1941.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gurney	Overton
Alken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Herring	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Rosier
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brown	Hughes	Schwartz
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Burton	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lee	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Ellender	Murdock	Wallgren
George	Murray	Wheeler
Gillette	Norris	White
Glass	Nye	Wiley
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator

from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent due to the serious illness of their mothers.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

One of the greatest resources in the arsenal of democracy is our national ability and interest in industrial research. For the vigorous prosecution of our defense program and for the assurance of national progress after the emergency we rely heavily on the continued vitality of research by industry in both pure and applied science.

Our people can justly take pride in the record of the accomplishment by American industry contained in the report on Research—A National Resource, Part II, Industrial Research, which I am transmitting for the information of the Congress. This document is one of a series on our research resources being prepared by the National Resources Planning Board, with the assistance of scientific councils and committees. The National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council are responsible for the organization and presentation of this volume.

The report presents a clear record of how successfully we have translated our old-time Yankee ingenuity for invention into American genius for research. Our scientists have uncovered and explained the secrets of nature, applied them to industry, and thus raised our standard of living, strengthened our defense, an enriched our national life.

The following significant paragraph in the report sums up the great changes that have come about through industrial research:

More efficient and economical methods have conserved our resources; new materials have made possible better products; and new products have contributed to the health, pleasure, and comfort of the general public. Such changes have not taken place without some temporary misfortunes. Here and there industries have disappeared and people have been temporarily thrown out of work, but

the net result of 40 years of organized industrial research in this country has been the enrichment of life to an incalculable degree.

I commend a careful reading of this report to the Members of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1941.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAND AT COAST GUARD LIGHT STATION RESERVATION, AU SABLE, MICH.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain lands owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MARCH 1941 REPORT OF THE R. F. C.

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of March 1941, including statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritance, and gifts

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That application be, and it hereby is, made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualifica-

tion that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress, by a vote of three-fourths of each House, may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power, while the United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"Sec. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"Sec. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Michigan be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate on April 29, 1941.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on May 16, 1941."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 47

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make an investigation into safeguarding the copper mines in Michigan in case of invasion, and providing for a training camp in the Upper Peninsula

"Whereas the possibility of planes flying from Greenland to Fort Wilkins, at Keweenaw Point, in the Upper Peninsula, should be carefully investigated and studied, especially in view of the fact that there is at the present time but one road leading to Fort Wilkins, and Portage Canal between Hancock and Houghton is vulnerable, thus leaving the copper mines in the Upper Peninsula without protection in case of possible invasion; and

"Whereas steps should be taken to strengthen defense facilities, and in accomplishing this result it may be considered advisable to establish a training camp for called men in the Upper Peninsula: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to thoroughly investigate the necessary safeguarding of the copper mines and the desirability of establishing a training camp in the Upper Peninsula; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

"Adopted by the senate on May 19, 1941."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing Congress

to investigate the feasibility of the growing of guayule rubber in California, and, if found feasible, to subsidize the same, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. (See joint resolution printed in full, when presented by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 26th instant, p. 4390, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Papers and a letter in the nature of petitions from several citizens of the United States, praying that the United States keep out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from Earl Miller, of Rochester, N. Y., favoring the use of the United States Navy to convoy war material to Great Britain and other allied nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the Foster-Gatewood Sunday School Class of the First Methodist Church, Shreveport, La., praying that the national-defense program be expedited and be not delayed by strife between capital and labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to reject proposed legislation designed to repeal the tax on retail outlets handling oleomargarine; to the Committee on Finance. (See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on the 26th instant, p. 4390, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying that strong and effective action be taken by the Government to prevent further strikes in the coal industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Memorials of sundry citizens of Oswego, Altamont, Chetopa, Mound Valley, Parsons, and Greenwood County, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Berryton Grange, No. 1430, Patrons of Husbandry, of Berryton, Kans., remonstrating against lowering of the draft-age limits under the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens of Minneola, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. MEAD (for Mr. WAGNER):

Letters and telegrams, etc., in the nature of memorials from John Cashmore, borough president of Brooklyn; the Sugar Committee of the Port of New York; the International Longshoremen's Association, Joseph P. Ryan, president, New York City; the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Brooklyn; John J. Brady, of New York City; Sugar Refinery Workers Local No. 1476, of Brooklyn; the Merchants' Association of New York, New York City; the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State in convention assembled at Elmira; the Common Council of the City of Yonkers; the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens, New York City; the Woman's Press Club of New York City; and the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment

of the bill (S. 937) to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937; to the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

Memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying that the United States keep out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Detroit (Mich.) Youth Assembly protesting against the use of convoys or patrols by the United States in the present international situation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Lansing (Mich.) Chapter, America First Committee, protesting against the employment of convoys, patrols, or any other device in the present international situation which may lead to involvement in war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of New York Central System Post, No. 134, American Legion, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of legislation for development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions of the Lions Club, of Muskegon, and the board of governors of the Michigan Trucking Association, both in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation curtailing the use and possession of firearms by citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the adoption of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) providing for an advisory war referendum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

Memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments in its present form; to the table.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Legislative Resolution 32

"Resolution memorializing the United States Price Control Administrator, Leon Henderson; head of purchasing department for the Army, Colonel Logan; and Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, all of Washington, D. C., to require purchasing departments of Army, Navy, and other Federal agencies to purchase more weighty steers and fewer handy-weight steers

"PREAMBLE

"Whereas Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America, on or about May 5, 1941, appealed to the livestock farmers of the Nation to market greater numbers of beef cattle; and

"Whereas livestock farmers of Nebraska and neighboring States patriotically responded to said appeal; and

"Whereas the response of the livestock farmers to the Secretary's appeal resulted in sharply expanded receipts at the seven principal markets on May 12, 1941, and subsequent market days; and

"Whereas livestock farmers since responding to the Secretary's appeal have been forced to sell weighty steers below the depressed market which dates back to January 20, 1941, for a price that has lost livestock farmers money on 75 percent of the cattle sold by them since May 5, 1941, because the packers contend that the purchasing departments of the Army, Navy, and other Federal agencies have refused to buy the weighty steer carcasses, but are in the market only for handy-weight steers weighing from 850 to 1,050 pounds, which sell readily; and

"Whereas further expansion of the market, pursuant to the Secretary's appeal, is certain to extend the break in prices payable to livestock farmers; and

"Whereas livestock farmers have been losing money and further reductions in price will be serious to them; and

"Whereas cattle feeders of Nebraska and of neighboring States cannot be expected to have confidence in this beef market which has continued to show loss from week to week since January 20, 1941, with the cost of producing beef constantly increasing because of increased prices of corn, plus increased labor cost; and

"Whereas every part of the defense program is operating on a higher rate, except the producers of food products; labor has higher wages, the manufacturer and processor are practically guaranteed a reasonable rate, but the livestock farmer, in the last 4 months, has had not only his margin of profit eliminated, but is today at a point where the cattle he markets lose him money: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska in fifty-fifth regular session assembled:

"1. That it is the sense of this legislature that Price Control Administrator Leon Henderson, acting in concert with other Federal governmental agencies in Washington, including the purchasing departments of the Army and Navy, take such steps without delay as will result in the purchasing departments of the Army and Navy and other Federal agencies purchasing greater numbers of weighty cattle carcasses from the seven principal markets in Nebraska and surrounding States.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be spread at large upon the journal of this legislature; that the clerk of this legislature be directed forthwith to forward copies of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, to the following persons: Nebraska Senators and Congressmen; Iowa Senators and Congressmen; Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard; Governor of the State of Iowa; secretary of agriculture, State of Iowa; Leon Henderson, Price Control Administrator; and to Colonel Logan, purchasing department for the Army in Washington, to the end that the parties to whom copies of this resolution are sent may know that the livestock farmers must, without delay, be permitted to sell their weighty beef cattle in the markets where the purchasing departments of the Army, Navy, or other Federal agencies will purchase the same.

"Introduced May 19, 1941.

"Adopted May 19, 1941."

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, out of order I present letters and telegrams, and so forth, in the nature of memorials from Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City; D. L. Tilly, president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, of Brooklyn;

the Merchants' Association of New York; the International Longshoremen's Association, by Joseph P. Ryan, president, New York City; John Cashmore, borough president of Brooklyn; the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State; the Employees Committee to Maintain Brooklyn's Cane Sugar Refining Industry, W. P. Coster, chairman, of Brooklyn; John J. Brady, Brady & Gioe, Inc., of New York; Sugar Refinery Workers, Local No. 1476, I. L. A., affiliated with A. F. of L., Edna M. Geraghty, secretary, of Brooklyn; the Sugar Committee of the Port of New York, and the Community of Councils of the City of New York, Inc., all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of the pending bill, S. 937, to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters, telegrams, and so forth, presented by the Senator from New York, will be received and lie on the table.

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES, ETC., IN THE VICINITY OF MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. STEWART presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nashville, Tenn., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION TO UNITED STATES SENATE

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned residents of Davidson County, State of Tennessee, respectfully urge you to use your influence to bring about the passage of S. 860, a bill to stop the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the Army and Navy camps, and to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and of the Navy to set zones sufficiently wide around all Army and Navy training camps to prevent taverns and vice districts in close proximity thereto.

We urge this in the interest of efficiency, health, and safety of our soldiers, and the general morale of the people throughout the country.

FRANK A. COFFIN
And sundry other citizens.

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONROE, WIS.—WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILEY presented a letter from the city clerk of Monroe, Wis., transmitting a resolution adopted by the common council of that city, which letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MONROE,
Monroe, Wis., May 21, 1941.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the express request of the Common Council of the City of Monroe, Green County, Wis., I am forwarding to you a copy of a resolution adopted May 20, 1941, relating to the 1941-42 relief bill relative to the Work Projects Administration, which we understand is shortly to be before the Senate.

Anything you may be able to do as to the furtherance of this matter will be greatly appreciated by this community.

Very truly yours,

FRED W. WETTENGEL,
City Clerk, City of Monroe.

Be it resolved by the Common Council of the City of Monroe, a municipal corporation

of the State of Wisconsin, That the Congress of the United States, in enacting the 1941-42 relief bill relative to Work Projects Administration, embrace therein the following provisions:

1. That the 18-month rule be eliminated.
2. That the 95-5 percent rule be changed to 90-10 percent.
3. That the percent of sponsors' contributions be reduced appreciably since the present percent is very severe and taxing local resources.
4. That small communities in nondefense areas not be penalized by reduction in quota of Work Projects Administration workers.
5. That construction work (operations) not be curtailed in favor of community service type projects.

Dated this 20th day of May 1941.

Offered by the board of public works.

WILLIAM F. BECKMAN.
ERNEST C. WAEFFLER.
GEO. J. MEYTHALER.
HENRY TSCHUDY.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of the Committee on Foreign Relations was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1488. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage, an employee of the United States, to service under the government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the government of the Punjab, India" (act of June 29, 1940, Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.); without amendment (Rept. No. 365).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1570. A bill to further amend the acts for promoting the circulation of reading matter among the blind; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 1571. A bill for the relief of Robert Zane Collings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1574 (by request). A bill to provide for the election of at least three full-blooded Indians of the Osage Tribe to the tribal council of such tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1575. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fortified military post at or near the naval depot at Hawthorne, Nev.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the

stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

GRADING OF COTTONSEED

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This morning I was instructed to request the return to the committee of House bill 571, to establish and promote the use of standard methods of grading cottonseed, to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on prices and grades of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes. My understanding is that the bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that the committee has agreed to it. A Senator was given charge of it, but it has not yet been acted upon. I submit the request.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask leave to enter a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill (S. 1074) for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, was passed on the 26th instant.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

INSURANCE OF LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OF LIVESTOCK, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. NYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1325) to provide for insurance by the Farm Credit Administration of loans made by financial institutions for the purpose of enabling borrowers to purchase livestock for restocking or herd-foundation purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

STABILIZATION FUND AND WEIGHT OF THE DOLLAR—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill to insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner any of the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised,' approved July 6, 1939."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the House joint resolution making appropriations for relief and work relief, fiscal year 1942, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place to insert the following:

"In the allocation among the States for expenditure of the funds appropriated to the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps by this act, the Federal Security Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the unemployment problem in the various States has been affected and will be affected by the expenditure therein of funds appropriated for national-defense purposes, and the funds appropriated to the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps by this act (other than funds for administrative expenses) shall be allocated for expenditure in the several States, respectively, on the basis of the extent to which expenditures for national-defense purposes do not meet the needs for the relief of unemployed persons in such States."

At the proper place to insert the following:

"In the allocation among the States for expenditure of the funds appropriated to the Work Projects Administration by this joint resolution, the Federal Work Projects Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the unemployment problem in the various States has been affected and will be affected by the expenditure therein of funds appropriated for national-defense purposes, and the funds appropriated to the Work Projects Administration by this joint resolution (other than funds for administrative expenses) shall be allocated for expenditure in the several States, respectively, on the basis of the extent to which expenditures for national-defense purposes do not meet the needs for the relief of unemployed persons in such States."

REPORT ON SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TEXAS (S. DOC. NO. 60)

Mr. OVERTON (for Mr. BAILEY) presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated November 20, 1940, from the Chief of Engineers of the Army, on reexamination of the Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON INTERVENTION IN WAR

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on intervention in war delivered by Senator TAFT on May 28, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER AT LEXINGTON, NEBR.

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BUTLER at Lexington, Nebr., on May 29, 1941, commemorating annual Plum Creek Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA IN A WORLD AT WAR—ADDRESS BY CHESTER C. DAVIS

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Chester C. Davis, member of the National Defense Advisory Commission, at the Army Day celebration at St. Louis, Mo., on April 7, 1941, on the subject America in

a World at War, which appears in the Appendix.]

**THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
AND NATIONAL DEFENSE**

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release by the Tennessee Valley Authority which appears in the Appendix.]

**THE SUNDOWN PATROL—ARTICLE BY
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER**

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger entitled "The Sundown Patrol," which appears in the Appendix.]

**IN DEFENSE OF THE PEOPLE—EDITORIAL
FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST**

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Saturday Evening Post of May 31, 1941, entitled "In Defense of the People," which appears in the Appendix.]

**AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE—LETTER
FROM M. C. MIGEL TO GEN. ROBERT E.
WOOD**

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Mr. M. C. Migel to Gen. Robert E. Wood, in reply to a request from General Wood that Mr. Migel contribute funds to support the activities of the America First Committee.]

**HEALTH CONDITIONS IN LOUISIANA
MILITARY CAMPS**

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of the issue of May 22, 1941, relative to health conditions in military camps in Louisiana.]

**USE OF MUSICAL COPYRIGHTS—DECI-
SIONS BY SUPREME COURT**

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two Supreme Court decisions relating to the use of copyrights in the musical field.]

**MACHINISTS' STRIKES IN SAN FRAN-
CISCO AND OAKLAND, CALIF.**

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on National Defense has been investigating certain labor controversies in the cities of San Francisco and Oakland. I believe at this time it is appropriate for me, as chairman of that committee, to make a statement to the Senate on some of the facts developed at our hearings during the past 2 days.

On Tuesday night the President proclaimed the existence of an unlimited emergency, and, in connection therewith, said:

When the Nation is threatened from without, however, as it is today, the actual production and transportation of the machinery of defense must not be interrupted by disputes between capital and capital, labor and labor, or capital and labor. The future of all free enterprise—of capital and labor alike—is at stake. A Nation-wide machinery for conciliation and mediation of industrial disputes has been set up. That machinery must be used promptly, and without stoppage of work. Collective bargaining will be retained but the American people expect that impartial recommendations of our Government services will be followed both by capital and by labor.

The Secretary of Labor said, with respect to the west coast strike:

In this case, all the machinery of the Government has been used to secure a just and fair program of working conditions. The

machinists have wantonly disregarded this program and are in violation of their contract, which is a most serious disloyalty to union principles and to the program of the labor movements in this country. Moreover, the machinists made no substantial efforts to have any grievances they may have fully considered. There are methods set up where-by real grievances may be adjusted. These methods have not been invoked.

Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, testified that the metals trade department had made a pledge that—

there be no strikes among metal trades workers in defense industries, that wage scales would be negotiated through collective bargaining and differences would be settled through mediation and arbitration.

Consequently, even if there had been no stabilization conference and no agreement upon zone standards, there should have been no stoppage in work.

The stabilization conference had before it the contentions of both the employers and the employees, and the evidence establishes that consideration was given to them.

The bulk of the employees involved in the strike are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, for which Mr. William Green, president of the A. F. of L., spoke in testifying. Mr. Green spent nearly an hour before our committee and went into the matter in detail. This is the substance of what he said:

We must disavow the action of the machinists in the outlaw strike, in which they are engaged.

And Mr. Green called it an outlaw strike.

Their action cannot be approved or countenanced by the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. John Green, president of the Industrial Marine and Shipbuilders of America, affiliated with the C. I. O., likewise took the position that the strike was an outlaw strike.

One thousand one hundred and thirty-one machinist affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and less than 500 machinists affiliated with the S. V. O. C.—that is the C. I. O. shipbuilding steel organization—are striking, and by their picketing activities and otherwise are preventing 10 times that many men from working on a total of approximately \$500,000,000 of Navy and Maritime Commission work in San Francisco Bay.

The objectives of the strike appear to be to obtain \$1.15 an hour and double time for overtime, as against \$1.12 an hour and time and a half for overtime provided for in the zone standards; but also to obtain, incidentally, the closed shop. The closed shop did not become an issue, however, until the strike started.

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

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator says it appears to be that these are the two issues—wages of \$1.15 instead of \$1.12, and double time for overtime instead of time and a half. Perhaps the Senator is coming to this, but is it not a matter of fact that Mr. Hook stated positively to our

committee yesterday that those were the only two issues?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. That nothing else was involved?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator was present, and that is exactly what he said.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does my colleague intend to touch on the situation in St. Louis involving the jurisdictional strike in the Busch Sulzer Diesel-engine plant?

Mr. TRUMAN. That matter has not been before our committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should simply like to suggest to my colleague that when he is talking about the strike in San Francisco Bay, an even more flagrant case is that having to do with the Busch Sulzer Diesel Engine Co. plant in St. Louis, because in that case there is no question of wages, or collective bargaining, or anything of the sort, or any question between the employer and the employee. No question as to conditions of labor is involved; but at the present time the company, under contract with the Navy Department in which speed is of the very essence, is being prevented from installing absolutely essential machinery before it can enter upon the performance of the contract by a jurisdictional dispute between, as I recall the machinists and the carpenters. That seems to me to present an even more startling case than that which my colleague is now discussing.

Mr. TRUMAN. The strike referred to by my colleague is perfectly asinine. The committee of which I happen to be chairman is made up of Members of the Senate who are all friends of labor, and the hearings which we have held on this subject have been perfectly disgusting to us, because of what has been shown as to the manner in which the laboring men have acted. I do not think they represent the backbone of labor at all. I think that is true as to the situation in St. Louis. I think it is a quarrel between a couple of leaders.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If my colleague will permit a further word, the very unions which are holding up the performance of the contracts by a jurisdictional dispute in St. Louis do not even represent contending major labor forces. They are both affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and there is a jurisdictional dispute between them. No question of wages, or hours of labor, or conditions of labor, collective bargaining, or anything of the kind, is involved; but the controversy is holding up a series of very essential naval contracts, as to which time is of the very essence.

Mr. TRUMAN. It is asinine, and they should not do what they are doing.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri subsequently said: Mr. President, in the course of the remarks of my colleague [Mr. TRUMAN], I made some reference to the jurisdictional strike in St. Louis, which is impeding the work of national defense. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial

from the St. Louis Star Times of May 27, 1941, dealing with that subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of May 27, 1941]

WHY NOT A FACT-FINDING BOARD?

In Washington today a battery of Government and labor officials is wrestling with the stubborn jurisdictional union dispute halting installation of machinery in the new Busch Sulzer Diesel Engine Co. plant. If all other approaches fail, it would seem that this absurd controversy might be settled on a simple fact-finding basis.

Why could not both unions involved (carpenters and machinists, each affiliated with the A. F. of L.) be asked to submit the dispute to an impartial board of engineers, which would decide the single question of which group of workmen would perform most efficiently the type of work required?

This is simple, perhaps, to the point of being naive. Anyone who knows anything about jurisdictional conflicts knows that at least one union in each case is not concerned with facts—it is concerned solely with power. It is cut to get and keep as many jobs as possible for itself, even at the expense of fellow unionists and the labor movement generally. This has been the history of the lengthy quarrel between machinists and carpenters in the many areas which it has afflicted.

But Busch Sulzer has Navy contracts, in the execution of which speed is all important. Both unions can reasonably and fairly be asked to submit their dispute at this plant to a fact-finding board of competent industrial engineers, which would not be prejudiced in favor of either, but would simply examine the type of work, consider the special skills of carpenters and machinists, respectively, and render a decision on which should have the employment.

If unions refuse all conceivable instruments of mediation and arbitration and persist in intralabor fights which endanger the Nation, the eventual solution will be much more drastic. Pressure for congressional action outlawing jurisdictional strikes will become irresistible. Would not a fact-finding board be preferable?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the wages which formerly prevailed were \$1 per hour and double time for overtime, which, however, was very limited in amount because of the insistence of the Maritime Commission and the Navy that overtime be eliminated except where absolutely essential.

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

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to have the Senator emphasize again the point about double time. It is a fact, apparently, from the testimony which came before us, that these agreements have been in force on the west coast for a number of years, perhaps since 1908, providing for double pay for overtime. But practically all the testimony that I recall coming before the committee was to the effect that the double time was in reality never paid, that it was used as a means of spreading work among employees, and employees themselves benefited hardly at all from the provision for double time. Is that correct?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is absolutely correct. It was a penalty for the

purpose of spreading work during time when there was little work. It was inaugurated, I understand, during the early years of the depression; in fact, in 1929, if I remember correctly.

Mr. HATCH. As a matter of fact, the difference between double time and time and a half is largely mythical, is it not?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

It is now contemplated to work a 48-hour week, for which, on the old basis, an employee would have received \$56 per man per week, and for which, on the new basis, he will receive \$58.24, so that it would appear that despite the change from double time to time and a half the men will receive for a 48-hour week an increase of wages amounting to \$2.24. Consequently there is little basis for complaint that the men are being deprived of what they already had.

It is inherent in the negotiation of any zone standards for a situation as complex as shipbuilding, involving, as it does, so many different crafts and so many different localities, that some of the existing arrangements will have to be changed to conform to the zone standards. The very essence of zone standards is agreement on general conditions applicable to all.

The zone standards were negotiated, and then individual agreements were negotiated between the different unions and the employers, and in every city in the West, where the shipbuilding controversy was on, the men are at work, and are satisfied with the agreement, which was signed by these very unions which are striking.

Any attempt to make the zone standards conform to every condition of every agreement of every craft in every locality would destroy all possibility of negotiating zone standards. Negotiations of zone standards must be a give-and-take proposition. The unions cannot, on the one hand, take an increase in wage rates, and on the other hand refuse to make reasonable arrangements on overtime rates to conform to the national necessity for producing ships at maximum speed.

The question of the rates of wages to be paid for regular and overtime work is not, in this instance, a question between the employees and the employers, but is a question between the employees and the Government, because in the last analysis it is the Government and not the employers who will pay the wage rates, for these are cost-plus contracts, and the Government meets the pay roll.

The Under Secretary of the Navy and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission have informed the committee officially that it is their firm position that the Government should not and will not countenance any increase in the regular or overtime wage rates provided in the zone standards, and the zone standards provided time and a half.

The International Association of Machinists, through its vice president, Mr. Castleman, participated in the negotiations for the zone standards, and it appears from the testimony of Mr. H. S. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, that the international organization would not sanction

the strike if all employers were willing to sign the so-called master agreement, containing as it does, provisions for closed shop. Mr. Brown, speaking for the international, agreed that the real issue, as he saw it, was whether there should be a closed shop.

Mr. H. S. Hook, speaking for Local 68 of the International Association of Machinists and its 1,131 members out on strike, testified that his local was not insistent on a closed shop.

Mr. Smith, for the C. I. O. machinists, Local 1034, stated that his union was striking for a closed shop, and for a \$1.15 per hour, plus double time for overtime on the theory that his 500 men had not been represented in the stabilization conference, and that they did not consider themselves bound by the decision of those participating in the conference. There is no evidence that they were not permitted to set forth their position. The fact is that they walked out of the conference. It is unfortunate that they did not agree with the conclusions reached by the conference, including as it did representatives of the great majority of laborers involved, but it is inherent in the American way of doing things that the opinion of the majority should prevail. Five hundred machinists cannot be permitted to prevent the application of working agreements found to be fair by many thousands of workmen, who were also parties to the agreements.

Under all the circumstances involved here, the Senate committee is of the opinion that the zone standards agreed upon after such an extended investigation and negotiation should not be disregarded and set at naught; that the Government of the United States has taken no position either for or against the closed shop, and that the desperate need of the United States for ships ought not to be used as a weapon to obtain closed shops where for 25 years no closed shops have existed; and that any provisions as to which an agreement cannot be reached, other than those in the zone standards and other than a closed shop, should be submitted to arbitration.

The Senate committee believes that the machinists of San Francisco are loyal Americans and that they will give heed to the unlimited emergency proclaimed by the President and to the request of the President that the vital defense program of the Nation be not impeded by the stoppage of work on defense projects. The Senate committee will write each of the machinists out on strike as soon as the names and addresses are furnished as requested by the Senate committee, asking each person to answer, "Yes" or "No" whether he is prepared to return to work, and the committee requests such machinists, without waiting for the receipt of a formal communication from the committee, to send in their answers to the committee.

The United States must and will have ships, and it must have them and will have them now.

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

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. How long has this strike been going on?

Mr. TRUMAN. For about 2 weeks.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not nearly 3 weeks now?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think it is beginning the third week.

Mr. HATCH. It is beginning the third week.

Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator has said, I wish to say that in common, I think, with practically every other Senator on this side of the Chamber, I have voted for every piece of labor legislation that has come before the Senate during the present administration. I have always favored everything which would improve the conditions and the lot of the workingman in this country, but I was terribly shocked when this condition was revealed to our committee. As a matter of fact, these men were drawing a dollar an hour and not working many days a week when this emergency program started. Under the emergency program every day in the week is a work day for them, at \$8 a day, and under the agreement that was reached they received an increase in wages of 12 cents an hour. The only difference at all which now exists, as I see it—because I do not think that double time has anything to do with the controversy—is the difference between \$1.12 an hour and \$1.15 an hour; 3 cents an hour, or 24 cents a day, involving at the outside, I think, some 1,600 men.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is the number of men on strike, but about 16,000 men are out of work.

Mr. HATCH. I know. One thousand and six hundred men are out on strike, whose possible gain would be \$400 a day, and for 2 or 3 weeks now 16,000 or 17,000 men have been without their daily wage of \$8 a day, at a cost of some \$350,000 or \$400,000.

Like the Senator from Missouri, I cannot believe that any group of men is willing to pay such a cost as that in dollars and cents. It is hard for me to believe, Mr. President, that in a great emergency program, when the welfare of our country is involved, 1,600 men can or will tie up a vital defense industry.

Mr. President, I hope the men involved in this strike will take the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, made over and over again in our committee, and go back to work, and go back to work now, and let the other 16,000 go with them.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator from Oregon was on his feet first. I yield to him.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri and other Members of this body, I should like to make the observation that during the past several months, while hearings have been held on subjects that have to do with the national defense, I have put the question to witnesses representing the highest authority in the military, naval, Air Corps, and procurement departments of our Government: To what extent are strikes and lack of coopera-

tion on the part of civilians retarding the Nation's program for national defense? Invariably the answer was that strikes are seriously impairing the progress of the national program for defense. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that point: These strikes, according to our highest authorities, are seriously retarding the program for national defense and aid to Britain. I wish to make the further observation that when using the word "labor" we must differentiate between those who labor and those who racketeer on those who labor. It is those who racketeer on labor who by intimidation and coercion force many honest and patriotic laboring men into unpatriotic and unjustifiable strikes in a time of national emergency.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Missouri had completed his statement, and I desired to address the Senate.

Mr. MEAD rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield the floor?

Mr. TRUMAN. With the permission of the Senator from Louisiana, I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], because he is a member of the committee and I think has something to say about the matter at this time.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, while I in no wise condone the strike, or the agitation which brought on the strike, I ask if it is not true that the record reveals that in the preliminary meetings or negotiations leading up to the development of the agreements, the Bethlehem Co. refused to participate and was rather reluctant to go along as enthusiastically as did the other employers on the Pacific coast? Does not the record reveal the fact that the Bethlehem Co. refused in many instances to participate in the deliberations, and was reluctant to accept the master agreement?

Having that in mind, and realizing that this difficulty existed in most part between the machinists and the Bethlehem Co., while not in any way condoning the strike, yet recognizing the fact that the master agreement provided improved working conditions and higher wage standards, vacations with pay and a higher hourly rate, which the men, in my judgment, should accept, I believe it must be admitted that there is to be found in the hearings ample basis for the immediate settlement of the strike. For instance, President Brown of the International Machinists Association said to us that he would withdraw the sanction for the strike if the Bethlehem Co. would agree to the master agreement. Representatives of the Bethlehem Co. told us they would agree to the master agreement, with the exception of the closed-shop provision. Mr. Hook, the business agent of the striking machinists' union, No. 68, said the closed-shop issue was not important, or words to that effect.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. MEAD. Yes, I am glad to.

Mr. HATCH. As a matter of fact it developed that the strike was called before the closed-shop issue arose. That was developed in the hearings, was it not?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator is correct. Mr. HATCH. It could not have been an issue for calling the strike.

Mr. MEAD. But, nevertheless, it was given to the committee as the issue by the international president.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. That was given as the reason why he gave the sanction.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. In view of the fact that representatives of the unit, Machinists' Union, No. 68, that asked the international president for permission to strike, have explained to the committee that the closed-shop issue is not important, and in view of the fact that the international president said that the closed-shop issue is why he gave them the right to strike, and because he reiterated that he would withdraw the sanction to strike if the Bethlehem Steel Corporation would conform to the master agreement, and, further, in view of the fact that representatives of the Bethlehem Co. told the committee they would yield to the master agreement with the exception of the closed-shop provisions, which we are now told are not important, I cannot understand why this strike should continue.

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

Mr. MEAD. As the Senator indicated, there does not seem to be any reason or excuse for this strike.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Even if there is confusion about the closed-shop issue, does not that fact conclusively demonstrate that there is no reason for the men stopping work? They could go on with their work, call in the conciliation agency of the Government, the Mediation Board, and arbitrate this immaterial point without any trouble whatsoever. That is what should be done.

Mr. MEAD. That is what I suggested at the committee hearing. In my judgment this strike is an injury to the cause of labor. The men ought to accept the improved conditions in the master agreement and arbitrate the differences for which they now find reason to strike.

