

Adolph C. King
Sheldon H. Kinney
Donald C. Kirk
John E. Kirk
John J. Klrwin
David C. S. Kline
Leon C. Klingaman
Qwenton V. Koecher
Eugene W. Krebs-
bach
John T. Kugler
John L. Landreth
Herbert F. Lannon
Lewis E. Larson, Jr.
Jack A. La Spada
Harold G. Leahy
Richard E. Leary
John S. Leidel
Frank O. Leighton
William E. Lemos
Clifford A. Lenz
Percy A. Lilly, Jr.
Harold W. Lockhart
Marvin F. Loetterle
John H. Lohm
Robert Long
Walter H. Louney
Earl A. Luehman
Robert P. Luker, Jr.
James P. Lynch
Charles W. Lynn, Jr.
Joseph Lynn
Neil A. MacKinnon
Robert D. Macklin
Oscar D. MacMillan
Giuseppe Maeri
William J. Maddocks
Everette A. Malcolm
John D. Malone
Thomas F. Malone
James P. Marion, Jr.
Richard C. Mar-
quardt
Collis O. Marshall
Tom B. Martin, Jr.
Dante R. Marzetta
Robert H. Mathew,
Jr.
William G. Matton,
Jr.
Victor S. Mauldin
Frederick W. Max-
well, Jr.
Francis W. McCarthy
Arthur W. McCulloch
Leland S. McDaniel,
Jr.
Frank H. McDonald
Arthur G. McIntyre
Waldron M. McLellon
James E. McManus
James H. McPherson
George W. McRory,
Jr.
Thomas O. McWhor-
ter
Paul H. Medling
Charles J. Merdinger
John G. Messer
Roderick O. Middle-
ton
Donald R. Midgley
Edward G. Miller
Harry Z. Miller
Clay A. Mitchell, Jr.
Francis R. Mollitor
Howard H. Mont-
gomery, Jr.
George S. Morrison
Jay C. Moss
Vincent U. Muirhead
Walter P. Murphy,
Jr.
Arthur J. Myers
Sherman Naymark
Charles E. Nelson
John R. Newland
Wayne M. Newport
John W. Newsom
John T. Nichols, Jr.
George H. Nolte

William J. North
Mohl C. Norton, Jr.
James A. Oliver, Jr.
John F. O'Malley
John W. Palm
Grant A. Palmer, Jr.
Burton L. Parke
Elwin A. Parker
Franklin F. Penney
Ray O. Penrod
Ramon M. Perez
Brewster Phillips 2d
Richard J. Pierce
Robert E. Plaut
Moffatt R. Plaxco, Jr.
Arnold G. Plemons
David P. Polatty, Jr.
Clare C. Poole
Frank H. Price, Jr.
Lewis B. Pride, Jr.
Welby N. Pugin, Jr.
Donald F. Quigley
Charles M. Quinn, Jr.
Robert W. Ramage
Alan Ray
John M. Reade
Edward W. Rebard
Joseph E. Reedy
Gerald M. Reeves
John W. Reeves, 3d
William H. Rein-
hardt, Jr.
Wallace J. Richard-
son
Roland Rieve
Francis A. Riley
William P. Robert-
son, Jr.
Theodore S. Roder-
ick, Jr.
William B. Rodman
4th
William J. Rogers,
Jr.
William H. Rowen
James V. Rowney
David M. Rubel
Frederick J. Ruder
Marvin B. Ruffin
Charles W. Rush, Jr.
Frank M. Sanger, Jr.
Lowell C. Savage
Howard R. Schoen-
baum
Bleeker P. Seaman,
Jr.
Walter F. Seedlock
Robert L. Settle
Tully Shelley, Jr.
Walter B. Shrout
Richard G. Shutt
Milton J. Silverman
Bruce T. Simonds
Waldo W. Simons
Harry M. Simpson
Hoke M. Sisk
Robert K. Slaymaker,
Jr.
Charles W. Smith, Jr.
Richard J. Smith, Jr.
Francis E. Somers
Pemberton Southard
Ross B. Spencer
Joseph C. Spittler
Burns W. Spore
Craig Spowers
John "C" Stanley 3d
Robert C. Starkey
Kenneth Steen
James W. Steidley
Stoughton Sterling,
Jr.
Richard L. Stewart
Robert M. Strieter
Charles G. Strum
Charles W. Styer, Jr.
Edward C. Svendsen
John Sweeney
Edward A. Taber, Jr.
Joseph K. Taussig,
Jr.

Kenneth M. Tebo
Robert E. Thomas,
Jr.
Wendell C. Thomp-
son
James R. Thomson
John B. Thro
Russell F. Trudeau
Charles P. Trumbull
Edwin A. Tucker
Robert E. Tugend
Thomas A. Turner
Powell P. Vail, Jr.
Henry D. Vanston
Harry L. Vincent, Jr.
Hubert W. Wager
Howard W. Walker
Theodore T. Walker
William C. Walsh, Jr.
Alton "J" Wana-
maker, Jr.
Melvin H. Warner
Don Watson
Maurice F. Weisner
Frank Welch, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of February 1941:

Claude H. Welch
Ralph W. Boyer, Jr.
Hensley Williams
Robert L. Schreier
Nat M. Pace
Arthur E. Holdt
Arthur M. Finkel
Manual Brilliant
Wilson E. Hunt
Vance H. Hudgins
Everett V. Alward
Earl J. Rowse
William Clay, Jr.
William M. Miller

Raymond V. Welch
James M. Werth
Herbert E. Weyrauch
Joseph C. Wheeler,
Jr.
Malcolm W. Whit-
aker, Jr.
William C. William-
son, Jr.
Russell Willson, Jr.
Robert W. Windsor,
Jr.
Hubert P. Wirth
William H. Withrow
Malcolm E. Wolfe
Thomas B. Woife
Robert K. Wolter, Jr.
Clarence C. Wright
Richard M. Wright
Norman O. Wynkoop,
Jr.
Frederick C. Wyse,
Jr.
Lloyd V. Young
Joseph C. Zirkle, Jr.

Charles E. McLean,
Jr.
Roland J. Spritzen
Wilbur L. Jobanek
Floyd Cummings
Robert L. Leasure
William T. Herring
Edward S. Dzura
Allan L. Feldmeier
Kenneth L. Brown
Francis F. Parry
Richard F. Harrison
William McReynolds

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 16, 1941, as follows:

GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO
Guý J. Swope to be Governor of Puerto Rico.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY
NOTE.—For a list of appointments in the Navy and in the Marine Corps which were confirmed today, see midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy and second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, under the caption "Nominations" in the proceedings of today.

POSTMASTERS
ARIZONA
Redmond Joseph Huddleston, Ajo.
David D. Phillips, Thatcher.
ARKANSAS
Bennie H. Lucy, Elaine
MISSISSIPPI
Samuel Mabin Davis, Guntown.
Carolyn G. Sturua, Kreole.
NORTH CAROLINA
James R. Lowry, Pembroke.
Lloyd E. Ardrey, Pineville.
TENNESSEE
Ruby Hensley, Iron City.
Albert Seaton Garrett, Knoxville.
TEXAS
Bernard H. Cartwright, Boerne.
Clyde Franklin, Rockdale.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Mont-
gomery, D. D., offered the following
prayer:

O merciful Providence, which never forsakes us! Oh, wonderful promise: "I will go with Thee all the way!" Heavenly Father, remind us that blessed is the man who has a vision of truth and reverently hears and heeds. As custodians of our democracy, with all its unspeakable experiences, in these smothering times, we pray that loyalty, fidelity, and cooperation may enter into the enduring fabric of our minds. Arm us against all indifference, all temptations, which dull the edges of conscience, which suppress the best aspirations of our Republic and defeat a free people. We praise Thee that we are singing today our birthday song of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. O Thou who art able to lead us aright, speak to us in truth, wisdom, and justice, inspiring us to be watchful, energetic, and enthusiastic, that the blackness and the pulsing pain of war may never fall upon our shores. Let us accept all the blessings which are coming to us as a free people, remembering that they come from the bountiful hand of our Heavenly Father upon earth. Abundantly and richly bless our President with strong, sturdy health. Thou who lived, walked, talked, and worked with man, give Thy counsel to our Speaker, the leaders, and every Member of the Congress, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 13, 1941, 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.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES O'CONNOR

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to formally inform the Members of the death in New Orleans, on Tuesday, January 7, last, of James O'Connor, former Member of the House of Representatives from the First District of the State of Louisiana, and a predecessor of mine from this district. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad duty for me to perform, because it is the first time that I have appeared on the floor of the House of Representatives, and it makes my heart heavy to realize that the death of a predecessor of mine should cause me to rise to my feet for the first time.

There are still many Members in this House today who were here when Jim O'Connor was here. They knew him and knew him most favorably. The Members of the House of Representatives of the United States who served with Jim O'Connor from 1919, when he came here to succeed the late Albert Estopinal as Congressman from the First District of Louisiana, until he retired in 1930, remember him for his geniality, his good humor, his eloquence as an orator, and

his superiority as a platform speaker, which brought him the affectionate title of "Creole Calliope."

Jim O'Connor gave 40 of his 70 years to public life. He was self-educated; he sold newspapers on the streets of New Orleans to provide for an education which was to take him from the halls of the State Legislature of Louisiana into this room, where sits the greatest deliberative body in the world. His public offices were many. He served as an assistant city attorney in New Orleans, and later became a criminal district judge. Following his service in the National Halls of Congress he served on the staff of the attorney general of the State of Louisiana until a few months before his death.

The name of Jim O'Connor is known far and wide. Those who met him never forgot him. Only last Tuesday night, at the Democratic congressional banquet here in Washington, I sat at a table where older Members of this Congress were gathered, and they spoke of Jim O'Connor and his days of service in the House of Representatives with an affection which comes to few men.

Everybody knew where Jim O'Connor stood. Well has the editorialist said of him, "He was a temperamental partisan in every dispute, yet always absolutely loyal to the cause of the moment." Would such tribute be paid to more of us. We may not have always been on the same side as Jim O'Connor, but at least we always knew on which side of the fence he stood. Jim O'Connor is going to be missed by those who knew him. Jim O'Connor is going to be missed and mourned by those who laughed with him and those who laughed at him, for his principles were true and his heart was warm. He needs no better epitaph.

Mr. Speaker, Jim O'Connor, your former colleague, the former colleague of many Members of this House, is dead; but his memory, I am sure, will always be with you. May you write his "virtues on tablets of love and memory."

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, those of us who served with our late friend join with our distinguished colleague in the very beautiful expression of regret and sympathy that he has just made on the passing of a great figure.

It was my pleasure to have served with him. Many Members here also served with him. He was a great legislator, a lovable character, and a very colorful figure. I join with the gentleman and the Louisiana delegation in the expression of regret upon his passing, and in extending our sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. HÉBERT. The members of the Louisiana delegation thank the gentleman for his kind expression.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of this House to insert in the Appendix of the Record two editorials published in the New Orleans States and the New Orleans Item following the death of Jim O'Connor. They bespeak the regard in which this former colleague of yours was held in the esteem of those among whom he lived. I also ask the unanimous con-

sent of this House to insert in the Appendix of the Record the story by Mr. Harnett T. Kane, which appeared in the New Orleans Item on Wednesday, January 8, following Jim O'Connor's death, and which tells more adequately the life of this unusual man who has passed to the great beyond.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include excerpts from the inaugural address of the Governor of North Carolina, Hon. J. M. Broughton; and also a resolution passed by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein statements made by Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, and other members of the Cabinet as they appear before our committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House this week and next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask for its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 61

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, to wit: Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Bartel J. Jonkman, of Michigan; and Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and incorporate therein a statement from a voter in my district on the domestic and foreign situation—Hon. Wendell L. Willkie.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WALTER REUTHER

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is commonly reported that a nest is being warmed up in the Government service for one Mr. Walter Reuther, who happens to

be as violent a "red" as was ever turned loose on the American public by Russian communism. I would like to tell my colleagues who Walter Reuther is, and what I say is taken from the record of the Dies committee.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why does not the gentleman tell us now, and what the gentleman has reference to?

Mr. COX. I have reference to his communistic activities.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. What communistic activities?

Mr. COX. The activities of Mr. Walter Reuther, covering a period of several years. If the time was at my disposal, I would be glad to make the full statement right now.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am reserving the right to object to give the gentleman an opportunity to give the House this information; because, if this is a fact, we ought to know it now. It is just as important as anything else that we can take up. I ask the gentleman if he will give us some of the facts?

Mr. COX. I will be glad to tell the whole story if the time is given me.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman has time now.

The SPEAKER. If the regular order is demanded, it might save the situation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that he may extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

INFORMATION FROM THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I present a privileged resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 37

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives all such information as he may possess, or which may be available in the Navy Department, to answer the following questions:

(1) Has the Navy Department, or any official or representative thereof, entered into any contract for the construction of anything to be used in connection with our national-defense program, and especially contracts for the production of munitions of war, tanks, aircraft, artillery, including anti-aircraft guns, warships, camps, cantonments, buildings, or structures of any kind, or furnishings for the same, which provide in substance, or are to the effect, that only members of a union are to be employed on such work?

(2) Under any contract let by the Navy Department for any of the foregoing purposes, has any contractor or subcontractor entered into any contract which in substance provides for the employment of only those men who belong to a designated organization?

(3) On any of the work above designated, has any contractor or subcontractor refused employment to any man otherwise qualified for the reason that he did, or did not, belong to a union?

(4) If, in answering the foregoing questions, it appears that men who are not mem-

bers of a union have been denied employment because they were not members of a union, when they applied for work on any defense project or in any manufacturing industry which was engaged in making materials for the national defense, give three instances where men, for the reasons stated, were denied employment.

(5) If in any instance a demand has been made that only union men be employed on the work hereinbefore referred to, by whom was such demand made, and if the information is available, was the demand the result of a vote of the membership of the union, or of some official or officials of the union?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary be read in lieu of the report.

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

The Clerk read the letter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 14, 1941.

The CHAIRMAN,
Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: House Resolution 37, requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Navy, was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for reply.

The questions propounded by the resolution are set forth below, with the answers thereto immediately following:

Question 1. Has the Navy Department, or any official or representative thereof, entered into any contract for the construction of anything to be used in connection with our national-defense program, and especially contracts for the production of munitions of war, tanks, aircraft, artillery, including anti-aircraft guns, warships, camps, cantonments, buildings, or structures of any kind, or furnishings for the same, which provide in substance or are to the effect, that only members of a union are to be employed on such work?

Answer. No.

Question 2. Under any contract let by the Navy Department for any of the foregoing purposes, has any contractor or subcontractor entered into any contract which in substance provides for the employment of only those men who belong to a designated organization?