I wish to say to the chairman, who, in my judgment, deserves the congratulations of the Senate for his effort in this very connection, looking toward the improvement of our national defenses, that Mr. Hook also said that if it was the wish of the Government that the men forego double time and accept time and a half, he would accept that proposal. He also said to the committee that if the President wanted the men to go back to work he would use his efforts to bring them back to work.

We quoted the President's speech and the requests made by the Maritime Commission, the Office of Production Management, and the Navy Department with reference to double time. In my judgment the strike ought not to continue

another 24 hours, in view of the revelations made by the defense committee, under the leadership of the chairman, who has just completed his statement.

I wish to say a word of approval for President Green, of the American Federation of Labor; for Mr. Green, who represented the C. I. O. on the coast; and for John Frey, of the meta' trades union. They cooperated with our committee and worked tirelessly in an effort to bring the men back to work. They deserve our commendation.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. This is at least one instance in which the heads of organized labor apparently have done everything they can to prevent what they call an outlaw strike.

Mr. MEAD. That is quite correct.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator was speaking about what Mr. Hook said as to the willingness of the men to go back to work provided the President wanted them to do so. I am reminded of what the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said yesterday. Apparently Mr. Hook wanted the President of the United States to make a social call on each member of the union and personally invite him to go back to work. That seemed to be Mr. Hook's attitude.

Mr. MEAD. I am hoping that his attitude will change, and that, as the result of the work of our committee, the efforts of the President, and the airing of the matter here, he may see the light.

ACQUISITION AND USE OF MERCHANT VESSELS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is unavoidably detained, and at his request, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on House bill 4466, which was submitted by the senior Senator from North Carolina on May 26 and which now lies on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4466) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 8, strike out "that"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the

following: "Provided further, That such compensation hereunder shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, and the fund so deposited shall be available for the payment of such compensation, and shall be subject to be applied to the payment of the amount of any valid claim by way of mortgage or maritime lien or attachment lien upon such vessel, or of any stipulation therefor in a court of the United States, or of any State, subsisting at the time of such requisition or taking of title or possession; the holder of any such claim may commence within 6 months after such deposit with the Treasurer and maintain in the United States District Court from whose custody such vessel has been or may be taken or in whose territorial jurisdiction the vessel was lying at the time of requisitioning or taking of title or possession, a suit in admiralty according to the principles of libels in rem against the fund, which shall proceed and be heard and determined according to the principles of law and to the rules of practice obtaining in like cases between private parties; and such suit shall be commenced in the manner provided by section 2 of the Suits in Admiralty Act and service of process shall be made in the manner therein provided by service upon the United States attorney and by mailing by registered mail to the Attorney General and the United States Maritime Commission and due notice shall under order of the court be given to all interested persons, and any decree shall be subject to appeal and revision as now provided in other cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction:"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That if the Maritime Commission, after consideration by it of evidence submitted to it within ten days after the approval of this Act, shall find that on September 3, 1939, and continuously thereafter, any vessel was exclusively owned, used and operated for its exclusive sovereign purposes by a sovereign nation making claim therefor, such vessel may be taken under this section only by purchase or charter; and in determining said ownership, use and operation the Commission shall disregard (1) all contributions made in whole or in part at any time to the construction, repair, reconditioning, equipping or operation of said vessel, (2) all such matters, in nature similar to or dissimilar from, the foregoing clause as in the opinion of the Commission are immaterial or irrelevant to the determination of such ownership. Use of such vessel at any time since September 3, 1939, in commercial trade shall be presumptively deemed to show that said vessel is not owned, used and operated by a sovereign nation for its sovereign purposes. The final determination by the Maritime Commission shall be conclusive: Provided further, That if any vessel shall be found under the proviso next preceding to be exclusively owned, used and operated by any sovereign nation so that it can only be chartered or purchased, and such vessel shall be chartered or purchased, then the cash to be paid for said charter or purchase, to the extent that may be necessary, after payment of existing claims and liens of creditors against said vessel, shall be held for application upon such debt, if any, as may be due to the United States from the sovereign nation so found to have exclusive ownership to said vessel: Provided further, That the Maritime Commission and the Department of Justice are authorized to make just provisions out of funds provided in section 2 of this Act for employees displaced by the taking of any ship hereunder and report to the

Congress their action within thirty days after the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. BAILEY,
HATTIE W. CARAWAY,
BENNETT C. CLARK,
CHAS. L. McNARY,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. J. MANSFIELD,
RICHARD J. WELCH (by J. W.
BAILEY, by request),
FRANCIS D. CULKIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

OBSERVANCE OF SOIL-CONSERVATION WEEK

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Governor of Iowa has designated next week for special observance as soil-conservation week. I ask unanimous consent to have his proclamation printed in the RECORD. In that connection, I invite attention to the fact that the distinguished Iowan who now occupies the chair, the Vice President, by his foresight, initiative, and labor, has contributed more than has any other citizen in behalf of the Soil Conservation Act.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Iowa people are to be highly commended for their fine response to the appeal for practical efforts at soil conservation embodied in law 2 years ago authorizing cooperation in conservation districts. Farmers in eight counties have taken advantage of this law, and educational work in controlling erosion and building soil fertility has been carried on in all other counties. Last year some 85 counties participated in soil-conservation week, largely under the leadership of the Iowa State College Extension Service.

The readiness with which farmers and land owners become conservation conscious demonstrates that Iowa is prepared to go on to greater triumphs in maintaining the great agricultural plant we possess and developing it to highest possible usefulness. The whole book filled with statistics as to grain, fruit, livestock, poultry, and dairy products is to be made still more imposing by improving farming as never before. Soil conservation is coming into its own as one of the essential sciences of production.

In recognition of this splendid work and in anticipation of things still greater to come, I, George A. Wilson, Governor, do hereby designate the week of June 2 to 7, 1941, inclusive, as

SOIL-CONSERVATION WEEK

I urge upon all who are interested in the welfare of our fair and fertile State to make special effort during the week designated to advance the cause of soil conservation in every possible way—by proper cultivation, by grasses, and special crops, by tree planting, by liberal fertilizing, not only on the largest farms but upon every kitchen garden.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Iowa. Done at Des Moines this 12th day of May in the year of Our Lord 1941, of the State of Iowa the ninety-fifth, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and sixty-fifth.

[SEAL]

GEORGE A. WILSON,
Governor.

PRICES OF GASOLINE AND OTHER PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, during the past 3 or 4 days announcement has been made of an increase in the price to the public of gasoline. In Iowa the increase amounts to 1½ cents a gallon; in the New York area, 2 cents a gallon; and in areas served by the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, 1 cent a gallon. In connection with a statement of the facts which I have prepared, I have before me a press release issued by the Office for Emergency Management under date of May 23, calling attention to the fact that these increases in the price of gasoline are claimed by the industry representatives to be due to cleaning up distress gasoline stocks. In presenting these matters for the RECORD I wish to suggest that the distress gasoline stocks are reasonably concluded to be pooled surplus stocks of independent oil jobbers and producers which are controlled by the integrated oil companies; and they are now trying to get rid of them at substantially increased prices. I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I have prepared, together with the press release from the Office for Emergency Management, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT PREPARED BY MR. GILLETTE

From January 15, 1941, on through March 21, according to the Chicago Journal of Commerce, the price of regular 72-octane gasoline, f. o. b. refineries in Oklahoma, from which Iowa gets its supplies of gasoline, was 4½ cents per gallon. Then on March 22, according to this publication, the market started rising. It kept on rising until 2 months later; the May 22, 1941, issue of the Chicago Journal of Commerce reported the price of regular 72-octane gasoline, free on board refineries in Oklahoma, at 5½ cents per gallon. This is a rise of 1½ cents to the wholesaler and distributor or tank-car buyer. Today this price is 5¼ cents, or a rise of 1½ cents.

The Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) raised the price of gasoline to the consumer one-half cent per gallon on April 5, 1941, and again on May 26, 1941, it raised the price of gasoline another one-half cent per gallon. That is a full cent rise in the price of gasoline to the public in their territory.

Other petroleum products, such as fuel oils and tractor fuels, have also been advanced correspondingly.

Early this year the New York Harbor price for gasoline in tank-car lots, 72-octane regular gasoline, according to the New York Journal of Commerce, was 5½ cents per gallon. On May 23, 1941, this same market is quoted in the New York Journal of Commerce at 7½ cents. Thus the tank-car buyers are paying 2 cents more per gallon on the East coast than earlier this year. Only a part of this has been passed on to the public as yet. But the consumer on the East coast is certainly going to be hurt worse on gasoline and fuel-oil prices than is the consumer in the Middle West.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
AND CIVILIAN SUPPLY,
Friday, May 23, 1941.

Representatives of leading oil companies operating in the New England and Mid-Atlantic areas held a general discussion on recent price trends for gasoline, industrial fuel oil, and lubricants, with officials of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply today.

Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply officials have been concerned over recent price increases for such products along the eastern seaboard.

It was the consensus of the meeting, with some reservations, that no further substantial increases in gasoline prices are called for unless basic cost conditions change. All refiners and marketers present agreed to the request made by Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply officials not to institute further increases of a substantial character on gasoline prices without prior consultation with Leon Henderson, Administrator of Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply.

It was insisted by industry representatives that increases to date have been due to cleaning up of distress gasoline stocks and increases in costs.

It was stated by Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply officials that a conference with crude-oil producers and buyers will be held in the near future to consider the price situation in that sector of the industry.

The meeting was conducted by Dr. J. K. Galbraith, head of the Price Division, and Quinn Shaughnessy, price executive in charge of the fuel section of the Price Division. Twenty-two companies were represented.

TRADE WITH AXIS POWERS IN ESSENTIAL WAR MATERIALS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, there is pending in the Senate, having been reported by the Commerce Committee, and now in the hands of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, a concurrent resolution whose purpose is an investigation into the charge that American companies dealing in essential war materials are selling them to the Axis Powers. I very much hope—and I am sure every other Senator will agree with me—that favorable action will be taken on that resolution.

In that connection I ask to have printed in the RECORD two newspaper articles dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Coronet for May 1941]

HOW THE UNITED STATES AIDS THE AXIS—QUICK TO RECOGNIZE THE DANGER OF THE DICTATORSHIPS, AMERICA IS SLOW TO STEM THE FLOW OF GOLD TO THEM

(By Michael Evans)

Adolf Hitler sneers sarcastically at the "degenerate" democracies, and well he may. All our talk is of aid to Britain. We have offered the brimming dipper of American industrial production to the thirsty lips of an England fighting for her life.

But our dipper leaks and a hundred spurting streams gush to the aid of the dictators—Hitler, to the Mikado's bewitched little militarists, to Mussolini, and to the cryptic Stalin.

Let's look at these leaks that honeycomb America's defense mobilization. Some exist because no one has thought to plug them. Others can never be plugged completely unless we enter the war as a full belligerent.

Do you remember Gen. Charles de Gaulle's fiasco at Dakar last September? There was a lot of mystery at the time, but now it is known that part of the stake for which De Gaulle gambled was a billion dollars or more in gold, stored in special vaults completed by the French only after the war's outbreak. De Gaulle wanted to get that gold before Hitler did. But he failed.

And here's where we enter the picture. Early in the New Deal, the United States Treasury posted an offer to buy gold from any source at \$35 an ounce. The offer still stands.

Of course, the Treasury would not knowingly buy stolen gold, but gold is the perfect international medium of exchange. Once it has been melted and cast into bars, no test can show whether it came from a vault at Dakar or a mine in the Urals.

If Russia or Japan will obligingly recast those Dakar bars they can be shipped to the United States Treasury, and every ounce will put \$35 of badly needed dollar exchange into Hitler's pocket. You can't prove it, but some financial experts suspect that very thing has already happened.

The United States gold law is a hole in our armor against totalitarianism. It will be hard to close, but Germany's dollar famine makes it most important.

That's why technically neutral United States is a happy hunting ground for Nazi financial tricks. Look in any of the fifty-odd German-language papers published in the United States. You'll find it filled with ads calling on German readers to buy small food orders to be "shipped" to persons in Germany. Actually, of course, no food is shipped from the United States. The order is just cabled over and delivered from a Nazi storehouse. A messenger boy delivers the goods and gets a signed receipt for the folks back in America. The next day, some say, SS men come around and confiscate the foodstuffs. But that is another matter. From the Nazi standpoint, all that counts is the addition of a few more dollars to German currency reserves.

Sworn reports made to the United States State Department show that some \$1,137,000 was collected last year in the United States for food orders and other German "relief" work. There are three big organizations soliciting Nazi funds here. They are Fortra, Inc., and the Hamburg-Bremen Steamship Agency, Inc., which deal largely in "food orders" and the Kyffhauser League of German War Veterans. The Kyffhauser League has headquarters in Philadelphia and also aids Nazi war prisoners in Canada and Jamaica. On the Pacific coast the United German Societies of Portland, Oreg., make some small collections.

Possibly the most important and certainly the most obscure phase of United States aid to dictators is that which stems from international corporate relationships and patent contracts.

Such a corporate agreement usually means dollars for the Nazi foreign-exchange fund. And more important, it means that German military experts have a constant check on what the United States Army and Navy are ordering to improve America's defenses.

We all know how the United States has aided Tokyo's war machine, how we have shipped \$700,000,000 in iron and steel scrap, finished steel, machine tools, gasoline, copper, and zinc—a tidy catalog of the basic weapons of total war—to Japan from 1937 to 1940. We know that we've footed a big share of Japan's war bill by buying her silk, but we have the impression that the spigot of war aid to Japan has been closed at least half way by President Roosevelt's embargoes on aviation gas, iron scrap, and machine tools.

What we may not know is that last year we sold Japan more goods than any other countries except Britain, Canada, and France, and we bought more goods from her than from any country of the world except Canada. The plain fact is that the United States today is still the foundation stone of totalitarian Japan's economy.

One reason why America today is short of ships to fill Britain's desperate needs is the fact that for 6 years or more Japan and her scrap agents bought almost every American cargo vessel placed on the auction block, using them for scrap to feed the blazing steel mills of Nippon.

This sort of aid goes on despite table-thumping debate and columns of newspaper editorials.

Actually, no one really knows how many hundred agreements like that still exist. They were made in pre-war days because United States firms saw a chance to turn an honest dollar. They were legitimate transactions. But war gives a changed aspect to many routine commercial dealings.

These agreements keep bobbing up at critical bottlenecks. There was one in the beryllium industry. Beryllium, discovered only a few years ago, makes amazing light and strong new alloys for airplane parts—altimeters, cowl hinges, feed lines, magneto parts, valve springs, etc. The contract was between the Beryllium Corporation of America and the great electrochemical firm of Siemens & Halske in Germany. They agreed to exchange all patents, information, and techniques and divide sales territory.

The British discovered this agreement shortly before the war broke out. When they found themselves dependent on a German firm for this vital metal they cracked down.

There is an antitrust case which charges a patent pool, market division, royalty contract existed in the magnesium industry. Magnesium is another light material used in bomb casings, truck parts, fast-moving machine tools, and airplane construction.

The Government contends that Germany got a royalty of 1 cent a pound on America's production of magnesium, that United States magnesium could be sold to Britain only with German approval, and that although United States production never amounted to more than a quarter of Germany's, a big share of our output was shipped to the Reich.

The importance of such agreements is obvious. They provide Germany revenue. They provide a day-by-day check on the progress of United States technology. They offer a brake which can often be applied to United States defense production.

In the last war Germany lost her enormously valuable patents in the United States. They were confiscated and handed over to American firms. That won't happen on a large scale again. Germany has thoughtfully transferred patents to American holders this time. In United States hands, they can't be touched.

Meantime the Reich uses the United States as a base of operations from which to direct a far-flung trade and keep alive commercial connections despite the British blockade. Germany even uses American industry and American goods in a fight to keep United States business from taking over the pre-war Nazi markets in South America and elsewhere.

In Latin America German, Italian, or Japanese agents represent many United States firms. These hostile agents even use advertising appropriations of American products to subsidize totalitarian propaganda sheets in some cases or as a pressure device to force newspapers to take a pro-Axis line. Usually, a Government inquiry reports, the American firms have no knowledge that their dollars are being spent to foster anti-American causes south of the Rio Grande.

This only scratches the surface of the ways in which the United States contributes to the German war effort. The most direct method, of course, is through American investments and industry located within Germany and the conquered countries. It is hard to underestimate the value of these United States holdings to Hitler.

Hitler has within his grasp upward of \$2,000,000,000 of American capital and property in the Reich and in France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Poland, and Scandinavia. Some estimates run much higher, one being that the United States has a frozen investment of \$2,000,000,000 in Germany alone.

This stake is in the form of property—great industrial plants like the subsidiaries of General Motors and Ford, which are integrated right into German war production—and investments which Germany freely uses to finance her war. United States owners get

no return whatever from their holdings except for an illegal trickle over the border.

A list of United States firms involved reads like a blue book of American industry. It makes no difference whether these firms like Hitler or not; whether they favor Nazi methods or not. The Germans have their plants and their money. They use both as they please.

The Nazi foreign-exchange headache increases the strong suspicion that the Germans have attempted to loot the stock holdings of conquered countries. Evidence is hard to get at. Even special experts of the Federal Reserve and the British Treasury, who have made every effort to prevent this form of robbery, can't be too sure of the situation. A few facts are known. The conquered countries held about \$1,000,000,000 in United States stocks. They had United States bank balances of \$800,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000. As fast as each country was invaded, the United States froze these holdings, prohibiting any transactions without special United States Treasury permission. It is suspected, however, that where the Germans actually laid their hands on stock certificates they have smuggled out some, probably through Switzerland to South America, and then up to the United States. Here, it is thought, unknown quantities have been marketed privately with great care and probably at prices below the market. The origin of the securities, of course, would be concealed.

In these and other complex international operations the Nazis find Switzerland a convenient stepping stone to the United States and other more distant neutrals. Six months before the outbreak of war it was authoritatively estimated that at least a third of Swiss holdings of United States securities and Swiss deposits in United States banks actually were German, held by Swiss dummies.

The United States was the first democracy to recognize the world menace of the dictators. It may be the last democracy to stem the flow of bright new dollars into totalitarian war chests, to stop selling matchless Yankee machines to antidemocratic armies, to ban from its soil the busy agents of its enemies, to break dictator-devised bottlenecks which constrict American defense production in a score of vital sectors.

[From the Washington Post of May 28, 1941]

NAZIS' LATIN DEALERS LINKED TO THREE UNITED STATES FIRMS

NEW YORK, May 28.—The New York Herald Tribune is able to shed light today on the mystery of German profits from the patent medicine trade of the 21 American republics.

Evidence has come to hand that manufacturers in the United States are supplying German dealers south of the Rio Grande with products exactly the same as those made in Germany, in similar boxes under exactly the same labels and trade-marks.

On one portion of the trade, estimated at \$4,000,000 annually, Germany receives 75 percent of the profits, but in a larger trade, estimated as high as \$20,000,000 a year, the terms of profit-sharing remain unknown.

The problem has puzzled Washington ever since the early days of the war, when American products began turning up under German labels in Latin America despite the British blockade which cut them off from Germany.

This trade not only keeps the German products before the market ready for a resumption of trade after the war, but also supplies Nazi agents in Latin America with funds for propaganda.

To date three companies have been found engaged in the German-label trade in Latin America—the Bayer Co., Inc., of New York; the Schering Corporation, of Bloomfield, N. J., and the Bilhuber-Knoll Corporation, of Orange, N. J.

Chief of these is the Bayer Co., Inc., manufacturers of aspirin products. This company has a contract with I. G. Farbenindustrie, the German dye trust, by which 75 percent of the profits from the sale of aspirin products in Latin America goes to the German trust, whether the products are manufactured in the United States or in Germany. The remaining 25 percent goes to the Bayer Co. in New York.

Until the war, the German company manufactured all or almost all of the aspirin products sold in Latin America. Recently the American company has taken over that trade, selling the same products under the same labels as those used by the German company.

What resulted is shown by two packages bought by Walter Kerr, Herald Tribune correspondent, in Caracas, Venezuela. Both contain "caffaspirina," a combination of aspirin and caffeine, and both are exactly the same except for the manufacturer's name.

In one case the label, translated from the Spanish, reads "Made by I. G. Farbenindustries, Aktiengesellschaft, Leverkusen, Germany, for La Quimica Bayer, Weskott & Cia., Caracas."

On the other box the label reads: "Made by the Bayer Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., U. S. A., for Farma Pan-American, S. A. Caracas."

SUPPLIED FROM UNITED STATES

When the German sources of supply were cut off, Bayer in the United States began supplying aspirin products to German dealers in Latin America, and agreements were made governing the use of the Bayer trade-mark in that area.

The name of Bilhuber-Knoll was found on two packages in Caracas, one containing "bromural," a sedative, and the other "cardiazol," a heart stimulant. In each case the same product was bought under labels similar in all respects except that the name of the manufacturer was "Knoll A.-G. Ludwigshafen, Germany."

Questioned in his factory, Dr. E. A. Bilhuber, president of Bilhuber-Knoll and of E. Bilhuber, Inc., said he knew nothing about what happened to his goods after he sold them to shipping agents, but in any case his Latin-American trade was very small.

Dr. Bilhuber said the idea of imitating the German labels originated with the Latin-American buyer.

Dr. Bilhuber denied that he had any connection with Knoll, of Germany, although he admitted that before the last war he had acted as its agent in the United States. He also admitted that some of his products were made under patents obtained from the German company.

Officials of the Schering Corporation, four of whose hormone products were bought in Caracas under the same trade-mark as used by Schering A. G., of Berlin, told a somewhat different story. Dr. Julius Weltzien, president, said he sold his products, some in bulk and some in packages, to importers in Latin-American countries. Delta Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., a subsidiary, handles the sales.

These importers, called in most cases "Quimica Schering S. A.," own the trade-marks they use and pay no royalties to anyone. They are owned by "a Swiss company," Dr. Weltzien said, adding that he had made sure of that before trading with them. Until recently, these companies were all owned in Germany.

SUGAR QUOTAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 937) to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make rather an introductory comment on the pending business, the so-called sugar bill. I realize that it is a difficult time, but there are certain items which I think should go in the Record. I hope

Senators will bear with me for a brief time, not for a full discussion, but in order that I may put certain essential facts before them.

Only 29 percent of American continental sugar consumption is produced within continental United States. More than 70 percent of the sugar consumption of the United States must come to the United States in ships.

Sugar is a vital essential of American life. It is almost as critical a material as is ammunition. Our country requires it.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator has just made the observation that only 29 percent of the sugar consumption of continental United States is produced in continental United States. Does not the Senator think a better way to phrase the statement is that only 29 percent of the sugar consumption of continental United States is permitted to be produced in continental United States and that continental United States is capable of producing much more than 29 percent?

Mr. ADAMS. That is the situation.

Mr. President, as I was saying, 70 percent of this vital essential to American life must come to our shores today by water, in ships. Never before has there been such hazard to water-borne commerce; but what do we find? We find that those charged with the administration of sugar production are restricting the production in the United States of this essential commodity. There is not, so far as I know, a single sugar-producing area, cane or beet, which is producing as much as it could or as much as it would.

I come from a State which at times has had as much as 246,000 acres of sugar-beet production. Today it is limited to 136,000 acres. In other words, the sugar-beet acreage in my State is reduced almost 50 percent. The same condition prevails throughout the country—reduction and repression and discouragement to American production of this crop which is a minority crop. We struggle and we spend money in order to dispose of surplus crops, but here is a crop of which we do not produce enough for our needs, the production of which would take over acreage now producing surpluses of other crops, and we restrict it.

To get back to the question of shipping, 12.7 percent of all the incoming shipping of the United States carries sugar. If molasses is included, 17 percent of the shipping coming to the United States carries either sugar or molasses; and, of that amount, 15 percent of the American sugar production has to come from the Philippine Islands. It so happens, by reason of the immediate shipping shortage, that the Philippine Islands will, in all probability, be unable to deliver to the United States their quota of sugar. They have an outside quota of 1,055,000 tons, of which 982,000 tons are tax-free and 73,000 taxable.

The Sugar Act provides that if the Philippine Islands are unable to market this tremendous quota, or any part of it, the deficit shall go—where? Where does the Sugar Act provide the deficit shall go? Who is to be given the privilege of

producing that sugar? Is it to be the sugar-beet farmer, with his idle acres and his idle machinery? Is it to be the cane farmer, with his idle acres and his idle machinery? No. The Sugar Act provides that every single ton of the Philippine deficit shall go to foreign countries other than Cuba.

Those foreign countries at the present time have a statutory quota under the Sugar Act of some 27,000 tons. Only in one or two cases have the foreign countries even brought in their 27,000 tons. The particular foreign countries number 26 nations, including Germany, Italy, Japan, and China.

The Sugar Act provides that the deficit shall be allocated to foreign nations; then, if the foreign nations to whom the quota of the deficit is allocated do not fill it by July 1, that on September 1 it shall be reallocated among those foreign nations that have filled their quotas. There is no provision in the law by which a single ounce of Philippine deficit sugar can, in any way, be produced in the United States, even though foreign nations fail utterly to produce it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator uses the term "United States." As I understand, he means not only continental United States but also Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and all other possessions under the American flag?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; the Senator is correct. No area under the American flag can produce a single ounce of the Philippine deficit. What we are seeking in this bill is to take out of the law this restriction so as to provide that the deficit may go to the producers of sugar under the flag.

The bill as written provided that the deficit should go to domestic sugar-producing areas. An amendment was offered in the Finance Committee, and is printed in the bill, which would give a priority to the foreign countries to the extent of 75,000 tons. I shall not today discuss that phase of the matter other than to say that it represents this practical situation: The only foreign countries of the long list of 26 which produce sugar and which are in a position to fill any deficit are 4, namely, the Dominican Republic, Peru, Haiti, and perhaps China. There are only 2 countries that will provide any substantial part of it, namely, Santo Domingo or the Dominican Republic and Peru. The statutory quota for the Dominican Republic is a shade over 3,000 tons. The statutory quota for Peru is slightly over 5,000 tons. If we have a deficit, as we may have, of 300,000 tons or more in the Philippine quota—and as delivery to the United States from the Philippines is 575,000 tons now less than its quota, it is readily understandable that at least 300,000 tons will not come—then the 300,000 tons of Philippine deficit will be divided between the Dominican Republic and Peru. They, with Haiti, have an aggregate quota of 10,000 tons. We will multiply their quota 30 times, during all of which time in my State and in other States of the Union the farmer has idle acres and idle ma-

chinery ready to produce beets and beet factories are closing.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it not fair to say, from the record, that when the Sugar Act was written, with its provision allocating the Philippine deficit to foreign countries, no such situation was remotely in contemplation such as we now confront in this country? The deficit then contemplated was a relatively minor deficit related solely to dutiable sugar. There never has been a time under the act when there was any such deficit as we now confront in the Philippine situation, and those who wrote the law and those who voted for it never contemplated the kind of deficit which the Senator is now discussing. Therefore we have a right to assume that Congress is not violating the spirit of the Sugar Act when it reexplores this particular subject and undertakes to meet a new condition which was not remotely contemplated when the act was passed. Is not that true?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is absolutely correct, and the correspondence which took place, parts of which are before the Senate committee, indicate that the deficit under consideration was the dutiable part of the Philippine quota, amounting to from 73,000 to 75,000 tons. That was the only part of the Philippine quota that was even thought of as being subject to diversion to foreign countries.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it not also true that the 75,000 tons preference which the committee's amendment still allows foreign countries exceeds any previous deficit which they have enjoyed, and, therefore, exceeds anything which they ever had any right to contemplate?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; and I will say to the Senator that on page 18 of the committee hearings is a tabulation which shows that the allocations of the Philippine deficit which have been made from 1934 down to 1940, with a single exception covering dutiable sugar, have been filled but once and that was in 1934. The tabulation shows that the original quotas for foreign countries averaged about 25,000 tons, and when they had quotas added to them not a single year since 1934 has the aggregate of the 26 foreign nations ever filled the quota, even limiting the quotas within 75,000 tons, and 75,000 tons was allocated, I think, only once. In most years, including 1940, they did not even fill their own quotas. The foreign countries had a 24,000-ton quota in 1940, and they shipped in only 17,400 tons. They are not entitled to this quota; they cannot deliver it. Provision for it in the law—I do not know just how to phrase it, because I do not want to reflect on anybody, but it is a thing utterly incomprehensible from the standpoint of people interested in American agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a member of the Finance Committee, and one who has at various times been a member

of the subcommittee handling sugar legislation, I can bear witness to what the Senator from Colorado has said and what the Senator from Michigan has said: That the only thought in the mind of the Finance Committee, at least, and I think in the mind of the Senate on the passage of the measure, had to do with the possible deficit which might be created by the addition of certain duties to Philippine sugar growing out of the progressive steps indicated under the Philippine Independence Act, and that nobody had ever contemplated that lack of shipping would very much complicate the situation and bring about the Philippine deficit. If any such deficit had been contemplated, I think I am perfectly safe in saying, as one member of the Finance Committee who represents a constituency which has no interest whatever in sugar except as consumers, that no such provision ever could have been enacted into law.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is absolutely right. I have some personal knowledge of the drafting of the 1937 act. A bill was introduced in the Senate at that time by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself which provided, as the Costigan-Jones Act did, for the allocation of deficits among all sugar-producing areas in proportion to their quotas. That provision was changed at the instance of the Secretary of State, who stated that there was a desire to have a limited amount of sugar to distribute to other foreign countries, specifying that it would not in any way impinge upon the Independence Act quota, and would merely be the part which the Sugar Act gave over and above the Independence Act quota, and which was a taxable sugar quota which would not come in. There is no question as to the understanding of those who drew the act, and of those who passed it, that it had no contemplation of application to a situation such as has now arisen.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To what extent does Santo Domingo appear in the figures which the Senator has in his hands?

Mr. ADAMS. I will give the Senator the figures. The Santo Domingo quota, as it goes from year to year, is approximately 3,000 tons. The quotas were small enough so that they were stated in pounds. I have the figures here. The quota of Santo Domingo is a shade over 3,000 tons.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was thinking particularly of Santo Domingo's prospective share of the deficit. Is not Santo Domingo one of the chief beneficiaries of the unlimited redistribution of the Philippine deficit?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; it will be one of them. Here is the 1941 revision: Santo Domingo had an initial quota of 3,618 tons. The bill which is now pending, with an effort to correct this injustice to American sugar producers, was introduced in February. It has been pending ever since February; but on the 11th of April, while the bill was pending, the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to allocate the Philippine deficit, and he allocated the entire taxable quota of the

Philippine Islands, which amounts to 73,232 tons. Of that total he gave the Dominican Republic 9,654 tons, making an aggregate for the Dominican Republic of 13,272 tons; in other words, giving them four times their normal quota; and then there would be perhaps two or three hundred thousand tons to be further distributed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I want to ask the Senator. Suppose there were a deficit of 300,000 ton: How much would Santo Domingo get?

Mr. ADAMS. About 100,000 tons.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention, if he will allow me to do so, to what I think is a very significant exhibit. The Secretary of State is opposing the Senator's bill because, as he says in his letter, referring to foreign countries:

These countries are suffering severely from the restriction of their European markets for sugar and other products as a result of the war.

In other words, he is pleading that we continue to give Santo Domingo this extraordinary and unanticipated privilege in our market because Santo Domingo has suffered from the European war in respect to its own sugar exports; but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the sugar-market letter of Farr & Co., which is a very reliable and standard reference, points out that Santo Domingo has been, if anything, favored as a result of the war situation; and I read:

This means that Santo Domingo has sold approximately 300,000 tons out of the current crop, leaving but 75,000 tons for sale all told.

In other words, the Santo Domingo situation, concerning which the very distinguished and able and sympathetic Secretary of State is worrying, is virtually nothing compared to the desperate situation in our own domestic sugar field. I respectfully suggest that the argument the Secretary of State makes in behalf of Santo Domingo is not only answered by the facts but would also be far better aimed at our own domestic difficulties.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the figures show how far the Agricultural Department has gone in favoring the Dominican Republic in the past. In 1937 the initial quota of the Dominican Republic was 3,300 tons. The Department gave them an aggregate quota of 32,000 tons, of which they failed to fill 6,200 tons; so they could not fill a 32,000-ton quota. In 1938 the Dominican Republic had 3,600 tons as an initial quota, and they were given an additional amount until they had 6,100 tons, and they failed to fill that quota by a small amount. Nineteen hundred and thirty-nine was an unusual year, in which they did fill their quota. In 1940 their initial quota was 3,500 tons, and that was reduced. There was no Philippine deficit in 1940. So, when we are thinking of the Philippine deficit, and reaching back to say that we should not take away from somebody something he had last year, it should be remembered that there was not an ounce of Philippine deficit allocated to any country in 1940. The Philippines filled their quota.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, under the terms of the committee amendment, if the bill passes in that

form, we shall not take away from any country anything it ever had at any time in the whole life and existence of the Sugar Act. Is not that correct?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; that is correct; and the statement should be made and reiterated that the pending measure does not change the quota of any sugar-producing area on the globe. By this bill we neither increase nor decrease the quota. There has been some discussion as to whether or not the international sugar agreement was being violated. The international sugar agreement deals only with quotas, and this bill changes no quota. It does not change the Philippine quota. It merely provides, if the Philippines are not able to send to the United States the sugar which their quota authorizes them to send and which we need, how it shall be supplied. We are seeking to provide that the lands of the United States and the farmers of the United States shall produce a little more sugar for themselves, and not have to go to Peru and Santo Domingo for this emergency item.

The quota situation as the Department seeks to have it would accomplish outrageous results, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out. It is one thing to allocate the 75,000 tons; and yet, when that amount has been allocated, we have never had the sugar. If we now add two or three hundred thousand tons, we shall find sugar prices in the United States skyrocketing as they did during the World War days. An amendment of this kind is essential to protect the American sugar consumer from a repetition of the conditions which led to the rationing of sugar on our tables and \$25 sugar at the grocery store.

The Secretary of State has said that if we pass this bill we are repudiating the doctrine of hemispheric defense. In other words, if we give to Peru and Santo Domingo a larger quota than they have ever been able to fill, and then fail to give them every ounce of the additional Philippine deficit, we are repudiating the doctrine of hemispheric defense.

I understand that the principal sugar farms in Peru are owned by Germans; and we are seeking to preserve democracies. If there are two genuine dictatorships on this globe, one is in the Dominican Republic and the other in Peru. In Peru the legislative body was forced to pass an act abolishing itself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is just a little more frank than we are; that is all. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. I am talking about sugar.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Colorado has not observed any restraint on the efforts of the Senator from Michigan from time to time to express himself wisely and pertinently and persuasively on issues as they arose, has he?

Mr. VANDENBERG. And futilely.

Mr. PEPPER. If I may interrupt further, perhaps that is due to the fact that the Senator has not been able to persuade

his colleagues of the wisdom of his course.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To the fact that they were not free agents to be persuaded.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, there is no sound reason back of the statement that compliance with the unreasonable provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937 in the matter of the allocation of the Philippine sugar deficit is a repudiation of hemispheric defense. I am sure in my own mind that the very able Secretary of State never saw or read the document which made that statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is not present today. He was the author of the amendment which is in the bill which saves this first 75,000 tons for foreign countries. I am sure he would say, if he were present—because I know what was in his mind, and I know what the Finance Committee thought when it adopted the amendment—that he thought the 75,000 preference was a complete and generous acknowledgment of the good-neighbor policy which the able Secretary of State promotes, and it was in a full-hearted desire to support the viewpoint of the Secretary of State, within reason, that the amendment was inserted in the bill. So I think it would be fairer to say that the bill, as it comes to the Senate, has been written with an anxiety to acknowledge the very thing for which the Secretary of State prays.

Mr. ADAMS. In my judgment, Santo Domingo, Peru, and the other foreign countries are not entitled to one single ton of the Philippine deficit, as a matter of right, so long as Americans stand in need of the opportunity to produce the sugar, and so long as America needs the sugar.

The next step, the fair thing, if we consider their right to consideration, is that every sugar-producing country in the world should have its proportionate share of the deficit. That was the Jones-Costigan provision, to give to the United States continentally, to Hawaii, to Puerto Rico, and to the foreign nations, their proportionate share of a shortage. That is the fair thing to do, adequately fair.

I was willing to go a step further, as the Senator knows. Naturally, the apportionment method would not give a great amount of sugar to countries which have contributed very little to the incoming sugar, and I was willing, so far as I was personally concerned, to give them a quota double what they had ever had, as a priority quota.

As the Senator has said, his colleague, together with my colleague and others in the Finance Committee, said, "No; let us go the whole way, give a priority so that foreign countries will have four times, in the aggregate, what their quota has been." That, when we eliminate the countries which do not produce sugar, will mean a quota 20 times what they would have had. Yet the Secretary of State says that the things he said in his first letter applying to the bill in its original form still apply, even with the

amendment added. In other words, we cannot satisfy the people who write these letters in the Department of State unless we give to Peru and Santo Domingo every ounce of deficit from the Philippines, in the name of "hemispheric defense."

Consider the case of a boy from the beet fields of my State. He has been drafted. We have reached out with the strong arm of the Government and have taken him into the training camp. We have put a gun on his shoulder. We are taking other boys and putting them in the Navy, and putting them in airplanes. Their fathers are paying the taxes to meet the defense bills. The farm of the father is deteriorating because he cannot produce what his farm was designed to produce. His machinery is rusting; notes at the bank are coming due; actions to repossess his automobile and his machinery are proceeding. The sugar-beet factory in the neighborhood is closing; schools are short of support; churches are short of support; merchants are short of business. Yet this boy with the gun, this father who is paying the taxes, and who has the farm, are not to be considered, in the name of "hemispheric defense." The only hemispheric defense comes in giving the sugar production to the Indian in Peru and to the inhabitants of Santo Domingo. That is national hemispheric defense, while those who are to do the fighting are getting no consideration.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I am in full accord with the remarks now being made by the able Senator from Colorado respecting the deficit of about 72,000 tons in the quota from the Philippine Islands. I should like to know what the Senator thinks as to how it should be allocated among the various States. Probably allocation is physically impossible now because of the lateness of the season.

Mr. ADAMS. So far as my State is concerned, the delay in the consideration of the bill has been too great. The bill was introduced at a time when there was ample opportunity to plant and increase tonnage in the fields of Colorado and in the fields of Oregon. I understand there may be some places in the Senator's State where there is still a chance for some planting; but that opportunity has passed so far as my State is concerned. There are two considerations which lead to insistence upon the pending bill. The first is that, as a matter of principle, we should not depart from the stand we have taken merely because of the delay. The next consideration is more practical. Some beets can be planted, but there is overhanging the market a surplus of sugar in the United States. The cut in the beet acreage in my State was sought to be sustained largely by the argument that there was so much sugar in the warehouses that if we were permitted to produce a normal crop we would still further add to the surplus. If the deficit from the Philippine Islands can be allocated here, it can be filled out of the warehouses containing the surplus sugar so that next year rational planting can be had. It is perhaps too late for this year's planting, as I have said, but not too late

to save ourselves from the imposition of unfair planting next year.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has made a very full and fair explanation in answer to the question I propounded. I did not know of the immense carry-over of sugar which might fill the shortage resulting from the deficit of Philippine sugar.

The Senator from Colorado is fundamentally sound in his position, of course, but I still think—and I may make this observation on my own part—that some of the Northern States probably still can plant sufficiently to make up the deficit, or a goodly portion of it, and I was simply making the practical inquiry by the question which the Senator has so very ably answered. I made reference to the Northern States. Michigan, one of the sugar-beet States of our country, with a late, wet season, could plant beets now beyond her quota, which would result in doing her part in the contribution toward this deficit.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will give a few additional statistics. I know more of beet-sugar production than I do of cane-sugar production. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will, in the course of the discussion, perhaps on Monday, give us more information concerning cane-sugar production. The Sugar Act provided for a minimum quota of 1,550,000 tons of beet-sugar production annually. It provided that in working out allocations, normal carry-overs should be taken into account.

No provision was made for taking into consideration abnormal carry-overs. The present abnormal carry-over is due to the administration of the sugar section. The quota limitations were taken off in 1939, and the increased overproduction is solely due to what was then done. The limitations were first made, and then were taken off, and the increase in warehoused sugar is due to taking off the limitations. Now, however, it is proposed to fix an acreage limitation upon the beet-producing area which will result in the production of 200,000 tons less sugar than the minimum amount fixed in the Sugar Act. Instead of producing 1,550,000 tons, the acreage proposed to be allocated will produce only 1,350,000 tons. It is now proposed to penalize the sugar-beet farmer and processor because of what has happened as a result of the mistake made by those administering the Sugar Act. As a result of that mistake, action is proposed to be taken which will penalize the 94 beet-sugar factories of the United States. I do not know how many of them will be closed. There will be 4 or 5 closed in my State.

The beet-sugar industry is, I think, quite different from any other industry in the country. The beets are grown in an area contiguous to the factory. It is a unified agricultural and manufacturing unit. The beets, by reason of the low price the producers get for them, must be produced within easy and cheap hauling distance of the factory. The factory is the center, and around about it must be an area of at least 10,000 acres producing sugar beets. If that area is cut to 6,000 or 5,000 acres, it will result in closing the factory. The factory cannot con-

tinue to operate with the production of beets on only five or six thousand acres. The factory cannot operate unless it receives enough beets to maintain it. About the factory grows the village with its churches, its schools, its libraries, and stores. So when the factory is closed, an agricultural and industrial unit is destroyed.

Mr. President, there has been much said about the price of sugar. No product which goes upon the American table is so cheap in proportion to its actual nutritive value as sugar. No product has so small a gap between actual cost of production and selling price. We have been given statistics within the last few days showing that the sugar-beet farmer was receiving only from 19 to 25 percent of the cost of his product. The farmer receives, roughly, 2 cents a pound for the sugar in his beets. The factory gets the other 2 cents. The sugar is sold on the market for a little over 4 cents. The margin between cost of production and selling price is very small.

The sugar beet brings about \$6.50 a ton, or one-third of one cent a pound. There is not another agricultural product under the shining sun in this country that can be produced at one-third of a cent a pound. That is not all. The sugar beet is an expensive crop to raise. It requires fine land. It requires adequate water. The plants must be thinned out, the ground tilled, and the crop harvested. If one were to ask a producer of cabbage, a crop with a tremendous tonnage, to sell his crop at one-third of a cent a pound he would say, "You are crazy."

Recently we have heard it said that the potato farmer is facing ruin because he receives only 85 cents a hundred for potatoes. The sugar-beet farmer is receiving 33 cents a hundred delivered to the factory.

The price of sugar has gone down and not up since the passage of the original Sugar Act. I have before me a pamphlet issued by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I do not think that group is particularly interested in the beet-sugar industry or the American sugar industry. The pamphlet contains a tabulation showing that the wholesale price of sugar has gone down from \$5.40 a hundred, the price in 1912, to \$4.34 a hundred, the price in 1940. The retail price in that time has gone from \$6.30 a hundred to \$5.20 a hundred. The retail sugar price today is lower than it has been at any time.

Mr. President, much has been said of the cost of this sugar program to the Government. Let me give the Senate a figure or two concerning the cost to the Government of the program. We have voted—I among others—very willingly for crop loans. We have provided an 85 percent of parity loan price for major crops, not including sugar. We have provided insurance for certain major crops, so that farmers are guaranteed a good price by the Government if they raise the crops, and are insured in case they lose them.

So far as sugar is concerned, there is no guarantee of price. There is no guar-

antee of crop. What happens, which is said to be so expensive? On every 100 pounds of sugar marketed in the United States a tax of 50 cents is levied. The farmer is given 60 cents a hundred pounds. Therefore the Government gives to the farmer one-tenth of a cent a pound.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On that point I wish to ask the Senator a question. Some of the sugar experts in the Department of Agriculture claim that the price of refined sugar in the export market is 2 cents a pound, but that under the Government sugar program the same sugar brings the domestic producer 4.95 cents a pound. Is that true?

Mr. ADAMS. That is not true; and I will tell the Senator why. It costs practically 4 cents a pound to produce refined sugar in the United States. If a producer wishes to sell it for 2 cents, he may do so; but people do not do such things.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the same sugar which brings 2 cents a pound in the foreign market bring 4.95 cents a pound at home?

Mr. ADAMS. The figures are not accurate. However, not a pound of American sugar is exported, so in the first place the Senator is not talking about American sugar.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about any kind of sugar.

Mr. ADAMS. Cuba and Java, with their tremendous production, are forced to market their sugar for what they can obtain for it. Raw sugar in America has gone down below \$1, and the cost of refining is from \$1 to \$1.50. We do protect the American sugar producer. He cannot produce sugar in competition with tropical islands and cheap labor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I grant that; but the reason I asked the question was that I gathered from the Senator's argument that he was minimizing what the Government has done in behalf of sugar producers. If the foreign price of sugar is 2 cents a pound, and if under the legislation and the policy of Congress that same sugar brings the domestic producer 4.95 cents a pound, it seems to me we have done something for the sugar producers.

Mr. ADAMS. The Government in its tariff legislation has done much. The sugar industry could not live in the United States in open competition with foreign sugar any more than many other industries could live in competition with foreign production. I do not know of a single major industry in the United States that could live without tariff protection. Take wheat, of which we have a surplus. We know what has happened in connection with cotton. We have tried, with some difficulty, to keep the price at a living point; but if we should open the markets to cheaper foreign cotton, I do not know what would be the result. I am not an expert on the cotton situation, but I know that if American producers of steel, textiles, and various other products had to compete with foreign production, without any protection, our producers would go out of business.

The cattlemen, sheepmen, and manufacturers of woolen goods would be forced out of business. If we are to maintain a high standard of living we must pay a little more. Consequently it costs the American consumer more to buy sugar here than he could buy it for in Cuba. Also, by reason of legislation, the consumer receives higher wages with which to buy sugar. If we want wages to go down to the level of wages in Cuba and Peru, we can remove the tariff protection.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it not a fact that the retail price of sugar in the United States is lower than in any other country on earth?

Mr. ADAMS. With the exception of certain countries such as Cuba and Peru.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Every major country in the world pays a higher retail price for sugar than we do.

Mr. ADAMS. In many countries the retail price of sugar is from 13 to 15 cents a pound.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exactly.

Mr. ADAMS. The point I had in mind was the cost to the Government of the Sugar Act, as distinguished from the tariff. The Government pays one-tenth of a cent a pound to the domestic producer of sugar. That is the difference between the 50 cents which the Government collects and the 60 cents which it pays. But that is not all the story. Since the inception of the Sugar Act the Government has collected in excise taxes \$314,640,000, and has paid out in benefit payments \$217,293,000, representing a net profit to the Government of \$97,347,000. That is the amount which has gone into the Treasury as a result of the Sugar Act. The sugar industry is the one industry which takes no money out of the Treasury, but puts money in. Since the 1937 act—dealing with that alone—the Government has collected \$212,017,000 in excise taxes and has paid out \$132,222,000, or a net surplus to the Government of \$79,795,000. Yet we are told that the sugar producers are robbing the Government and robbing the consumer. The consumer is getting his sugar more cheaply than he ever got it—and I say that advisedly—and the Government is profiting to the extent of millions of dollars by the process. So the arguments based upon the amount that is being shoveled out from the Treasury to the sugar producers should be turned around. The shoveling is back into the Treasury.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago the Senator pointed out, among other things, some of the reasons assigned by Mr. Hull for having given the extra quota to Santo Domingo, Haiti, and other countries, and among the reasons suggested by him was the fact that those countries are now suffering severely from the restriction of their European markets for sugar and other products as a result of the war; also, that the enactment of the bill would amount to public notice that the United States is indifferent to the grave problems

confronting our neighbor republics, and so forth.

Does the Senator know that on the day the Department of Agriculture made the allocation of 73,000 tons of sugar the quota allotted to Peru, Santo Domingo, and Haiti was immediately filled by operators and refiners who had been carrying excess quota sugars from those areas since the turn of the year? In other words, quotas were allocated to those countries which are in such need of help while refiners at the port of New York and other places were carrying over stores from the previous year and utilized such sugars to fill the quotas for those countries. My guess is that the producers of sugar from those countries had already disposed of their product and American interests were partially responsible for causing these new allocations, while the Senator's bill was pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. ADAMS. The quotas were filled from bonded stocks in this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct. I take those data from the Sugar Review of Lowry & Co., dated April 17, 1941.

Mr. ADAMS. That information is also contained in the report of the minority of the Finance Committee.

I think it would be interesting to have the list of countries or areas to which we allocate quotas under the Sugar Act. They are Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Hong Kong, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, the Dutch East Indies, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Netherlands, Peru, Salvador, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, Brazil, British Malaya, Colombia, Dutch West Indies, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan.

All those countries share in the Philippine quota of sugar raised for the United States in the dependency of the Philippines. We are not permitted to take any part of the small amount that is allotted to Germany or the small amount that is allotted to Japan or to Italy. In the interests of "hemispheric defense" we must turn that over to some foreign country; that is to say, we are defending ourselves by letting American farmers go into bankruptcy. I say that advisedly, because in the finest agricultural areas in my State hundreds and hundreds of farmers are going upon the W. P. A. rolls by reason of the sugar situation—the reduction from 246,000 acres to 136,000 acres. When we have an economy based upon the larger amount, and when we have an average acreage production of 200,000, is it conceivable in the interest of hemispheric defense to destroy one of the greatest and most stable industries in the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that connection it might be that our producers could get help from our Government to the same extent that such help is being extended to Cuba. Cuban producers are in rather bad shape. It was impossible for them to dispose of all their crops; and just a

little while ago our generous Government made it possible to lend to Cuban interests \$11,200,000 so that they could put in warehouses 400,000 tons of surplus sugar. Mr. President, that amounts to almost a cent and a quarter per pound loan the Government of the United States has made available to Cuban producers. The facts are, and the record shows, that 56 percent of the sugar produced in Cuba is owned by American interests; and only about 21 percent is owned by natives of Cuba. The rest of the sugar production of Cuba is controlled by foreign interests such as English, French, Spanish, and other foreign nationals. It is silly to assume that we are helping the Cuban people when as a matter of fact the help seems to inure to nonresidents of the island.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in returning for a moment to a discussion of the sugar-beet industry, it is the one industry in the United States in connection with which the Secretary of Agriculture regulates the price of farm labor. The Secretary of Agriculture tells the farmer in my State how much he is to pay for his farm labor; he tells him how many acres of beets he can raise; he tells him how he is to cultivate his land; he forbids his using certain kinds of labor. The result is that the raising of sugar beets takes practically more labor than any other crop; and when the acreage is reduced, not only is the crop reduced but a great number of laborers are thrown out of employment.

Not only is the farmer affected but a great army of farm laborers is thrown adrift.

The refinery, located near the farm, employs thousands of men, and they are thrown out of employment. It consumes coal and lime. The mines are affected. American sugar goes into cotton bags. One company in my State, not the largest in my State, consumes the cotton from 6,000 acres; and that is not the largest beet-sugar company in the country.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I read from the bill:

Any portion of such sugar which the Secretary determines cannot be supplied by domestic areas and Cuba shall be prorated to foreign countries other than Cuba on the basis of the prorations of the quota then in effect for such foreign countries.

What are those foreign countries at present?

Mr. ADAMS. I read a few moments ago a list of 26.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Philippines be one?

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, no; it is the Philippine deficit we are dealing with. The Philippines are not a foreign country, and we are dealing with the Philippine deficit.

Mr. TYDINGS. Santo Domingo would be one?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. What others?

Mr. ADAMS. Peru and Santo Domingo are the two countries which would get the benefit.

Mr. TYDINGS. Peru and Santo Domingo at present?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. They would get the benefit under the bill, would they?

Mr. ADAMS. Under the bill as I introduced it, no part of the Philippine deficit would go to them. Under the amendment which was reported by the Finance Committee, they would get a 400-percent increase in their quota.

Mr. TYDINGS. What arrests my attention about it all is that this bill is apparently reported adversely. Is that correct?

Mr. ADAMS. What does the Senator mean by "correct"? Does he mean is it right? If the Senator asks if it is right, I say, "No." If the Senator asks if it is correct, I say, "Yes."

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean, is it the fact?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; it is the fact.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the chief argument against the bill? I do not desire to ask the Senator to argue on the other side, but will he state what is the chief argument against the bill?

Mr. ADAMS. I am not a member of the committee, so I shall have to speak more or less from hearsay. I think the opposition was made up of two parts. First, there was opposition by the State Department and by the Department of Agriculture, the State Department saying that if we permitted American farmers to take up the deficit, which they desperately needed to do, in preference to allowing the Peruvians and Santo Domingans to do so, it would be a repudiation of the hemispheric-defense policy; and the Department of Agriculture rather quoted what the State Department said, and simply said they could not approve.

The second argument—and I think it is the argument which probably was more effective—was that it would cut off some raw sugar from the refiners.

There are, as the Senator knows, a group of seaboard refiners. If the 75,000-ton deficit, or 100,000-ton deficit were allocated as the bill originally provided, the refiners would get the raw sugar which came from Puerto Rico and Hawaii, and the cane sugar which came from the United States; that is to say, they would get, roughly, 60 percent of that part of the deficit, while perhaps 40 percent or less than that would go to the beet producers; and, of course, they produce and refine it themselves. There would be a loss of from 30 percent to 40 percent. The refiners now get most of the Philippine sugar, but there is no limitation against any of these foreign countries bringing all their quota in as refined sugar; and, as the Senator knows, those of us who have been interested in the sugar situation, both from the standpoint of refiners and from the standpoint of beet-sugar producers and cane-sugar producers, dared the wrath of some of the leaders in our Government by putting in the sugar bill a restriction providing that not more than a certain proportion of the incoming sugar from the Philippines, from Cuba, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, should come in as refined sugar. We went a long way. We jeopardized the whole sugar legislation to protect the refiners in that way.

If the deficit is allocated as we ask it to be, the refiners will get a little less sugar; but, as a matter of fact, under the sugar acts refinings have been increasing year by year, and the amount of sugar refined today is greater than it was when the sugar act was first passed. In the last year 4,600,000 tons were refined; so that if 40,000 tons were taken away from the refiners, it would be a very trifling concession of cost imposed upon them in order to reestablish thousands upon thousands of farm families in the West and in the South.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What restriction is there in the bill about the importation from foreign countries of refined sugar as differentiated from raw sugar?

Mr. ADAMS. None. Foreign countries can send in every ounce of their sugar in refined form. As a matter of fact, in the case of Peru, for instance, and Santo Domingo, their customers were abroad, and they ship refined sugar rather than raw sugar.

Mr. TYDINGS. Where was the Santo Domingo sugar refined?

Mr. ADAMS. I cannot answer that. There are some refineries there just as there are refineries in Cuba and Peru.

Mr. TYDINGS. On one occasion when I was visiting in the West Indies it was the custom, as I recall, to transport raw sugar across the Caribbean to Puerto Rico, where it was refined. Whether that is still the case, I do not know, but, at any rate, under the bill, could any more refined sugar come in from Cuba than now comes in?

Mr. ADAMS. None at all. Cuba is excluded from the operation of the amendment, and its quota is fixed both as to raw and refined sugar.

Mr. TYDINGS. How would the refineries be hurt if, as the Senator has outlined, there would be a bar against the importation of refined sugar from these foreign areas?

Mr. ADAMS. I think the injury would be very trifling, I will say to the Senator from Maryland. It cannot be said that there would be no injury at all, because when the course of sugar is changed there might be a relatively small amount which would not go to the refineries, but it would not be more than one and a half or two percent of their refining and would affect perhaps 130 or 140 people.

Mr. TYDINGS. My concern and the reason I am asking the Senator these questions is that I have received, either today or a few days ago, from Baltimore, Md., a request to oppose this bill, on the ground that it would seriously injure the existing business of a sugar refinery located in Baltimore City, which employs some 800 persons. How well informed those interested in the refinery are as to the facts, I do not know, but I do know that they have had not altogether a rosy road in the last 5 or 6 years; their earnings have been very small, and I would be reluctant to impose on them, in these difficult times, a greater burden than that which they have been carrying. Therefore, I am particularly interested in knowing whether, if the bill were

passed, more refined sugar would come in or less refined sugar would come in than now comes in as the result of the operations of the present law.

Mr. ADAMS. No more refined sugar would come in, but a little less raw sugar would come in. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] handed in a letter to the committee—I will not say that he wrote it—which indicated he had the same misinformation that has been given to the Senator from Maryland. In his letter he said:

If enacted, S. 937 would result in the economic disruption of the cane-sugar-refining industry in New Jersey and other refining States.

The Senator presented that letter in the utmost good faith; somebody told him that; but the utmost that could happen to the refiners would be a reduction of 2 percent of their refining; and I am sure that the American Sugar Refining Co. and others are not on quite so narrow a margin as that. It would hurt to a very limited extent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, it would not necessarily be fatal, but I will say to the Senator from Colorado that, as I understand the picture from the examination I made a year or 2 ago, of the particular refinery in Baltimore, which is supposed to be as fine a one as ever was built and which cost many million dollars, its earnings have been far from justifying the investment. In other words, it has had to go along on a very narrow margin, and has materially reduced the number of its employees both regular and part time. While I realize that there is no perfect solution for many of these problems, I want to make sure that the industry in Baltimore will not have to bear a larger burden of any necessary readjustment than it should bear, particularly in view of the fact that it has not been making money, as I recall, for some years.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not know anything about the Baltimore refinery, but I happened to read recently a statement of the American Sugar Refining Co. and find they have made very handsome profits during the past year.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot speak for the whole industry; it may be that for the past year conditions have been better than for other years; but I do know that the Baltimore refinery is one of the finest and most expensive ever constructed, that its business has gone steadily down, and it would be a real hardship if it were materially adversely affected.

Mr. ADAMS. The refineries have been increasing their output year by year since the passage of the Sugar Act, until they have reached 4,600,000 tons. It is true of the refining industry generally, as it is doubtless true, from what the Senator says, of the refinery in his State, that the plants were built and equipped for a much larger handling of sugar than is available. So they have a large overhead to carry, and the seaboard refineries could probably refine twice what they are now refining. They were built on that kind of a scale.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has put his finger on a vital point; I appreciate his candor and fairness, and I hope those

qualities characterize my own remarks, but the point is, with that kind of an overhead and an increasingly difficult situation because of wage increases, labor and other factors, any percentage of reduction in the business makes it a more difficult job to survive. My concern is that, in this readjustment, we do not lose sight of the fact that the refineries were built and equipped to do a job which they have not been permitted to do under our law.

Mr. ADAMS. Suppose the Senator and I should look at this question from the standpoint of a State that neither produces nor refines sugar and consider it on the basis of the welfare of the United States and the production of wealth in the country. In the case of sugar produced in the domestic sugar-beet area, every cent of the cost of its production and the cost of its refining is paid within the United States and becomes a part of the wealth of the community; that is, the farmer puts in his money, and the refining costs and the distributing costs and the profits benefit our own people, while in the case of sugar coming from Peru, the cost of raising the sugar, including the labor cost and the cost of shipping, are spent elsewhere. Some of it will come back, accrue to this country; namely, the part the refiners spend, but not a hundred percent. I imagine that the refiners spend from 1 to 1½ cents per pound in the process of refining. That would be spent here as distinguished from probably 5 cents, which is the cost of the sugar raised in the United States. The refining in the case of the beet industry takes more labor per ton than the refining on the Atlantic seaboard, because the sugar comes to the Atlantic seaboard refinery in a raw state.

Mr. TYDINGS. And in the beet area they start with the product as it is taken from the ground?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; and all the cost is expended there. In the seaboard refineries when some type of brown sugar comes in, it undergoes a small number of processes for the elimination of impurities, but in the case of the beet factories they have to slice the beets, and the beets have to go through a number of more intricate processes. In the beet-sugar refinery 300 pounds of sugar, on an average, are obtained from a ton of beets; that is, they handle a much larger volume to obtain a ton of refined sugar, whereas from the raw sugar to the refined the reduction is only about 7 percent. Looking at it in that way, we might say there is more money involved in the beet than in the other process.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can see the Senator's point of view, and I think there is much to his argument; but let me put this point of view to him: When the original Sugar Act was passed, allocating sugar between the various possessions of the United States and the continent, and also what might come in from outside, from Cuba, and so on—under the situation which then existed, it seemed to indicate that Congress was in favor of making an allocation according to the factors then in existence. Now, with the coming of the world war which is now

in progress, the whole process of growing and marketing sugar, because of the loss of shipping, because of the countries involved in the war, and because of one thing and another, has been changed. Assuming the first equation and that the first sugar bill dealt with all the then diverse situations, and assuming that the first sugar bill was a sound bill, why should not, as a matter of logic, every factor, both domestic and foreign, be proportionately affected by the changed world conditions, and are we not in this bill—perhaps rightfully—attempting to take advantage of the situation by giving some profit to the interior, while taking it away from the exterior investments of our own country?

Mr. ADAMS. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator understands what I mean?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; I agree with the Senator's premise. I have argued it with the Agriculture Department, because I have said before the Senator came in that, in my State, we have been raising 246,000 acres of sugar beets. We now are limited to 136,000 acres. In other words, the Department officials have been putting on the pressure and reducing our production. I have argued with them that when the Sugar Act was enacted it was with the idea of stabilizing the existing conditions. Now they are not stabilizing them, but they are restricting the production.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator said, earlier in his remarks, that in some cases the sugar refineries were built to do a job many times greater than that which they may do under existing law. In other words, a tremendous investment was made by them, a large financial outlay, in order to do a business which subsequent acts of Congress practically denied them the right to do. Like the Senator's farmers, as the thing unfolded, as the years went on, they were not permitted to do what they had spent their money to do, what they had invested in the business to perform. What they were attempting to do they were denied the privilege of doing by acts of Congress. Then came along the sugar bill.

Mr. ADAMS. But, of course, the denial was by the tariff, and not by the sugar bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; but, whatever caused it, Congress did it. It took away from invested capital, which had invested in good faith, the opportunity to employ that capital and cause it to earn.