Answer. The Navy Department has information that an agreement was entered into July 16, 1940, between the general contractors, contract NOy-4100, with the International Union of Operating Engineers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, under which the contractor agreed to employ during the life of the agreement only such workmen who are members in good standing of the International Union of Operating Engineers, and furthermore agreed to employ only members of the American Federation of Labor. It is understood that other general contractors have agreements or understandings with union labor, but the Navy Department does not have the details of such agreements or understandings. Definite information with reference thereto could only be established by communicating with each activity where contracts under the cognizance of the Navy Department are in effect. This would require some time for accomplishment. Other than the above and except as set forth in the answer to question 3 following, the Navy Department knows of no case.

Question 3. On any of the work above designated, has the contractor or subcontractor refused employment to any man otherwise qualified for the reason that he did, or did not, belong to a union?

Answer. The Navy Department is informed that the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation

has a contract with a union under which it will not retain an employee after a specified period unless he joins the union. Otherwise the Navy Department knows of no contractor or subcontractor to the Navy Department who has refused employment to any man otherwise qualified for the reason that he did or did not belong to a union.

Question 4. If, in answering the foregoing questions, it appears that men who are not members of a union have been denied employment because they were not members of a union when they applied for work on any defense project or in any manufacturing industry which was engaged in making materials for the national defense, give three instances where men, for the reasons stated, were denied employment.

Answer. The Navy Department, because of lack of information, is unable to answer this question.

Question 5. If in any instance a demand has been made that only union men be employed on the work hereinbefore referred to, by whom was such demand made, and if the information is available was the demand the result of a vote of the membership of the union or of some official or officials of the union?

Answer. The Navy Department, because of lack of information, is unable to answer this question. No such demand has been made by the Navy Department.

There has been insufficient time to submit this report to the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL, Acting.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy gives the information called for in the resolution, I move that the resolution be laid on the table; and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to insert in the Appendix a complete statement of the contracts entered into by the Navy Department with reference to the shipbuilding program, and other information about which the House may be deeply concerned.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I desire to have extended in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement by

the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mr. O. F. Bledsoe.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert therein an address by the commissioner of agriculture of my State.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation designed to extend the authority of the Secretary of State as contained in section 22 of the act of February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1210), to permit him to order American employees of the Foreign Service on statutory leave of absence at Government expense in the same manner and under the same conditions therein authorized for certain officers of the Foreign Service of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 16, 1941.

[ENCLOSURES: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER—INAUGURAL CEREMONIES—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 62

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, January 16, 1941, it stand adjourned until 11:30 a. m. Monday, January 20, 1941; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Tuesday noon, January 21, 1941.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what the program for Monday and the rest of next week will be, if he can tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only program for Monday will be that in connection with the inauguration, after which, if this resolution is adopted, the House will adjourn until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be no business on Monday except the inauguration?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

On Tuesday it is expected that two bills which have been reported out by the Naval Affairs Committee will be called up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I notice that one of those bills deals with additional cadets for Annapolis. The other deals with naval expansion, does it not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the naval-expansion bill is one of them. I understand about \$1,000,000,000 is involved in that bill. Whether the second bill is the one to which the gentleman refers I could not say.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Both of them, however, are Navy bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. Both of them are bills reported out by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

I am unable at the present time to state what the program will be for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMISSION OF MEMBERS TO OFFICIAL PLATFORM AT INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies was appointed during the last session of Congress. The Chair has had many inquiries by Members with reference to the proceedings on Monday. The Chair has been requested to announce to the House that all Members who expect to go out on the official platform will assemble here in the Chamber of the House at 11:30 o'clock Monday morning. I have been requested to state that in order to get by the police, including the marines, it will be absolutely necessary for each Member to display the official ticket in order to get his seat on the platform. Those tickets are in the possession of the Sergeant at Arms now and will be distributed tomorrow. The committee feels that this is an entirely reasonable regulation.

If a Member does not have his ticket it may be difficult for him to get his seat, for there will be no opportunity to join the procession after it leaves the House. There are no tickets available to ex-Members for this platform, inasmuch as the seating capacity is limited.

The Chair is further requested to announce that no children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

That, the Chair thinks, covers the announcement that he was requested to make.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been attacked in my representative capacity in a libelous article appearing in an issue of a magazine styling itself *The Nation* under date of January 11, 1941. I will be glad to read the portion of the article to which I refer, or I shall send it to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would prefer that the gentleman read the portion of the article to which he objects.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the article has reference to the recent report filed by the Select Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board. It is entitled "State Lies and a New Trick." The paragraph to which I have reference reads as follows:

We do not have the space at this time to disentangle and answer all the state lies and shabby calumnies reshaped in the final report of the Smith committee.

In another paragraph it is stated:

The committee's majority of three dared make no reference to the existence of a dissenting minority. To have done so might the sooner have called attention to the unprincipled way in which the report was prepared. The three members of the majority, Chairman SMITH and Representatives HALLECK and ROUTZOHN, kept the preparation of the report a secret from the two members of the minority, Representatives ARTHUR D. HEALEY and ABE MURDOCK, the latter now a Senator. These two were given no opportunity to make their own views heard. The filing of the report was delayed until 4 days before the close of the session, leaving the minority insufficient time to prepare a dissenting report. When Representatives HEALEY and MURDOCK asked the House for permission to submit their report after the close of the session they found that technical rules denied them the opportunity. The minority intends to file a report of its own in the near future, but this report will have no formal status, and the official printed record of the Smith committee will contain no indication that there was a dissenting opinion. The Nation believes that the House of Representatives owes it to itself formally to rebuke Chairman SMITH and Congressman HALLECK (Routzohn was defeated for reelection) for this sort of underhand procedure.

Mr. Speaker, that is the item to which I refer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized on the question of personal privilege.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, while I am recognized for 1 hour, I will relieve your mind by saying that I shall not occupy over 10 minutes. I have read you the portion of the article to which I take exception. Ordinarily I would pay no attention to the article itself. Members of Congress are pretty busy and we do not have time to argue with every yellow journalist who yaps at our heels.

The reason I take notice of this particular libel is because of the source by which it was inspired. The source to which I have reference and to which the article refers is a minority statement made by the members of this select committee who did not agree with the majority either in the intermediate report or in the final report. The reason I am con-

cerned about that and bring it to your attention is the statement which occurs in the minority report, as follows:

The majority did not file its report until 4 days before the close of the present session. It prepared and submitted its final report without consulting the other two members of the committee.

And further on it says:

This action makes impossible a detailed minority report at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the feature that I particularly object to is the inference carried in the statement that I and the majority members of that committee have been discourteous to our colleagues in the House. I have been here some time, and I think I have learned, as most Members learn quite early, to respect our colleagues and to never indulge in ungentlemanly or discourteous conduct toward them. I know we have our differences of opinion—and we ought to have them—but we learn early in the game to respect those differences and to treat our fellow Members with all due courtesy. So this statement having been made in a public manner, which very clearly intimates what I would regard as extreme discourtesy on the part of the majority members of that committee, I want to bring to the attention of the House, in order to keep the record straight, the exact facts relative to the preparation and the filing of the majority report.

You Members who served in the Seventy-sixth Congress will perhaps recall that last year this committee filed an intermediate report in which the majority of three members concurred and to which the same minority filed a minority report. From that time on it was quite well understood that the differences between the majority and the minority of that select committee were irreconcilable, even though friendly. I want the House to know exactly what did happen about the preparation and the filing of the majority report.

Mr. Speaker, instead of keeping the matter secret from the minority, the fact is that I personally wrote a letter to each of the minority members on the 16th day of December, which was 20 days before the time limit in which either the majority or minority report could be filed. In that letter I advised them of their rights and that unless a minority report was filed before the 3d of January it could not be filed at all under the rules of the House. I advised them that the majority report had been in course of preparation for some time and advised them further that it would follow the general outline of the intermediate report. In that letter I also suggested that if it met with the desires of the committee I would be glad to call a final meeting of the committee to discuss the report.

This was 20 days before the filing time. That letter was sent by air mail to the home addresses of the minority Members because they were both out of town. I received no acknowledgment or reply to that letter, which I intended to be a very courteous reminder to my colleagues of the minority. As soon as the majority

report was completed in its rough form, on the 23d day of December, members of the staff of this committee took to the post office in the city of Washington a letter addressed to each of the minority Members, containing a complete draft of the majority report. That letter and report were mailed on December 23, which was 12 days before the filing time. I received no acknowledgment of that from one Member of the minority and from the other Member of the minority I received an acknowledgment expressing the hope he would see me before the report was filed. In the letter sending the draft of the majority report it was stated that on a certain day, which I think was the 28th, the majority report would be filed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question as to the mailing of that letter, as to whether the postage was paid, whether the letters were franked, and whether there was a return address if not delivered?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They were sent by air mail and special delivery. There is no franking privilege connected with those services, so the postage had to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, our report was not filed 4 days before the time limit but 7 days. The report was filed on the 28th day of December and it was given publicity in all the papers of the United States on the following morning.

There is a further complaint in the minority statement that the majority of the committee did not consult the minority relative to the draft of the majority report and did not state the minority views in the majority report; and that we filed it only a few days before the expiration day. I should like to comment on these criticisms briefly.

In the first place, it has never been my conception of a committee report that the minority should participate in the drafting of both the majority and the minority reports. It is a pretty well established custom here that the majority write their report and the minority write theirs. Neither is it customary in the majority report to make reference to the minority report. The minority are assumed to be perfectly capable of speaking for themselves, and I can vouch for the fact that these two distinguished Members are certainly very capable of speaking for themselves.

As to the complaint that this report was filed only 4 days before the conclusion of the session, as far as I can learn, select committees make it the rule to file their reports approximately at the close of the session. Unless I am misinformed, this committee was the only select committee of the House that did file its report prior to the very last day of the session.

I should like to say to the House that this report of this committee, while very elaborate, contains statements of fact drawn from the record of the hearings. The report will come from the Public Printer in a day or two. I invite the attention of the Members of the House to that report. I hope you will find an opportunity to read it. If you do, you will find that where a statement of fact is made in the report there is a footnote

which will refer you to the volume and the page of the hearings from which that statement of fact was taken.

There are in the concluding portions of the report conclusions drawn from those established facts. Of course, conclusions, I admit, are always debatable; but in inviting the attention of the House to the statement of facts in that report and to the conclusions, I merely wish to urge the Members of the House who are interested in this most vital subject to read the report, verify the statement of facts from the hearings, which are largely documentary, taken from the documents of the Board itself, and then form your own conclusions as to the facts. I leave it to your judgment as to whether the majority or the minority in that committee have reached the correct conclusions upon those facts.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I should like to read the correspondence to which I have referred. The first letter, dated December 16, 1940, was addressed to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. ARTHUR D. HEALEY, and a similar letter was sent to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]. It reads as follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1940.

DEAR ARTHUR: The select committee to investigate the National Labor Relations Board must file its final report not later than noon, January 3, 1941.

I have been having the staff of the committee at work on the committee report for some time, and it has just occurred to me to remind you and ABE that January 3 is the deadline if you desire to file a minority report.

The draft of the report, as far as it has proceeded, is a recapitulation of the intermediate report and will carry a recommendation similar to the recommendation of the original report. It occurs to me that you may desire to employ some assistance in the preparation of a minority report as you did in the case of the intermediate report.

It also occurs to me that it might be desirable to have a final meeting of the committee during the last week in December, as the time is getting short.

I would welcome any suggestion from you, and I am sending ABE a similar letter and sending copies to HALECK and Routzohn on the assumption that the line-up on the final report will be similar to that of the intermediate report.

To that letter no reply was received. That was the 16th of December. Then on the 23d of December the following letter was written to both Representative HEALEY and the now Senator MURDOCK. I shall read the letter addressed to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]:

DECEMBER 23, 1940.

DEAR ARTHUR: I am sending you herewith draft of the final report of the committee appointed under House Resolution 258 to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. I expect to file the report not later than Saturday of this week.

My purpose in sending it to you is twofold: First, that you may have the opportunity to sign, if you so desire; and second, so that you may, at the earliest opportunity, have knowledge of its contents to aid you in the preparation of a minority report, in case you desire to file such a report. There will probably be some minor changes in the final draft, but the draft enclosed is substantially what the report is expected to be.

A similar letter was sent to Mr. MURDOCK. Both being out of town, we com-

municated with their offices and found the proper addresses to which the letter should be sent.

On December 26 I received the following letter from the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative HEALEY, dated December 26, and addressed to me:

DECEMBER 26, 1940.

DEAR HOWARD: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your draft of the final report.

Although I am extremely busy attempting to clean up many matters here before going to Washington for the next session, I shall do everything possible to familiarize myself with this report. I shall likely see you before the report is filed, and I shall then let you know my position regarding the same.

That was the last communication had with either of the minority members.

I do not wish in this statement to be construed as criticizing either one of the minority members. That is not my function, and I would not do it under any circumstances. My sole purpose is to clear my own skirts by putting in the RECORD the facts as they actually were. As much as I regret to have to make this statement, I do feel that I cannot keep silent while somebody, whoever it may be, undertakes to make a sidewalk out of my toes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The RECORD should show, may I suggest to the gentleman, that during this entire time from December 16 up to the time the report was filed the Congress was in session.

May I say further to the gentleman that no one who knows him would suspect that he would ever under any circumstances seek to take advantage of anyone, and no one who knows him would expect that there is a word of truth in the story taken from the Nation, which is as nasty a sheet as soils the newsstands of this country. It is fit for one thing, and it is hardly fit for that.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes of his time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not undertake to in any sense justify any article that has appeared in any magazine or periodical. My sole purpose in rising at this time is to say something with reference to the statement made by Senator MURDOCK and myself, dissenting from the report of the majority of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Act. The only part of that statement that refers to the matter of notice was contained in the first two paragraphs, and I shall read those. They are as follows:

The circumstances surrounding the issuance of the final report of three of the five members of the House committee investigating the Labor Board and Wagner Act do not, in our opinion, reflect an impartial fact-finding investigation. The majority did not file its report until 4 days before the close of the present session. It prepared and submitted its final report without consulting the other two members of the committee. Despite our previous expressions of opposition to the majority's position with respect to the National Labor Relations Board, as evidenced by our

intermediate report and subsequent statements, no mention was even made of our known disagreement.

That, of course, refers to the fact that no mention was made in the report of the majority of our known disagreement.

This action makes impossible a detailed minority report at this time.

We therefore sought special permission from this House to prepare and issue our report after the close of the session. We were denied this opportunity under the technical rules of the House. It is our intention within the near future, however, to make known in detail our conclusions with respect to the investigation of this committee, although this future report must necessarily lack formal status.