When the Sugar Act came along, assuming that the Senator's statements are to receive the weight to which they are entitled, the farmers were likewise penalized; that is to say, their acreage was reduced; and as their acreage was reduced, and as the sugar refineries' business had been previously reduced, they both came to a point where there was a reduction in opportunity to earn both on the producer's side and on the refining side; and that situation was frozen. Then, looking at that problem or that equation or that condition, the Sugar

Act was written, and the Sugar Act has been in existence from that day to this.

Now conditions have changed. The world is not the same world that it was when the Sugar Act was originally passed; and my query now is, Why should not both the farmer in the interior and the refiner on the seaboard bear this new burden equally? Why give the advantage to the farmer in the interior, and put an extra burden upon the refiner and the working people in the refinery on the seaboard?

If the Senator's bill provided that they should both share equally this new burden, this new expense, this new situation, I think we could not very well argue against it; but what I see in the bill is that the change in the world situation is to result only in benefit to the farmer in the interior, while the workmen on the seaboard are to have a poorer situation than that which they had under normal conditions.

Mr. ADAMS. That is not entirely correct. As a matter of fact, under the proposal 60 percent of the Philippine deficit will come into the United States as raw sugar, which will go to the refineries. We shall not receive a certain amount of this sugar from the Philippines. That condition is changed, beyond our control. The shipping situation and the war situation are creating that condition. The question, then, is simply, Who is to fill this deficit? Then it reduces itself to this question, Are we to have the deficit filled by the foreigner, or by the man who lives under the American flag?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interpose there? He has been most generous in yielding. I should like to see the farmer fill that deficit.

Mr. ADAMS. Do not overlook the fact that the Philippines are included in the distribution; Hawaii is included; the cane producers are included, as well as the beet producers.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand.

Mr. ADAMS. Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the southern cane producers bring in raw sugar which will go to the refineries.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to see the farmer get all the benefit that he can out of the situation, and I am disposed to vote for legislation which will accomplish that result; but I say we ought to be careful when giving the farmer the advantage which is rightfully his because of the situation in the world, not to do it at the expense of the workingman, who, too, must earn the money with which to buy bread to eat and to buy the farmer's produce.

Mr. ADAMS. Would the Senator be satisfied with an arrangement by which the beet-sugar factories would be permitted to produce the same amount of sugar they produced in 1933, and the refineries would be permitted to refine the same amount of sugar they refined in 1933?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator that I am not so familiar with sugar statistics as he is, because we have no sugar interest in our State at all except the refinery, and I am interested in the subject of sugar only as a collateral problem, whereas in the Senator's State sugar production is a great industry. I

am glad it is, and I wish it well; but I cannot bind myself to a situation that I do not know about.

Mr. ADAMS. This is the situation: In 1933 the refineries of the United States were refining 4,128,000 tons. In 1940 the amount was 4,630,000 tons. That is, they increased the amount they refined 500,000 tons in the period covered by the Sugar Act. On the other hand, in 1933 the beet-sugar factories produced 1,736,000 tons, and this time they are to be allowed to produce 1,350,000 tons. In other words, they have been cut down in their production, while the refineries have been growing.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator—and it is as direct an answer as I am able to make, not having the figures—that taking as a basis the Sugar Act, of which I believe the Senator was one of the coauthors, whatever additional benefits come to the United States or its possessions as a result of world conditions I should want his farmers, as well as the workmen in the seaboard plants, to share in as equitably as possible; and whatever losses or disadvantages come to the United States or its possessions I think also ought to be shared as equally as possible. My sole contention is that I hope the bill will not be so arranged as to give all the advantages to one class, and throw all the disadvantages onto the other class. Inasmuch as we passed a Sugar Act which would be in existence today without amendment if it were not for present world conditions, which are unusual and could not be foreseen when the act was passed, I ask that the same philosophy which caused Congress to write it originally be carried into the new legislation, so that the whole country generally will bear equally whatever disadvantages and whatever advantages may accrue from the world situation.

Mr. ADAMS. I think we might increase even more substantially the production of cane sugar in the South and cane sugar in the Philippines.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that is equity, I should be for it; but, as I see the matter, while I am not familiar with all the figures, and I am not on the committee, the advantage is being given pretty much altogether to the one interest, with no corresponding advantage to the other.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator does not want a sort of reverse curve; that is, he does not want to do injury to the American citizen for the benefit of the foreigner in order that there may be a minor, indirect benefit to the refiner.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Gladly.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the Senator to what years the bill will apply.

Mr. ADAMS. Only to the current year, because the Sugar Act will expire on the 31st of December 1941.

Mr. PEPPER. So it will affect primarily the marketing quotas of the various sugar-producing areas and not the acreage quotas?

Mr. ADAMS. In the major amount there will be some increase. There are some areas where the farmers can still plant beets, in the Pacific Northwest and in other northern areas. The major effect at this late date will be to permit

the marketing of an overhanging surplus, which would put restrictions on next year's crop planting.

Mr. PEPPER. I have asked the question of the Senator because, as the Senator knows from our previous conversation—and I think I speak the Senator's sentiment also—I am very much interested in seeing that an additional quota is given to the new producers in the several States who desire to produce sugarcane or sugar beets. I had intended to suggest an amendment to the Senator's bill to the effect that any additional quota which shall go to any domestic area under the terms of the act shall be allotted to new producers who are actual farmers desiring to produce sugarcane or sugar beets, as the case may be. But if the bill will primarily affect only the marketing quota, at least in my State, I think perhaps the farmer would not get any advantage from such an amendment, even if it were proposed and adopted.

Mr. ADAMS. There are stocks of sugar on hand in the Senator's State?

Mr. PEPPER. We have stocks of sugar on hand. I will merely say, in passing, that I heartily favor the bill, and I hope it will be enacted.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have indulged myself longer than I had intended. I desired to place before the Senate and on the Record some of the reasons and some of the facts which have led me to feel that the pending measure should be enacted. I very earnestly ask Senators to give consideration to the arguments which have been presented.

DIVERSION OF WATERS OF NIAGARA RIVER—EXCHANGE OF NOTES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be laid down, as in executive session, an executive message from the President. Since the matter is of vital public importance, I ask that the ban of secrecy be removed therefrom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFarland in the chair). Without objection, and as in executive session, it is so ordered. The message will be read and the injunction of secrecy is removed therefrom.

The message was read, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

To the end that I may receive the approval of the Senate, I transmit herewith the texts of notes exchanged at Washington on May 20, 1941, between the Governments of the United States and Canada amending in its application of article 5 of the treaty signed on January 11, 1909, between the United States of America and the United Kingdom, to permit for the duration of the emergency, and in all events subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, an additional diversion, for power purposes, of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a report by the Secretary of State regarding this exchange of notes.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1941.

[Enclosures: 1. Texts of notes exchanged at Washington on May 20, 1941. 2. Letter from the Secretary of State.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUFFERING AND STARVATION IN EUROPE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, aside from the awfulness of the war, I suppose there is nothing in the world today that is attracting to a greater degree the attention of civilization than the conditions which prevail in Belgium and the other small countries of Europe. There starvation has reached a greater intensity than at any time in the history of the world. It is an unfortunate and unhappy condition when a great republic, with 130,000,000 inhabitants, is putting forth every effort possible to manufacture and transport engines for human destruction, and at the same time sitting by and refusing in any way to go forward with a movement to feed the hungry and the starving women and children, innocent civilians, in countries which in times past have been the greatest friends of this Republic.

Because of a blockade held and maintained steadfastly by the British Government, one of the belligerents in this unhappy war, neither Great Britain nor the United States is doing anything to feed the hungry or clothe the naked or lend succor to suffering ones who in times past never did us any harm, who in times past were our friends.

Mr. President, we lost one of the greatest friends the United States ever had when France went over to the Axis Powers because France was starved into submission. She submitted to the force of the dictator in Germany because starvation was setting in wholesale in France, not because France wanted to go with the Axis Powers, but because she had been receiving only promises, empty promises, if you please, given to her over the last year and a half by those who should have been, and in reality are, the friends of the French people.

No one could possibly know conditions in France and Belgium and the small countries of Europe better than John Cudahy, who has but recently been our Ambassador to Belgium, and who is familiar with all the conditions existing there. In an article published recently by a syndicate, he gives a picture so vivid that the American people should read it and know it. I therefore ask leave that the article by ex-Ambassador Cudahy to which I have referred be inserted in connection with the remarks I have just made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELGIANS STARVING—HOPE FOR UNITED STATES HELP—HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF THE CHILDREN REPORTED IN PERIL OF MALNUTRITION DISEASES—CAPITAL CITY OF WRAITHS—EX-ENVOY DESCRIBES CONDITIONS IN BRUSSELS AND TELLS OF PLEA FOR HOOVER PLAN

(By John Cudahy, ex-Ambassador to Belgium)

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, May 26 (via Berlin).—Belgium is hungry. Of 8,400,000 Belgians more than 8,300,000 are subsisting on starvation rations. In nearly every Belgian home

there is cruel suffering. Some 2,000,000 young Belgians will be cursed for the rest of their lives by stunted and impoverished physique, weakened and degenerated brain, and discolored, embittered characters unless relief comes soon.

These are facts that even an American could read in the newspapers with concern as detached as that with which he learns of a flood in China. In Portugal and Spain and Germany I met people everywhere who told me harrowing stories of famine in Belgium and, because I have lived in the country and have a genuine affection for the people, I felt sympathy, but I cannot say my heart was really affected until I met my friend René Colin.

He was 10 years old when I went away from Brussels last July, a robust juvenile specimen with apple cheeks and sturdy legs. We were great friends. One of my first calls on my return to Brussels was in Rue de l'Industrie, where René's father kept a barber shop I always patronized. I shall not soon recover from the shock of my reunion with René.

A TIRED, LITTLE OLD MAN

It was not that his cheeks, now sunken in, had turned to pasty gray; nor that he had grown so thin that his neck resembled a pipestem, nor was it the heavy smudged shadows under his eyes. It was the complete metamorphosis of the pink, hearty, happy Belgian boy I had left only 10 months before into a dejected, tired, little old man that stood before me as spiritless as a wounded bird. He had given up school, his mother told me. Two weeks before he had fainted in the classroom and so she had decided to wait for better days before resuming his studies.

René's father changed the subject to America. Like many Europeans, he was always talking about America and asking questions about that dreamland where everybody was rich and happy and where in great abundance were found all the good things of this earth.

"But I suppose even in America you feel the war?" he asked.

"Yes," I lied. "In a world of disaster like this no one can escape."

I thought of our elevators piled with grain cereals, stocks of frozen meats in our refrigerators, tier upon tier of bacon, ham, and lard, marketless surpluses of Wisconsin milk, cream, butter, and cheese. I thought of the great ranks of overeating American dyspeptics, the endless line of succulent "hot-dog" and hamburger stands stretching from New York to California, and the vast wilderness of waste from overloaded American tables, enough in itself to feed all famishing Belgium. And I was silent.

I went to see my friend, Dr. Nolf, at the office of the Red Cross, to tell him the story of René Colin. When I finished the doctor was standing at the window, his spectacles off, his handkerchief wiping his eyes.

"You must excuse me," he apologized. "I am ashamed. I am an old doctor and accustomed to human misery, but I have never seen anything like this now in Belgium."

Then he told me that René's case was only one of hundreds of thousands. Two million children of Belgium under 15 were all seriously underfed.

Brussels was a city of walking wraiths, but Dr. Nolf said his main worry was not about grown people. What concerned him above all was the blighting influence upon the rising generation, who could never grow without the materials for growth and who, because they could not get these materials, were rapidly developing diseases like rickets, edema, partial blindness, bronchial pneumonia, tuberculosis, pellagra, eczema, and anemia.

I went to see Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, at Laeken, the royal palace outside of the city where her son, King Leopold III, is a German prisoner of war.

Often the Queen drops in unheralded at the soup kitchens and always unofficially, as befits her status in enemy-occupied country. Every Belgian will tell you about her devotion to the people, her unrecorded benevolence, and her heroism at Ostend, where she administered to the wounded while bombs smashed close by and struck terror in the hearts of those of the royal household whose duty compelled them to stand by.

She spoke to me in a detached, uncomplaining way about this grieving, distressed land she knew so well in every part. You could detect her professional training when she mentioned maladies of nonnutrition. Children were her main concern, she said, and she could not hide her dread for their future lives.

Back in Brussels, I talked to Emile de Winter, secretary general in the Ministry of Agriculture, who gave me an inventory of Belgian food supplies. He said that bread, of rye and potato flour, now came entirely from German sources. There was oil in Antwerp for the manufacture of margarine to provide a quarter-ounce ration until the end of the summer. Potatoes were running very low and there was milk to supply 1 pint for children and one-half pint for the aged and for invalids.

There would be little milk next winter, since Belgium imported the great bulk of its stock feed from the Western Hemisphere, and most of the cows would have to be slaughtered when the pasturing season was over. Sixty percent of the swine had already been killed and three-quarters of the chickens, so there were very few eggs.

Meat could still be rationed, an ounce a day, but this was so unevenly distributed that some markets, like Hamur, Charlevoile, and Dinant, got only half the amount to which they were entitled. Beef and veal would soon become luxurious tidbits, as pork now was. The situation would be relieved a little by vegetables during the summer, but, he concluded, it was impossible not to be a pessimist about the future.

WHERE THE FOOD WENT

I asked him if the Germans had requisitioned much food in Belgium and, if so, whether they were still shipping much to Germany and living off the country. In answer to the first question, he said it was impossible to reply with accuracy because none of the burgomasters or commune officials had made an inventory of provisions in the country before the invasion, but he was of the opinion that the Germans had taken a great deal, not so much by requisition as by purchase by soldiers.

M. de Winter admitted that the German Army was being fed entirely from Germany now, and that Belgium in large part was living on German rations. He gave the following account of what had been shipped from Germany since the occupation: One hundred and forty thousand tons of rye, 30,000 tons of rye flour (enough together to make bread on the basis of the reduced ration for nearly 3 months), 50,000 tons of eating potatoes, and 12,000 tons of seed potatoes. He said the German Government had promised to ship 130,000 tons of potatoes for food and 43,000 tons of seed potatoes.

Meanwhile, the famished do not revolt. As in the great potato famine of 1843 to 1849, when a million of the fighting Irish race were buried beneath the old peat sod; and as in the Ukraine in 1932, where the toll of the famine was like a pestilence, the will to protest falls with dying strength.

It is a nasty world, this Europe after this first winter of war. My sleep is haunted by black dreams of another winter of want in Belgium. Yet no one despairs, and the courage and nobility of the people are an inspiration.

A banker who came to see me off on the train asked me timidly about the Hoover plan

for children, but I told him that the American people were against the Hoover plan because they thought it would give aid to the enemy. He was mystified at this, and, being a banker, used earmarked gold to illustrate how all shipments to Belgium could be identified and thus safeguarded to their intended destination. He asked why, if that could be done with gold, the same thing could not be done with provisions. The train came then and I did not have to answer—and I was very glad the train came.

Mr. GEORGE rose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Georgia proposes to reply to the Senator from Colorado. I was about to ask unanimous consent that I might offer a resolution, out of order, but I thought that if the Senator from Georgia desired to make his comments following the address of the Senator from Colorado, I would defer until he made his remarks because what I am about to say will be on an extraneous subject.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator from Florida inquiring of the Senator from Georgia whether he is about to talk on the sugar bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not intend to. I should like to make one observation, if the Senator will permit me, while the distinguished Senator from Nevada is present.

Very naturally we would be less than human if we did not earnestly desire to take care of the actual pressing necessities of the people of occupied countries and areas in Europe, so far as we are able to do so, so far as is consistent with our means. I think it should be said, on the basis of the best information obtainable, that there is not a scarcity of food in Europe sufficient to result in starvation or great suffering. There is not an abundance of food there, of course, but, on the basis of the most trustworthy information obtainable, there is enough food in Europe at this time to maintain the populations there.

The question is as to the proper distribution of the food; and when the proper distribution of food in Europe is considered, I do not think we can afford to leave out of consideration the very clear responsibility for the lack of proper distribution of food in Europe and the responsibility for the monopolization and appropriation of food in Europe.

I am sure no one would wish for a moment to withhold any assistance which could be given by this country to those in Europe or elsewhere who are in need of the necessities of life—food and other things which they must have to sustain life properly. But in considering the question we cannot do so wholly upon a basis of sympathy for those who are in want without giving some consideration to the facts as they actually exist.

I merely wanted to call attention to this thought because it seems to me that most of us, in our strong sympathy, are concerned only with whether some of the peoples of Europe are properly fed, not concerning ourselves at all with any further problem, and bringing the sole responsibility to the people of the United States.

If there is sufficient food in Europe to sustain life on a fair basis, then the peo-

ple of the United States certainly ought to be willing to consider whether that food is properly distributed, and if not, who is responsible for the maldistribution, and who is primarily responsible for conditions which exist.

The proper answer to that question would not relieve us of moral responsibility, but at a time when it is at least debatable whether our efforts might not be misdirected, and might not defeat other purposes which we sincerely and earnestly seek to foster and to advance, we should consider this question solely with reference to those fundamental considerations which, I humbly beg to submit, would seem to be proper to keep in mind in passing upon this very important question.

I merely wish to make that statement, Mr. President, because more and more the question will be thought of by the American people, and more and more a just, humane, and sympathetic people will be desirous of doing something. Sometimes we may be disposed to do something without full consideration of the possible consequences and the possible effect of our action upon other actions which we are also seeking to take at the same time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the able Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has expressed himself as he has. The only information that comes to those of us who are, as he is, vitally interested in this all-important subject, comes from those who, we think, should have the best source of information at their disposal. That was the reason for my having inserted in the RECORD the article by ex-Ambassador Cudahy. It struck me that Mr. Cudahy, from his knowledge of Belgium, from his knowledge of European conditions, would certainly not have authored an article such as that which I have placed in the RECORD were he not possessed of the facts. His article draws a very vivid picture of conditions of starvation existing in Belgium.

Again, Mr. President, I think we will all agree that during the first World War the matter of distributing food properly to the suffering in Belgium was handled masterfully by one who was afterward elevated to the Presidency of the United States, Mr. Hoover. Today Mr. Hoover is pleading with the people of this country that they may give heed to his movement to distribute the necessary food to the needy Belgians and to the people of the smaller countries of Europe. He has submitted a plan whereby the Belgian Government, and the governments of other countries of Europe, because they have the money with which to buy, propose to purchase the necessities of life, and to take them over there under American supervision, so that in their distribution they will not go where America does not want them to go.

In keeping with the sentiments expressed by the able Senator from Georgia, and in keeping with the purposes of those of us who are trying to bring this matter to the attention of the American public, it seems to me most appropriate that the Senate itself should give great thought to the subject, because I think in the not

far distant future a resolution may be submitted here which should have the very grave thought, indeed the sympathetic thought, of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4466) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, two evenings ago the President of the United States delivered a stirring message to the people of America and to the world. I believe the people of the United States and those who are the friends of democracy everywhere have been deeply moved by that message. The President called upon the people for unity of purpose and effort. I know of nothing which could so accelerate that response which the President hoped for, and which I believe every Member of this body hopes for, as a clear-cut expression from this body voicing approval of what the President said, and confidence in the President.

So, Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed Senate resolution which I ask to have stated, and then when it is stated I shall ask unanimous consent that, out of order, it may be submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution—Senate Resolution 122—was read, as follows:

Resolved, That, being informed of the forthright and straightforward address by the President on the 27th instant, it is the sense of the Senate that the President was right and deserves the full confidence of the Congress and the country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered as submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I now propose to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. But I think it is only fair, before doing so, to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall insist on the regular order, and that the resolution be referred.

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bulow	Clark, Idaho
Aiken	Bunker	Clark, Mo.
Andrews	Burton	Connally
Ball	Byrd	Davis
Bankhead	Capper	Ellender
Bone	Caraway	George
Brown	Chavez	Gillette

Glass	McFarland	Shipstead
Guffey	McNary	Smathers
Gurney	Maloney	Smith
Hatch	Mead	Stewart
Hayden	Murdock	Taft
Herring	Murray	Thomas, Idaho
Hill	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Holman	Nye	Truman
Hughes	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Van Nuys
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Wallgren
La Follette	Reynolds	Wheeler
Lee	Rosier	White
Lucas	Russell	Wiley
McCarran	Schwartz	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, there is an existing unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the pending bill Tuesday next at an hour fixed. Is that true?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is ordered that not later than 2 o'clock on Tuesday, June 3, the Senate proceed to vote on S. 937 and all amendments thereto.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Vice President, for I desire to have it understood that by the resolution I have submitted I do not in any sense expect to encroach upon the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, I will say that in the absence of some Senators who have come into the Senate Chamber in response to the quorum call, I have said that a few days ago the President of the United States delivered a message which deeply touched the hearts of the people of this Nation. He aroused the hope of oppressed peoples all over the world that this Nation was taking a position which indicated the moral character and stamina of our foreign policy. Our President in that memorable address pleaded for unity on the part of our people. I believe that the people are responsive to that appeal; but I know of nothing which would give them greater encouragement, greater strength in that needed effort, than to have a declaration from the Senate of the United States that it, too, joins in those noble sentiments expressed by our President.

Accordingly I ask that the clerk first read the resolution, and then I shall submit a request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Consideration of the resolution is not now in order.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, already other Senators have indicated that they would interpose an objection; and I rise for the purpose of saying that in my opinion, the resolution would precipitate an unnecessary and a most regrettable debate at this time. I believe that if the distinguished Senator from Florida will further consider the matter he will be willing either to have the resolution now go to the appropriate committee or else, if he wishes to have it take the other

course, to have it lie on the table, under the rule, for such subsequent motion as may be made.

It seems very clear to me that while the resolution merely approves an address delivered by the Chief Executive of the United States, it is one which should go to the Foreign Relations Committee, because, of course, it is well known that the President was speaking not only on domestic and national questions, but particularly on international matters; and, therefore, it would seem to me that the resolution should very properly take one or the other of the courses I have suggested. The motion is not in order, except by unanimous consent; and at this time I am making my appeal to the Senator from Florida to consider the advisability of permitting the resolution to take its regular order; because under the primary rules of the Senate it is not in order at this time, and under any circumstances would go over on the objection of any Senator. More than one Senator indicated—one Senator so indicated from the floor, prior to the roll call—that he would interpose an objection to its immediate consideration. It would seem to me to be the part of wisdom to permit the resolution to take its regular course. I repeat, Mr. President, that it would seem most regrettable to throw into the discussions of the Senate mere approval or disapproval of what the President of the United States has said, even upon an official, and particularly upon a nonofficial occasion. It could be productive of no good, in my opinion, with all due respect to the Senator from Florida. It would promote no spirit of national unity to throw this matter open to discussion in this body at this time.

Therefore I express the hopes that the Senator will recognize that the objections made are, of course, good to the immediate consideration of the resolution, and that he himself will consent that the resolution either go to the Committee on Foreign Relations or for the time being lie on the table.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida has no disposition to provoke conflict. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Florida, however, the regrettable fact is not that the sentiment of the Senate might be called for but that it is the opinion of the able Senator from Georgia that there is such a disunity in the sentiment of the Senate on these fundamental truths that were uttered in this eloquent and stirring address that he could not with confidence approach an expression of that sentiment at this crucial time. That is the danger spot, Mr. President. If that is true, the world and the Nation are entitled to know it, because sooner or later we will not be able to dodge these issues longer. If we do not believe in what the President said 2 days ago, the sooner we tell the world that the sentiment of the Senate will not support him in that policy, the less the danger of disappointing all the hopeful, the less the danger of some tragedy that might follow in the wake of such denial.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I do not agree with the Senator from Florida that there is any disunity when it comes to protecting American interests, but there is a difference of opinion. Does the Senator believe that it is because of Senators' belief in "the four freedoms" about which the President spoke?

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Senator be good enough to repeat the last part of his statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly. I said that I do not believe there exists in the Senate of the United States the disunity the Senator speaks of, but if there is a difference of opinion in the Senate of the United States, is it not brought about because the Senate believes in "the four freedoms" about which the President spoke?

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean to ask if the disunity would be attributable to belief in those freedoms?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not believe that there is disunity, but I do believe that there is a difference of opinion, and, if there is a difference of opinion, is it not brought about because the Senate believes in "the four freedoms" about which the President spoke?

Mr. PEPPER. That may be a matter of opinion; perhaps in the opinion of the able Senator from New Mexico that may be true; in the opinion of other Senators it might not be true.

The only thing the Senator from Florida desires, Mr. President, is this: We have been seeing unofficial statements from various individual Senators that the address meant this and did not mean that; that it was spoken with authority or without authority. So much has been said by way of commentary that I suspected that the heart had been pretty well eaten out of it. I thought, therefore, it would be consoling to the people of America to have an expression from the majority of the American Senate that they had confidence in their President and they were willing to say to the world they thought he was right when he said what he said.

If that is not the sentiment of the Senate; if the Senate is not so unified that it can speak those sentiments, there may be nothing to do, of course, but allow the disunity to proceed and the country, perhaps, to go more rapidly toward the abyss which it approaches with gaining speed each passing day. In the light of the utterances by the able chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that Senators have resolved to object, which they have the right to do, there is nothing, of course, that I can do except to make the motion and, in view of the statement that there will be objection, to acquiesce in the suggestion that was made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry as to the parliamentary status. Of course, the Senator from Florida is speaking by unanimous consent, and it is not my purpose to object to his making a speech. However, if he asks unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the resolution, I shall object, and the objection would carry the resolution over to the following legislative

day, when it would come up automatically under the rule. If he desires to conform to the wishes of the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the resolution go to that committee, then I shall not make objection. Therefore, I address an inquiry to the Senator: Does he desire that the resolution be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I desire that the resolution lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table.

STATUS OF RETIRED JUDGES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to suspend action on the pending bill and to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1050, which was reported by me from the Judiciary Committee on Monday last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1050) relating to the status of retired judges.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the form of the request, I think, is not correct. I have no objection to laying aside temporarily the pending business, but that was not the form of the request.

Mr. KILGORE. I accept the modification of my request by the Senator from Colorado, and thank him for calling my attention to it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, we have not had up the calendar today; the bill was just called to my attention a moment ago; I have not had time to peruse it, and I am not familiar with its contents. We will probably have a call of the calendar the first of next week. I shall object to considering the bill now, because, while it may be a very good bill, I have not had an opportunity to read it, and I have not had an opportunity to obtain the judgment of the other members of the committee. For that reason, I shall have to object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if no Senator wishes to address himself to the pending business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Roy H. Ireland, to be postmaster at Wadena, Minn., in place of J. P. Mettel.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Walter L. Miller, of Harrisburg, Pa., to be Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third district of Pennsylvania, in place of William Driscoll.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Jay Dixon Edwards, of Oregon, now a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 8, effective as of May 16, 1941.

ARMY NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. HILL. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I report sundry routine nominations in the Army, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the nominations be dispensed with and that the names of the nominees be printed in the RECORD. As I have said, the nominations are routine ones in the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the Army nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Samuel B. Kemp, of Hawaii, to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

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

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph H. Young to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

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

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all confirmations of nominations made today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTOCOL CONCERNING FOREIGN COMPANIES IN THE COUNTRIES OF AMERICA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there remains on the calendar a protocol—Executive E, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session—concerning recognition of the juridical personality of foreign companies in the countries of America. I am loath to call up the protocol, because I do not see present the Senator

from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONET], who raised certain objections the last time the protocol was before the Senate. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], who was chairman of the subcommittee which reported favorably on the protocol, is present, but I should dislike to call it up in the absence of the Senator from Wyoming. I ask, therefore, that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the protocol will go over.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. GEORGE. In conformity with the agreement heretofore made and ratified by the majority leader, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 2, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 26), 1941:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be assistant attorney general in charge of customs, vice Hon. Webster J. Oliver, resigned.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Ganson Purcell, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1942, vice Jerome N. Frank.

Robert E. Healy, of Vermont, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1946. (Re-appointment.)

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Malcolm Elliott, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Roger G. Powell, Corps of Engineers, relieved.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William L. Sutter, August 30, 1940.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Gilbert R. Evans, September 1, 1940.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Wallace L. Hancock, Jr., September 1, 1940.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Adrian F. Werner, September 4, 1940.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Woodrow W. Vennel, September 30, 1940.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) John Montrello, October 1, 1940.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Walter L. Miller, of Harrisburg, Pa., to be collector of internal revenue for the twenty-third district of Pennsylvania, in place of William Driscoll.

BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Luther Harr, of Pennsylvania, to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel.

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, vice Alvin J. Wirtz, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY MARINE CORPS

Maj. William F. Brown to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Peter P. Schrider

Robert H. Rhoads

Frank M. June

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1941:

John A. Saxten

Robert W. Shaw

Carlo A. Rovetta

Alfred L. Booth

Dorrance S. Radcliffe

Charles M. DeHority

Howard B. Bengé

William P. Spencer

Richard B. Church

Nathan T. Post, Jr.

Alton D. Gould

John S. MacLaughlin, Jr.

Randolph C. Berkeley, Jr.

William P. Pala, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of May 1941.

Harold R. Thorpe, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of May 1941.

Robert A. Churley, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of May 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Catherine C. Hudson to be postmaster at Spring Hill, Ala., in place of Catherine Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Oscar H. McCollum to be postmaster at Atkins, Ark., in place of J. E. Darr, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Ross T. Kemper to be postmaster at Arroyo Grande, Calif., in place of R. T. Kemper. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Thomas A. Gianella to be postmaster at Marysville, Calif., in place of T. A. Gianella. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Fred R. Carpenter to be postmaster at Middletown, Calif., in place of F. R. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Nellie A. Britten to be postmaster at Three Rivers, Calif., in place of N. A. Britten. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Maude A. Northey to be postmaster at Williams, Calif., in place of M. A. Northey. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

COLORADO

Edward F. Baldwin to be postmaster at Nucla, Colo., in place of E. F. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1941.

Clarence A. Reynolds to be postmaster at Swink, Colo., in place of C. A. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

CONNECTICUT

John L. Bradley to be postmaster at Cheshire, Conn., in place of J. L. Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

Joanna Madeline Clifford to be postmaster at Colchester, Conn., in place of J. M. Clifford. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Everett F. Wilson to be postmaster at Mystic, Conn., in place of E. F. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

FLORIDA

Thomas West Gary to be postmaster at Bartow, Fla., in place of T. W. Gary. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Leslie A. Sherouse to be postmaster at Hawthorn, Fla., in place of L. A. Sherouse. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Frank H. Clyatt to be postmaster at Micanopy, Fla., in place of F. H. Clyatt. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

William J. Bulloch to be postmaster at Monticello, Fla., in place of W. J. Bulloch. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Harry W. Craig to be postmaster at Tarpon Springs, Fla., in place of H. W. Craig. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

Dorothy E. Franklin to be postmaster at Venice, Fla., in place of D. E. Franklin. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

Paul A. Tompkins to be postmaster at Webster, Fla., in place of P. A. Tompkins. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

GEORGIA

Orian A. Moorhead to be postmaster at Greensboro, Ga., in place of O. A. Moorhead. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Roy B. Allen to be postmaster at Lenox, Ga., in place of R. B. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

HAWAII

Albertina M. Redfeam to be postmaster at Kaneohe, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

IDAHO

Mildred Richards to be postmaster at Mackay, Idaho, in place of Mildred Richards. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

ILLINOIS

James R. Wick to be postmaster at Albion, Ill., in place of G. C. Jones, transferred.

Martin Ferentchak to be postmaster at Argo, Ill., in place of Nancy Michael. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

Harold F. Mayer to be postmaster at Bartlett, Ill., in place of F. C. Watermann, deceased.

William W. McIntire to be postmaster at Belvidere, Ill., in place of W. W. McIntire. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Kenneth Henkhaus to be postmaster at Bethalto, Ill., in place of Kenneth Henkhaus. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Norbert C. Knapp to be postmaster at Glen Ellyn, Ill., in place of N. C. Knapp. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Harry F. DuQuoin to be postmaster at Greenview, Ill., in place of H. F. DuQuoin. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Guy R. Knappenberger to be postmaster at Kirkland, Ill., in place of G. R. Knappenberger. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

George A. Boeke to be postmaster at Lena, Ill., in place of G. A. Boeke. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Robert L. Davis to be postmaster at Lincoln, Ill., in place of R. L. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Harold Vogel to be postmaster at Minonk, Ill., in place of W. D. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1940.

Arthur T. Ellis to be postmaster at Neoga, Ill., in place of A. T. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1941.

Charlotte H. Eekhoff to be postmaster at Nokomis, Ill., in place of A. J. Eekhoff, deceased.

Bessie B. Kampmeier to be postmaster at Pearl City, Ill., in place of B. B. Kampmeier. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Peter L. Kelly to be postmaster at Piper City, Ill., in place of P. L. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Monroe R. Hanneman to be postmaster at Silvis, Ill., in place of M. R. Hanneman. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Louis L. Eubanks to be postmaster at Sparland, Ill., in place of L. L. Eubanks. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

INDIANA

Ozro Latshaw to be postmaster at Carlisle, Ind., in place of Ozro Latshaw. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Damon C. Thompson to be postmaster at Darlington, Ind., in place of D. C. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Neola S. True to be postmaster at Demotte, Ind., in place of N. S. True. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1939.

Leander Franklin Adams to be postmaster at Depauw, Ind., in place of L. F. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Frank E. Louette to be postmaster at Goodland, Ind., in place of F. E. Louette. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Gertrude Armstrong to be postmaster at Hazleton, Ind., in place of Russell Armstrong, deceased.

Ethel L. Price to be postmaster at Howe, Ind., in place of E. L. Price. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Georgia M. Mougeotte to be postmaster at Lagro, Ind., in place of G. M. Mougeotte. Incumbent's commission expires June 29, 1941.

Ruth O. Storen to be postmaster at Lexington, Ind., in place of R. O. Storen. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Carl R. Kluger to be postmaster at Morristown, Ind., in place of C. R. Kluger. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

Ralph H. Adams to be postmaster at Newport, Ind., in place of R. H. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Thomas J. Lemasters to be postmaster at Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Dawson M. Liggett to be postmaster at Spiceland, Ind., in place of D. M. Liggett. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Mary H. Greene to be postmaster at Westfield, Ind., in place of M. H. Greene. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Lydia Rae Parker to be postmaster at Wheatfield, Ind., in place of L. R. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

IOWA

George H. Abernathy to be postmaster at Blakesburg, Iowa, in place of G. H. Abernathy. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

Ralph M. Griesy to be postmaster at Keystone, Iowa, in place of George Harder. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1940.

Norvil B. Richards to be postmaster at New Sharon, Iowa, in place of T. R. Osborne, retired.

Wayne O. Thomas to be postmaster at Rake, Iowa, in place of W. O. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1941.

Elizabeth L. Fisher to be postmaster at Spencer, Iowa, in place of E. L. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1941.

John N. Lichty to be postmaster at Toledo, Iowa, in place of J. N. Lichty. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1941.

George W. Montag to be postmaster at West Bend, Iowa, in place of G. W. Montag. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1941.

KANSAS

Edith Lawson Gray to be postmaster at Alden, Kans., in place of E. L. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Charles E. Hanlon to be postmaster at Caney, Kans., in place of C. E. Hanlon. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Einathan B. Gray to be postmaster at Jewell, Kans., in place of M. M. Schafer, resigned.

George W. Ryan to be postmaster at Lincoln, Kans., in place of G. W. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Vernon T. Hill to be postmaster at Logan, Kans., in place of V. T. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

KENTUCKY

Fulton L. Gosney to be postmaster at Alexandria, Ky., in place of F. L. Gosney. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Henry W. Stewart to be postmaster at Campbellsburg, Ky., in place of H. W. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

George M. Beasley to be postmaster at Russellville, Ky., in place of G. M. Beasley. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Leonard Horton to be postmaster at Waynesburg, Ky., in place of C. B. Reynolds, deceased.

LOUISIANA

James C. Howell to be postmaster at Jackson, La., in place of J. C. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

John Gordon Hewitt to be postmaster at Mansfield, La., in place of J. G. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Lowery L. Matthews to be postmaster at Vidalia, La., in place of L. L. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

MARYLAND

John C. Frasch to be postmaster at Edgewood, Md., in place of J. C. Frasch. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

MASSACHUSETTS

James E. Bellew to be postmaster at Mansfield, Mass., in place of J. E. Bellew. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

John E. Higgiston to be postmaster at Millford, Mass., in place of J. E. Higgiston. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

Kathryn C. Smith to be postmaster at Petersham, Mass., in place of K. C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Leah D. Burke to be postmaster at West Falmouth, Mass., in place of A. W. Baxter, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Fred Clair McOmber to be postmaster at Allegan, Mich., in place of Clair McOmber. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

William J. Schindehette to be postmaster at Bay City, Mich., in place of W. J. Schindehette. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

John D. Campbell to be postmaster at Douglas, Mich., in place of J. D. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Clarence S. Goodrich to be postmaster at Elsie, Mich., in place of C. S. Goodrich. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Edward J. Weipert to be postmaster at Ida, Mich., in place of E. J. Weipert. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Christopher C. Lerg to be postmaster at Lake City, Mich., in place of C. C. Lerg. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Frank M. Gierke, Sr., to be postmaster at Manistique, Mich., in place of F. M. Gierke, Sr. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Harrison D. Sweet to be postmaster at Marcellus, Mich., in place of H. D. Sweet. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Marguerite M. Ryan to be postmaster at Mattawan, Mich., in place of M. M. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Ethel A. Hruska to be postmaster at Nahma, Mich., in place of E. A. Hruska. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Mark B. Hawes to be postmaster at Parma, Mich., in place of M. B. Hawes. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Carl S. Schmid, Jr., to be postmaster at Petersburg, Mich., in place of C. S. Schmid, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Fred B. Wadsworth to be postmaster at Pittsford, Mich., in place of F. B. Wadsworth. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Charles A. Vogelheim to be postmaster at Rogers City, Mich., in place of C. A. Vogelheim. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1940.

Regina K. Bresnahan to be postmaster at Roscommon, Mich., in place of R. K. Bresnahan. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Edgar L. Erskin to be postmaster at Vestaburg, Mich., in place of E. L. Erskin. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

MINNESOTA

Mervill W. Monroe to be postmaster at Browns Valley, Minn., in place of J. L. Paul, deceased.

Carmon J. Auble to be postmaster at Chisholm, Minn., in place of C. E. Berkman. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1939.

MISSISSIPPI

Leo G. Ford to be postmaster at Bay St. Louis, Miss., in place of L. G. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1941.

George Y. Banks to be postmaster at Columbus, Miss., in place of G. Y. Banks. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Mercer L. Gewin to be postmaster at De Kalb, Miss., in place of M. L. Gewin. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Nathan B. Williams to be postmaster at Fernwood, Miss., in place of N. B. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Dewey W. Tullos to be postmaster at Mize, Miss., in place of S. C. Tanner. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1939.

Aubrey O. Hammack to be postmaster at Scooba, Miss., in place of A. O. Hammack. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Albert F. Zachry to be postmaster at Stone-wall, Miss., in place of A. F. Zachry. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

MISSOURI

Susan T. Fulbright to be postmaster at Doniphan, Mo., in place of S. T. Fulbright. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1940.

Ernest P. Goggins to be postmaster at Elvins, Mo., in place of E. P. Goggins. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Earl J. Vinyard to be postmaster at Leadwood, Mo., in place of E. J. Vinyard. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Edgar L. Todd to be postmaster at Morehouse, Mo., in place of Edgar Todd. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

William Goebel Ray to be postmaster at Purdy, Mo., in place of W. G. Ray. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Ercelle W. Johnson to be postmaster at Ridgeway, Mo., in place of E. W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1941.

Martin C. Mikkelsen to be postmaster at St. James, Mo., in place of M. C. Mikkelsen. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

James D. Evans to be postmaster at Stoutland, Mo., in place of J. D. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1941.

Herbert Frank Nelson to be postmaster at Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of H. F. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Frank E. Lafferty to be postmaster at Trenton, Mo., in place of F. E. Lafferty. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1941.

Willa B. Dodge to be postmaster at Union Star, Mo., in place of W. B. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Ethel L. Lauderdale to be postmaster at Wellington, Mo., in place of E. L. Lauderdale. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1941.

MONTANA

Kenneth LeCompt to be postmaster at Arlee, Mont., in place of Kenneth LeCompt. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1941.

George A. Wright to be postmaster at Havre, Mont., in place of G. A. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Abbie J. Yandell to be postmaster at New Deal, Mont., in place of Abbie Yandell. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1941.

Guy R. McClarren to be postmaster at Rye-gate, Mont., in place of G. R. McClarren. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Marvin E. Corkill to be postmaster at White Sulphur Springs, Mont., in place of M. E. Corkill. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

NEBRASKA

Mary B. Packwood to be postmaster at Cook, Nebr., in place of M. B. Packwood. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

Stephen N. Roche to be postmaster at Gibbstown, N. J., in place of Samuel Mullan, retired.

Rachel E. Berger to be postmaster at Ringoes, N. J., in place of R. E. Berger. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1940.

NEW YORK

H. Bertram Miller to be postmaster at Amenia, N. Y., in place of H. B. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Otis J. West to be postmaster at Bayville, N. Y., in place of O. J. West. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Eugene A. Westcott, Jr., to be postmaster at Cleveland, N. Y., in place of E. A. Westcott, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

Augustus W. Dymes, Jr., to be postmaster at Croton on Hudson, N. Y., in place of A. W. Dymes, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Fred W. Odwell to be postmaster at Downsville, N. Y., in place of F. W. Odwell. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Henry J. Hoogkamp to be postmaster at East Greenbush, N. Y., in place of H. J. Hoogkamp. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

John E. Savage to be postmaster at Holland, N. Y., in place of Cort Kramer, retired.

Joseph J. Reilly to be postmaster at Irvington, N. Y., in place of J. J. Reilly. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1941.

Isidore F. Linehan to be postmaster at Mamaroneck, N. Y., in place of I. F. Linehan. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

William A. Eggison to be postmaster at Marcy, N. Y., in place of W. A. Eggison. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

Orville E. Velley to be postmaster at Miller-ton, N. Y., in place of O. E. Velley. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

James H. Mackin to be postmaster at Oswego, N. Y., in place of J. H. Mackin. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1941.

James Boylan to be postmaster at Peekskill, N. Y., in place of James Boylan. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Bert E. Holden to be postmaster at Peru, N. Y., in place of B. E. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Maryann Batt to be postmaster at Woodmere, N. Y., in place of Jack Batt, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Perry C. Millikin to be postmaster at Halifax, N. C., in place of P. C. Millikin. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1941.

Ada G. Badgett to be postmaster at Pilot Mountain, N. C., in place of A. G. Badgett. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Oliver L. Ammons to be postmaster at Robbinville, N. C., in place of O. L. Ammons. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

William R. Holmes to be postmaster at Shallotte, N. C., in place of W. R. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Theodore T. Thomas to be postmaster at Tarboro, N. C., in place of T. T. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1941.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mildred L. Feldmann to be postmaster at Wildrose, N. Dak., in place of C. H. Larson, removed.

OHIO

Cleo M. Richter to be postmaster at Pickerington, Ohio, in place of P. B. Mason, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Wilson G. Gray to be postmaster at Anadarko, Okla., in place of W. G. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Dora E. Senter to be postmaster at Bristow, Okla., in place of D. E. Senter. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

George N. Horlacher to be postmaster at Allentown, Pa., in place of G. N. Horlacher. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Eugene C. Wonder to be postmaster at Chalfont, Pa., in place of E. C. Wonder. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Milton M. Brooke to be postmaster at Confluence, Pa., in place of M. M. Brooke. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

William G. Walker to be postmaster at Copley, Pa., in place of W. G. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Margaret M. Wink to be postmaster at Ed-dington, Pa., in place of M. M. Wink. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Paul W. Koblarchick to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Pa., in place of Henry Bourns, retired.

Harry W. Fee to be postmaster at Indiana, Pa., in place of H. W. Fee. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Carl E. Reisch to be postmaster at Lemoyne, Pa., in place of C. E. Reisch. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Frank E. Neumeyer to be postmaster at Macungie, Pa., in place of F. E. Neumeyer.

Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

John M. Hartman to be postmaster at Millersville, Pa., in place of J. M. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Horace H. Cornell to be postmaster at New-town, Pa., in place of H. H. Cornell. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

John P. Johnson to be postmaster at Pocono Pines, Pa., in place of J. P. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Carl D. Kohl to be postmaster at Stroudsburg, Pa., in place of C. D. Kohl. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

TENNESSEE

John E. Malone to be postmaster at Adams-ville, Tenn., in place of J. E. Malone. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1941.

Joseph A. Muecke to be postmaster at Kingston, Tenn., in place of J. A. Muecke. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

Mumford S. Stewart to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Tenn., in place of M. S. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

Ernest P. Lassiter to be postmaster at Smithville, Tenn., in place of E. P. Lassiter. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

TEXAS

Ralph B. Martin to be postmaster at Cam-den, Tex., in place of R. B. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1941.

Shelley G. Tarkington, Jr., to be postmas-ter at Cuero, Tex., in place of S. G. Tarking-ton, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

James E. Heaton to be postmaster at Cush-ing, Tex., in place of J. E. Heaton. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

David P. Slaughter to be postmaster at Howe, Tex., in place of D. P. Slaughter. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Helen C. Wallace to be postmaster at Kyle, Tex., in place of N. C. Schlemmer, resigned.

John H. Watson to be postmaster at Mc-Dade, Tex., in place of J. H. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1941.

Allen Tolbert to be postmaster at Midland, Tex., in place of Allen Tolbert. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Benjamin E. Ramsey to be postmaster at Newton, Tex., in place of B. E. Ramsey. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Una B. Walker to be postmaster at Pecan Gap, Tex., in place of U. B. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

William C. Wallis to be postmaster at Richardson, Tex., in place of W. C. Wallis. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Wade H. Taylor to be postmaster at Semi-nary Hill, Tex., in place of W. H. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Sallie V. McAdams to be postmaster at Stratford, Tex., in place of S. V. McAdams. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Farris A. Brown to be postmaster at Talco, Tex., in place of F. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1941.

Harold D. House to be postmaster at Three Rivers, Tex., in place of H. D. House. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Floyd K. Rose to be postmaster at Tomball, Tex., in place of F. K. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

WEST VIRGINIA

John R. Fortney to be postmaster at Morgantown, W. Va., in place of J. R. Fortney. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

WISCONSIN

James F. Horan, Jr., to be postmaster at Friendship, Wis., in place of J. F. Horan, Sr. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1939.

John D. Costello to be postmaster at Racine, Wis., in place of J. D. Costello. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Walter J. Amend to be postmaster at Ripon, Wis., in place of W. J. Amend. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Alfred H. Bernhard to be postmaster at Waupun, Wis., in place of A. H. Bernhard. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Oscar L. Ringle to be postmaster at Wausau, Wis., in place of O. L. Ringle. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

WYOMING

Anna Edith Morgan to be postmaster at Sunrise, Wyo., in place of A. R. Craven, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 26), 1941.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Samuel B. Kemp to be chief justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joseph H. Young to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

POSTMASTERS

MINNESOTA

John A. Peterson, Belview.
Jarl I. Sundseth, Halstad.
Jeannette Schilling, Newport.
Alice F. Lane, Olivia.
Cornelius W. Vahle, Tracy.

NEW YORK

Marie Delaney, Rosendale.

PENNSYLVANIA

James F. McAleer, Folcroft.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Paul Ernest Ruestow, to be major, Air Corps.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Charles Albert Piddock.
Second Lt. Karl Tweeten Rauk.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lloyd Baxter Bennett, to be colonel with rank from May 12, 1941, Infantry (colonel, Army of the United States).

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

John Farley Splain.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Perry Bruce Griffith.
Second Lt. John Patrick Dwyer.
Second Lt. Edward Aloysius Murphy, Jr.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

William Bryden
Richard Curtis Moore
Henry Harley Arnold
Henry Conger Pratt
Walter King Wilson
Ernest Dichmann Peck

Frederic Harrison Smith
Philip Bradley Peyton

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Henry Harley Arnold
Maj. Gen. George Howard Brett, to be Chief of the Air Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

Brig. Gen. Courtney Hicks Hodges, to be Chief of Infantry, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

Col. William Nichols Porter, to be Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

Addison Dimmitt Davis, to be assistant to the Surgeon General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

Larry Benjamin McAfee, to be assistant to the Surgeon General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations for promotion in the Regular Army of Maj. Warren Hayford 3d, and others, which were referred to the committee on the 23d instant.

(NOTE.—For a full list of the names of the persons whose nominations for promotion in the Regular Army were referred to the committee on May 23, 1941, and which were today confirmed, see Senate proceedings of May 23, 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 4382 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Daniel W. Justice, D. S. T., M. A., pastor of Trinity Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom our lives have come and unto whom our spirits look for guidance in all goodness, we unite our hearts in the strength of quietness and the beauty of holiness this lovely day of new mercies. As we go forth to our work and into the world, give us, we pray, dependent but brave and trustful hearts. We are not creatures of perfect knowledge, but day by day help us to ponder the pattern of life we are weaving. Give us the grace, through Jesus Christ, to do justly, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with our God.

As we face difficult tasks, may we use the strength Thou dost supply.

If our undertakings are blessed and prospered of Thee, let us give heed that Thy word may also prosper in our hearts.

If we should be called upon to go through the valley of personal sorrow or of collective sacrifice in days to come, let not our hearts be troubled, but, more than ever, let us believe in Thee and console one another.

Let none of us refuse any opportunities of service which may come to us today, nor fall prey to any temptations that may lie in wait for us.

Let not any mistake of yesterday be repeated in the experiences of today, nor the life of today become any evil example to any life of tomorrow.

Kind Lord, as our people gather on the morrow to honor our dead, may we all be still and know that Thou art God, for we purpose in our hearts that they shall not have died in vain.

Merciful Father, in these trying days bless the nations of the world created of one blood by Thee. May goodness overcome evil; may love conquer hate; for surely Thou needest men as brothers to bring the Kingdom of God on earth.

On this day and always we beseech Thee to guide by Thy Spirit our President, our Speaker, and each Member of our Congress, in all of their counsels.

Bless our loved ones, our homes, our churches, our communities, and all interests dear to each heart. In the Name of our Lord we humbly but gratefully pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 28, 1941:

H. R. 327. An act for the relief of Paula Liebau Anderson;

H. R. 336. An act for the relief of Della B. Birnbaum;

H. R. 682. An act for the relief of Julius Springer;

H. R. 694. An act for the relief of the Fairchild Aerial Surveys, Inc.;

H. R. 696. An act for the relief of J. K. Love;

H. R. 819. An act for the relief of Littlefield-Wyman Nurseries;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Foot's Transfer & Storage Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 1678. An act for the relief of W. A. Facht;

H. R. 2672. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement fixing boundary lines on Wind River Indian lands, Wyoming;

H. R. 3362. An act to amend the act of May 24, 1940 (Public No. 520, 76th Cong.);

H. R. 3404. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain property;

H. R. 3514. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain tribal land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value;

H. R. 3538. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes," approved April 28, 1906;

H. R. 3987. An act to provide relief for, and to promote the interests of, the landowners on the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

THE LATE ISAAC H. DOUTRICH

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of one of my predecessors in office, the Honorable Isaac H. Doutrich, of Harrisburg. Mr.

Doutrich served with great honor and distinction in this body in the Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth Congresses.

Mr. Doutrich was born in the Nineteenth Congressional District, which he served, on a farm near Middletown, in Dauphin County, Pa., the son of Eli and Caroline Doutrich. He engaged in the retail clothing business, operating stores in various cities throughout eastern Pennsylvania, and built up one of the largest and most successful businesses in the State. He was the president of Doutrich & Co., retail clothing store in Harrisburg. He is survived by one son, Paul D. Doutrich; one daughter, Mrs. D. Bailey Brandt; and one sister, Mrs. Owen L. Underwood, of Pottsville. His wife, the former Miss Lena Erb, of Palmyra, had predeceased him.

In addition to his many business activities, Mr. Doutrich had for many years found time to serve the public in various ways. He was very public spirited and actively and generously supported civic and philanthropic works. He was city councilman of Harrisburg in charge of parks and public property, and did much to develop the beautiful and extensive park system which is one of the proudest possessions of the city of Harrisburg today.

During his service in the House of Representatives, Mr. Doutrich was a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and he also served for a time on the Indian Affairs Committee.

Mr. Doutrich had been seriously ill for some time preceding his death. He will be mourned by his many friends throughout the United States and particularly by those in the Nineteenth Congressional District for whom he labored so long and so well. The country has lost an outstanding citizen and a true American, and I join with the thousands who mourn his passing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed of the death of a former colleague of ours, Isaac H. Doutrich, at Harrisburg, Pa. I had the privilege and the honor of serving in the House with this gentleman for a number of years. Mr. Doutrich was a man who was always interested in the things that were vital and essential to the welfare of his country. He gave of his time to the duties of the office in a way that would do credit to any Member of Congress.

The Pennsylvania delegation always considered Mr. Doutrich as a man who was kind, considerate, diligent in doing those things which were assigned to him, and I am sure the delegations from every State join me when I make that statement. I knew him not only as a Member of Congress, but I traveled back and forth with him to the State of Pennsylvania. I often had the privilege of discussing questions with him and he always appealed to me as a sincere individual, as a man who desired to do the best he knew how. He was interested in doing that which was for the best interest of his district, his State, and his Nation. He served in that manner.

His passing will be regretted by many of the older Members of the House. We have lost a great American citizen, we have lost a good friend. He has gone to his reward, but I feel confident that some day we will have the privilege, if we live the right kind of life, of joining him around that great white throne, where we may all sing those hallelujahs and where our life's troubles will be ended, and where joy and happiness will reign forever.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the contents of a leaflet put out by the Association of Consistent Americans in my district.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the loyal Americans of Polish extraction at a program commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LECOMPTE. 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 Iowa? There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I made by electrical transcription urging the establishment of a public-utility district at Baker, Oreg.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a reply that I made to an editorial on that same election, together with a letter I wrote supporting that project.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I appreciate the complimentary words of my colleague from Mississippi. I do not deserve all those kind words. I deeply appreciate the cooperative spirit of my colleagues. You all know I have a partner, my wife, who is my secretary and untiring helper. Her aid has made possible much that I have accomplished.

I entered this House later in life than most men. I was well toward 72 when I was sworn in as a Member of this body. When I finish my present term I will have served 10 years in this body, and a total of 30 years in public life. I went into Oregon almost 60 years ago, as a farm hand and teacher, without money and without relatives or friends in that section. I have been highly honored by the people of that State. It has been a great privilege to serve in this body and meet so many colleagues who have treated me so well. I appreciate you, each and every one. I thank you all. [Applause.]

INTERSTATE PETROLEUM PIPE LINES

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report to accompany the bill (H. R. 4816) to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on the ninth annual Eucharistic Congress.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Missouri Retail Hardware Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rosella H. Werlin, a distinguished lady of Galveston, has written a short historical sketch of Galveston which is quite

interesting. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include this article.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND
NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be permitted to sit during the session of the House next Wednesday.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by Roy L. Smith, editor of the Christian Advocate.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial published in the Chilton Times-Journal entitled "Action on the Home Front."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Oregon Bar Association and in the other to include two news releases by the Bonneville project.

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

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER M. PIERCE

Mr. ANGELL. 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. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would consider myself derelict in my duty if I did not add a word of congratulation and respect to the tribute already paid to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] on his arriving tomorrow at the eightieth milestone in his life's work. Of course, I have known Governor PIERCE for a good many years. While it is true that he serves in this body on the opposite side of the aisle from where I sit, I recognize and have recognized down through the years the fine, outstanding service he has rendered to our State of Oregon and the Nation.

Governor PIERCE represents that type of citizenry who came to the great State of Oregon in the far West in the early days, who crossed great expanses of prairie and mountains that were not yet traversed by railroads, to hew out of the wilderness and build there in the West homes, schools, and a civilization.

While he is a member of the great party now in control here, nevertheless in my own State, even while it was very strongly Republican, he was elected not only to local offices in his own county but later to the State legislature, where he served with distinction, and still later he was elected Governor of the State of Oregon. Then the people of my State selected him to serve here in this body.

I wish to add my word of appreciation and congratulation to my distinguished colleague and particularly to express my personal feeling of gratitude for the interest he has shown in me as a new Member and the kindly offices he has rendered me in my short service in this body. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GILLIE. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the country are united in support of an immediate speed-up of our national-defense program, and for this reason I feel certain that the President's timely appeal of Tuesday evening for an all-out defense effort will receive a loyal response from Americans in all walks of life.

But let us not be deceived. Adequate national defense is not going to be accomplished by the appropriation of funds by Congress and the ordering of more planes and guns and ships.

Real national defense can only be achieved if we stamp out and forget those class hatreds and intolerances which have been too much in evidence in recent months. America can only be defended when we all realize that we are Americans—working, living, and sacrificing for the same high ideal. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter of former Congressman Pettingill in the New York Herald Tribune of May 26.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under the notorious leadership of Howard Hunter and David Lasser, the W. P. A. is letting down the bars. I have from a welfare officer in western New York a communication from the W. P. A. district office reading as follows:

We have received authorization from the State office to accept all male and female cases of persons on relief whether they have a small budget and receive a small amount of relief weekly, semimonthly, or monthly; where they received hospitalization without any home relief; where they have received medical care without home relief or hospitalization; or where they have received clothing and surplus commodities without home relief, hospitalization, or medical care.

If you have any such persons on your relief rolls, we now can accept them. Our interviewers will call on you with the necessary forms within the next day or two.

These folks are out soliciting trade just like the rest of these relief rackets. America has no hope for her future until we put an end to these racketeering performances. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED STATES—INDUSTRIAL RE-
SEARCH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers and illustrations, was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed with the illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

One of the greatest resources in the arsenal of democracy is our national ability and interest in industrial research. For the vigorous prosecution of our defense program and for the assurance of national progress after the emergency we rely heavily on the continued vitality of research by industry in both pure and applied science.

Our people can justly take pride in the record of the accomplishment by American industry contained in the report on Research—A National Resource, Part II, Industrial Research, which I am transmitting for the information of the Congress. This document is one of a series on our research resources being prepared by the National Resources Planning

Board with the assistance of scientific councils and committees. The National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council are responsible for the organization and presentation of this volume.

The report presents a clear record of how successfully we have translated our old-time Yankee ingenuity for invention into American genius for research. Our scientists have uncovered and explained the secrets of Nature, applied them to industry, and thus raised our standard of living, strengthened our defense, and enriched our national life.

The following significant paragraph in the report sums up the great changes that have come about through industrial research:

More efficient and economical methods have conserved our resources; new materials have made possible better products; and new products have contributed to the health, pleasure, and comfort of the general public. Such changes have not taken place without some temporary misfortunes. Here and there industries have disappeared and people have been temporarily thrown out of work, but the net result of 40 years of organized industrial research in this country has been the enrichment of life to an incalculable degree.

I commend a careful reading of this report to the Members of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1941.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. 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. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] upon his patriotic and timely remarks, and I hope that each and every Member here who has the interests of our country at heart will follow suit. We need many more men like him, not only here but throughout the entire Nation, to bring home the real need of cooperation and unity.

As to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] with respect to Mr. Howard Hunter, Administrator of the Work Projects Administration, who happens to be a Chicagoan, I wish to say that Mr. Hunter is a gentleman of ability. He has served the Government and the people ably and well in various capacities, and if he has any fault it is a fault of the heart, because I know it is his aim to aid and assist the poor, unfortunate people who actually need help, but who through technicalities many times have been deprived of the assistance which Congress intended them to have. He is a man whose policies and activities should be approved and not criticized. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Nebraska State School Boards Association.

LXXVII—288

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. KING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the American Legion Monthly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement made before the House Committee on Flood Control.

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

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER M. PIERCE

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my congratulatory words to those that have been spoken about my next-door neighbor in the Old Office Building, the gentleman from Oregon, Governor PIERCE. During these years, I have learned to love him and admire his stalwart character and pioneer spirit. Governor PIERCE began his public life in my district. He was a school teacher in Franklin County, Kans. That was by the side of the old Santa Fe and Oregon Trails, which blazed the "path of empire" to the West. I know that he was a great teacher, because that county has never failed in a primary or election to give me a big majority. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PIERCE. Oh, that was when I stopped over there on my way to Oregon. I stayed there one year.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. That is the only mistake I have known Governor PIERCE to make. It was the great loss of Kansas and the great gain of Oregon.

Governor PIERCE was a fine example of the young pioneers of both Kansas and Oregon which made up the citizenship of those two great American Commonwealths.

We join in congratulating him upon reaching his ripe age with the spirit and strength of seasoned manhood so that he may enjoy and see the prosperity and cultivated civilization of the great West.

Governor PIERCE possesses good American blood, the kind that has left its impress upon American history. His father was a cousin of Franklin Pierce, the fourteenth President of the United States.

I am sure that there is no man in the House of Representatives with more friends to wish him many more happy years, and no one who deserves it more. [Applause.]

WIDOW OF A. J. CHITTY

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report upon the bill (S. 991) for the relief of the widow of the late A. J. Chitty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the statement.

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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 991) entitled "An Act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty" 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$5,000" insert "\$7,500"; and the House agree to the same.

JOHN M. COFFEE,

LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI,

Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

ARTHUR CAFFER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 991) for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

In consideration of this Senate bill, your committee believed that the amount recommended in the bill was excessive and therefore reduced the amount to be paid to the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty, from \$10,000 to \$5,000. The late Artis J. Chitty, was killed on August 22, 1940, in the State of Washington while in the performance of his duty as a United States marshal.