I received the letter to which the chairman has referred, the letter of December 16. At that time I was in my district, busily engaged with many pressing matters involving the welfare of my district and constituents. This letter, of course, furnished no satisfactory basis on which to write a dissenting report. Later, I believe on the day before Christmas, I received a voluminous draft report which involved thousands of pages of testimony, quoted in support of the conclusions and findings of the majority of the committee. Even though it was Christmas time, rather a busy time, I read that report. It was no small task to read, digest, and analyze a report of the proportions of that submitted by the majority, and I spent several nights until the wee hours of the morning in attempting to arrive at a sound grasp of the findings and conclusions of the majority. I venture to suggest that it was no small or easy task to prepare such a report.

The minority submitted an intermediate report of some 60,000 words documented with numerous references to the testimony. The majority had submitted a report of about 60,000 or more words previous to that time, also with a great many references to the evidence. These reports undertook to analyze all the facts and went with great detail into the testimony which had been taken by the committee. I believe it must have taken the majority 3 weeks or a month, or even more than that, to prepare its intermediate report. It took the minority 3 weeks or a month to carefully examine the evidence and testimony in order to arrive at our contentions, conclusions, and findings.

We believe a studied and carefully considered report is the type of report that this investigation merits and that this House is entitled to expect from a special committee. Manifestly, you cannot make a minority report until you have seen the majority report. You cannot dissent until you know in clear terms that from which you are dissenting. In the case of a complex report of this type, an intelligent consideration of the report requires that it be available in black and white so that the full import of its language may be studied and its findings and conclusions carefully appraised. Moreover, in deciding upon the correctness of the findings, it is necessary to compare those findings with the tremendous volume of evidence on record, and, finally, in making a minority report, it

would be necessary to implement our conclusions with exhaustive and time-consuming references to the record of the evidence developed by the committee. I submit that this is not the type of an obligation that can be faithfully fulfilled in haste or in an inadequate time.

The actual report of the majority, according to the chairman, was filed on the 28th day of December. The minority stated that this allowed 4 days, and the chairman says 7 days. Our difference in this respect arises only from the fact that the chairman counts an intervening Sunday and holiday, and we did not. But even if we call it 7 days, it certainly cannot be contended that the minority was afforded an adequate opportunity to prepare and submit a careful and documented report.

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

Mr. HEALEY. In just a moment.

Now, I am authorized to say, by Senator MURDOCK, that he failed to receive the draft of the report which was sent to him by the chairman of the committee sometime around the 23d or 24th of December. His brother and secretary stated to me before I came over here that that report was sent to Salt Lake City, which is not the Senator's address, and that it was not delivered to him until it finally came back here to Washington after the report had already been filed and the Seventy-sixth Congress had expired.

I dislike very much to enter into a controversy with the chairman or the other members of the committee. Although our views have sometimes differed, I am certain that the committee conducted hearings that were judicial and worthy of the membership of this House. There prevailed on that committee the most cordial relations. Even though there was a division of views on the committee there has always been the utmost respect for the ability and the integrity of all of the members held by each member of that committee.

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

Mr. HEALEY. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. The gentleman, I take it, is not seeking to justify this statement contained in the Record from which the gentleman from Virginia quoted?

Mr. HEALEY. I have already stated that I am not seeking to justify the statement quoted by the gentleman from Virginia and that my remarks are not intended to apply to it.

Mr. COX. And the gentleman joins with me and others in condemning those statements.

Mr. HEALEY. I have not read the article, sir, and, of course, I do not know its full content. My only purpose is to explain the position of the minority of the committee.

Mr. COX. Knowing it from the quotations given by the gentleman reading it, the gentleman does condemn it?

Mr. HEALEY. I did not hear the quotation, and I have not read the article.

Mr. COX. May I read it to the gentleman?

Mr. HEALEY. As I have already stated, the only purpose of my remarks is

to explain and amplify the statement of the minority, and I do not wish to yield for any further comment about the article.

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

Mr. HEALEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that under the technical rules of the House the minority cannot submit their views now?

Mr. HEALEY. We cannot submit them in a formal way at this time, but we hope that at some future time it will be possible for us to submit our views in some method under the rules of the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I simply want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I feel sure a large portion of the membership of the House, at least, would like very much to have the minority views of the group that has not yet submitted a report.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if and when the minority report is prepared and ready for filing I shall be very happy to ask the unanimous consent of the House that it may be filed.

Mr. HEALEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The members of the minority undoubtedly are familiar with the rule requiring the filing of a report. Is there anything in the rules that would prevent them inquiring of the majority as to when the report would be filed or what would be in it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I received no inquiry. I have told exactly everything that happened, and there is just one thing that I wish to add, and that is with respect to the failure of Senator MURDOCK to receive a copy of the report. The first letter, written on December 16, was sent to him at the address given by his office to my secretary, and I verified that this morning. Apparently he received that letter. When the time came to send the report my secretary, in order to be sure that it reached its destination, again called Mr. MURDOCK's office and was informed that the same address to which the letter of December 16 was sent was the proper address to send a copy of the report, and it was so sent.

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded everything I wish to say.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman is not stating that he takes umbrage at the statements in the views of the minority?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; except the imputation that I have been discourteous to the gentleman, and I wanted to refute that by the written record, and I think that I have done so. I have, Mr. Speaker, therefore concluded what I have

to say, and I thank the House for hearing me. [Applause.]

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

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk on Tuesday, the 21st day of January 1941, and any special orders heretofore made, I be granted permission to address the House for 25 minutes.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert an editorial by Mr. P. L. Clark, of the Norwich Sun.

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

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a sermon delivered by the Most Reverend John J. Mitty, archbishop of San Francisco.

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

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered by me before the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

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

BEANS

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the State of Michigan is one of the largest producers in the world of the so-called navy bean. The National Broadcasting Co., the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, and the Farm and Home Hour are cooperating in and promoting what is known as the national bean sales week. The restaurant of the House is very kind in providing for us daily the navy bean soup and also pork and beans, and speaking in behalf of the Michigan bean industry, as well as other States which produce dry beans, I invite the House and the Nation to join in the bean sales week, January 16 to 22, inclusive, 1941.

AIR BASES IN ALASKA

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the 1941 Army appropriations bill carried funds to

build, among other things, an air base at Anchorage, Alaska, and another one at Fairbanks, Alaska. Work was started on these bases about July 1.

Accompanied by my colleagues, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], members of my committee, we visited and inspected the different Army centers, installations, and construction projects in Alaska the first week in August. We were at the time agreeably impressed with the progress that was being made with the construction of the \$12,000,000 air base at Anchorage and the \$5,000,000 air base at Fairbanks. It was encouraging and heartening to observe the enthusiasm and determination of both the Army and the contractors. Of course, the days were about 18 or 19 hours long up there and they were putting in every minute of time to hurry up the construction.

I just received yesterday from Brigadier General Reybold, Acting Assistant Chief of Staff, the following data and information pertaining to construction of these air bases in Alaska:

(a) Anchorage—85 percent complete as of January 1, 1941; will contain 1,530,000 square feet of space for personnel; 945,000 square feet of space for other purposes. Anchorage is being provided with a 250-bed hospital, 39 recreation buildings, 2 post exchanges, a theater to seat 1,038, a laundry, ample water supply, ample heat, modern sanitary facilities. The heat, light, water, food storage, and housing for the troops are already complete for the troops that are there.

(b) Fairbanks—75 percent complete; 140,000 square feet of space for personnel; 235,000 square feet of space for other purposes. Fairbanks will provide a hospital with 15 beds, a post exchange, a recreation room, permanent barracks for 300 men, laundry, water, sanitary facilities complete. The heat, light, water, food storage, and housing for the troops has been completed to take care of the troops that are there.

At both Fairbanks and Anchorage troops have been occupying temporary barracks in increasing numbers since November 1940. Of course, you understand that the barracks and housing facilities being built by the Army in Alaska must of necessity, because of the temperature and weather conditions, be more secure and thus will cost more than the building of barracks for the same number of men down South or in warmer climates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from an editor in my State, accompanied by an article relating to the Committee on Temporary National Economics.

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

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the conclusion of other business and any special orders that may have heretofore been made, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] may be per-

mitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

THE T. V. A.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to extend my remarks.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] a few moments ago about the T. V. A. being communistic, I made this statement, and do it again, that whenever you put the Government into all kinds of business and let the Government take over the business of this Nation, then you become a communistic nation, and that is just what we are doing, and what we would do if we do the things that the gentleman from Mississippi wants done. The trouble with the gentleman from Mississippi—

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, that statement is untrue, and he knows it. I am as far from wanting communism in this country as he is. But I am for protecting the electric consumers against racketeering through exorbitant rates and watered stocks.

Mr. RICH. Well, the gentleman wants the Government in all kinds of electrical business. His many talks on the subject should bear me out in that statement. Now, if T. V. A. had an honest set-up—that is, if it paid taxes; if it charged off depreciation correct, and renewed its own property by its revenues; if it did not charge one-third of the cost to flood control and one-third of its cost to navigation, but gave an honest cost of generating the power and then charged that price to the consumer, there would be a little merit to the T. V. A.

I just received a letter today from a gentleman from Madison, Wis., which contained the following information, and I give you just two paragraphs of this letter showing that he, too, disagrees with the statements that are made in the RECORD by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. If I had his permission to insert the full letter, I would have been only too glad to do so. That not being the case, I can only make as part of my remarks these two paragraphs:

I was pleased to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your reply to Congressman RANKIN's rantings. That is the only correct characterization of his propaganda. Most of it has absolutely no basis of fact. Take for example his statement that the overcharge in Wisconsin for 1938 was \$20,858,242, according to T. V. A.'s rates. This has no basis of fact whatsoever. I answered that charge in a letter to former Congressman Hawks which he inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5697.

Mr. RANKIN's own figures of overcharges are not consistent. In his Forum debate of August 18, 1940, he stated the overcharge in Wisconsin was \$17,960,000; in his reply to Congressman SCHAFER, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3 last, he said the overcharge was \$26,000,000, and now it is still another figure. In my letter to Congressman RANKIN, printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I quoted the

exact revenues and expenses of the Wisconsin private utilities from a preliminary report of the Wisconsin Power, or Wisconsin Public Service Commission. The final report gives the following income and expenses for 1938:

Gross revenue.....	\$54,541,801
Expenses:	
Operating expenses and maintenance.....	22,964,160
Taxes.....	9,206,858
Depreciation.....	5,971,666
Total expenses.....	38,142,684
Net income.....	16,399,117

This is \$1,560,000 less than the \$17,960,000 overcharge claimed in Mr. RANKIN's debate and \$4,459,125 less than the sum he mentions in his 14 pages of propaganda in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page A10. The fact is the Congressman does not know the truth and does not want to know it. I wonder who prepares his dope sheets.

The point is, the gentleman from Mississippi does not understand how to operate a business. He does not understand that the Government must receive taxes in order to exist. He does not understand that corporations have to renew their equipment and charge off so much for depreciation, and as long as they can get the money from the Federal Treasury to renew the equipment and keep up expenses the T. V. A. can furnish cheap power and in that way make a cheaper rate than any company under the sun. In a company all the capital is not charged up to the generating of power like in the T. V. A., which charges one-third to flood control and one-third for navigation. Whoever heard of such a thing when it was put there primarily for power? I say it is a deliberate steal and nothing else to it.

Now the T. V. A. is constructing great steam-power plants. What are they doing that for? In the name of heaven, it is only making this Government communistic. That is all we are doing. The New Deal has been doing that from the start and it is time we stopped. The T. V. A. yardstick is only 1 foot long.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Presidential Anger," which appears in this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order to address the House on Wednesday, but the House was not in session. I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the disposition of the business of the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

in the RECORD in two particulars, and in one extension to include an editorial from the Indianapolis Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a short editorial from the Newark Sunday Call.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have until midnight Saturday night in which to file a report on the bill H. R. 1437.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the legislative business of the day has been disposed of and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and in one to insert an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner, and in the other a letter from myself to a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, entitled "The Road to Peace."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert an article concerning the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF WAR AIMS BY BELLIGERENTS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussion on aid to Britain which has been taking place during the last year, the American people have been proceeding without one of the most important elements necessary for an intelligent appraisal of our position. No nation can willingly and intelligently offer its assistance to any other nation without some knowledge of the purposes for which that help is ultimately to be used.

We have shipped to Great Britain destroyers, planes, and materials, and I, for one, am in favor of continued assistance to her; yet I believe that the time is now here when Great Britain should declare to the people of the United States and to the entire world precisely what her war aims are and to define in specific terms the kind of peace which a British victory would establish. I do not believe that the American people are interested in underwriting another Versailles. Let us know now before we begin in deep earnest the task of defense preparation on the huge scale contemplated for 1941 exactly what the belligerents seek to accomplish.

I have introduced a resolution which seeks to compel our national administration to discover and reveal to the American people what we may expect as the aftermath of this war. Any nation which refuses to state its war aims renders itself at once a suspect in the minds of the world. We have every reason to expect that American public opinion may express itself through this resolution to force a definite revelation of the plans of the belligerent nations. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief letter from the Brotherhood of Railway-Steamship Clerks on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the disposition of the business of the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, and in one to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune and in the other a resolution of the International Hod Carriers Union.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE GROVER CLEVELAND HALL

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a tribute by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, a valiant, brilliant, hard-hitting, but kindly, happy warrior has fallen. He fell in the front rank, facing the foes that long had felt his steel, and went down fighting merrily. The Nation should note and mourn his passing, for the Nation can ill afford to lose such a man as Grover Cleveland Hall, distinguished editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, inveterate foe of ignorance and prejudice. He had the courage and the humanity to take up the cudgels for the people of this whole country; and for the whole people, rich and poor, high and low, whoever seemed to him to be wronged. He never waited for the cause he championed to become popular. He frequently made it so.

The Pulitzer prize in 1928 crowned his fight against the then powerful Ku Klux Klan.

Alabama cares not to conceal her tears as she mourns the untimely passing of one of her native sons, in the flood tide of his power, at an age when we who loved him looked forward to decades of his fruitful service.

Alabama loved him. He loved Alabama. But he was never provincial; he loved the United States—the world.

The distinguished columnist Westbrook Pegler wrote this:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

A GREAT JOURNALIST

Grover Hall, the editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, who died last week, was one of the greatest journalists in the history of the profession or craft. This has the stuffy sound of the standard obituary tribute, but let that not be held against Judge Hall. Hold it against me and the practice of heaping floral gates ajar and lodge emblems high on the graves of departed mediocrities, which tend to cheapen superlatives. This little newspaperman was wise, brilliant, and brave, but with his wisdom and courage he stirred in an ingredient of human understanding which distinguished his fighting tracts from mere flames of anger and hatred.