At the conference an agreement was reached on a compromise in the amount of \$7,500. The House conferees agreeing to this amount, because it was learned, that besides his widow, the late marshal was also survived by a minor daughter. Also, had the widow the right under law to file a claim with the United States Compensation Commission, the maximum award payable by the Commission, namely, \$7,500, would have been paid.

JOHN M. COFFEE,

LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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.

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

GRANTING PENSIONS TO CERTAIN UN-
REMARIED DEPENDENT WIDOWS OF
CIVIL WAR VETERANS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I call up the bill (H. R. 1091) to grant pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veterans subsequent to June 26, 1905, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dependent unremarried widow of a Civil War veteran who is barred from the receipt of pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to June 26, 1905, but who is otherwise entitled to such pension either under the act of May 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 585), or under the act of June 9, 1940 (46 Stat. 528), shall be entitled to pension in her own right under said acts at the rates and under the conditions specified therein and to the additional pension provided for minor and helpless children in the act of May 1, 1920, provided she married the veteran 10 years prior to his death and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death except where there was a separation which was due to misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided*, That if pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child of the veteran or to a child or children of the veteran under 16 years of age, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized in this act until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this act, then the difference between said amounts will be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That no pension shall be payable under this act to a widow under 60 years of age.

Sec. 2. Payment of pension as provided by this act shall be effective from the date of receipt of application in the Veterans' Administration, in the form prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but not prior to the date of enactment of this act. Pension under this act shall not be paid to the widow of a veteran of the Civil War who has remarried either once or more than once, and upon the remarriage of such a widow her pension shall be terminated. The penal and forfeiture provisions of the pension laws providing pensions for veterans of the Civil War and their widows and dependents shall be applicable to the provisions of this act.

Sec. 3. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years or by both such fine and imprisonment.

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

PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH
RESULTING FROM SERVICE IN UNITED
STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1094) to grant pensions for disability or death resulting from service in the United States Coast Guard before July 2, 1930, and for other purposes, which I sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration granting pension and other benefits to veterans and their dependents are hereby extended to the officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard and their dependents for disability resulting from personal injury or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease contracted or suffered in line of duty, when such disability was incurred in or aggravated by active service in the United States Coast Guard on or after January 28, 1915, and before July 3, 1930, and for death resulting from such injury or disease, under the same regulations and restrictions as provided by law for officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard who incurred disability in line of duty on and after July 2, 1930, or who died as the result of such disability.

Sec. 2. The administrative, penal, and forfeiture provisions governing the granting of benefits, including accrued pension, under Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, as amended, and the Veterans Regulations promulgated thereunder, as amended, are hereby made applicable to the benefits granted under this Act: *Provided*, That in no event shall the benefits herein provided be awarded for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act and the date of commencement of pension granted hereunder shall be from the date of filing application in the Veterans' Administration under such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe.

Sec. 3. This act shall not be construed to reduce any pension or compensation under any act, public or private.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS
TO VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS OF
DECEASED VETERANS OF THE INDIAN
WARS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I call up the bill (H. R. 1095) to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes," and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec.

381; 44 Stat. 1361), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That any person who served 30 days or more, or for the duration of one of the campaigns cited in section 1 of the act of March 4, 1917, even though such campaign was of less than 30 days' duration, in any military organization, whether such person was regularly mustered into the service of the United States or not, but whose service was under the authority or by the approval of the United States or any State or Territory in any Indian war or campaign, or in connection with, or in the zone of, any active Indian hostilities in any of the States or Territories of the United States from January 1, 1817, to December 31, 1898, inclusive, the determination as to what constitutes the zone of active Indian hostilities to be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and who is now or may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character which so incapacitate him for the performance of manual labor as to render him unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may provide, be placed upon the pension roll of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$60 a month and not less than \$20 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be rated, these rates to be fixed as follows: \$20 a month for one-tenth disability, \$25 a month for one-fourth disability, \$35 a month for one-half disability, \$50 a month for three-fourths disability, and \$60 a month for total disability: *Provided*, That any such person who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be entitled to receive a pension of \$30 a month; and in case such person has reached the age of 65 years, \$60 a month: *Provided further*, That any such person who is now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of \$100 a month: *And provided further*, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home, and while the Government of the United States contributes toward defraying the expense incurred in providing such inmate with domiciliary care shall be paid more than \$50 per month under this act."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381c; 44 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The pension or increased rate of pension herein provided for shall commence from the date of filing application therefor after the date of enactment of this act in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or the date of the inception of the requisite condition as shown by the evidence, whichever is the later: *Provided*, That as to veterans who hereafter apply for and receive pension under the provisions of this act, increased pension by reason of disability requiring the regular aid and attendance of another person shall be effective as of the date of inception of the requisite condition as shown by the evidence, but not earlier than the date of the original application for pension hereunder."

Sec. 3. The act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 381-381d; 44 Stat. 1361-1363), is hereby amended by adding a new section numbered 6 to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. The dependent unremarried widow of any person who rendered service as described in section 1 of this act, who is barred from receiving pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to March 3, 1917, but who is otherwise entitled to pen-

sion under section 2 of this act, shall be entitled to pension in her own right and to the additional pension provided for minor and helpless children in said section 2: *Provided*, That she has attained the age of 60 years, was married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death, and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death, except where there was a separation which was due to or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided further*, That if pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child of the veteran or to a child or children of the veteran under 16 years of age, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized by this section until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this section, then the difference between said amounts shall be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That any widow otherwise entitled to pension under this act who has attained or who shall hereafter attain the age of 70 years shall be entitled to and paid a pension at the rate of \$40 per month: *Provided further*, That the widow otherwise entitled under this act who was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in an Indian war or campaign shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$50 per month. Payment of pension or increase of pension at the rates provided in this section shall commence as provided in section 4 of this act. Pension and increase of pension under this section shall not be paid to the widow who has remarried either once or more than once since the death of the veteran, and upon the remarriage of such a widow her pension shall be terminated."

SEC. 4. The act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 381-381d; 44 Stat. 1361-1363), is hereby amended by adding a new section numbered 7 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed to discontinue, diminish, or reduce any pension heretofore granted, nor to abridge or deny rights under any law in effect on the date of enactment of this act, nor be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll, as provided by the act of April 27, 1916, but any pension or increase of pension herein provided for shall be in addition thereto."

SEC. 5. Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381d; 44 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House has under consideration H. R. 1091, H. R. 1094, H. R. 1095, and H. R. 2855. I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman [Mr. LESINSKI] and to the other members of his committee for their action in favorably reporting these bills,

and to the Speaker of the House and the Members of the House as a whole for permitting these bills to come up and be considered at this time.

Tomorrow is Memorial Day, the day when business is hushed in tribute to our honored dead. The American people will gather in the great cities of the dead, in the quiet country churchyards, and under spreading trees strewed with flowers the graves of our departed defenders and mingle our tears with the tears of the widows, orphans, and other dependents of those of our defenders who lie buried. It is most fitting indeed that the House of Representatives on today should pass these measures to aid our disabled defenders and the widows and orphans of those who have passed on and in that way express the Nation's gratitude in a substantial way.

Flowers placed on the graves of our defenders and eloquent eulogies are fine and noble. If the Senate passes these measures and they are signed by the President, providing food shelter, and clothing for our disabled defenders and for the dependents of those who have passed on, it will give more substantial and higher expression to our gratitude.

The clouds now hang heavy over our beloved country. Millions of our young men may be called upon to fight and die for this Nation. The Congress has already appropriated and authorized to be expended more than \$40,000,000,000 in the name of national defense. I have said many times on the floor of the House that in my opinion there could be no more effective expenditure of money for national defense than to care for our disabled defenders and to provide for the widows and orphans of our deceased defenders.

It has been well said that an ungrateful nation—a nation that fails to protect its protectors and defend its defenders—may some time find itself without protectors or defenders. This action today will be an inspiration to those who may be called upon in the months to come to protect and defend our country. They will not hesitate to fight for a grateful nation—a nation that will care for them if disabled in their country's service and a nation that will provide food, clothing, and shelter for their widows and minor children if they should give their lives.

My only regret is that we do not have an opportunity today to again pass the Rankin bill for the World War veterans and their dependents. I am very happy to give these bills my earnest support, and I trust that they may become law. [Applause.]

Under the present law, before the widow of a Civil War veteran can secure a pension she must prove that she married the veteran prior to June 27, 1905, nearly 36 years ago. Under H. R. 1091 a Civil War widow who is now 60 years of age and in needy circumstances and who married the veteran and lived with him for a period of 10 years and up to the time of his death is entitled to pension of \$30 per month, increased to \$40 on attaining the age of 70.

H. R. 1094 would grant pension for disability or death resulting from service in

the United States Coast Guard before June 2, 1930. This is a very meritorious bill and has been approved by the Treasury Department and the Veterans' Administration. It should be, and I am confident it will be, passed.

H. R. 1095 proposes to increase the rates of pension paid to veterans of the Indian wars and dependents of such veterans, and make the rates correspond with those payable to veterans of the Spanish War and their dependents. There are only a very few of these veterans still with us, and only a very small group of dependents. This increase is merited and should be granted.

H. R. 2855 provides for the restoration of pension to certain dependent parents who have remarried. This bill corrects an inequality now existing under present laws. It affects only a comparatively small group of cases, particularly peacetime death cases, where the death of the veteran was due to service. It should be passed.

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

NEVERMORE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress I made a request of my Congressman at that time, who represented the district I now have the honor to serve, the Honorable Edgar R. Kiess, after the World War, for a cannon to be placed on the public-school grounds of Woolrich, Pa. We received the cannon, made a large concrete base, and placed it thereon. After we painted the cannon black and the concrete aluminum and thought we had a monument erected as a relic of the World War, one evening an uncle of mine, Mr. S. E. Rich, of Woolrich, Pa., took a can of black paint and a little stencil brush and on the side of the cannon facing the street he wrote in large letters, "Nevermore." On the south side of that cannon, approaching it from the right, he wrote the word "Nevermore." On the north side of the cannon, approaching it from the left, he wrote the word "Nevermore." Everybody who comes to our community looks at that monument, and it was with a heart filled with joy they read the word "Nevermore" from any side they chose to look at it. It seemed to tell the people that war had ceased and would be no more.

That all happened after we sent the boys to Europe in 1918 to make the world safe for democracy, and now, with hearts heavy and saddened, we feel that those who lost their lives in Flanders Field died in vain; that the world is not safe for democracy; and those who fought and died, and those who fought and were crippled, and those who fought and still maintain their good health, all fought in vain. That war cost America many lives, sacrifices, sorrows, broken hearts, wounded, and gave us the Unknown Soldier who now rests under the great mass of marble at Arlington.

With a lesson like that, it seems so foolish, so unnecessary, and so unjust that we call upon the American people

to try to police the world and do the same thing over again. I am not a pacifist and I do not like the things Hitler does. I do not believe it is the duty of America to become involved in the affairs of Europe or Asia except what we can do in America by peaceful means in trying to settle disputes, in trying to settle wars, and in trying to make people happy. Why should we give every ounce of energy, spend billions of dollars, have great armies and great navies to fight battles on foreign soil? I am for the defense and protection of America 100 percent. I want to be as loyal an American as any man who lives in America, and I must say I do not like the policy laid down by President Roosevelt, by Wendell Willkie, and those who are trying to get us into foreign entanglements by war. I believe that America wants peace; at least, 80 percent of the Americans do not want a foreign war; and my heart has been so heavy since I heard the President's address Tuesday night, when he declared an unlimited national emergency exists, then assuming the great powers that the laws passed the past 8 years gave him before he made such a declaration. Congress passed a Neutrality Act. The President declared zones which our ships should not enter. Is he now going to send any of our ships into these forbidden zones to become a prey for submarines or targets for the airplanes—to be sunk only to arouse the American people to the fact that we should enter this war? I hope such will not be the case.

Mr. President, I have opposed most of this legislation giving you vast powers because I do not want to place this responsibility in your hands. I wanted to assume my share of the responsibility. I wanted the Congress to assume its share of responsibility in case of national emergency. But since the majority of the Congress has seen fit to grant that power to you, I implore you to keep us from entering the field of danger. I implore you, for the mothers and fathers and sons of America, that we do not enter the field of war and ask you to fulfill your promise.

I am calling your attention to the promise you made to the American people at Boston on October 20, 1940:

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.

God forbid that you betray the American people now. I and millions of Americans do not want war, Mr. President. Use your good office now to throw out feelers for stoppage of the terrible war that is going on in Europe and Asia. Do it now, Mr. President; do it now. The American people want peace. Let us preserve our democracy, our freedom, and our independence. We can do it by peaceful means, I am sure, or I would not request it. God bless and save America. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF PENSION TO CERTAIN DEPENDENT PARENTS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I call up the bill (H. R. 2855) to provide for restoration of pension to certain dependent parents upon termination of remarriage, and for other purposes and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we wish 10 minutes time on our side on this bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. That will be agreeable.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph LV, subparagraph (b), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended by paragraph 2 of Veterans Regulation No. 2 (d), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Pension to a dependent mother or father shall continue during dependency until death or remarriage of the mother or father, whether dependency arises prior or subsequent to the death of the veteran: *Provided, however,* That pension or compensation discontinued or disallowed by reason of remarriage may be recommenced or awarded upon proof of dependency, if it is shown that such remarriage has been terminated by death or divorce without fault on the part of such mother or father."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That pension or compensation payable to a dependent mother or father under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration shall continue during dependency whether dependency arises prior or subsequent to the death of the veteran on whose account the benefit is payable. The fact of remarriage of the mother or father shall not operate to terminate such pension, provided that dependency exists notwithstanding such remarriage.

"Sec. 2. Paragraph IV (b), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2—Series (U. S. C., title 38, ch. 12, appendix), is hereby repealed and any provision of law inconsistent with this act is also repealed."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES ENTER THE EUROPEAN WAR?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of this body I have consistently supported by both my voice and my vote legislation for the benefit of veterans of all wars. I know it is a tremendous burden to the taxpayers of the country, but I think it is a good

thing to make the American people conscious that wars are expensive enterprises and that the people will eventually have to pay for them. The best way to avoid taxes is not to enter another war.

I congratulate the various committees of the House that have dealt with these pieces of legislation for the benefit of our veterans of all wars, and I intend to continue to support legislation to take care not only of the disabled veterans but of the widows and orphans as well.

Mr. Speaker, if not at this very moment, the American people will soon be confronted with this question: Shall we enter another European war?

I want to give the Members whatever benefit there may be from my reflections on this question that I have been seriously disturbed about and have considered very much in recent months.

The United States of America should not enter the present European War for at least two impelling reasons:

First. It is not our war; and

Second. We are not today adequately prepared to fight a successful war on European soil.

Let us discuss briefly these two reasons for our nonintervention. First: Recently it has been repeatedly said that this is our war. Such a statement is absolutely false. The present conflict in Europe broke out without our advice or consent so far as the American people know. It was Great Britain and France who declared war upon the German Reich after being clearly forewarned by Colonel Lindbergh that it would be utterly impossible for them to compete with Germany's air force. If this is really our war we should have been in it from the start and should never have cowardly hidden behind the skirts of any other nation. Our first line of defense is not Great Britain or any other country, but our first, last, and only dependable line of defense is ourselves. When war began in Europe no one in the United States admitted that it was our war nor did the British or French people claim that it was our war. Only after months of insidious propaganda over the radio, on the screen, and through the press; only after this administration passed one law after another bringing us closer to actual involvement—and all in the name of peace—has it been said that this is our war. Now we are told that it is a war for humanity, democracy, and civilization. These are high-sounding terms but they are old stuff. We were persuaded to enter the first World War in 1917 out of high idealism to make the world safe for democracy and to end war. Though we got 2,000,000 men to France, spilled their blood, and spent our treasure; though we came out of the conflict without a dollar indemnity or a square acre of territory, we did not achieve either objective. All we got was 10 years depression, 10,000,000 men unemployed, and \$13,000,000,000 of bad war debts we will never collect, and four cemeteries in France.

This war, like all wars, is an economic conflict, the result of selfishness and greed and a battle to control the seven seas and to dominate the world's trade.

It is merely one of the chapters in the endless struggle among nations of the Old World.

Washington and Jefferson both warned us against entangling alliances and against attempting to solve Europe's problems or to police the world. Both major political parties in the campaign last year solemnly pledged the American people that American boys would never again be sent to Europe unless we were attacked. No nation has yet attacked us. No American ship has been sunk; no American life has been lost. Yet we have called other people dirty names, hurled epithets and insults at the leaders of other countries, and displayed not only an unneutral but a hostile attitude toward one of the sides in the present war. Last October before the election both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie solemnly pledged the fathers and mothers of America that their sons would not be sent to fight in any foreign war. These pledges should be more than "campaign oratory" for no man is better than his word. Pledges should be kept and promises should be fulfilled.

Now for the second reason why we should not enter Europe's war. While all Americans are united in the program for national defense and while we are making noticeable progress, in spite of inexcusable and unjustifiable strikes in defense industries, anyone who is actually acquainted with our present state of preparedness knows that we could not successfully fight a war on European soil. When we entered the last war our national debt was \$1,000,000,000. Today our national debt, including authorizations for the present defense program and certain contingent liabilities, is in excess of \$100,000,000,000. The first line of defense of any nation is its own financial solvency. In the last war Japan, Russia, and Italy were on our side and we had France and Belgium where we could land troops. Today Belgium and France are occupied by Germany and the other three powerful nations mentioned are her allies.

America is by no means impotent. We have vast natural resources, an enormous reservoir of skilled labor, and the greatest industrial plant in the world, and could win in a long-drawn-out conflict, but not without the expenditure of billions of dollars and the sacrifice of many millions of the best flower of our young manhood. While we cannot fight a winning war in Europe so far from our own bases of supply, no nation in Europe or combination of nations in Europe can successfully attack us on our home ground. We cannot get over there and they cannot get over here, so why enter a war in Europe exposing our west coast to a rear attack from Japan who would certainly fight us if we entered a war in Europe? It simply does not make sense.

Regardless of our inherent or inherited prejudices and in spite of where our sympathies might lie in the present European struggle, our first allegiance and our first duty is to the United States and our own people. The wisest thing we could do at this hour is to center our thought, attention, prayers, and ener-

gies upon our own country and not upon some foreign land. The moment we enter this world struggle our economy will be bankrupt; our democracy will die; our Republic will be supplanted by a totalitarian state. The civil liberties of the people will be destroyed and a military despotism established. America should put forth all her effort to make herself impregnable and invincible to attack from abroad and remain in a position to exert a moral influence to bring about, by example, peace in the world.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for payment of pension to certain dependent parents notwithstanding remarriage, and for other purposes."

Mr. LESINKI. Mr. Speaker, we have no further bills to offer.

ESTABLISHMENT OF MARINE SCHOOLS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1311) to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, with respect to the location of the nautical school at the port of San Francisco, and its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the bill does and the necessity for it?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am asking to have passed at this time was introduced by Senator DOWNEY in the Senate. A companion bill was introduced in the House by the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

It deals with the location of one of the four existing nautical schools and simply extends the area within which the school may be located. It provides that the port of San Francisco, specified in the first paragraph of the first section of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, shall be construed as embracing, in addition to the city of San Francisco, any city, town, municipality, or other locality on San Francisco Bay or the San Pablo Bay or waters tributary thereto.

It is my information that conditions are such that it is necessary to move the school. The Legislature of California is now in session and will soon adjourn. It is desired to have this bill passed before that time. The gentleman from California, the ranking member on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries [Mr. WELCH] is in approval of the bill and the House bill has been unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this school was located at Sausalito, on San Francisco Bay, for many years. It became necessary for the Government to take over this location for national-defense purposes and, therefore, the school ship has to be moved to another part of the bay. This bill simply defines the port of San Francisco by including San Pablo Bay and tributaries thereto.

Mr. BLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. And it is for legislative purposes only?

Mr. BLAND. That is correct. The House bill was considered by the committee this morning and unanimously ordered to be reported favorably with the recommendation that the bill should pass. The Senate bill (S. 1311) is identical with the House bill, which the committee ordered to be reported today. Therefore, I am asking that we take up and pass the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The port of San Francisco specified in the first paragraph of this section shall be construed as embracing, in addition to the city of San Francisco, any city, town, municipality, or other locality on the San Francisco Bay or the San Pablo Bay, or waters tributary thereto."

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 was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF TREASURY TO RELEASE CERTAIN INTERESTS IN LAND IN MONMOUTH COUNTY, N. J.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 578) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to release certain interests in certain land which adjoins the Shark River Coast Guard Station, in Monmouth County, N. J., and, Mr. Speaker, I will make the statement at this time that this is to relinquish the right-of-way over certain property granted to the Coast Guard and no longer needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, to the estate of James A. Bradley, deceased, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to property owned by the estate of James A. Bradley, deceased, which adjoins the Shark River Coast Guard Station, in Monmouth County, N. J.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill was considered by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries this morning. We had a letter from the Member of the House in whose district the property is located, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN], and he agreed with the statements made by the Coast Guard authorities that it was desirable to relinquish the right-of-way now owned by the Coast Guard. When the right-of-way was originally granted to the Coast Guard it was the only way to get into the Coast Guard property. The road was granted without any charge whatsoever. It was donated. Since that time roads have been located, and there is no further need for the right-of-way. The purpose of this bill is to relinquish that right-of-way which was originally donated.

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Miss RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was called to my attention during the last war that no provision was made for suspending the statute of limitations during the war period. Some Members of Congress have expressed a fear that activities of a very questionable character are going on in our defense program. There may be no opportunity to check them until after the war emergency.

In order that the same situation may not arise during the confusion created by expansion in our present military defense, I am offering a bill to suspend, during the time of war or national emergency, the operation of any statute of limitations on prosecutions for Federal offenses, so that for the purpose of computing the period within which prosecutions must be brought for an offense punishable under the laws of the United States, there shall be excluded any period during which the United States is at war or in a state of confusion over preparations for military defense.

This is necessary if we are to give all our attention to military defense and, at the same time, feel secure that profiteers, or those who take advantage of the opportunity to commit crimes, trusting that they will be outlawed before they can receive the attention of the people, will not be able to take the profits of their crime with impunity.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on the bill H. R. 4466, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the leadership on the other side and our colleagues in the House of the program for next week.

On Monday the bills on the Consent Calendar will be called, after which the appropriation bill relating to the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Administration will be called up for consideration, and general debate will continue the balance of Monday. What the committee will decide on Tuesday, so far as general debate on that bill is concerned, I do not know; however, that bill will take Monday and Tuesday and may go into Wednesday.

On Thursday the military appropriation bill will come up for consideration.

Those two appropriation bills will probably take the greater part of next week. If it is possible the Cole bill, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland, relating to the extension of pipe lines for the transmission of petroleum and by-products, will be called up for consideration. I would like to get that bill considered and disposed of next week, because I understand that whatever differences there are either have been or will be adjusted, and it is a matter of extreme importance.

There are three rules from the Committee on Rules relating to bills reported out of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I understand there is no opposition to them, but I make that statement with reservations. If it is possible to take up those bills or any one of them, it is my intention to do so.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman have the numbers of those bills?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I was just going to state them. They are H. R. 4823, H. R. 4473, and H. R. 3536. If it is not possible to take up all of these bills, then if it is possible to take up any one of them I do not want to be bound by the order in which I have read the numbers of the bills as to the order in which they may be taken up.

The important thing next week is the fact that there are two appropriation bills to be considered, together with these other bills. If it is possible to take them up, as many of them as possible will be considered, particularly the Cole bill, which I understand is likely to be reported out of the committee on Monday. I do not know that it can be done, but it may be possible to consider that bill by unanimous consent if everybody is satisfied, and from the evidence I have to date I believe practically all differences but one have been ironed out, and the

probability that that difference will be adjusted satisfactorily is very good.

I also wish to announce that on Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called.

Mr. MICHENER. The Private Calendar will be called the first thing?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; the calendar will be called first, before the consideration of the appropriation bill proceeds.

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman will yield, does that include omnibus bills on the private calendar?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; not omnibus bills.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

AGRICULTURE AND THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. Speaker, the administration will shortly present to the House and Senate for their approval a resolution permitting the United States to pay two-thirds or more of the cost of building a seaway from the great Lakes to the sea. A resolution permitting the President to make the agreement and start the work on a project, two-thirds of which will lie in Canada. A resolution that appears to be a deliberate attempt to avoid the necessity of securing a two-thirds vote of the Senate for approval of a treaty. This is a matter to be handled by treaty only, for it can well effect control of border waters and our sovereignty over Lake Michigan. All this in the name of national defense.

In a recent interesting and instructive discourse before this body, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] established some very pertinent facts as to why the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project should not be launched at this time. It is labeled a national-defense project, both because of its water transportation and power possibilities; but, by what stretch of the imagination, can any project be called essential to our national defense when it cannot be completed in less than 8 years?

We are burdening our taxpayers with a financial load for which our most astute financiers are unable to discover a satisfactory method of repayment, and it naturally follows that Canada is also being burdened with a like obligation. Admitting that our financial stability and resources exceed those of our good neighbor to the North, what would be the result if they should find themselves either unable or unwilling to pay their proportionate cost? I would not accuse them of future failure to meet their obligations, but there comes a time, especially during wartime, when a nation's obligations sometimes surpass its ability to pay, and we are rapidly reaching that point in our own United States. England claimed to have reached such a point, and the world knows England's answer to our demands for repayment of the interest on her debt to America, to say nothing of the principal loans to her in the last World War.

At the present time, we exercise total sovereignty over Lake Michigan, and any agreement made which would permit this

project would seriously affect our control over this lake. Even though we retain control over its surface, it would result in joint control between the United States and Canada over the necessary withdrawals of water.

While some may say this is farfetched, let us assume that at some future date, international difficulties should encompass the United States or Canada with some foreign power; whose obligation would it then be to protect this waterway against foreign naval encroachment?

There are many arguments both for and against this proposed seaway, but, in my judgment, the arguments against far surpass any arguments for. It is impossible in the limited time at my disposal to discuss them all, and my primary interest at this time is the interest of the great mass of the American farmers in the Middle West, and humbly I shall endeavor to develop this one factor, as it appears to me and the vast majority of agricultural interests.

Grain interests in the States immediately tributary to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway have abandoned their original argument that the seaway would largely contribute to restoration of American export markets for wheat and other farm products. Thus, while President Roosevelt is urging the Congress to ratify an "agreement" with Canada for development of the seaway in the name of "national defense," the agricultural interests are forced to admit that its completion would neither assure added profits to farmers in the way of reduced grain shipment rates nor operate to restore world markets.

Accordingly, these interests, still insistent that the seaway should be constructed, have developed the argument that it would promote industrialization of the Great Lakes area and thus enlarge the home market for agricultural products. Specifically they assert that a deep-water avenue to the sea would promote shipbuilding around the great inland seas, and accordingly the farmers would sell more crops.

By what system of logic this conclusion is arrived at is not clear. It does not follow that location of shipbuilding docks in Great Lakes ports will increase the national consumption of wheat, rye, oats, or any other farm product. The national-defense program now calls for shipbuilding, and ships will be built, but the location of the yards and the location of any other particular industry will have no immediate effect upon agricultural consumption.

The position now held by the agricultural proponents of the seaway was set forth in a telegram to Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, from the Michigan Great Lakes Tidewater Commission. The telegram urged the Senator to support the President's position on the seaway proposal.

The farmers of the Midwest—

It set forth—

have lost their world market, and in all probability will never regain it. American agriculture must depend largely upon industrial localities to furnish them a home market. Shipbuilding would become an impor-

tant industry around the Great Lakes if a deep-water avenue to the sea were provided. A great industry that has never existed before would take its place around these great inland seas. Michigan has the raw material consisting of iron, copper, coal, and limestone, and, above all, a food supply ample to sustain an industrial population of 50,000,000 people. Michigan has the factories that manufacture the machinery that goes into boats and also has the manpower available.

I am certain that not one of this House would be averse to the proposition of added industries on the Great Lakes. In fact, shipyards there might be a permanent aid toward solving our unemployment. But not under the misleading label of our present emergency or national defense. If we need additional ships in this crisis, we need them now, not 7 or 8 years from now, and we need to build them in yards from which they can reach the sea, not 6 months of the year, when ice does not block the canals, but 12 months of the year. We need to build them where one act of sabotage cannot bottle up the production of many shipyards, on waters 2,000 miles from the sea.

The concentration of industry in a particular area or the massing of manpower in a particular city does not necessarily mean increased food consumption or direct benefits to agriculture or any other particular industry. The law of supply and demand will continue inexorably to operate, especially in relation to food products.

In thus conceding that completion of the seaway cannot assure a restoration of export markets for American agricultural products, the proponents of the seaway in effect substantiate the arguments which for years have been advanced by its opponents. It should be noted in this connection that supposed reduction in ocean freight rates on American exports of grain was basically the end sought by agriculturists through construction of the seaway.

Enthusiasts saw an opportunity to regain our export markets and promote the welfare of the American farmer by savings of 6, 8, or even 12 cents a bushel on ships via the seaway. Notwithstanding steadily decreasing demands for American grain abroad and the fact that for more than a decade the average total charge for moving wheat from the head of the Lakes was only 5½ cents, and that the cost of handling grain at Montreal was only three-fourths of a cent a bushel, or a total of a little more than 6 cents for the entire movement from the farm to a ship at Montreal, the argument of savings on shipments continued until now to be the chief prop of the seaway proposal insofar as agriculture was concerned.

Such arguments apparently failed to take into consideration the relation between possible savings and the cost of the waterway—as yet undetermined, but estimated to range between \$600,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000—the loss to the railroads in grain freights from the Midwest to the seaboard, and finally the fact that the American farmer cannot control world prices, as was demonstrated in 1929 when cuts on rail freight rates here were fol-

lowed by lower quotations on wheat in the Liverpool market.

WHAT BENEFIT TO AGRICULTURE?

Proponents of the proposed treaty argue that a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway would be a great advantage to agriculture in the Midwest. Let us compare the grain rates by rail of the farmers in the United States with those of Canada in order to get their grain to points on the Great Lakes where they could use the proposed waterway. The following data will serve to illustrate the lower rail cost of transporting the grain of the Canadian farmer to the Lake.

Let us consider the rate on wheat only for comparable distances. The Canadian farmer, from Winnipeg, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 424 miles, pays a ton rate of \$2.80, while the American farmer will pay, from Yankton, S. Dak., to Duluth, a distance of 424 miles, a ton rate of \$5.30. The Canadian farmer, from Virnden, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 604 miles, will pay a ton rate of \$3.66, while the American farmer will pay, from Helena, Ark., to Chicago, a distance of 607 miles, a ton rate of \$7.30. The Canadian farmer, from Grenfell, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 704 miles, a ton rate of \$3.80, while the American farmer will pay, from Oklahoma City to Chicago, a distance of 775 miles, a ton rate of \$7.80. The Canadian farmer, from Rush Lake, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 912 miles, a ton rate of \$4.40, while the American farmer will pay, from Salina, Kans., to Chicago, a distance of 641 miles, a ton rate of \$6.20. The Canadian farmer, from Maple Creek, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 1,017 miles, a ton rate of \$4.60, while the American farmer will pay, from Helena, Mont., to Duluth, a total of 1,138 miles, a ton rate of \$8.90, or from Twin Falls, Idaho, to Duluth, a total of 1,630 miles, a ton rate of \$12.20. These rates were collected approximately 5 years ago, but we are advised that they are yet relatively and comparatively and substantially the same.