He did hate the evils that he fought, the greatest of which was the brutal bigotry of the modern Ku Klux, but without sparing the evils themselves he nevertheless could spare those who were guilty of them in a way which somehow shamed them inwardly without humiliating them to the point of obstinate violence. Hate, however, was not his weapon. He fought hatred without inciting it, and, though many men were for a time aroused against him when he was fighting the Ku Klux in a focus of that strange infection, he lived to see a day when he was honored in his home town as an honor to the town and the people were proud to say they knew Grover Hall personally.

He was so much better journalist than any columnist of the New York or Washington cult that without leaving Montgomery or attempting to extend his earnings and celebrity through syndication in the package-goods trade, he nevertheless became a man of good renown, as distinguished from mere fame or notoriety, throughout the newspaper trade. I wish it were possible to say that he was popularly well known to the same extent, for his influence would have been helpful, but that wouldn't be true. Beyond his own fork of the creek he wasn't very well known outside the calling which he adorned.

All this seems to call for some example of his greatness. That I am able to quote from an autographed copy of an editorial of his called *The Egregious Gentile Called to Account*.

This was an essay on antisemitism in which Judge Hall, as he was called, began by saying that the gentle brother of the Jew, "invites and deserves arraignment before the bar of his own conscience." The turn of thought and phrase in which the judge called the gentle before the bar "of his own conscience" was an example of his wise tact by which he appealed to the honor of his defendants and won them when the lack of it might have provoked them to barn burning.

"The earth," he wrote, "swarms with men who think they are experts on Jews. Nobody attempts a critical estimate of the gentile, as a gentile. Nobody audits his balance sheet. Nobody invites him to give an account of his long unbroken stewardship as the undisputed master of the human race. * * * If the gentile could but bring himself to face his own microscope, held in his own steady, ruthless hand, the experience might save him from possible disaster which his demeanor invites. We think we do no harm to ourselves and our common institutions when, in individual social relations, we patronize the Jew. We think we are shrewd, discerning fellows when, in contemplating a citizen and neighbor who happens to be a Jew, we think of him and discuss him first as a Jew and then whatever else he may be. We attribute virtues to him as a class that are characteristic only of individuals; we attribute vices and frailties to him as a class that any man of sense should know are peculiar only to individuals, whether Jews or non-Jews.

"Thus we hound the Jew while imagining ourselves to be his friends, meaning by 'we' those of us that comprise the majority of us Americans, and could not consciously injure the Jew. * * * We forget that the fools who form our mobs may be influenced profoundly by the manners and prejudiced department of people of their own kind above them in the scale of life. * * * I have no disposition to low-rate the status of the gentile. Our political and social position are more secure. We make more money than the Jews. We know nothing of the bitterness that flavors the acrid cup of a helpless minority group. We have been so long * * * in undisputed power, politically, economically and spiritually that we have never had an opportunity to know whether in facing an invincible oppressor of our kind, we would be brave * * * I as a gentile know that if I wish I can steal, lie, murder, get drunk, or commit any other of the known indecencies, and that while I may be punished, I, instead of my kind, will be put on trial. In no circumstances would I hear that taunting phrase, 'Gentile. Catch him.'"

A great American, the Judge was whose country and profession are the better for his having lived and worked among us. And the people of Montgomery, where he fought the Klux to its face in daytime when the hoods were off, so regarded him that when he lay dying, the Governor, the men of the Advertiser staff and, in all probability, the Greek

waiter at the lunchroom with whom he sometimes argued world affairs, offered their blood for transfusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good time for everybody to know as much as can be known about what the lawmakers are thinking. If we could know what was in the back of the minds of a lawmaker we could understand sometimes his position that mystifies us.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] clarified this on the 10th of January very clearly, as appears on page 135 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota and myself. I stated to the gentleman:

The gentleman is trying to argue that the Nazi form of government is superior to the English form of government; that is the only thing that that means.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] replied:

I do not think we should kid ourselves.

I said:

I cannot follow or stay with the gentleman in that view, and that is the only thing that that argument could lead to, and that is the purpose of it in the end.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] answered:

Of course, it is.

Then I stated:

At least the gentleman speaks frankly.

So if we can get our position clearly before the people and let everybody know where we stand, then the people can understand the voice and vote they are getting in Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include an article on which I have an estimate from the Printer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Secondly, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders for the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a letter received from a constituent of mine upon the question of strikes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters from certain departments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LEND-LEASE PROGRAM

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a revision of the McCormack bill. My purpose in doing this is to call to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs certain amendments I feel should be introduced in the legislation in order to eliminate from the bill powers that are being granted that I do not believe are necessary at this time.

I have attempted to strike out the provision which would nullify both the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act, as well as other legislation. I believe if this Congress desires to change existing legislation it should bring in specific bills that deal directly with the question of the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act. I do not believe that at this time it is necessary for us to repeal these laws, but if it is to be done I think the country should be notified and the Congress should have the courage to bring in specific legislation on this subject.

I have also attempted to restrict somewhat the activities that might be carried on under the provisions of the bill. I have attempted to remove the power of the President, under the present wording, to give away, if he saw fit, the entire Navy, as well as the entire air force of our country. The President does not intend to use these powers and I do not, therefore, believe they should be incorporated in the bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a recent editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting in the Appendix a letter from Mr. Herbert Hoover.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made earlier today may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is easier to speak than it is to get an audience to listen, especially at luncheon hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman waited until we were all hungry. The choice between self-preservation and listening to the gentleman is a hard choice. I am going to stay, however.

Mr. GIFFORD. I presume some Members think lockjaw would be a good thing if certain people had it. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I have so often spoken along the line that I intend to pursue today that I presume I am anticipated; however, I have one or two matters that, I think, will be new. I did hope that the new Members on the minority side would be present, even at the lunch hour. Will you call their attention to a few of the remarks I shall make which are directed to them? I want to encourage them. We on the minority side may need encouragement, but the joy of pointing out errors is ours, after all. The mouths of the majority are closed. They cannot object. They can hardly suggest. It is the duty of the minority to point out the dangers, make worth-while suggestions, even though these should be construed by opposition leaders as partisan.

To you new minority Members, 22,000,000 people did not approve of at least the domestic policies of this administration. The South, as usual, voted as a unit because they are Democrats, not because they favored this administration. Far from it. Bait. Vast sums paid out to people who felt obligated to vote for Roosevelt for a third term. Oh, no, the majority, not the minority, in this Nation was not in accord with the domestic policies of this administration, at least. They must not claim it. It is not true.

I was greatly heartened by the voice of the Speaker, and I hope he has not left the chair. But I now notice that he has. Perhaps I can speak more freely in his absence now that I cannot disturb him. This is what he said when he assumed the gavel this year:

The House of Representatives has been my life and my love for more than a quarter of a century. I love its traditions, I love its precedents, I love its dignity. I glory in the power of the House of Representatives.

He then made a pledge, and we shall not let him forget it.

As your Speaker and presiding officer it shall be my highest hope, my unswerving aim, to preserve, protect, and defend the rights, the prerogatives, and the power of the House of Representatives.

Will he do it?

As the majority leader during the last few years, our present Speaker valiantly fought to grant enormous powers to the President which greatly lessened the dignity and powers of the House of Representatives. Relinquishing power over the purse strings and granting of blank checks to the Executive were perhaps the most important errors. Abandoning our tariff-making authority to the Executive was another humiliating sacrifice of the prerogatives of the House. The

granting of extraordinary powers to change the structural forms of the departments of Government under the reorganization bill was another abandonment of the prerogatives and even the dignity of this body. Our Speaker's attitude in the matter of the Supreme Court will be found in his brief questioning in the RECORD. He was spared from taking the leadership of the House on that occasion by the adverse action of the other Body and the failure or unwillingness of our own Judiciary Committee to report the bill out of the committee.

However, I have great respect and admiration for our Speaker's ability, his character, and lovable personality, and there is now abundant reason that he will see to it that this President of ours will be made to understand that he will not in the future regard us as his docile rubber stamps. Through the grapevine method of communication I have been told that the Executive has been fully warned by the present Speaker that certain former methods of approach will not be tolerated.

I wanted to say to the minority Members that there is a committee known as the committee to watch the expenditures of government. I am the ranking Member on the minority side. It is a peculiar assignment. The committee is never allowed to meet to investigate any expenditures. However, this is my honorarium in this Congress. As that committee does not meet, I have to take this forum, and I shall do so often if I am physically able, and discuss certain indefensible expenditures.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I always yield. May I say right here that the man who does not yield this floor when he takes it to discuss certain problems lacks courage. Before I yield to the gentleman I want to relate a rather remarkable example of courage. This, to flavor my remarks:

"How did you come out in your fight with your wife last night?"

"I had her crawling on her hands and knees to me."

"What did she say?"

"Come out from under that bed, you coward."

[Laughter.]

May I say to the new Members, do not try to hide under the bed of what you think may be public opinion at the moment. Your people are entitled to your best judgment after careful study, and you will be fooled if you think public opinion does not sometimes change suddenly, leaving you stranded. Do not hide under that bed. I beseech you to act with courage.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's feeling. The comment I want to make fits in with his reference to the gentleman's membership and honorarium on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The other day it was my privilege to visit with a man who was professor of political science when I was

in school. He has been a close student of government. He was in Washington the other day and remarked to me that he was impressed by the fact that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments seemed to have developed into an apologetic body for executive expenditures. He called attention to the act of the chairman of the committee the other day in explaining away some irregularities found by the Comptroller General. Then he made this suggestion: In the British House of Commons the committee that corresponds to this committee is a minority committee with the majority of the members on that committee assigned to the minority, and it was his conviction that if the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is ever to be really effective for controlling expenditures, it should become a minority-governed committee, regardless of what party is in power.

Mr. GIFFORD. I shall never apologize for my activity on this committee. You will find me doing all that I can to resist and expose very many indefensible expenditures.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. As a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I have not been advised of any meeting, but if we had a meeting would it be proper for that committee to learn how Mr. Jump, down here in the Department of Agriculture, who gets \$8,500, and is also a paid professor in one of the universities or colleges here, goes out and spends Government time at Government expense on side trips, lecturing? Would that come under the jurisdiction of the committee?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but that committee has hogsheads of whitewash on tap. You saw it used the other day with respect to the home-loan bank people. The majority will protect their own. You recall the old story: "So and so is a jackass." "Yes; but do not forget he is our jackass."

Mr. HOFFMAN. But if Mr. Jump did not have so many jobs, there would not be so much unemployment, it seems.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is wonderful that we should have set up such a committee with only whitewash to be used in its operations.

I must hasten on, as I have but 25 minutes, and I should require 2 hours to cover the subjects needed to be discussed and aired. But let me give you a startling statement, not of my own, but nevertheless relating to a tremendous expenditure of money—an indefensible expenditure—if you accept the statement.

Who wrote the draft bill that we passed last year? Is it a peace draft bill or is it a war draft bill? Is Hitler coming within a week or two, or a month or two? I was amazed that on yesterday the Secretary of State should say that Hitler can cross the Atlantic so easily. But let me give you an opinion, and I shall quote from high military authorities, relating to the draft bill. They claim we provided a war draft bill when we needed a peace draft bill, and this

enormous unwise expenditure is now being exposed to you, if you believe these authorities. And if you cannot believe them, I do not know whom you can believe.

Certain local draft boards may have sent perhaps four men. The men did not wait to be drafted. They just came and volunteered. These draft boards are allowed a \$150 secretary and a \$100 stenographer. The members of the board are paid for their travel and their meals. Yet they may have sent only 4 men in the last 3 or 4 months and they may be called upon to send not more than 10 or 12 more for many months. Then, before the next 1,400,000 men are called, they will be twiddling their thumbs. All they have to do is to send out a certain number of postal cards to get the draftees to come in. It is a great expense. Shall I complain about it? Should I talk about it? And they have asked the Appropriations Committee already for \$22,500,000 for 1942. During the World War more than three million men were drafted at a cost of thirty-nine millions, according to my information. Can we save some of this expense?

However, now I quote from those who know:

Under the guise of building a trained military reserve, we have committed what is probably the prize bonehead military mistake of all time.

Who originated this legislation does not concern me. I am interested only to bring to your attention a blunder which you and I committed at the instigation of the War Department, which ought to be corrected now.

I will challenge your attention by saying that if and when Hitler can subjugate England; if and when he can create the merchant transport necessary to bring sufficient of an attacking force to land and maintain a hold; if and when he can build the necessary naval escort to guide such a merchant transport; if and when he can do all this, the military reserve we have been training won't be there.

I have yet to meet the general or admiral who will admit that he can even contemplate an attack on America for years to come.

If that is so we have time to build the best kind of a military reserve, instead of the kind of an army we are about to create.

The trouble is that someone in the War Department grabbed a war plan and demanded it be made into law. Look at what we have done. We have authorized the training of hundreds of thousands of men who, before Hitler can get here, will have married and begun to raise families.

If you are I are here when Hitler pays his visit, will you stand for ordering hundreds of thousands of husbands and fathers to the battle line? What will their families live on—the soldier's dollar a day—or a Government grant?

How do I know this is going to happen? It's a law of nature. The Census Bureau takes the trouble to find out how many men are married at the various ages. Its last report is based on the 1930 census. This is what I find. At the age of 18, 2.2 percent of all the males of that age were married.

Now for the rest of the ages we are going to draft:

Age	Percent
19	5.8
20	11.6
21	19.7
22	28.2
23	37.2

Age	Percent
24	45.0
25	51.2
26	56.9
27	62.1
28	65.7
29	70.8
30	70.6
31	76.5
32	75.9
33	78.8
34	79.8
35 to 39	81.0

There is nothing in our law that says they cannot marry and just as soon as they finish their year's training they are going to do just what you and I did and our forebears did before us—they are going to marry, build a home, and raise a family.

It is going to cost \$1,000 to train each one of these men, and before they have finished one-half of their 10 years of Reserve, there will be 50 to 75 percent married and heads of families.

We will have wasted annually enough money to pay the bills for building our new Atlantic fleet, and when we have that Hitler can't get here anyhow.

We have ticketed 16,000,000 men for military service who will never be used.

We have foisted a great selective-service system on the country which will eat up our tax dollars, when an organization one-tenth its size would do a better job. Somebody has committed a prize blunder and it's our job to correct it.

We should find out that age or ages which would give us the best military reserve for the longest time. That reserve would save us literally billions of dollars, if that means anything to you.

We should ascertain from the Army, the Navy, industry, labor, agriculture, and education that age which would give us the best results and we should begin training that age. Someone in the Army which realizes its blunder suggests that it would be unfair to cause all the war losses to fall on one age. This is pure bunk. Hitler won't be here tomorrow—the Army admits that. The Regular Army with 450,000 men represents all ages. The National Guard with 200,000 also covers many ages. Before Hitler comes we would have an Army of draftees which will be of the ages 21, 22, 23, and 24. And when he does come it will be time enough to clamp down on the ages 21 to 36 with the war plan which we have mistakenly made into law.