CANADIAN SUBSIDIES

When we take into account the many governmental aids and subsidies given to the Canadian railroads to aid them in the transportation of Canadian grain, the lower wages paid to Canadian railway labor, and the much lower taxes upon the railroads in Canada than on the railroads in this country, it is clearly impossible for American railroads to meet Canadian rail rates on grain.

How can a Nebraska farmer pay twice as much per mile as the Canadian farmer to get his wheat to the lake port and then pay an extra 10 cents per hundred pounds tariff at Liverpool, compete with the Canadian farmer? How can a farmer in Nebraska, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, the Dakotas, Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, Tennessee, Missouri, Oklahoma, or Arkansas, carry all of these handicaps and use the St. Lawrence seaway in competition with the farmers of Canada; especially so, when the land in this country is more expensive and the cost of farm labor is higher? How can they compete?

MISSISSIPPI SYSTEM

The hope of the farmer of the Middle West to reach world markets lies not in

a seaway through Canada, but in low barge service to the Gulf and out to the sea upon the Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, and the Ohio Rivers and their tributaries. These rivers penetrate the wheat fields of the United States and reach the sea through our own country. This is a navigation system that has been developed through projects upon which we have already spent millions of dollars, and which is, in a large measure, completed. We certainly cannot solve the problem by spending hundreds of millions of dollars to bring cheap foreign-flag ships to the wheat fields of our strongest competitor, for in many instances they will bring in import loads that will compete directly with our American farm products and they naturally will reload with products such as Canadian wheat, which can be bought at a delivered price with which the American farmer cannot compete.

Mr. Speaker, every farmer in the Middle West producing corn, wheat, oats, rye, or livestock, and every producer of coal, steel, or ore, every railroad, every truck, would be financially hurt by this seaway project. American laborers would be hurt and we want nothing to do with any project that would make them compete with slave labor or the underprivileged, underpaid laborer of Europe. At this time, in principle, as well as in fact, we are definitely committed to the national policy of all-out aid to Britain and her allies, and at this time we are also in the process of building an impregnable national defense, and all our time, our manpower, and our resources should be devoted to this defense program. We are facing an emergency now, not 8 years from now. Let us finish first these obligations we have assumed and relegate projects, such as the St. Lawrence seaway, to future discussion, where they properly belong. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein comment by Mr. Raymond L. Hoadley that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune under date of May 29.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANDERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees 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. 4466) entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes."

COAST GUARD ACADEMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a report of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy for the year 1941, and certain exhibits attached thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to my friend and colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] for the kind remarks he made on this floor yesterday relative to my selection as chairman of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy for this year.

I am placing in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the report of the Board of Visitors for this year. I call the attention of the Members of the House to this report, to the splendid curriculum of the Academy, and to the fine training the boys attending the Academy receive. As far as I am concerned, I have not realized before this what a fine institution we have at New London, Conn., and what a splendid opportunity it furnishes for the young men of the country to become officers in this great organization, which antedates both the Navy and the Army.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the Congressional Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, 1941, is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1941

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939 (Public, No. 183, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated in January this year to constitute the 1941 Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy:

Senators: Hon. CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico, appointed by the President of the Senate. Hon. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, appointed by Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, and ex officio member of the Board of Visitors, to serve in his stead. Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, and Hon. RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine, appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, member ex officio; Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of New York; Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia; and Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, all appointed by the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Hon. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD, of Connecticut, and Hon. LEWIS D. THILL, of Wisconsin, appointed by the Speaker, House of Representatives.

In accordance with previous arrangement, a special car was available on the Colonial Express, leaving Washington at 9 a. m. May 2. Senators HATCH and PEPPER and Representatives CULKIN, RAMSPECK, FITZGERALD, and THILL departed on above train and arrived New London at 3:38 p. m. Those present witnessed a special evening parade and re-

view of the cadet battalion at retreat. Later in the evening, at 8:32 p. m., Senator BREWSTER and Representative BLAND arrived, they not having been able to leave earlier in the day. The Superintendent of the academy, Capt. James Pine, entertained the Board at a dinner at the Mohican Hotel, which was attended by a number of academy officers and other senior officers located in New London. Senator BREWSTER and Representative BLAND were able to arrive before the dinner was completed.

The next morning, May 3, the Board met at 9:30 a. m., and following the custom of choosing a chairman alternate years from the Senate Members and House Members, Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, was elected chairman. Commander (E) Ellis Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard, continued to act as secretary to the Board.

The chairman invited Capt. James Pine, Superintendent of the Academy, to be present at the meeting. The meeting was also joined by Prof. G. E. Russell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dean J. W. Barker, Columbia University; and Judge T. W. Swan, United States circuit court of appeals, these three gentlemen being members of the advisory committee of the Coast Guard Academy and representing a quorum of said committee.

Captain Pine addressed the meeting and explained that of the five recommendations made by the previous Board of Visitors, each of said recommendations covering the need for appropriations for new construction, four of the items had been authorized, and that the items for extension of the library and extension of the cadet barracks appropriations had been set up, contracts let and work already commenced, and that in connection with the proposed new infirmary and ordnance buildings and boathouse and wharves, the appropriations had been made and the contracts were in the process of being let. He stated that no funds had been made available for item 5, which recommended a sailing vessel to replace the schooner *Chase*, of \$200,000. He stated, however, that the magnificent gift of the schooner *Atlantic* by Mr. Gerald Lambert had supplied the academy with this need but due to the present conditions of emergency there would not be available this year any Coast Guard cutters to take the majority of cadets on the very necessary summer cruise. The *Atlantic* would be satisfactory for handling the second class which makes a short cruise in a sailing vessel, but could not possibly be used to accommodate the major portion of the corps. He explained to the Board that the Coast Guard had entered into negotiations with the Danish Minister tending toward the purchase of the *Danmark*, a Danish training sailing ship. This vessel, he explained, was ideally suited for the purpose of training Coast Guard cadets and could accommodate 120 cadets. It was further developed that the *Danmark* could probably be purchased for \$350,000, but could not be replaced in this country for less than several times such amount.

The Superintendent then explained to the Board the need for a chapel at the academy; which had been provided for in the original plans but which had not been built due to the shortage of funds. He explained that at present chapel services were held in McAllister Hall and that said auditorium seated a maximum of not over 306, which would not be large enough for next year's cadet corps.

The Board expressed the desire to meet the chaplain, and Commander W. J. Moore, Chaplain Corps, United States Navy, entered and gave a short talk, explaining that he was detailed to and serving part time at the academy and part time at the submarine base. He went into the matter quite extensively, explaining the very great need for a

suitable chapel, to be built as such and not to be in any way a makeshift arrangement. He especially emphasized the tangible advantages to a cadet corps in having such an institution part of their cadet life and the advantages that the chapel would serve in memorializing outstanding events in the history of the school and the service. He complimented highly the solidarity of the battalion of Coast Guard cadets and spoke from experience and knowledge of the other two Government military academies. He left with the Board a memorandum, which is attached hereto.

A number of the members of the Board questioned the Superintendent, and it was developed that a suitable chapel would probably cost in the neighborhood of \$250,000 or \$300,000, and that in the case of the ship *Danmark* said vessel would be of sufficient size to handle all of the cadets this year and would be of definite permanent value to the Coast Guard. Some discussion was had as to whether or not the *Danmark* could be purchased under the terms of H. R. 4466 should it become law. It later developed that the provisions of said bill would probably not provide for the purchase of such a vessel.

The advisory committee was invited to explain to the Board its origin and the part it had played in developing the curriculum now in effect at the Coast Guard Academy. This was done, and the Board was much impressed with the splendid contribution this group of prominent educators had made in raising the Coast Guard Academy to its present high standing, which includes accrediting by the Association of American Universities and the authorizing the granting of bachelor of science degrees. A copy of the committee's recent report to the commandant of the Coast Guard, following its spring meeting, was produced for the information of the Board and is attached hereto.

Appreciation for the high type of educational institution maintained by the Coast Guard for the instruction and preparation of its young officers is expressed by the Board, a majority of whose members had not previously seen the Academy. The Board is pleased with what it finds as regards the administration of the academy, with the curriculum so ably and intelligently supervised by the advisory committee, with the maintenance of the buildings and grounds, and with the splendid type of American youth composing the cadet corps.

The Board recommends:

That the Danish training ship *Danmark* be acquired through proper procedure from the Danish Government for use in national defense as a training ship by the Coast Guard Academy.

That there be constructed with all reasonable dispatch a suitable and appropriate chapel at the Coast Guard Academy.

That, because the Coast Guard Academy offers an excellent opportunity for an education and career to qualified young men throughout the country; and because better material obtained insures a more efficient operation of the academy and a higher class product, the Coast Guard make a thorough study to reach a still larger number of prospective suitable candidates with information regarding the opportunities in the yearly competitive examination held throughout the United States, and refer this study with recommendations to the committees of Congress having appropriate jurisdiction.

The following motion was passed unanimously:

"That the chairman of the Board be authorized to appoint subcommittees of this Board to make recommendations for the promotion of the welfare of the Coast Guard Academy and of the Coast Guard, and to deal

with any other matters within the jurisdiction of the Board."

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman.

CARL A. HATCH.
CLAUDE PEPPER.
RALPH O. BREWSTER.
SCHUYLER O. BLAND.
FRANCIS D. CULKIN.
LEWIS D. THILL.
WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD.

ELLIS REED-HILL, Secretary.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY,
New London, Conn., May 3, 1941.

Memorandum.

From: The Academy Chaplain.

To: The Congressional Board of Visitors.

Subject: Necessity of an academy chapel, report on.

1. The Congressional Board of Visitors is informed that the United States Coast Guard Academy has no chapel, designed as such, for the service a chapel affords to such an institution as the United States Coast Guard Academy.

2. The use of the McAllister Engineering Building auditorium as a chapel is a makeshift, and within the calendar year may be found to be very inadequate even as to seating capacity for the academy personnel and authorized visitors to the academy.

3. Far more important, however, than as to seating capacity in the need of a chapel is its service to morale, direct recognition of religious belief, and the stimulation of esprit de corps of the entire United States Coast Guard Service, ashore and afloat, to be had only through memorial channels fixed in a carefully designed chapel. We need a real chapel at the United States Coast Guard Academy.

4. A site is in mind. Groundwork as to preliminary planning is in existence. The temper of the entire battalion of cadets is ripe for making varied and constant use of a real chapel. At West Point and at Annapolis the Army's and the Navy's great regimental chapels are indispensable to the esprit de corps of those services.

It is particularly important that in such an organization as is the United States Coast Guard, an organization founded and maintained to enforce the law of the land, to save life, and with a record as inspiring as it is long, should have a chapel second to none in significance and beauty of construction.

J. W. MOORE,
Commander, Chaplain Corps,
United States Navy.

APRIL 17, 1941.

Rear Admiral R. R. WAESCHE,
Commandant, United States Coast Guard
Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL: The Advisory Committee of the Coast Guard Academy held its annual meeting in Washington on April 10 and 11, 1941, and herewith makes its report to you as follows:

ITEM NO. I. CRUISE

This appears to our Advisory Committee to be one of the most important educational problems now facing the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Academy. The transfer of 10 lake-class cruising cutters to British control and the probable unavailability of other cruising cutters makes the assignment of Coast Guard cutters for the practice cruise an impossibility. From the educational viewpoint we have always considered, and we now strongly reaffirm, that the entire curriculum contemplates practical work in deck and engineering duties, and the discipline and indoctrination in seamanshiplike qualities which can only be given on the practice cruises. There is no substitute. Conditions at the academy during the progress of construction work will make the use of the

academy a practical impossibility this coming summer.

The suggestion for sending the first-class cadets in small groups of five or six to the remaining cruising cutters has certain possibilities and certain drawbacks. The adequacy of the training to be received by such small groups would depend entirely on the sympathetic understanding of commanding officers. Certain questions also occur to us as to the possible supervision which would be given to the development of the cadet notebooks on engineering and deck exercises under such divided responsibilities. The consequent dispersion of the cadets would tend to defeat one of the objects of the cruise, namely, the development of esprit de corps under the leadership of the first class.

Another suggestion has to do with securing from the Maritime Commission the complete assignment to the Coast Guard of either the *American Seaman* or the *American Sailor* for the period of the usual academy practice cruise of 10 weeks. Although the engine-room equipment of the converted cargo ships is not by any means equivalent to that on a Coast Guard cutter, we believe that this suggestion offers the only acceptable substitute for a cutter cruise. We recommend that immediate steps be taken to secure the assignment of one of these vessels.

As to the second-class cruise, which has previously been made with the *Chase* and certain 175-foot Diesel cutters of the *Argo* class, we believe this to be an invaluable training complementing the practice cruise. The following quotation from a memorandum of Coast Guard Academy for Sailing Training Ships" is endorsed by the advisory committee: the Academy staff entitled "The Need of the

"It is the considered opinion of the Superintendent and faculty of the Coast Guard Academy that training in sail is essential to the proper instruction of cadets in preparation for their future duties as commissioned officers of the Coast Guard. This opinion is based upon the considerations of the duties that these officers will be called upon to perform.

"Coast Guard cutters are relatively small, ranging in size from patrol boats to ships of about 2,000 tons. Most of the work of the service is performed in coastal waters, where shoals are treacherous, currents swift, and violent storms with heavy seas are to be expected. Since calls for assistance are usually a result of severe weather the cutters must be prepared to perform their duties under difficult circumstances. Under these conditions ability in seamanship is essential not only to the safety of the boats and ships of the service but to the adequacy of the protection afforded to ships in distress. The reputation of the Coast Guard in the final analysis depends upon the ability of its officers in seamanship. This ability can only be acquired through training in handling all types of boats and cutters and a thorough knowledge of the causes of disaster to ships in distress. The specialized knowledge required of officers of the Coast Guard is thus broader in scope and more detailed in character than that required of any other seagoing group of men.

"While it is true that steamers have largely replaced sailing ships in commercial trade the fact remains that there are several hundred thousand small boats, yachts, and sailboats in operation and that from these vessels come most of the calls for assistance, to which the Coast Guard must respond. The responsibility of the Coast Guard for the safety of this class of vessels has recently been emphasized by the creation of the Coast Guard Auxiliary. It is now most necessary that Coast Guard officers should know more about the operation of yachts and small craft generally than ever before because they are required to instruct small-boat operators in seamanship and navigation upon which the

safe operation of their boats so largely depends. In this, as in other phases of Coast Guard work, the duties performed by naval officers are fundamentally different. Whereas the average naval officer must be prepared for duty aboard large combatant ships operating in fleets and squadrons, Coast Guard officers act in a field where ships of relatively small size perform independent duties in which they are thrown upon their own responsibility under the most severe conditions.

"The training of cadets in seamanship begins in the small boats of the Service propelled by oars, by sail, and by motor. Each cadet must become a proficient oarsman; he must learn to handle a small boat under sail and he must understand how to run a motorboat engine and be able to handle all types of boats under all conditions of wind and weather. This work continues during the 4-year course at the Academy.

"The next phase of a cadet's training in seamanship is learning to stand a watch at sea. Cadets are taught to stand lookout, wheel, and lifeboat watches, to act as officer of the deck and to handle vessels of the Service underway and in coming to anchor. In the performance of these duties alertness is of the utmost importance. It has been found through years of experience that unremitting observation of changes in wind, sea, and weather are more necessary in a sailing ship than in a boat or ship propelled by machinery. The constant attention required in a ship under sail instills a habit of alertness that can be acquired in no other way and that once acquired will never be lost.

"For this reason, as soon as cadets have become proficient in handling pulling boats they are placed in small sailboats and when they have been taught the elementary principles are encouraged in racing tactics until their proficiency becomes sheer instinct.

"The next step in their training is to accustom the cadets to larger vessels both under sail and under power. In these more extended cruises are possible; piloting and navigation are introduced and the cadets begin to apply the theoretical knowledge acquired in the classroom to practical uses.

"It has been found both practicable and economical to extend the benefits, already outlined, of training in watch standing under sail to ships approximating in size the larger cutters. This can only be done in larger sailing ships and while there is a certain artificiality in continuing training under sail in these larger vessels it has been found that only by this means can the alertness that is the basic characteristic of a competent watch officer be carried over to the more complex routine established on a cruising cutter. It was noticeably apparent that when cadets were sent on summer cruises on board cutters having no sails there was a tendency among them to stand watch in a perfunctory manner. The benefits of their training under sail in small boats were lost before they were able to adjust themselves to the duties of watch officer on steam cutters.

"This condition was remedied when the Gloucester type schooners *Chase* and *Dobbin* were obtained to supplement the practical training on steamers during the summer cruise. The loss of these two vessels during the hurricane of 1938 has caused a notable decline in alertness on watch, and it is urgently hoped that this deficiency may be remedied by the acquisition of the square-rigged sailing ship *Danmark*. The availability of this fine, modern sailing ship built for training purposes appears a practicable solution to the problem of training in sail at a reasonable cost.

"It has been estimated that it would cost at least \$750,000 to duplicate the *Danmark* at the present time if suitable building facilities were available. The possibility of

obtaining this ship at less than half this cost is one that should require no further arguments.

"The experience of the Coast Guard Academy of the desirability of training in sail is amply confirmed by the opinion of other nations in training seamen. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and numerous other countries have reverted to training in sail after having tried with less satisfactory results to substitute steamers for this purpose."

The Advisory Committee agrees with the statements contained in the above memorandum and strongly recommends the purchase of the *Danmark* for assignment to the academy for use on practice cruises.

ITEM NO. II. ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTORS AND PERSONNEL

Because the prospects of obtaining additional Regular officers as instructors for the 100 additional cadets are extremely small at the present time, it is apparent that needed additional instructors will of necessity be temporary or Reserve officers. A minimum of 4 will be required to meet the known additional teaching load:

Mathematics.....	1
English and Spanish.....	1
Engineering.....	1
Navigation.....	1

If Mr. Smith, who was recommended by the Advisory Committee, be appointed, the work in mathematics would be provided for. The Committee met Mr. Santa Cruz and has a very favorable impression of him, with nothing unfavorable except possibly his desire to accept appointment for but 1 or 2 years. He seems suitable for the English and Spanish assignment. The Committee understands that the Superintendent has met another possible candidate, but the Committee has not met him. It is possible that a retired officer could handle the engineering, and a Reserve officer the navigation.

In previous reports the committee has pointed out the need for revision of the act of April 16, 1937 (professors' bill) in order to remove the restrictions on the number of civilian instructors to be appointed to the academy. The present fixed numbers of five professors and three civilian instructors should be revised to include the other well-known ranks of associate professor and assistant professor without regard to the number in each grade; and the law should state merely the total number of civilian teachers allowed. The difficulties of undertaking further revisions of this bill at this time are recognized, but the urgency of the present situation requires that these revisions be made at once, and the advisory committee so recommends.

In earlier reports the advisory committee pointed out the necessity of relieving part of the extra load now to be placed on the teaching staff by the detaching of additional technical and clerical enlisted men as assistants. Further study of the present situation makes it apparent that something must be done soon to detail the necessary ratings (or civil-service personnel) which the superintendent will list, after completion of the study by the academic board, of the individual loads to be placed on the members of the teaching staff. We recommend serious consideration of this matter and the appropriation involved.

ITEM III. COURSE OF INSTRUCTION

The basic features of the course of instruction as presented in this committee's report of 1934 are still sound and in operation. Some revision of the details will be necessary because of (a) the present emergency and (b) changes in the duties of the Coast Guard. These revisions are:

(1) The desirability of including special instruction relating to aids to navigation.

The basic sciences serve as foundation material in this field, but it is desirable that illustrative examples and numerical problems be drawn from the practices of the lighthouse engineering section. We note with approval the assignment of a subboard of the academic board to study this phase of instruction; but we recommend against the introduction of a special or additional course in aids to navigation.

(2) The Coast Guard officers assigned to the teaching staff are heavily overloaded in the summer, and there is need for equalizing the staff load between the summer and academic terms.

(3) The desirability of closer coordination of English and history throughout the curriculum has been suggested. The committee would welcome recommendations from the academic board.

(4) Both the shortage of available officers and the probable increase in the cadet corps to about 350 during the present year emphasize the desirability of simplifying the course of instruction wherever practicable in order to employ all instructors and plant facilities to the best advantage. Larger sections in some subjects and the use of assistants in laboratory work are examples of revisions in the schedule, but not in the course, which should not reduce the value or the content of the curriculum but might well increase its effectiveness.

The Advisory Committee notes with approval the present procedure of the academic board and the superintendent in studying these problems.

ITEM NO. IV. COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Three suggestions relative to the commencement exercises at the Academy are made by the committee:

(a) That diplomas be presented by the Superintendent. It is normally the function of the president of an educational institution to present degrees and the certifying diploma. The position of superintendent corresponds to that of president, and it is fitting that this ceremony be performed by him.

(b) That the Commandant of the Coast Guard administer the oath of office to the graduates as a group before the presentation of diplomas and commissions.

(c) That the Secretary of the Treasury, or his representative, present the commissions.

It is also suggested that a slightly different method of handling diplomas and commissions be followed. It is desirable that each man receive his own diploma and commission from the hands of the awarding officer. This may be done by placing the certificate in a simple wooden rack consisting of a baseboard with vertical dowels inserted to act as separators. The diplomas may occupy the right end of the rack and the commissions the left end. They are so placed in the vertical files that the order of their removal is that of the order of their presentation. As a double check, each certificate may have a small slip of paper, inserted beneath the ribbon, on which the recipient's name is typed. The executive officer may preside at the rack, handing to the superintendent and the Secretary in turn each man's diploma and commission.

The administering of the oath to the graduates as a group forms an impressive ceremony. The executive officer orders the graduates to arise and receive the oath of office from the Commandant. The latter administers the oath in sections of such length as may be easily repeated, each individual, at the start, inserting his name after the opening word "I."

ITEM NO. V. PROBLEMS OF "ADAPTABILITY"

The selection of cadets for admission to the academy and the retention under instruction only of those who give promise of general fitness for a career in the Coast

Guard service present problems grouped under the heading "Adaptability." They should be considered under two classifications: (1) Selection of candidates for cadetships; (2) adaptability of cadets under instruction.

(1) The selection of candidates involves (a) the character of entrance examinations to test the candidate's scholastic attainments and (b) some attempt to appraise his general fitness to become an officer. The records show that since 1932 less than 40 percent of the candidates admitted to each fourth class have been graduated. Academic failures and low adaptability marks account for most, though not all, of those who drop out of the Academy. Hence the desirability is obvious of devising, if possible, some method of selection which will eliminate at the outset as many as possible of those who are doomed to fail. The suggestion that our entrance examinations might be improved by the addition of a test on the combined subjects of physics and chemistry is approved by the Advisory Committee.

In principle the Advisory Committee believes that the entrance examinations should be prepared by an independent group of experts such as the College Entrance Examining Board. This would prevent "cram" schools from coaching candidates of indifferent mental attainments so that they can pass with high marks; it would also tend to greater uniformity in the entrance examinations of different years. It would probably entail expense. Prof. George W. Mullins, of the College Entrance Examining Board, has expressed the desire of the board to cooperate with the Academy and his expectation that the board would furnish its services at cost, which he roughly estimates at four or five dollars per candidate examined. Whether the necessary funds for such expense can be found or whether it would be feasible to require each candidate to pay a \$5 examination fee are matters upon which the Advisory Committee expresses no opinion. In any event any arrangement with the College Entrance Examining Board could not be put into operation before 1942.

A subboard of the Academic Board has recommended "that prior to appointment as a cadet each candidate be examined by a traveling board consisting of at least two Coast Guard officers and one senior medical officer who are serving, or have served, at the academy." The Advisory Committee understands that this proposal contemplates that the traveling board will pass upon the candidate's "adaptability" and that its judgment will be in addition to the adaptability mark provided by the present examination procedure. In principle we approve of the recommendation of the subboard. Commander Ellis Reed-Hill has expressed the view that it is impracticable to combine with the present procedure an additional examination by the proposed traveling board. Lack of opportunity for thorough consideration of this objection has prevented the Advisory Committee from reaching any conclusion as to it. This subject, as well as other recommendation of the subboard, will be taken up for further consideration at the next meeting of the Advisory Committee.

(2) Adaptability of cadets under instruction. The lack of any reliable objective method of measuring traits of character and personality essential to officer personnel makes the solution of this problem most difficult. The advisory committee notes with gratification that the subcommittee of the academic board is giving the subject careful study. Its recommendations will be considered by the advisory committee at the next meeting.

ITEM NO. VI. CONSTRUCTION

The report on progress of building construction at the academy, as presented by the Superintendent, was received with much

interest. With the early completion of the barracks extension by September 1, the present crowding of cadets will be greatly ameliorated, although the committee notes the fact that the quartering of three men in a room will still be necessary to a considerable extent.

The plan to give preference to the barracks construction over library construction is commended.

The authorization, recently received, to proceed with plans and construction for a building to house a new infirmary and armory is very gratifying to the committee. The space now devoted to infirmary and gunnery should furnish much desired space for class rooms, and gunnery will be placed where it belongs, in the armory.

The proposed plans for the water-front development, as presented by the Superintendent, appear to provide unusual and excellent facilities for boating and sailing.

The need for improvements at the athletic field is appreciated and, as future construction when appropriations are available, these improvements are recommended. The present conditions at the field are dangerous to players and spectators by reason of the extreme narrowness of the field and the presence of the bleachers. By the removal of the bleachers and the construction of a field house and grandstand combined, this dangerous condition would be removed and a real need met. The field house can be placed to advantage on the low land to the east of the field, permitting the erection of a welded steel grandstand on the roof of the house. A plan similar to that adopted by Waterbury, Conn., at the high-school athletic field, is recommended.

The committee considered in detail next year's requirements for auditorium facilities. McAllister Hall, now used for this and chapel services, seats 306 at the present time. By adding movable seats, the capacity may be expanded to 340 seats. Even then, the hall will be inadequate for chapel services. As a tentative arrangement, the committee suggests that a plan be studied by which the present stage would be moved backward into the present roof space above the engineering laboratory, allowing additional seating capacity. Such a step should be considered as an emergency provision, and the committee feels strongly that the erection of a suitable chapel should be seriously considered as soon as present emergency conditions end.

The chapels at the other two Government academies play a very important part in academy functioning and a similar edifice at New London is much needed and to be desired. The crypt beneath the chapel could furnish opportunity for the housing and protection of service memorials.

No educational institution of the size of the Coast Guard Academy can operate efficiently without the use of a suitable auditorium. With McAllister Hall now inadequate for next year's enrollment, studies of possible extensions, or new construction, should be undertaken at once. Any proposed plan should be made with a view to providing an auditorium that will be satisfactory for years to come.

J. W. BARKER,
H. E. CLIFFORD,
G. E. RUSSELL,
T. W. SWAN,
H. L. SEWARD, *Chairman*,

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the country at last has the truth about the Roosevelt administration's foreign policy. Mr. Roosevelt's fireside

chat to the world on Tuesday, May 27, was without any question of doubt a declaration of war. It was a declaration of undeclared war. It could not be construed as anything other than a declaration of war, because never in the history of this Nation has any President referred to the head of another nation with whom we were supposed to be at peace in such terms of personal abuse and defiance as Mr. Roosevelt directed at Hitler.

The President's fireside chat made it apparent that he has been advised by someone that he now possesses the power to short circuit the Congress and to declare war, or to begin war, or to bring on those conditions or incidents which will cause some other nation to declare war or begin war against us. It can no longer be doubted that Mr. Roosevelt believes he now has the power to short circuit the Congress, to send the United States Navy in convoys, or patrols, into waters where they can hardly avoid violent and hostile contact with the German boats and war planes, without asking the leave of Congress, and without consulting the people.

Mr. Roosevelt himself has said, not so long ago, that "convoying means shooting, and shooting comes very close to war." In his speech he set at naught, without apology or explanation, the assurances of the majority leader of the Senate, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and other administration spokesmen in the Congress, that he would not think of engaging American naval ships in convoy work without coming to Congress for permission to do so.

In declaring for absolute, unequivocal and unlimited freedom of the seas, Mr. Roosevelt laid down the gage of war. We are bound to get into a shooting war, and the question now is not will we, but where, how, and when. The moment may not be far distant. There can be no question but that the administration expects the necessary incident to occur that will precipitate the Nation into armed conflict.

To insist upon freedom of the seas at this time is to insist upon a right that is historical and traditional. But, to look at the question frankly and honestly, the Nation finds itself in the position of an individual who insists upon his right to walk down a public thoroughfare. On each side of the thoroughfare at various points are groups shooting at each other, dropping bombs, launching torpedoes, and so forth. The citizen faces the certain fate of getting shot at, if not shot, by insisting on his right to traverse the public thoroughfare between these two warring groups. The question then becomes not one of right, but of the wisdom in exercising the right at a moment when the highways of the seas are the scenes of hostile gunfire, bombing, and torpedo operation.

No one would have to ponder long to determine how foolish it would be for any citizen to thus insist upon his rights to the public thoroughfare, warring groups notwithstanding, especially if he had no weapon by which to protect himself—not even so much as a club.

The United States is now going to embark—rather is embarked by the action of the President—on what may be a two-ocean war with a one-ocean Navy. We do not have enough trained men to make up an army of half a million, let alone three or four million. We do not have the equipment even to train a million men, let alone 4,000,000. We have not the equipment to prepare an army of half a million men for active battle work. We have neither the naval nor the merchant ships to convey airplanes or men to any European base. Every military and naval expert has agreed time and again that it will take an army of 4,000,000 men to compose an expeditionary force that would mean anything in Europe now. Military necessities require that there be provided with each man seven tons of impedimenta, such as supplies, munitions, and instruments of war. That means that to send an expeditionary force of 4,000,000 men to England's aid would require the transport of 28,000,000 tons of military equipment and supplies. There are not enough ships afloat in the world, if we had them all, to carry any such expedition across the Atlantic Ocean. If we had the trained men, and if we had the equipment for them, and if we had the ships to get them across, there is no place we could land them in Europe. If we could land them in Europe, it is obvious that if we have not enough ships to get enough aid to Britain now, we would not have enough ships to keep a line of communications open with an army of 4,000,000 men engaged across the Atlantic or Pacific in battle operations.

These are some of the naked and awful facts which cannot be replaced by Presidential wishful thinking, and which cannot be rendered innocuous by ignoring them. It is all well and good to breathe defiance and talk about exercising our freedom of the seas everywhere in the world, but it is distinctly something else to have the trained armies and the ships and the guns and the submarines and the airplanes with which to enforce that freedom of the seas everywhere in the world. Some authorities insist that we can do the job with airplanes. They say it would require anywhere from eighty to one hundred thousand long-range bombers, as many more fighters, and perhaps a quarter or a third as many more scout planes. Military officials say frankly that it would be 2 or 3 years before we could possibly provide such a force of airplanes.