Time usually heals or effaces mistakes. Here is one that time will magnify. Unless this mistake is corrected, we will live to damn the men who foisted it on Congress. It is a farce today—it will be a tragedy tomorrow.

I am told the major who brought this fool scheme to Congress has been jumped 1,500 files to brigadier general. Even the President has been fooled.

He had nothing to do with the framing of that; he was only a clerk there, but he pulled it out of the pigeonhole and sent it down here and we took it.

There is no place here for partisanship, no place here for excuses. We have not drafted these men yet—time enough to begin over and begin right.

I am not on the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not advising the Committee on Military Affairs. My job is to watch the Public Treasury over which I have worried much, and about which I have predicted for 8 or 10 long years. Any prediction I have ever made never came anywhere near being as bad as the results actually were. I was once called a Jeremiah, but my predictions should have been far more frightening.

Before I forget it, I want to report that the resources of our Nation are really not back of our debts. Only the Congress is back of them. We must tax and confiscate to meet the debt. We will not do it! We do not dare! Those poor, deluded people who care to loan the Government money at such a low rate of interest are only baiting us not to tax people, but to accept loans at low rates as the easiest way out.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GIFFORD. Gladly.

Mr. PATMAN. What rate of interest would the gentleman suggest that the Government pay for its money?

Mr. GIFFORD. I believe the Government should pay about what I have to pay if I am sound in my assets.

Mr. PATMAN. How much is that?

Mr. GIFFORD. When we are obliged to renew a note at the bank today we are charged 6 percent. If we are able to pay in cash we can make a bargain with them as to interest.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman believe the Government should pay 6 percent?

Mr. GIFFORD. No.

Mr. PATMAN. Four percent?

Mr. GIFFORD. Something like that, or else the people will never hold the bonds. The gentleman is very able but how dangerous he is! He wants to print money. He does not want the Nation to pay any interest on its credit. God help us on that day when this Government can print greenbacks and be depended upon to retire them when danger of inflation appears on the horizon. It would not be done! Thank God there is a due date, and some rate of interest, that the securities will have to be retired or be renewed.

Mr. PATMAN. How does the gentleman justify authorizing the banks to print the money on the credit of the Nation and not pay the Nation a penny for the use of that money?

Mr. GIFFORD. I justify it under present banking principles, and I will argue that with the gentleman any time he desires, when such time is placed at our service. The gentleman and I are as far apart as the poles on this banking business. He wants to buy in the Federal Reserve banks. He wants the President to control by politicians the money of the country.

Mr. VOORHIS of California rose.

Mr. GIFFORD. And so does the gentleman from California. I have your speech here already marked up and I wanted a few minutes today to answer it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again on that line?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman think it is better for people who represent the Government and are under oath to represent the people to have the money-issuing privileges farmed out to them rather than to selfish interests who will promote their own interests?

Mr. GIFFORD. Not when the President appoints them. You do not agree with your own man Eccles. You want a man appointed that you will agree with,

and God help us the day when this President has power to appoint members of the Federal Reserve Board with full and absolute authority to do that. They have too much power altogether now.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I suppose these two gentlemen are trying to heckle me in a way so that I will forget the things I expected to discuss in these remarks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not trying to heckle the gentleman, but he mentioned my name and I asked him to yield for one purpose. I would just like to say to the gentleman that my view of the matter is not that these powers should be vested in the Executive as the President, but rather that they should be vested in an agency of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GIFFORD. And then that agency of the United States will abdicate, as it always has, its power to the President. He has the appointive power, and they are always good little boys when they have a strong President. We could not trust them.

I have here the speech of the gentleman from California, and I have been diverted, have I not, from some of the things I was going to say? Shall I proceed with him now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I hope the gentleman will.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one thing there?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute.

Mr. GIFFORD. One minute ought to be enough to dispose of the gentleman's arguments in his speech.

One hundred percent reserves in the banks. Lend money only on preexisting money. Explain that to the House later. Such wild theories have their followers only for a time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California rose.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no; I cannot yield in 1 minute.

The gentleman wants us to buy up the stock in the Federal Reserve banks so the President shall control it. Read the gentleman's speech and study it. He is a lovable man. He is a thoughtful man. He is so thoughtful and so dangerous that they put him on a committee hunting witches, so that they would divert his attention from these banking matters which the leaders are so fearful about.

I do think highly of him, and he knows it; but he is very dangerous because he is so persuasive. I read all of his speeches. I mark them up with a blue pencil. Do listen to him. Love him, but do not believe in him. [Laughter and applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain tables which I have compiled.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include some excerpts from letters from constituents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from a highway commissioner.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Max L. Hollander, in "Brith Abraham." The article is more than two pages, Mr. Speaker, but I ask unanimous consent that I may include it as an extension of remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that about the first of September, 1940, when it had under consideration the Army housing appropriations bill, I made a statement on the floor. A clerk of the Appropriations Committee came to my office at 5 minutes to 12 and asked me to approve the Regular Army housing bill, which amounted to \$338,000,000, without a full committee meeting. I refused to do this. When I got to the floor, the House was in session, and the bill was being considered. I reserved the right to object, but finally realizing the need of immediate Army housing for the draftees, did not object. I later commented upon the fact that the committee had only one mimeographed copy of the break-down. Some of you will recall that I stated then that the costs as submitted by the Army in that break-down were excessive as compared to costs of projects which I had examined; that I wanted a further break-down, showing just what each item covered. I obtained that break-down and placed it in the Appendix of the RECORD on October 17, 1940. I stated then that I expected the Army and those responsible for the expenditures of this money to account to Congress for every dollar.

I have been working since about the first of December trying to obtain information as to just how this money is being spent. I hope to give you today some of the information which I have thus far obtained.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress there was appropriated a total of \$466,371,000 for Army housing. This was to cover the total construction costs according to Army estimates submitted to the deficiency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

I am placing into the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a statement giving the following information on 23 out of 85 projects that had been commenced prior to January 1, 1941. This statement shows:

(a) The total funds set up or available by the construction quartermaster general for each of the 23 projects. The amount set up exceeds the original estimate for each project by the quartermaster general, but is supposed to be the actual amount available from the appropriation bill for each of these projects.

(b) The statement shows the total field estimates as revised on December 31, 1940.

(c) The obligations incurred against each appropriation on December 21, 1940.

(d) The percent physical completion on the latter date: The quartermaster general's figures show that there is available for these 23 projects the sum of \$186,984,613. The total field estimate as revised on December 31, 1940, shows that these same projects will cost \$319,942,484. If not further revised upward there will be a deficit on these 23 of 85 jobs of approximately \$133,000,000, or 71 percent. Camp Blanding, Fla., has available \$13,797,000. The project will cost in excess of \$23,000,000. Fort Custer, Mich., has available \$7,644,000. It will cost in excess of \$13,000,000. Fort Devens, Mass., has available \$12,474,000. It will cost in excess of \$25,000,000. Camp Edwards, Mass., has available \$10,815,000 and will cost in excess of \$29,000,000. Fort Meade, Md., has available \$9,900,000 and will cost in excess of \$18,000,000. Fort Lewis, Wash., has available \$15,000,000 and will cost in excess of \$24,000,000, and so on.

The amount available exceeds the original estimates submitted to Congress by the Army. For instance, it was estimated that Camp Edwards, Mass., would cost \$8,229,000, which included a supplemental estimate of \$989,000. The amount available under this statement is \$10,815,000 and the field estimate shows it will actually cost \$29,000,000. A study of all the projects convinces me that there will be a deficit on this housing program in excess of \$300,000,000. While I have information on various projects all over the United States, it is impossible for one person with a limited time available to study each project and to give reasons for the deficit; neither is it possible to be absolutely accurate. The project which has had the most attention in the press and in which the differential between the estimated cost and the actual cost is greatest is Camp Edwards, located at Falmouth, Mass. I have studied this project, tried to analyze it with a view of determining just where the additional cost lies and just how this project will cost \$29,000,000 instead of the original Army estimate of approximately \$8,229,000. In view of the fact that all the projects are handled, purchases are made, wage scale fixed in the same way, I thought that an analysis of this one job might give us an idea of what happened on a majority of all the jobs. The Falmouth job was given to the contracting firm known as the Walsh Construction Co., of Davenport, Iowa. I shall give here the exact steps that were taken in

awarding the contract and carrying out of this project as an example of how this work was being done and how the jobs were being let.

HOW CONTRACTORS WERE SELECTED AND HOW JOBS WERE BEING LET

(a) The Walsh Construction Co. filed with the construction quartermaster general a statement showing its qualifications to handle Government contracts, giving information as to its financial ability, its equipment, experience, and so forth.

(b) An advisory committee of three selected the names of three contractors for each job who were presumably best qualified to do this work. They were supposed, under the rule laid down, to select the contractors, wherever possible, from the locality or State in which the project was located. The members of the advisory committee were appointed by the Secretary of War. They sent the names of three contractors selected to the construction quartermaster of the Army.

(c) A civilian employee in the Construction Quartermaster Corps, who was a civil appointee, then selected one of the three contractors to do the job.

(d) The contractor, who was in the case of Camp Edwards, the Walsh Construction Co., then took bids for subcontract work, such as electrical work, plumbing work, heating, and so forth. There was no advertising done, but the contractors could select the names of the subcontractors who bid on the subcontract.

(e) The subcontractors then submitted bids to the contractors, who opened the bids (either in the form of letters or sealed bids) in the presence of an Army officer.

(f) The contractor then submitted a list of bidders with the amount of each bid to the quartermaster general, together with his recommendation as to whom should be given the subcontracts. In case the lowest bidder was not the one recommended he would give his reasons why. The War Department, as a rule, followed the recommendation of the contractor.

CAMP EDWARDS

The original War Department estimate for Camp Edwards was \$7,240,462, which together with the supplemental estimate of \$989,000 brought the total original estimate up to \$8,229,719. The amount available, as heretofore stated, under the appropriation was \$10,815,475. The Army estimated on December 31, 1940, that this project will cost \$29,000,000. I tried to analyze and break down the actual cost and to determine just why there was this great discrepancy between the original estimate and the final cost of this project. Mr. Walsh, president of the Walsh Construction Co., was in my office on two occasions. On one occasion he had with him Mr. Harry Dugan, his assistant job manager, who brought with him records and information that I requested. The Walsh Construction Co. is an old construction firm with years of construction experience dating back to a period prior to the World War. Mr. Walsh seemed very willing to give me anything I asked for and cooperated in

every way. Mr. Harry Dugan, the assistant job manager, was very efficient; in fact, he was more than a job manager. He was a cost accountant and furnished me with much of the information which I am giving. He had complete records with him. In fact, he had worked out much of the cost information before he was in the office.

ALL COSTS PAID BY THE GOVERNMENT

All the costs, including help of every kind such as bookkeepers, timekeepers, cost accountants, stenographers, telephone operators, and so on, are paid by the Government.

ADDITIONAL COSTS OF CAMP EDWARDS Cost of utilities

The original Army estimate of the cost of utilities on this project was \$540,000. The actual cost when completed will total over \$4,000,000. The Army apparently fixed the cost of utilities at a certain amount per soldier in arriving at the total cost. The break-down of the actual cost as nearly as I can obtain it at the present time is as follows:

(1) Water system, including wells, pumping equipment, tanks, distribution mains, and service to buildings.....	\$618,000
(2) Sewer system.....	420,000
(3) Sewage-disposal plant (permanent plant was built).....	356,000
(4) General cleaning, grading, and drainage.....	262,000
(5) Electrical-distribution system (street lighting, substation, high-tension line to power company line).....	618,000
(6) Railroad connection..... (Eleven miles of railroad was built which, together with a coal storage, trestle, one temporary bridge, one permanent bridge, and one water tank, will cost, according to the contractor's estimate, \$750,000.)	560,000
(7) Thirty miles of road..... (Permanent roads were built with a gravel base ranging from 6 inches to 2 feet thick which was surfaced with black top. The subsoil was clay.)	\$350,000
(8) Truck park areas.....	344,000
(9) Telephone system.....	115,000
Total.....	3,655,000

The contractor estimates that utilities for added buildings will bring the total utility cost to at least \$4,000,000.

Purchase of lumber

First. On September 11, 1940, the procurement section of the construction division of the Quartermaster Corps purchased 34,056,500 feet of lumber at a cost of \$1,399,722, or an average of \$41.10 per thousand. The officer in charge stated that this was a very fair price, not excessive in view of the fact that it included every type of lumber including flooring, siding, and so on, and included the cost of the lumber delivered on the job at Camp Edwards. This lumber had to be hauled by truck approximately 11 miles. He stated that the price of lumber has come down since the original purchase was made.

Second. In addition to the 34,000,000 feet of lumber purchased by the Government the contractor purchased 26,000,000

feet more at a cost of \$46 per thousand delivered on the job including the drayage. The lumber was hauled by truck from a siding to the camp, a distance of about 11 miles. Mr. Walsh said the lumber ran true to grade and was of good quality. I call attention to the fact that while the Army bought the first 34,000,000 feet of lumber in September at \$41.10 a thousand, claiming to have purchased the lumber f. o. b. camp and further claiming that the lumber price had come down since the original purchase was made, the price paid by the contractor for the 26,000,000 feet was \$46 per thousand delivered at the job. The contractor claims that the War Department price was a price delivered at the siding and not at the camp; that the haulage was in addition to the \$41.10 a thousand. The distance from the railroad siding to Camp Edwards is 11 miles.

Labor

The wage scale on this job was originally fixed by the Secretary of Labor under the terms of the Bacon-Davis Act. The original decision was made on August 27, 1940. I am informed by the contractor that the original wage scale was undoubtedly the wage scale of the various unions of the vicinity of New Bedford, Mass., the city nearest to the project. New Bedford is a city with approximately 100,000 population. I have a photostatic copy of the decision and wage scale as fixed and revised by the Secretary of Labor. I do not wish to place the entire scale in the RECORD but will take the crafts which did most of the work giving the wage rate as fixed on August 27 and then the increase under the supplemental order of September 28. This is as follows:

	Per hour	Increased to—
Laborers, unskilled.....	\$0.625	(0)
Painters.....	.90	(0)
Pipe layers.....	.65	(0)
Plumbers.....	1.00	(0)
Plumbers' helpers.....	.65	(0)
Roofers.....	1.10	(0)
Sheet-metal workers.....	1.50	(0)
Structural-iron workers.....	1.50	(0)
Truck drivers:		
1½ tons or less.....	.67	(0)
Over 1½ tons.....	.71	(0)
Bricklayers.....	1.25	\$1.50
Carpenters, journeymen.....	1.00	\$1.175
Cement finishers.....	1.25	\$1.50
Electricians.....	1.00	\$1.50
Operators of power equipment, Glade graders, 40 horsepower and over.....	1.00	\$1.15
Motor graders, 40 horsepower and over.....	1.00	\$1.15
Tractors, 40 horsepower and over.....	1.00	\$1.15
Plasterers.....	1.25	\$1.50
Plasterers' tenders.....	.80	\$1.90

No change.