Finally, the President of the United States does have the power to plunge this Nation into war. He has declared an unlimited emergency, whatever an unlimited emergency may mean. Presumably it means an emergency due to the imminence of war. However that may be, the President of the United States does have the power and the opportunity to plunge this country into war. Regrettable as it may be that he has done so, or may do so, he has taken us in so far now that we must subordinate everything to the building of an adequate national defense. Mr. Roosevelt's talk to the world has made that doubly necessary now.

My devotion to a proper national defense is established by an unbroken record of support of every proposed appropriation for equipment and supplies for our Army and Navy over a period of 23 years as a Member of this House. What a pity—yes, what a tragedy—that this administration, prior to a year ago, failed to ask the Congress for appropriations with which adequately to equip our armed forces to successfully meet the emergency which long before that had become apparent to the world.

I propose to support every move in this Congress to provide a properly equipped American Army and Navy. I shall vote for any appropriation necessary to provide a national defense so powerful that no nation or no combination of nations will ever dare attempt to set a hostile foot on our shores. This does not, however, include appropriations for the purpose of arming nations in every part of the world whenever it pleases a President to believe such action contributes to our national defense.

A dispatch from London within the last few minutes announces that Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden today announced officially that Britain is fighting to establish in the post-war world President Roosevelt's four freedoms—"freedom of speech * * * everywhere in the world," "freedom of religion * * * everywhere in the world," "freedom from want * * * everywhere in the world," "freedom from fear * * * everywhere in the world."

Eden warned also that Britain will impose drastic peace terms on Germany, which he characterized as "the worst master Europe has yet known." He further stated he counts upon the united support of the British Empire, the United States, and South America in reaching these objectives.

Unquestionably, Eden and the other members of the British Government count upon this country to carry on the heavy end of this program. Inasmuch as Great Britain apparently is not capable of insuring unaided the four freedoms to her own people in the British Isles, to say nothing of other portions of the British Empire, it appears that Mr. Roosevelt took on rather a large contract when he announced his four-freedom program to a joint session of the Congress on January 6, 1941. After all, is not it about time the Congress and the country woke up to what we are being let in for?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I listened last night on the radio to an attack on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, and I listened with a great deal of interest today to the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] from the great Midwest. I expect to answer that speech of his sometime next week. In the space of 10 minutes one does not have time to get started. But I do say to this

distinguished and noble-looking group of statesmen on my right this morning who work for their country and have the welfare of their country at heart, and who come mostly from the Atlantic seaboard, and also to this group on my left of hard-working Republicans who want to do the right thing, that there is a little map, which has been prepared by a department of the Government, called the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of the House. The map is prepared by the Department of Commerce, and is found in part 1 of the St. Lawrence survey. I commend that to the attention of every Member of the House.

When you begin to talk about the St. Lawrence seaway, the first thing to do is to find out what the project is. We already have from the Gulf of St. Lawrence 2,687 miles inland, a 14-foot seaway, to the head of navigation on Lake Superior at Duluth. The St. Lawrence project is, simply, a project to deepen a channel already built, to a depth of 14 feet, so that boats of a draft of 27 feet can travel up through the Great Lakes from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie, to Lake Huron, to Lake Michigan, to Lake Superior. There has been more propaganda about the St. Lawrence seaway than about any other measure that has ever been in Congress since I have served in this body.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that most of the Great Lakes are not navigable from about November 15 to about May 1?

Mr. PITTENGER. Oh, we have ice up there in the winter time, but during the open season for a period of several months, the Great Lakes are the busiest bodies of water in the world. They are sending this summer, during the shipping season, from the district which I represent at the head of Lake Superior, about 80,000,000 tons of iron ore, and I think that completely answers one of the bunk propaganda arguments that the railroads are advancing against the seaway, along with a few other selfish interests, to the effect that it is frozen over all the year. During the shipping season it is utilized every hour of the day and night.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House are being propagandized by the greatest propaganda factory in the world. The railroads are behind the opposition. I thought the other day that I had all of the objections that have been offered to the proposed seaway, but my distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] pulled a few more rabbits out of the hat this morning, and I quit counting after I reached 1,700 different objections to having the St. Lawrence seaway project deepened to 27 feet.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that we have a very long coast line on the Great Lakes in our own country?

Mr. PITTENGER. They are the greatest inland body of water in the world.

Mr. WHITE. And will not the failure to construct this seaway operate to keep those people along that coast line from having shipyards and all of the things they now have along the seacoast?

Mr. PITTENGER. If we could have this project which the President is advocating deepened to 27 feet, it would remove those objections against building boats in our shipyards on the Great Lakes.

Mr. WHITE. It would be a great thing industrially for the Nation?

Mr. PITTENGER. Oh, yes; for the whole North American Continent.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I was much surprised to hear the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] say that we would be competing against slave labor from Europe by permitting goods to go up the St. Lawrence. Does it make any difference, if we do not have any tariff wall, whether it lands in the Great Lakes or whether it lands in the ports of the East?

Mr. PITTENGER. Oh, the gentleman from Nebraska got his figures mixed up. That same argument could be used against the port of New York just as well. It is no argument at all for or against the St. Lawrence seaway.

What I wanted to say was this: There is a railroad lobby, well financed, that is reaching every Member of this House, through every avenue of approach, to head off a project that means as much to the general welfare of the people of this country as the building of the Panama Canal, namely, the St. Lawrence seaway project.

I had a letter from a coal dealer down in Kentucky, and so did you all. He says this will cost him some taxes. As I understand the argument of the opponents of the seaway, they are arguing first for delay. They say this is no time to go into an expensive problem like this. We had better put it off. It is the fine defeatist hand theory to ruin and to put to one side this great engineering project. A plea for delay is always a plea for defeat. It lacks the element of sincerity.

I want to make my position clear on that argument, as well as many others. While this country is engaged in a national-defense program, while it is engaged in furnishing munitions, food-stuffs, and other things to nations across the water, this is no time to neglect our domestic economy. Now is the time to build domestic economy while at the same time we are carrying out these other lines of conduct.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Right along the line of what the gentleman said, in this great emergency when we are short of steel and short of shipyards to furnish the necessary ships to carry ocean trade, would it not be a great thing if along the coast of these Lakes, for instance, at Gary, Ind., where they could fabricate steel, those people could participate in this ship-building program?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes. There is no question about that. But the whole

trouble with this proposition is that the railroads have got everybody hypnotized. Now, who owns the railroads? J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; and the rest of the international bankers. They are the ones who are out to defeat this project, because they have certain selfish interests they want to protect. Jesse Jones has loaned, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, some \$600,000,000 to the railroads. They have paid back around \$342,000,000. But this Congress is faced with a group of industrialists who have been the beneficiaries of Congress for years and who are now outmaneuvering Congress in doing the one thing it ought to do, that is, carry out the recommendation and request of the President, that the St. Lawrence seaway be undertaken. Those railroads, industrialists, and bankers have a mortgage on most everything. Under S. 2009 last year they took a mortgage on our water. They do not have any water down in Texas. The next thing they will want is a mortgage on the Atlantic Ocean. When those boys put everything under the Interstate Commerce Commission they upset the situation as far as freight traffic is concerned in a tremendous way.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Is it not true that the length of the St. Lawrence waterway is about 2,500 miles, but there is a bottleneck of about 40 miles that should be completed under the project now put forward?

Mr. PITTENGER. The distance is a little over 2,700 miles, I understand.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. But there are only a few miles to be deepened?

Mr. PITTENGER. Only a few miles to be deepened and one or two more locks to be constructed. It is a comparatively simple project. It is a continuation of what we have been doing in this country for years and years.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman would not insinuate that all the labor organizations that have asked us to vote against this project are controlled by the railroad interests?

Mr. PITTENGER. I will answer that question by telling the gentleman that the railroad brotherhoods can make mistakes the same as some of the rest of us, and in my opinion the railroad brotherhoods are being grossly misled, just as they were misled in the passage of S. 2009 in the last session of Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Ohio.

MEMORIAL DAY AND NATIONAL TRADITIONS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of Memorial Day, the day on

which the people of this country pause to acknowledge their debt to our soldier dead. It is a custom we of the North copied from the heartbroken women of the South, and since the Spanish War in which the Blue and the Grey merged into a common olive drab and khaki it has been a national day of drawing together in reverent gratitude to the men whose lives were sacrificed for the Nation.

This year the day will bring to all our people a more than usual poignancy standing as we do upon the possible threshold of war. It will bring the shadow of Europe's carnage darkly between us and the sun. It should unite us in a common desire to keep this Republic at peace.

Our traditional holidays are very dear to our people. I think perhaps nothing the President has done for some time has given greater joy to more people than his announcement that Thanksgiving Day experiments have failed.

Now, there has come to my attention Senate bill 1242, and I should like to call it to the attention of the House. I trust most earnestly it is nothing more than a casual gesture, for it is something that no earnest-minded person could believe would be considered seriously in this body. It is a bill to designate our Independence Day, the 4th of July, "Democracy Day." Let me recall to you that this July day has been a tradition with us, the day upon which we celebrate the declaration of our independence of England, our separation from the mother country. This separation was definitely symbolized in our flag, the red stripes representing the blood of our mother, the white stripes the pure separation from her for the sake of liberty.

I ask you to read our history. In it you will find no mention of democracy. Among the founding fathers and the early people of this country the word was unknown. You will find Jefferson constantly referring to the Republic and the republican form of government. I ask you to read world history, and you will find that no democracy as such has ever survived. So I would call your attention to this bill and suggest that we are a Republic, that our Constitution specifically guarantees the republican form of government to the separate States, and I would suggest that before we do anything more than smile at the suggestion of the bill S. 1242 we consider these things with earnestness, because we want the Republic of the United States to endure so long as the world exists. [Applause.]

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, these are days when things happen with lightning speed. Tremendous events of vital importance to the people of America are taking place almost constantly. Affairs in Europe, war disasters in the Far East, problems in the Mediterranean have brought the people of our country to the brink of war. We are faced with issues of the first magnitude. Much as we should like to avoid their implications, even the most confirmed isolationist must concede that this is impossible. In times like these the men and women whom you

have elected to Congress owe you the duty of the utmost good faith.

Today the Capital of the United States is the focal point of international attention. Our position as the most powerful nonbelligerent in the world, our determination to keep the democratic form of government, and the personalities of our national leadership have made Washington the greatest center of political thinking on the face of the globe.

Our country is a democracy, but it is a democracy only by virtue of the men and women in it. We know that there are forces in our own Nation bent on changing our way of life. There are Nazi sympathizers and Communist fellow travelers who are seeking to alter the American way of life. The one effective weapon which can prevent them from succeeding is the determination of every good American to resist their efforts. This means more than conversation. It means a willingness to do our part in civilian defense—to cooperate in every legitimate effort to solve our problems quickly and fairly.

Today it is obvious that our preparations are still lagging. A few days ago we were informed that American defense production is still lagging far behind Nazi Germany. Our people know that the industrial plant of the United States is the greatest in the world. We can build more of everything than our closest competitors. Given the need, we have the ability and the capacity to build more planes, more tanks, more ships than all our potential enemies combined. Then why have we not done it? You may well ask this question.

I have asked it frequently. Dozens of Congressmen on both sides of the floor have asked it, too. There is only one answer—lack of planning. We plunged into this national-defense effort on a tremendous surge of emotion. Emotion is a great stimulant; but it is all too far from being a constructive agency. The great camps we built to house our selective-service draftees give conclusive proof of my charge. They were not planned. They grew, like Topsy. We have had evidence presented to show that some of these camps were still being planned while contractors were building barracks. A United States Senate committee has just finished its investigation of expenditures at Camp Blanding, Fla. A camp expected to cost \$9,000,000 finally runs up to \$20,000,000 before it is completed.

What is true of our camp projects is equally true of other aspects of our defense program. Ask any small manufacturer to tell you how to go about getting a Government contract. He will not know the first thing about it. And if he comes to Washington seeking enlightenment, he will find the same kind of red tape and confusion which gave Government business a black eye in the days of the World War. Today Washington is full of rumors that there are sharp differences of opinion between the heads of our various national departments and the business leaders who have been asked to take a hand in our national-defense efforts. Only 2 weeks ago a famous national magazine described the Cabinet

leaders of our national-defense program as sick, aged, and blundering.

Despite all our talk of collective bargaining, our national leadership has not yet evolved an effective plan for dealing with labor disputes which threaten our entire defense machinery.

All this I ascribe to ineffective planning. For more than 6 months past the need for a central coordinator to push plans ahead, to gather together all the many strands of the huge web of mass production, has been obvious to everyone except the administration. The President has persistently refused to vest this authority in one man. He has created three-man committees and five-man War Cabinets. But the one basic solution he has consistently ignored. I for one believe that there are many men in the United States who would be eminently able to perform this task. My own choice and the choice of millions of others would be Wendell Willkie. He has the enthusiasm, the training, the boundless energy necessary for this undertaking. But some man, Willkie or another, must eventually be delegated to do just this job.

Very close to this entire question of national defense is another major issue of the day—the operation of the Selective Service Act. We have had 8 months of experience to guide our future course. The President has just set July 1 for the registration of young men who have become 21 since we first registered our sons last year. Have we learned anything since we began this huge transplanting of a million and a half men? I believe we have.

The men in charge of our draftees tell us that they regard men over 30 as less desirable rookies than their younger brothers. They tell us that the dislocation of family ties is far less serious in young men than it is when they have passed 30. Very well; I believe that we should act upon this conclusion.

We should pass legislation permitting the temporary deferment of men over 30. We should instruct our draft boards to listen more sympathetically to family pleas than they have been doing so far.

And I think, too, that we owe it to our young men to clear up some of the misunderstandings that have cropped up in the course of the last year. Our Federal Government when it set up its program under the Selective Service Act, apparently believed that things would just work out. They printed a long series of folders dealing with many anticipated problems. You remember the talk in our newspapers about the Federal Government assisting young men who were called to the draft. Something was going to be done to help them keep their automobiles, pay their insurance, and generally soften the blow to their normal civilian lives.

Most of this was just talk. Consult your friends whose sons have been called to the colors and find out how many of them were able to keep their automobiles. Find out how many of them have managed to keep up their insurance payments. These matters are of real importance to the individuals concerned.

But there are still other difficulties in the operation of our highly selective service which should be called to the public's attention.

I have had complaint after complaint that draft board officials are making up their rules as they go along. Some of them tell young men that their parents will be provided for by sons-in-law. They are discouraged from filing appeals by statements that anybody who appeals is a slacker. Yet at the same time prominent public officials of a pronounced New Deal tinge have managed to get their relatives, including sons and nephews, deferred on the ground of some peculiar indispensability.

These things are not trivial. I believe that every American father and mother is entitled to receive the same consideration from the draft board as the son or nephew of a prominent public official. Anything less than this is the kind of undemocratic favoritism which everyone condemns as un-American. I believe that the people of this country should demand that the selective-service regulations of the Federal Government be administered fairly.

While we are talking about these important matters, there is still another highly controversial issue which I regard as vital to the future of our country—the problem of labor legislation. We have read a great deal in the newspapers lately about strikes in key industries. All of us know that a few of these strikes were engineered by men who are completely opposed to the American point of view. For these strikes, none of us can have any sympathy.

There are other strikes, however, in which labor is seeking to receive a fair share of the appropriations voted by Congress for national defense. When a company makes a great deal of money from Government contracts, I believe that it owes a direct responsibility to its workers to share some of its profits with its employees. The history of intelligent business management demonstrates over and over again that companies which have this kind of policy do best in the long run. I believe sincerely that we cannot solve every labor problem by one broad formula. But I do believe that we must set up a labor machinery which will help fair-minded managers and fair-minded workers to solve their own problems.

I favor a 30-day cooling-off period during which meetings would be required by law in the effort to solve any labor controversy. I believe that such a period of negotiation and discussion should precede every lock-out and every strike. Where there are existing labor contracts, I believe that this 30-day period should come before the expiration of the contract. I do not believe that labor unions should be prevented from seeking new members or seeking agreements with their employers looking toward the establishment of a closed-shop arrangement.

Here is a place where Biblical precepts ought to be invoked. Here is certainly a specifically human problem in which the Golden Rule can find definite appli-

caution. If both employers and workers would remember the fundamental teaching of all moral law; if they would keep in mind that in their dealings with each other, they should "do unto others as they would have others do unto them," we should be much closer to a solution of our labor difficulties than we are now.

These problems are of major importance to the entire Nation. Every one of them becomes of more pressing concern each day. The President of the United States has proclaimed an unlimited national emergency. I believe that this proclamation was designed to rouse the people of our country from the indifference with which millions still regard events abroad. I do not believe that this proclamation was necessary. But, like every other American who places his country first, I am ready to do my share. This is a battle which the people of the United States cannot afford to lose. We have taken our stand by the side of Great Britain. I believe that Great Britain owes us and owes the world a clear-cut statement of its war aims. Those who argue that there is only one war aim—to beat Hitler—forget that in 1918 there was only one war aim—to beat the Kaiser. The kind of post-war world which this single aim achieved led us directly to Nazi Germany. It built the same machinery of destruction which we had in 1914. We do not want and must not have a repetition of this experience.

The people of our country are ready to do their part, to end the squabbling which has stymied our defense production, to go all out in aid of democracy. We have the right to demand two things of our national administration. We have the right to demand that every nonessential Government expenditure be cut to the bone. We have the right to demand constant and accurate information as to just what is happening both at home and abroad. [Applause.]

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, midway between the armistice ending World War No. 1 and the rise to power of Hitler I recall a dramatic and unprecedented scene in 1925 in the Chamber of the House of Representatives—in which I am honored to be a Member—which illustrated at that time world sentiment and desire for peace among nations. It was the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, a body composed of members of the parliaments of every great nation in the world, including Great Britain, her dominions, Germany, Italy, France, Japan, and China. It was the first and only time that the House Chamber was used by any legislative body other than the House itself.

The one and only theme discussed in that assembly of world statesmen was how to break down armaments and insure universal peace. This objective was sought by every man and woman in that momentous gathering, the only differences of opinion being as to methods. Nothing could have better illustrated or

evidenced the hope and yearning for peace. The world was weary of bloody, useless wars. This feeling was so strong in our own country that the man who dared to advocate a greater army or a larger navy as measures of preparedness to meet future dangers was regarded with suspicion.

You will recall the old hymn in which we ask:

When comes the promised time,
When wars shall be no more,
Oppression, lust and crime
Shall flee Thy face before?

There is only one answer, and that is wars will cease only when peace reigns in the hearts of men. We in America have discovered that peace cannot be treatyized into the hearts of men and nations.

It did not take 2 decades after the World War for men to resume the nefarious and destructive pursuits so inimical to the ways of peace.

On Memorial Day in 1919, just a few months after the cessation of hostilities, President Woodrow Wilson addressed a great throng in a cemetery near Paris. Listen as I repeat a portion of his message, words expressing the fears then in his heart:

There is here and there an attempt to insert into the counsel of statesmen the old reckoning of selfishness and bargaining, and national advantage, which were the roots of this war; and any man who counsels these things advocates a renewal of the sacrifice which these men have made.

I mention these things to show how quickly public sentiment may change in a few years. We must always reckon with the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, especially those who covet power even at the point of the sword; and when that time comes the watchman waketh in vain unless peace-loving people are prepared to meet the armed foe.

Someone has referred to the American people as "the resolutionizing sons of revolutionary fathers."

True, we have been given to conferences and to resolutions, but at the same time no nation on the face of the earth can point to a more sincere, a more consistent record of action toward world peace. Now, however, we are convinced that unless there is a definite and supporting peace mind in the world there can be no lasting peace.

Today our people are united for measures of national defense—for defense of our freedom, for defense of our homes and our flag, for the protection of which we will keep faith with the honored dead who fought and died to preserve and perpetuate this Republic, our heritage, which Thomas Jefferson once said is "the world's best hope." [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by making some observations with reference to an old Confederate soldier who recently died and to incorporate some remarks I made on the ninetieth anniversary of General Grant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech that he recently delivered at an airport dedication.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech which I recently delivered before a joint session of the Pennsylvania Legislature.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written to me concerning H. R. 3318, to extend domiciliary and hospital care to World War veterans of the United States merchant marine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the Western Massachusetts Association of Mayors, Selectmen, and County Commissioners, and, further, to include a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Everett, Mass., and the City Council of Malden, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4466. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 179. An act for the relief of Frank E. Nichols;

H. R. 250. An act for the relief of Otto Meyer and Leigh Kelly;

H. R. 713. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman;

H. R. 816. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain members or former members of the United States Coast Guard

(formerly the Bureau of Lighthouses) for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at several light stations on the coast of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Hazen G. Chamberlain, doctor of medicine, and Cuba Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Charles E. Allison;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Herman E. Schorr;

H. R. 1731. An act for the relief of Beulah Bell Nolte and George C. Nolte;

H. R. 1732. An act for the relief of Floyd Wilday, Vera Wilday, and James M. Wells;

H. R. 1771. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1801. An act amending the act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144);

H. R. 2054. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, A. J. McLaren, A. D. Barkeley, Oscar Clayton, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, the estate of C. E. Wells, and the estate of Theodore Bowen;

H. R. 2107. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell equipment and supplies to and perform work for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 2426. An act for the relief of H. B. Wilson;

H. R. 2569. An act for the relief of Charles R. Woods;

H. R. 2828. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa., and to authorize its construction by the Dauphin County, Pa., Authority.

H. R. 3084. An act for the relief of Hugh C. Russell;

H. R. 3205. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3309. An act for the relief of Louis J. Banderet;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Irene Trauernicht;

H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams;

H. R. 4105. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character;

H. R. 4305. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the diamond anniversary to be held at Columbus, Ohio, September 14 to 19, inclusive, 1941;

H. R. 4368. An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy;

H. R. 4466. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4534. An act 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

H. R. 4632. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1941.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

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 THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold public hearings on H. R. 3487, entitled "A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930" and other retirement bills pending before the committee. Hearings will be held Tuesday, June 3, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 246, House Office Building.

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.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold hearings on Tuesday, June 3, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on the following bills: S. 1544, to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and H. J. Res. 191, to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10 a. m. Wednesday, June 4, 1941, to sider H. R. 4873 (ALLEN, Louisiana), a bill to promote the national defense by limiting the entry of certain aliens into the United States. Also private bills.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold a further public hearing on the subject of Royalty Payments, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

577. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the Dis-

trict of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the selective-service system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

578. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

579. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Civil Service Commission, amounting to \$2,846,430, for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 235); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

580. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for 1941 and prior fiscal years, amounting to \$6,463,57, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 236); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

581. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting emergency supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, totaling \$114,091,080, together with a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation of the Navy Department for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 (H. Doc. No. 237); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

582. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian Reservations"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

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. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4887. A bill to authorize the construction of Coast Guard cutters necessary in the interest of national defense and for performance of Coast Guard duties; without amendment (Rept. No. 661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 991. A bill for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty (Rept. No. 662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DREWRY: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4836. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2308. A bill to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of Maryland: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4816. A bill to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense; with amendment (Rept. No. 685). 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. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 189. A bill for the relief of William F. Kimball; with amendment (Rept. No. 645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 732. A bill for the relief of Rinzo Takata; with amendment (Rept. No. 646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1532. A bill for the relief of Bernard E. Wareheim; with amendment (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1548. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. H. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum; with amendment (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1743. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass; with amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Reed and Ross Reed; with amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2861. A bill for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2888. A bill for the relief of H. E. Buzby; with amendment (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3121. A bill for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3607. A bill for the relief of Anton Waytashek; with amendment (Rept. No. 654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3801. A bill for the relief of W. A. Batchelor and wife; with amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Tony Cirone; with amendment (Rept. No. 656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wichmann; with amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4556. A bill for the relief of L. S. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4459. A bill to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 1, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCOTT: Committee on Claims. S. 212. A bill for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman; without amendment (Rept. No. 660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4359. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 191. A bill for the relief of Franklin Stencil; with amendment (Rept. No. 665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Laura McStay; with amendment (Rept. No. 666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2434. A bill for the relief of Margaret S. Holton; with amendment (Rept. No. 667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Donald Crump and Mrs. John N. Crump and for the relief of Emma Jane Crump and Mildred Lounedah Crump; with amendment (Rept. No. 668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3032. A bill for the relief of J. G. Fox; with amendment (Rept. No. 669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3086. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Marquis; with amendment (Rept. No. 670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Ernest Melotte and Mary Melotte; with amendment (Rept. No. 671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Sick; with amendment (Rept. No. 672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3772. A bill for the relief of the Sachs Mercantile Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4182. A bill for the relief of Mollie S. McHaney; with amendment (Rept. No. 674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 851. A bill for the relief of Edson E. Downs; without amendment (Rept. No. 675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Jess W. Harmon; with amendment (Rept. No. 676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1354. A bill for the relief of Herman R. Allen; with amendment (Rept. No. 678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1397. A bill for the relief of Jose J. Perez; with amendment (Rept. No. 679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of the Carr China Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Branchland Pipe & Supply Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Luebarta Wilson; with amendment (Rept. No. 682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3270. A bill for the relief of John K. Blackstone; without amendment (Rept. 683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3647. A bill for the relief of the San Diego Consolidated Gas & Electric Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 684). 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. WHITTINGTON:
H. R. 4911. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:
H. R. 4912. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULMER:
H. R. 4913. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate employees of the Department of Agriculture to make arrests for violation of the laws relating to and the rules and regulations established for the protection of lands acquired under or transferred for administration under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4914. A bill to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1940 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEALEY:
H. R. 4915. A bill to enable certain legislative employees to obtain transfer to a position in the classified civil service within 1 year after separation from active duty with the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Miss RANKIN of Montana:
H. R. 4916. A bill suspending during the time of war or national emergency the running of any statute of limitations on prosecutions for Federal offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:
H. R. 4917. A bill to classify civil-service employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. DREWRY:
H. Res. 220. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4839, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their senate concurrent resolution relative to funds in order to immediately begin the construction of a road to connect State Highway Route No. 39 with Fort Dix; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their senate concurrent resolution relative to an appropriation for the construction of a relief highway between Denville and the Picatinny Arsenal, in Morris County; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRY:
H. R. 4918. A bill for the relief of Anna J. Krogoll; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Merrill G. McKay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN:
H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary Migliaro, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:
H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Antonio or Anthony Maurin; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4922. A bill granting a pension to John A. Nail; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of George Knox and Orion Knox; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4924. A bill granting an increase of pension to Oscar F. Pridgen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. R. 4925. A bill for the relief of the Blue Ridge Overall Co.; 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:

1234. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition of the International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America, J. F. Jurich, president, George Lane, secretary-treasurer, Seattle, Wash., pointing out that House bill 3 (Hobbs) provides for the detention and supervision of certain aliens ordered deported, but whose deportation cannot be effected; and that such a bill is not compatible and cannot be reconciled with those beating the war drums today; alleging that such a measure is aimed at the labor leaders who are militantly protesting this legislation is inimicable to the Constitution and helps in the destruction of civil rights; urging that the Members of Congress talk and act against such a bill and averring that the Hobbs bill is a repetition of the repression of aliens occurring during the preparation for the World War and adding that the democratic and constitutional rights of the American people are now in grave danger; and therefore insisting that this Hobbs bill (H. R. 3) be decisively defeated by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1235. Also, petition of Local No. 2-198 of International Woodworkers of America, North Bend, Wash., alleging that native-born American citizens are discriminated against in the aircraft industry because they are not "second-generation Americans"; averring that such discrimination is intended to split unions and showing that under such rulings both Sidney Hillman and William Knudsen, Directors of Office of Production Management, would be disqualified; insisting that such discrimination is a dangerous precedent and would set up a class B of Americans; that it would create disunity and deprive our Nation from much of its skill amongst craftsmen; and therefore urging that prompt steps be taken to correct the situation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1236. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition signed by 51 residents of Sedgwick, Kans., objecting to the United States of America conveying ships to or through the war zones, to American soldiers fighting on foreign soil, and to American soldiers delivering or conveying materials to nations at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1237. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of Gladys Z. Murphy, of Cicero, Ind., and 50 others, in regard to Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1238. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of John R. Carter and seven other citizens of Wakarusa, Kans., protesting against every action which tends to lead us closer to participation in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1239. Also, petition of C. G. A. Berggren and three other citizens of Leonardville, Kans., urging support of the Tolan bill (H. R. 1052); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1240. Also, petition of Henry B. Schurr and 22 other citizens of Wakarusa, Kans., protest-

ing against every action which tends to lead us closer to participation in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1241. Also, petition of R. J. Henderson and 20 other citizens of Topeka, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 4000, a bill to stop the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the army and naval camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1242. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide the necessary funds to construct a road connecting Fort Dix with Route No. 39; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1243. Also, petition of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide the funds to construct a relief highway between Denville and the Picatinny Arsenal in Morris County; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1244. By Mr. RICH: Petition from citizens of McKean County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1245. Also, petition from citizens of McKean County, Pa., opposing House bill 3852 and Senate bill 983; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1246. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 41 relative to investigation by Congress of the feasibility of growing guayule rubber in California, and if found feasible to subsidize the same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1247. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, urging the enactment of a law to permit or require common carriers of passengers to extend special and reduced fares to persons serving in our military and naval forces during the existing emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1248. By Mr. VREELAND: Concurrent resolution of the Senate of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide the necessary funds to construct a road connecting Fort Dix with Route No. 39; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1249. Also, concurrent resolution of the Senate of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide the funds to construct a relief highway between Denville and the Picatinny Arsenal in Morris County; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, May 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of grace, who dost ever teach us that striving after noble ends is not like barren labor spent for naught, but hath in it the breath of immortality: Be with us now in this moment of dedicating prayer, to the awakening and opening of our souls, to the calming and strengthening of our spirits, that, holding communion with the invisible things of God, we may stand in our lot with a gracious poise, whatever that lot may be; that we may be wise of heart to find and assimilate the profit of life's discipline, attuned

to hear, whenever it speaks, the voice of our dear Lord.

If in the world the trust men had in one another is dislodged, if courage has gone out to meet its tasks and brought back no faint measure of success, then do Thou open wide the doors of understanding, that we may see and know that every lie is doomed, however long it lasts, that every imposture falls into the dust to be trodden under foot of men, that truth and righteousness can alone prevail through the Saviourhood of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, May 29, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on May 29, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following act:

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.

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. 578. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to release certain interests in certain land which adjoins the Shark River Coast Guard Station, in Monmouth County, N. J.; and

S. 1311. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, with respect to the location of the nautical school at the port of San Francisco.

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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 991) for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1091. An act to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905;

H. R. 1094. An act to grant pension for disability or death resulting from service in the United States Coast Guard before July 2, 1930, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1095. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 2855. An act to provide for payment of pension to certain dependent parents notwithstanding remarriage, and for other purposes.