² Per hour.

The increase made by the Secretary of Labor on September 28 was the equivalent of a 15-percent increase in the total labor cost.

In addition to the above increase made by the Secretary of Labor, the subcontractors increased the rate of pay of electricians, sheet-metal workers, and plumbers, as follows: The original pay for the electricians, fixed by the Secretary of Labor, for a 48-hour week with overtime in excess of 40 hours, would

have been \$52 per week. The subcontractors revised the schedule up to \$84 a week, or 61.5 percent above the regular union scale at New Bedford. Sheet-metal workers would have received \$78 a week for a 48-hour week. As revised by the subcontractors they received \$90.80 a week, or an increase of 16.4 percent. Plumbers would have received \$52 per week under the original scale fixed by the Secretary of Labor, which is a union scale; revised by the subcontractors to \$90 per week, or an increase of 73 percent. The normal relation of labor to material in the total contract was 50-percent labor, 50-percent material. The subcontractors' work cost 60-percent labor, 40-percent material.

Increased labor costs due to Sunday work and overtime amounted to 8.5 percent of the total pay roll, or \$490,000, on November 30, 1940. If this same percentage was carried through the entire contract, and it undoubtedly was, there was a material increase in the cost of the labor due to Sunday and overtime work. This Sunday work and overtime work was ordered by the Government.

Mr. Dugan and I, in going over the record, agreed that of the total cost of this job of \$29,000,000 approximately 10 percent, or nearly \$3,000,000, was due to increased labor costs, as follows:

(a) The 15-percent increase by the Secretary of Labor on September 28, 1940.

(b) The increase by the subcontractors, which was as high as 73 percent above union scale.

(c) Overtime and Sunday work.

Contractors' employees

Employees of contractors who worked on the project were paid by the Government. The contractor submitted to the construction quartermaster a list of his employees, giving the annual, monthly, or weekly salary that he, the contractor, paid the employees, and also the weekly, monthly, or annual salary he proposed to pay the employee out of Government funds. For instance, the assistant job manager was paid \$173 a week, or \$7,200 a year, while working for the Walsh Construction Co. He went on the Government pay roll at \$9,000 a year, or an increase of \$1,800 a year.

Pay of various managers, superintendents, and office help

The following is a partial schedule of the weekly pay of the office force as taken from the pay roll by myself on November 16:

	Per week
Manager, assistant manager, construction superintendent, and general superintendents, each received (\$9,000 per year).....	\$173
Office manager.....	150
Purchasing agent.....	130
Personnel manager.....	100
Office executive.....	120
Secretary.....	45
Stenographers.....	30, 35
Chief accountant.....	75
Time checker.....	35
Bookkeeper.....	40, 45, 50
Telephone operators.....	35, 45
Janitor.....	30
Typist.....	25

Fixed fee

The fixed fee on the contract which the contractor received was fixed by the advisory committee. The cost of every kind, including equipment, rental, bookkeeping, and so forth, was paid by the Government in addition to the fee. In this case the fee fixed by the advisory committee on the Camp Edwards project was \$233,000 or 3.22 percent of the original estimate of \$7,240,000. The contractor feels he is entitled and expects to get an additional fee because of the increased cost of the job. The Walsh Construction Co. is incorporated under the laws of the State of Iowa, is an Iowa corporation with its main offices in Davenport, Iowa. Its capital stock is \$500,000.

The Army officials stated to me that they expected to increase the fee where there was a material increase in the amount of the contract.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I will yield a little later.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I just wanted to ask if the original contract is let on competitive bids.

Mr. ENGEL. No; it is not. The original contract is given to this man upon an estimate, pure and simple. There is no bidding at all. Those three names are selected by this advisory committee of three, who are appointed by the Secretary of War, and are civilian employees. There is no competitive bidding whatsoever. In the subcontracts they have competitive bidding, and in some instances it is on a cost-plus basis.

Rental of equipment

The equipment of both contractor and subcontractors, together with other equipment, was rented by the Government on a rental schedule fixed by the Army. The amount of rental of equipment on this job will be somewhere between \$300,000 and \$350,000 when the job is done. The Walsh Construction Co. rented some of the equipment from other parties and is being paid rental on the equipment they own according to Government schedule.

Union labor

The New Bedford local of carpenters' union had, under union regulations, jurisdiction of this job. Initiation fees fixed by the union was \$75, \$25 cash, balance with pay checks. I tried to get additional information from the union through Mr. Walsh, but so far have not been able to obtain it. Mr. Walsh states that while the union exacted a promise from each worker to join, no one was refused a permit to work because he did not have the money, if he promised to join the union. He said that the union steward told him that 50 percent of the so-called carpenters paid no dues, the other 50 percent paid various amounts. Mr. Walsh thought that he could obtain for me the number of men who actually paid dues to the union, the total amount paid, and the number of cards issued. After coming back from Camp Edwards, he told me that he was unable to get the information but thought he could get it later. If he does

so, I shall be glad to place the information in the RECORD.

Carpenters

There were approximately 10,000 carpenters working on this job at the peak. Mr. Walsh estimates that 60 to 65 percent of the men drawing carpenter's wages were not carpenters. An assistant superintendent of a southern camp informed me that he had 800 men under him, 400 carpenters and 400 helpers. This man had 25 years construction experience, having been connected with a construction building company. He estimated that less than 10 percent of the men on that job drawing carpenter's wages were carpenters.

Army overhead

The Army adds 11 percent overhead to each cost-plus job for Washington office. This is broken down as follows: (1) Four percent engineering, including consulting engineer work; (2) 2 percent Army overhead; (3) 5 percent construction quartermaster overhead and contingencies.

If the same percentage is applied to total amount spent for Army housing, it would amount to 11 percent of \$466,000,000, or \$51,126,000 for Army overhead.

The increased labor costs mentioned hereinbefore equalled 10 percent of the total cost of the Camp Edwards job, or \$2,900,000. This sum together with the 11 percent Army overhead will amount to \$6,000,000, or 21 percent of the estimated cost of \$29,000,000.

Should we have the same condition on all projects, the 11 percent Army overhead plus the labor-rate increases, if we have them, will amount to nearly \$100,000,000, or 21 percent of the \$466,000,000 Army housing program.

Number of men working

I personally examined the pay rolls of November 16 and prior dates.

On October 12, 11,017 checks were issued.

On October 19, 16,042 checks were issued.

On October 26, 20,000 checks were issued.

On November 2, 20,091 checks were issued.

On November 9, 21,929 checks were issued.

And on November 16, the latest pay roll available at the Army finance office, 21,964 checks were issued.

On November 12 and 13 some 15,000 men were not working, nearly all carpenters and daily workers. I asked the War Department for an explanation and was told that this was due to inclement weather. I obtained the weather report from the Weather Bureau for Nantucket and Boston, the nearest points to Camp Edwards, for those days and found that there was a heavy rainfall. I have before me a further statement which the Finance Division obtained for me from the Construction Quartermaster Corps. This statement shows that from October 31 to November 12 there were 17,000 men working; that is, laborers, trades—not includ-

ing office help. From November 13 to 17, the days it rained, there were 2,500 men working, including 500 carpenters. From November 18 to December 4, 14,500 men were employed, or 2,500 less than were employed during the period immediately preceding November 12. The election was November 5. I asked the Quartermaster General to furnish me a statement showing the number of men working during each week from the beginning of each of the 23 jobs which I have been studying. The figures furnished later by the Quartermaster General on Camp Edwards did not agree with the figures I quote here which the Quartermaster General furnished the Chief of Finance at my request.

Mr. Walsh stated to me that in June 1940 he contributed \$2,500 to the Democratic national campaign fund—his company purchased Democratic campaign books—and that about 2 weeks before the election he contributed \$2,500 more to a Roosevelt organization in New York State, making a total of \$5,000.

I called Mr. Walsh's attention to the fact that, according to the policy of the War Department, the contractor chosen should be chosen from the vicinity in which the project was located, which in this case was Falmouth, Mass., within 70 miles of Boston. I asked him how it happened that the Advisory Committee gave the contract to a construction company organized under the laws of the State of Iowa, with its main office in Davenport, Iowa, when there were so many construction companies in Massachusetts much closer to the job. Mr. Walsh said he did not know why his company was chosen.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I hope to have definite recommendations when I have completed the work I expect to do along this line. I have examined superficially the entire program carrying \$466,000,000 Army housing program. I have examined in more or less detail one of the largest of these projects. It would be presumptuous for me to make definite, permanent recommendations at this time or when I have so small a proportion of the facts before me. However, you will recall that I have worked on this housing program for some 4 years. Three years ago I recommended to the then Chief of Staff that the construction quartermaster work be transferred to the Army Engineering Corps. I did so because:

First. In my contacts with the Army Engineering Corps and with the work they were doing on rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, I was impressed both with the system and the efficiency of their work.

Second. This construction work is primarily technical work. It is work that should be done by the Engineering Corps. Had the Engineer Corps done this work, they would have had the experience of constructing over \$300,000,000 of Army housing which was constructed out of relief funds during the past 6 years. This experience would have been valuable when the emergency came.

Third. The Quartermaster General of the Army has all he can do in times of

war to feed and clothe the Army and do other work which the Army places upon that corps.

In December 1939, when I came back from Panama, I then made certain recommendations to the then Secretary of War and the present Chief of Staff. One of these recommendations was that all Army construction work be transferred to the Army Engineering Corps giving the above reasons. I was told that for certain reasons, which I do not care to state here, the Army could not approve a transfer at that time. I then made this statement, which I repeated time and time again since then: "If you do not want to transfer the Construction Quartermaster Corps to the Army Engineering Corps, you ought to put engineers into the Construction Quartermaster Corps; but, for Heaven's sake, stop the lawyers filling teeth and dentists practicing law. In justice to the former Secretary of War and to the Chief of Staff some engineers were then placed into the Construction Quartermaster Corps, but we still have practically the same conditions existing as before. Construction work requires trained men. It is the engineers' and architects' job; and the sooner we learn this, the sooner we are going to eliminate a great deal of inefficiency, including waste and extravagance.

May I repeat that I hope to have more definite recommendations when I complete the work as I expect to do? [Applause.]

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We established this cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis for Government contracts under both the Army and the Navy for the purpose of getting away from the old wartime system of cost-plus. It is my understanding that, especially in naval construction work, once a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis is determined on the estimated cost of the job, that is the figure the contractor with the Government must be confined to. I am interested in what the gentleman says as to whether or not that fixed fee is going to be increased—not on the estimates, but on the actual cost of the job.

Mr. ENGEL. The Army comes back and says—and obviously there is some fairness to it, I believe—that a contractor cannot go out here and do \$9,000,000 worth of work for the same price as he would do a \$29,000,000 job.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The only point I have in mind is that unless we establish some definite principle of contract relationship between the contractor and the Government we cannot expect to get efficiency in these jobs. If the actual cost is going to run way beyond our estimate and there is no controlling influence in that cost by the contractor demanding efficiency then our whole system fails.

Mr. ENGEL. If the deficit on the remainder of the program runs as high as it does on these 23 projects they are going to come in here with at least a \$300,000,-

000 deficit bill to supplement this \$466,000,000 of contracts. My honest, candid opinion is that there will be a \$300,000,000 deficiency on the National Guard and the Regular Army housing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield, would that be 90 percent?

Mr. ENGEL. It would be 71 percent on \$466,000,000.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. As the gentleman knows, I have a camp under construction 7 miles from my home. I think I can draw the picture even worse than the gentlemen has, of \$300,000,000 on top

of \$466,000,000. This cost was estimated at \$7,000,000, and it is going to cost \$18,000,000 more.

Mr. ENGEL. The estimate for Camp Edwards was \$8,229,000, and it will cost \$29,000,000. [Applause.]

The table above referred to is as follows:

Emergency troop housing—Selected projects—Estimates, obligations, and physical completion

[War Department, Construction Division, office of the Quartermaster General]

Project	Total funds available or set up by office of the Quartermaster General	Total field estimate, Dec. 31 1940	Obligations incurred, Dec. 21, 1941	Per cent. physical completion
Total.....	\$186,048,613	\$319,942,484	\$194,767,197	-----
Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md.....	5,468,134	9,887,070	6,459,459	2.0
Fort Belvoir, Va.....	6,997,745	10,316,640	5,820,910	38.0
Camp Blanding, Fla.....	13,797,675	23,167,830	13,895,800	56.0
Boston, Mass. (HD).....	2,043,156	4,328,618	2,817,253	73.0
Fort Bragg, N. C.....	22,276,569	30,994,440	18,780,726	47.0
Fort Custer, Mich.....	7,644,276	13,308,995	9,004,128	50.0
Fort Devens, Mass.....	12,474,061	25,087,108	12,824,833	50.0
Fort Dix, N. J.....	13,441,375	18,224,410	13,234,007	50.0
Edgewood Arsenal, Md.....	2,348,818	3,083,034	2,536,739	5.0
Camp Edwards, Mass.....	10,815,475	19,000,967	15,631,263	76.0
Camp Grant, Ill.....	1,076,670	8,382,150	301,720	19.0
Hancock (Sandy Hook), N. J.....	2,021,690	2,351,690	100,226	20.0
Indiantown Gap, Pa.....	7,665,600	15,670,270	10,273,355	37.0
Fort Jackson, S. C.....	13,000,000	18,374,556	9,493,432	87.0
Camp Lee, Va.....	9,622,800	12,123,520	10,811,347	22.0
Fort Lewis, Wash.....	15,032,314	24,019,070	14,510,125	60.0
Long Island, N. Y. (HD).....	943,000	1,249,050	967,250	58.0
Fort Meade, Md.....	9,941,367	18,193,010	11,731,820	35.0
Narragansett Bay, Mass. (HD).....	1,330,424	2,441,424	2,162,995	55.0
Camp Robinson, Ark.....	5,754,970	10,066,130	6,922,188	93.0
Fort Sill, Okla.....	4,675,950	8,847,882	4,527,032	60.0
Camp Shelby, Miss.....	13,055,244	18,807,200	13,688,840	90.0
Camp Wolters, Tex.....	5,471,300	12,017,420	8,271,149	7.0

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Shenandoah Evening Sentinel and two letters from people in my district with respect to the lend-lease bill.

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

There was no objection.

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.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some tables and quotations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, perhaps at this time when every conceivable agency of war propaganda, both domestic and foreign, is being used to generate war hysteria a few facts may be acceptable to those whose reason has not been dethroned by the emotionalism of the day. I turn to facts with a full real-

ization that "sentiment has never been vanquished in its eternal conflict with reason." None realizes this truth more fully than the warmongers who are in possession of the powerful agencies of propaganda; therefore, those of us who venture to present facts relating to national defense are aware of the futility of attempting to stem the rising tide of war sentiment by the use of facts. I feel it my duty, nevertheless, to keep before the Congress and the country a picture of fiscal unpreparedness of the Nation, with the hope that the inordinate waste, extravagance, and inefficiency of the Government may be stopped and our defense program be put on an orderly and efficient basis.

Almost 2 years ago the Republican minority of the House of Representatives through its committee on national debt policy had the foresight to point out:

Also of vital importance is the question of financial preparedness in event of emergency. The spending plan assumes that public indebtedness will be reduced during the period of prosperity that follows spending, but what happens if prosperity does not follow? In that event, or if a sufficient period of prosperity does not ensue during which the debt can be appreciably reduced, we will enter the next emergency, perhaps war, with the odds heavily against us. Wars are costly and should we enter a great war with an impaired credit there would be the threat of inflation to contend with from the very start. Thus a sound fiscal policy is necessary for an adequate national defense.—Report of the special committee on national debt policy, May 16, 1939, page 10.

And a year ago, through the committee on national defense, the minority declared:

Let us remember, therefore, that should we be drawn into a war of first magnitude we should have to start with a debt of at least forty-four billions, probably more, and then finance the effort on top of that debt. It is a prospect which must concern every thoughtful person in the land.

No one at this time can foresee accurately the measures we might have to employ were we drawn into war, but all of us can visualize the danger of our institutions were we forced to resort to inflation, to confiscation, and ultimate repudiation. Could our free institutions survive such a strain? Similar institutions have perished in other lands within our time. Driven to such expedients it might well be that we shall have failed actually in our defense.

Such a possibility should convince us that the most serious weakness in the armor of our national defense today is the existence of a national debt of \$44,000,000,000. There it stands, towering, ominous. Much as we should like to we cannot consider our problem solely in terms of soldiers and sailors, of divisions and battleships.—The National Defense, February 14, 1939, and March 12, 1940, page 6.

The timeliness of our warnings should now be evident to all. We are now actually confronted by a national-defense emergency with a budget badly out of balance and with a tremendous public debt that has been more than doubled by the New Deal. The New Deal has been following a policy of deficit financing that potentially is inflationary. What is worse, the New Deal desires to finance the defense program in the same inflationary way.

The New Deal has built up a tremendously high public debt that is really a mortgage on each and every one of us,

and consequently a threat to our security. How much is this Federal debt mortgage? On December 31, 1940, it was \$45,024,631,488. This was \$9,000,000,000 more than the total value of all farm land, buildings, and livestock, as reported in the farm census of 1935. If all the property in all of the States west of the Mississippi River could be sold today for its assessed value, as last reported by the Census Bureau, the total amount realized would not pay off all of this debt mortgage.

The interest on the Federal debt mortgage in 1941 will be about \$1,100,000,000, or more than \$300,000,000 in excess of the total ordinary expenditures of the Federal Government in any fiscal year prior to 1916. To pay this interest bill in 1941 will require almost all of the revenue that will be collected during the year from any one of the following taxes: The personal income tax, or the corporation income tax, or the combined taxes on liquors and tobacco. In 1942 the interest will amount to \$1,200,000,000, or more than the total public debt at the beginning of the last World War.

The Federal debt has increased rapidly in the last 7 years. On March 4, 1933, the total was approximately \$20,200,000,000. This was a per capita Federal debt mortgage of about \$163. On December 31, 1940, the per-capita debt was about \$346. In the first 7 years of the present administration, the per-capita debt has increased by 111 percent. This is the most rapid increase of debt in a like period during peacetime that has ever occurred in our own country or in any other country not afflicted by an uncontrollable inflation. That fact, as the President would say, "deserves a headline."

This is not all. In addition to the direct Federal debt of \$45,024,000,000, the Government has guaranteed bonds and notes issued by its corporations and credit agencies to a total of \$5,940,011,000. Under existing laws these corporations are authorized to issue a total of \$14,900,000,000, which will carry this guaranty, thus leaving an unissued balance of \$9,000,000,000. None of these obligations are included within the statutory debt limit of \$49,000,000,000.

There is yet another chapter in the story of the public debt. To the Federal debt must be added the State and local debt. On June 30, 1932, the State and local debt was \$19,576,000,000, representing a per capita of \$155.78. As of June 30, 1940, the total was \$19,891,000,000, equal to a per capita of \$152. Thus, in 1932, the total public debt represented a burden on each man, woman, and child of \$312.42, but in 1940 this burden was \$498. The per-capita increase has been caused entirely by the growth of the Federal debt.

This debt is a first mortgage against every citizen. All of us actually pay taxes, whether we realize it or not. Every baby born in the United States begins life with a public debt charge of \$498 against his future earnings. Every couple that marries starts housekeeping with a public debt of \$996 in addition to what they may owe on the furniture. Every family with three children is car-

rying the equivalent of a mortgage of \$2,490, or enough to pay for a modest home.

The great increase of the Federal debt, as against a stationary State and local debt, led to the following comment in the Budget message for the fiscal year 1941:

Consequently, between June 1933 and June 1940 the Federal Government will have made available for local relief, work relief, and public works the sum of \$17,000,000,000. In addition, during this same period the Federal Government increased its grants for public roads by \$1,000,000,000 over the preceding 7 years.

By reason of these Federal expenditures it became possible for the States and municipalities during this period to rehabilitate their credit, and even to reduce slightly their aggregate indebtedness. If they had continued to discharge the responsibilities that were formerly theirs to a degree commensurate with the Federal Government's effort, the aggregate indebtedness of our States and municipalities would have been increased by not less than \$18,000,000,000 and their taxes would have been enormously increased (message transmitting the Budget, January 3, 1940, p. xvi).

What this passage says is that if the States and cities had spent as much as the Federal Government did, they would have had to borrow as much to do it. This is a statement of the obvious. But there is no reason to suppose that the States would have spent that much. Later it will be shown that the Federal spending has been motivated by other considerations than the relief of need. Many States might have escaped these influences. They would not have engaged in foolish and costly experimentation. They would not have destroyed confidence by tinkering with the economic system; hence they would not have continued to create the problem they were seeking to solve. They would have handled the bona fide relief job for far less than it has cost. It cannot be correctly said, therefore, that it was necessary for the Federal Government to borrow and spend \$18,000,000,000—up to that time—in order to save the States and cities from having to borrow that much.

Obviously the reason for this rapid increase of the Federal debt has been expenditure far in excess of revenue. While tax levies have increased, the expenditures have increased still more. The record since March 1, 1933, has been as follows:

[In millions]

Period	Revenues	Expenditures	Deficit
Mar. 1 to June 1933.....	\$885.1	\$1,307.0	\$421.9
Fiscal year:			
1934.....	3,115.6	6,011.0	2,895.4
1935.....	3,800.5	7,009.9	3,209.4
1936.....	4,116.0	8,665.6	4,549.6
1937.....	5,293.8	8,442.4	3,148.6
1938.....	6,241.7	7,625.8	1,384.1
1939.....	5,667.8	9,210.1	3,542.3
1940.....	5,387.1	8,998.1	3,611.0
Total deficit, Mar. 1, 1933, to June 30, 1940.....			22,762.3
Increase of gross debt (same dates).....			22,030.0

Source: Compiled from the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury Daily Statements.

This is the record of the past accomplishments of the New Deal in the realm of deficit financing. When this country was confronted with a national-defense emergency in the spring of 1940 a public debt of \$43,000,000,000 had been amassed in conformity with a wasteful and unsound theory of public finance. We then found it necessary to enter upon a national-defense program that, according to President Roosevelt's Budget message for 1942, will cost more than \$28,000,000,000.

The level of ordinary Government expenditures has been so swollen as a consequence of unsound theories that we do not have a surplus of funds to finance our needed defense program. During the fiscal year 1941, according to the President's Budget message, defense needs will take \$6,400,000,000 and non-defense expenditures will be \$7,100,000,000. Total receipts will be \$6,600,000,000; consequently, because of the excessively high level of ordinary expenditures resulting from unsound New Deal theories, almost all of the defense program must be financed out of the deficit. As a consequence, the President estimates a net deficit of \$6,180,000,000 for 1941. In 1942 defense expenditures will amount to \$10,800,000,000 and ordinary expenditures to \$6,600,000,000, or only a decrease of \$500,000,000 over the current year. Receipts will amount to \$8,275,000,000, leaving a deficit of \$9,210,000,000. The public debt will be increased to \$49,156,972,000 on June 30, 1941, thus apparently exceeding the present statutory debt limit of \$49,000,000,000 and necessitating a further revision of it. On June 30, 1942, the public debt will reach the stupendous figure of \$58,367,005,000.

Why is it that a tremendous debt of over \$42,000,000,000 was built up by the New Deal? In President Roosevelt's Budget message of January 3, 1941, he says:

For more than 25 years the world has been in a state of political turmoil and its economies have been out of balance. This world condition is reflected in unbalanced budgets in all countries. Here the first World War, the war against the depression, the present defense program all resulted in large additions to the Federal debt. * * *

It should be borne in mind that our national debt results from war and the economic upheavals following war. These conditions are not of our own making. They have been forced upon us (p. xlii).

Thus he distinctly says that the increase in the debt that occurred in his administrations was a consequence of the depression. But let us look at several of his other recent Budget messages, and it will be apparent that not all of the deficits were a consequence of alleviating the immediate consequences of the depression.

From these messages it will appear that these large deficits have not all been accumulated to discharge adequately the Government's obligation to provide for those in need. They have been made partly in response to a theory, accepted and approved by the administration, that it is a function of government to direct the course of the national economy by its spending. This theory was explained by the President in his Budget message

for the fiscal year 1940, transmitted to Congress on January 3, 1939. After introducing a highly questionable distinction of his own invention between ordinary and extraordinary expenditures, he said of the latter:

Beyond these questions of ordinary expenditures are those which relate to the non-operating or unusual costs of government and involve extraordinary expenditures that deal more particularly with the relationship between fiscal policy and the economic welfare of the country. These questions concern Government loans, capital outlays, and relief of need. Expenditures made under these heads are of such a flexible character as to provide, through their contraction or expansion, a partial offset for the rise or fall of national income (p. ix).

The spending policy, which has produced an enormous expansion of the Federal bureaucracy and has added more than \$25,000,000,000 to the debt in 7 years, should be examined. The President's defense of the policy has been that a large part of it has gone into "investments" or into permanent additions to the national wealth.

Let us all fix that fact in our minds, so that there shall be no doubt about it and so that we may have a clear and intelligent idea of what we have been doing. We have not been throwing the taxpayers' money out of the window or into the sea. We have been buying real values with it. Let me repeat: The greater part of the budgetary deficits that have been incurred have gone for permanent, tangible additions to our national wealth (p. x).

The insidious aspect of this line of argument is its implication that the roads, buildings, and other improvements are permanent, and hence that there need be no concern about retiring the debt created to finance them. But experience tells us that while these improvements are durable, they are not permanent. They will wear out or become obsolete. In order to justify the creation of debt to finance them it is necessary to pay off that debt within the useful life of the improvements. If this is not done, the expenditures for replacement, insofar as they are financed by new loans, will lead to debt pyramiding. It will be a case of buying new horses before the dead horses are paid for. The farmer will go broke by such financing methods. How can the Nation prosper by engaging in a practice which everyone would admit to be unsound in his own case?

A different line of defense of the policy of deficit financing was attempted in the 1941 Budget message, delivered to Congress on January 3, 1940:

Those who state baldly that the Government's debt is \$42,000,000,000—and stop there—are stating a half truth calculated to make our people apprehensive. For one thing, it would clarify the public mind if it were pointed out that of the \$42,000,000,000 figure the amount incurred between June 30, 1933, and December 31, 1939, is just over \$19,000,000,000. For another thing, it would be more honest and more honorable for them to say that while one line in the National Budget shows a national debt of \$42,000,000,000, other lines indicate that the Government has \$7,000,000,000 of cash, gold available for debt redemption, and proprietary interest in Government corporations, which reduces the net debt to \$35,000,000,000.

In addition, of course, there are the billions of dollars' worth of durable, tangible assets constructed or purchased by the Government that are a real offset to the debt, though never listed as such (p. xv).

In the Budget message of January 3, 1941, there is a new attitude toward the debt that is very, very startling. President Roosevelt directly implies that the public debt will never be reduced; that it will always be with us. He said the only thing to be concerned about relative to the public debt is the ability of the national economy to pay the interest charges on the debt. His exact words are:

I understand the concern of those who are disturbed by the growth of the Federal debt. Yet the main fiscal problem is not the rise of the debt but the rise of debt charges in relation to the development of our resources.

The fight for recovery raised national income by more than \$30,000,000,000 above the depression depth. In the same period the total annual Federal interest charges increased by \$400,000,000. Even if these interest charges increase, they can scarcely present a serious fiscal problem so long as a high level of national income can be maintained.

Investors are fully aware of this fact. The bonds of the United States Government are the safest securities in the world because they are backed by the best asset in the world—the productive capacity of the American people. Our tax burden is still moderate compared to that of most other countries (p. xiii).

Thus, since he does not contemplate the repayment of the debt, but only the payment of interest charges, the debt will continue to increase and never decrease. Interest will be paid on it until that becomes a very sizable item, and then to relieve the Government of that charge there will come repudiation, directly or through inflation.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there because I had the very paragraph the gentleman has just read in my address today, but I did not have an opportunity to comment on it. The gentleman states that the President does not intend to pay the principal, only the interest.

Mr. REED of New York. That is all. Mr. GIFFORD. I was going to put in there, and I will put it in now, if the gentleman will permit, that he said, "What of our national debt? Don't we owe it to ourselves?"

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman may insert that.

From the viewpoint of defense, the President has not given adequate consideration to the most advantageous method of financing of the deficit. He has not apparently thought through the dangerous inflationary tendencies that will be a real potential danger to his method of financing the deficit through borrowing. He apparently does not dare bring home to the consuming public the fact that they must now make real sacrifices for defense. Of course, the President likes to make the public believe that it can have defense without giving up lipsticks and ice-cream sodas, as he himself put it at a press conference late last May.

If the deficit is to be financed by borrowing, it should not be done through the sale of bonds to banks. It has been

the policy of the New Deal for the last 8 years to finance its deficits by the sale of bonds to the banks. This is evident from the following table:

Distribution of the total public debt and obligations guaranteed by the United States

Class of holder	[Billions of dollars]		
	Amount		
	June 30, 1932	June 30, 1940	Increase
Commercial and savings banks.....	6.6	19.7	13.1
Insurance companies.....	.8	6.1	5.3
Federal agencies and trust funds.....	.6	7.1	6.5
Federal Reserve banks.....	1.8	2.5	.7
Other holders.....			
Marketable issues.....	9.3	9.7	.4
Nonmarketable issues.....		2.9	2.9
Tota. debt.....	19.2	47.9	28.7

Source: Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, p. 98

There are several reasons for this. In all probability there was a real desire on the part of the New Deal to bring the banks more and more under Government control. Another reason is because it is much easier and cheaper to market bonds by coercing the banks than attempting to persuade private individuals to purchase them.

President Roosevelt has always regarded the debt as a rather insignificant problem. This same attitude is revealed in his current Budget message, especially as demonstrated by his attitude toward debt limits. On this subject he observed:

This raises the question of the debt limit. The Congress, by making appropriations and levying taxes, in fact, controls the size of the debt regardless of the existence of a statutory debt limit. If the Congress, subsequent to the establishment of a statutory debt limit, makes appropriations and authorizations which require borrowing in excess of that limit, it has, in effect, rendered that prior limit null and void. In the first 130 years of our national life, the Congress controlled the debt successfully without requiring such a limit. In view of these facts, I question the significance of a statutory debt limit, except as it serves as a fiscal monitor (p. xiii).

It is true that a debt limit is only a monitor and does not accomplish anything beyond that, but yet it has a psychological effect. It tends to keep the taxpayers' attention on the continued excess of expenditures over income. It must be admitted that under present circumstances a debt limit has little meaning because the consequences of a refusal by Congress to increase the debt limit would be many times worse than the increase in the debt limit. For if Congress does not increase the debt limit, the President could finance the Government through his tremendous power to inflate the currency by further devaluing gold, by monetizing silver and devaluing it, and by issuing greenbacks. This would be highly dangerous, for it would be inflation of the worst order. Such is the terrifying alternative forced upon Congress by its unwise delegation of power to the President.

In the current Budget message the President proudly boasts that industrial

recovery that has arisen because of armament expenditures makes it very easy to pay the interest charges on the national debt.

The defense program dominates not only the expenditure side of the Budget but influences also the expected revenue. Economic activities and national income are rising to record heights. From a higher national income a greater revenue will flow, although in the case of most taxes there is, of course, a time lag. The revenue for the fiscal year 1941 will reflect some of the increase in defense activities; the revenue for the fiscal year 1942 will be affected to a larger extent; but the full impact will not be felt before the fiscal year 1943 (p. x).

He again refers to the increase in the national income resulting from rearmament:

The fight for recovery raised national income by more than \$30,000,000,000 above the depression depth. In the same period the total annual Federal interest charges increased by \$400,000,000 dollars. Even if these interest charges increase, they can scarcely present a serious fiscal problem so long as a high level of national income can be maintained (p. xiii).

This is very, very strange since only a few years ago he referred to profits made from armaments as "fool's gold" and he compared an economy founded on armaments to a "house of cards." At Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, he said:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality (the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vol. 5, p. 290-291.)

And at Buenos Aires on December 1, 1936, he asserted:

We know, too, that vast armaments are rising on every side and that the work of creating them employs men and women by the millions. It is natural, however, for us to conclude that such employment is false employment; that it builds no permanent structures and creates no consumers' goods for the maintenance of a lasting prosperity. We know that nations guilty of these follies inevitably face the day when either their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbors or, when an unsound economy, like a house of cards, will fall apart (same, p. 606).

In this Budget message President Roosevelt definitely shirks one of his major obligations under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. Section 202 (a) of this law provides:

If the estimated receipts for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the Budget, on the basis of laws existing at the time the Budget is transmitted, plus the estimated amounts in the Treasury at the close of the fiscal year in progress, available for expenditures in the ensuing fiscal year, are less than the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the Budget, the President in the Budget shall make recommendations to Congress for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate action to meet the estimated deficiency.

Now, in the light of this, what are his recommendations for financing the deficit of \$9,000,000,000?

There is no agreement on how much of such an extraordinary defense program

should be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis and how much by borrowing. Only very drastic and restrictive taxation which curtails consumption would finance defense wholly on a pay-as-you-go basis. I fear that such taxation would interfere with the full use of our productive capacities. We have a choice between restrictive tax measures applied to the present national income and a higher tax yield from increased national income under less restrictive tax measures. I suggest, therefore, a financial policy aimed at collecting progressive taxes out of a higher level of national income. I am opposed to a tax policy which restricts general consumption as long as unused capacity is available and as long as idle labor can be employed.

We cannot yet conceive the complete measure of extraordinary taxes which are necessary to pay off the cost of emergency defense and to aid in avoiding inflationary price rises which may occur when full capacity is approached.

However, a start should be made this year to meet a larger percentage of defense payments from current tax receipts. The additional tax measures should be based on the principle of ability to pay. Because it is the fixed policy of the Government that no citizen should make any abnormal net profit out of national defense, I am not satisfied that existing laws are in this respect adequate.

I hope that action toward these ends will be taken at this session of the Congress (pp. xi, xii).

Here, then, it would appear that he shirks the obligation imposed upon him by law. He makes no positive and specific suggestions.

Thus, today, the United States faces a most significant crisis in its affairs with its Government finances deplorably and dangerously out of order. What is worse, the President does not even seem to realize that financial preparedness is an integral part of military preparedness. The truth of this is evidenced by the course of events in England during the last 16 months. [Applause.]

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

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I yield. Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman recited how large the per capita debt is and recited that a couple starting out in life would have a certain debt and a baby born into the world would have a certain debt. Does not the gentleman think it would be fair to all concerned to also estimate the per capita wealth and state that this baby that has a \$400 debt would also have \$4,000 in wealth?

Mr. REED of New York. I think it would be absolutely useless and not in any sense instructive to do so. In the light of the squandering program being carried on today there will be no wealth. The wealth will be confiscated and the people will have to start over again, and free government will be destroyed under the very policies you are advocating. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is recognized.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I ask that my special order be put after the other special orders for today?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

JAN BATA AND THE BATA SHOE CO.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in these days of turmoil when the condition of the world is fretful and frightful and we hear so much about the danger to our Nation I feel it both fitting and proper that I should call attention to a situation that is very disturbing to me practically within the dome of the Capitol.

Without question Hitler is the most hated man of all time. He has cut a bloody swath across the face of Europe with a callous indifference for humanity. Attila the Hun of an earlier day I know would admire this dictatorial aggressor who threatens our very civilization. We are painfully aware of the military advances of the dictators and are worried about them. What we are less aware of and what constitutes a greater menace to us are his more insidious methods by means of the propagation of his hideous ideology and by the economic penetration of our lands and the lands of our friendly neighbors to the south. These are underhanded devices that do not meet the eye. These are things that I wish to discuss now.

When Jan Bata, Czech shoe king, came to this country in the summer of 1939 he posed as a refugee from the Hitler terror, just a shoemaker. Of course we took him to our breasts in sympathy. It was only after he began wholesale violation of our laws in the plant he built at Belcamp, Md., that any of us became suspicious of his anti-Hitler pose. Following complaints of law violations against Bata, several investigations were made by various Government departments. Of these investigations, I understand never made public outside of official proceedings, a certain magazine has this to say:

They show that Hitler gives Bata complete freedom from Nazi domination in the conquered lands and helps him in all possible ways. They show that although Bata pretends to be an American concern and exploits the power and prestige of our Government he actually serves Hitler's interest. In the course of so doing Bata uses powerful connections high in the business and political life of our Nation.

After having given this most thorough consideration I have come to the conclusion as many others have that Jan Bata is not a refugee from Hitler. Rather from the facts I have he seems to be a Hitler agent. In fact, there is no doubt in my mind that Bata's claim of poverty is false. He is the unquestioned dictator of a tremendous industrial empire sprawling through 46 countries on 5 of the 6 continents. This tremendous industrial empire seems to find a place of strategic military importance such as Singapore, Malta, Panama, Hawaii, the Philippines, the Indies, and Indochina. In all these places you will find Bata. His retail stores I am told total 10,000 and a conservative estimate of the value of his many operations is approximately \$300,000,000. Although footwear is the basic product this concern also makes rubber and rubber products such as automobile tires, gas masks, synthetic

yarns, machinery, lime, cement, hosiery, and motion pictures. No, Bata is not poor as he professed to be when he came to this country sometime ago. His empire is one of the world's wealthiest.

In fact, there is nothing American in Bata's conduct. It has been shown that in his Belcamp, Md., establishment there has been repeated violations which undermine our laws. The sweatshop labor practices which he carries out and cut throat competition are a menace to both labor and industry. I am told that it is threatening the very foundation of the vast shoe industry in this Nation. Both labor and industry condemn him. I might say his contempt for Americans is shown by reason of his having Czechs unpack machinery at Belcamp, Md. When asked by Labor Department officials why he had Czechs unpack the machinery he stated that if he did not he would have gotten "junk, not machinery." I believe the worst mistake we could make about Bata is to believe him a refugee from the Nazis.

We are all aware of the fact that Hitler does not ordinarily allow German marks out of German territory or money to be withdrawn from German-controlled territory unless it is in the interest of nazi-ism. However, from investigation I am reliably informed that from Bata's European holdings which were either in German-controlled territory or German-conquered countries holdings were withdrawn notwithstanding regulations. In fact, in round figures it is shown that there was practically \$2,500,000 brought into the United States within a period of about 18 months. Let me say further that it is common knowledge that the Nazis have been pushing machinery exports to get foreign exchange. Bata admits that 95 percent of his machinery at Belcamp, Md., comes from his plants abroad or from Moenus Co., a Nazi outfit located on Frankfort-on-Main.

We all know of Hitler's economic aspirations in the Western Hemisphere which has become a menace in South and Central America. Bata seems to be interested at the moment in our neighboring democracies in this hemisphere. The most recent available information shows that he has operations in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Curacao, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, Peru, and the Virgin Islands. In some of these countries his representatives have wrangled special concessions such as permission to set up large rubber plantations and you know how much Hitler needs rubber today. His Panama manager is reputed to be a pro-Nazi. His Brazilian factory has a strange location, a situation that I will discuss more fully at a later date. Bata's factories in South America were supplied with machinery from European holdings, and as I said the Nazis have been pushing machinery exports to get foreign exchange.

I believe it will be of interest to our Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations with South America who just released information about the connections of some of the representatives of American concerns in South America with Nazi propagandists to check up on George Plihal, Bata's South American

manager. A peculiar and menacing thing to me is that this strange refugee Bata should select Belcamp, Md., as a site for his American plant. Belcamp is in Harford County, a county noted for agricultural products but not an industrial county. Bata admitted to the Department of Labor that it is not near either his source of raw materials or his market for finished shoes. It is far from an adequate supply of skilled labor, far from the centers of our shoe industry. I am firmly convinced of Bata's Nazi connections and I believe his selection of Belcamp for the location of a factory with 2,200 acres of ground, rather more than a plant requires, should be looked into. I say this because it is particularly strategically located in a military sense. Mark this well, it is located on Chesapeake Bay, about 20 miles north of Baltimore. During the last war a German submarine, the *Deutschland*, crossed the Atlantic and stopped at Baltimore. The bay is navigable to this point. The Bata plant straddles all systems of communications between New York and Washington. It is between the Pennsylvania and Baltimore Railroads, which border it. It is on United States Route 40 and a few miles to the east of United States Route 1, the two roads which are of strategic importance. Both railroads cross the Susquehanna River at Havre de Grace about 10 miles north of Belcamp. Slightly to the north of Havre de Grace is Conowingo, the giant hydroelectric project which supplies electric power to the Philadelphia area, a focal point in the national defense. United States Route 1 crosses the river across this dam. The Army proving grounds and the Edgewood Arsenal, a chemical warfare station, are each within 5 miles of the plant. About 10 miles southwest of Belcamp is the giant Glenn L. Martin aircraft factory, one of the most important airplane plants in the United States. Bata told Government officials that he selected Belcamp for his plant because of its "nature," but it is just the nature of this location that concerns me. It has been brought to my attention that a Department of Justice investigation concluded that there was no evidence to establish that the Bata Shoe Co. or its affiliates are at the present time being engaged in subversive activities here, but there is considerable evidence indicating that Jan A. Bata and officials of the Bata organization in the United States are persona grata with the present German Government. Further, there is every reason to believe that the Bata organization in this country is a part of the Nazi economic plan for trade expansion and that the Bata Co. and its affiliates serve as a source of foreign exchange for Germany. I feel very deeply about this and especially because of the strategic location of this plant. There should be a thorough investigation of everything surrounding this man and his organization. I believe that the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and the Department of Labor have done a very fine piece of work so far, but there is a question in my mind as to whether or not we have sufficient legislation upon the statute books of this

Nation to handle properly such subversive elements. We cannot afford to take chances. We must be completely informed and prepared. It is my intention to go more fully into this situation and to determine from the shoe industry and the leather industry just what effect this friend of Hitler's has upon American industry and upon American labor.

Might I close by saying that it might be of interest to all to read excerpts from a story in the current issue of Click magazine entitled, "Nazi Shoes on American Feet." Incidentally, if this concern should get control of the American shoe industry it wouldn't be stretching the imagination too far to think that Hitler's organization could so develop a shoe as to cripple the feet of American youth and you know that the feet of American soliders are very important in time of need. I almost forgot to tell you that some of the heels used in the shoes manufactured at Belcamp, Md., are imported from Germany because they are marked "made in Germany," but they are placed in the shoe when manufactured in such a manner as to hide the German mark.

Let us look into this in the interest of our own defense and for our own protection.

[From Click, February 1941]

NAZI SHOES ON AMERICAN FEET—HITLER'S FOOT-SOLDIER—THE SENSATIONAL STORY OF JAN BATA'S UNAMERICANISM

(By Harold Weisberg)

Hitler's onrushing legions were almost in Zlin. Jan Bata, Czech shoe king, paced the runway beside his waiting airplane, nervous and worried. Then an auto dashed into the airport and screeched to a stop beside him. Tenderly he lifted out his only son, sick little Jan, Jr., carried him into the plane, raced the motor a few times, and zoomed off into the east. In a few hours he landed in Bucharest, Rumania, safe from the Nazi terror.

This was on March 15, 1939. Four months later he landed in New York, "just a shoemaker without a nickel," a refugee.

Free America, which annually consumed 6,000,000 pairs of his shoes, held promise of a bright future for Bata. On his 2,200 acres at Belcamp, Harford County, Md., about 20 miles northeast of Baltimore, construction had begun on a shoe factory and plans were drawn for five more. He wanted for nothing, and his family was comfortable.

Maryland's farmers welcomed him and treated him with respect. Hitler's enemy was their friend. He told them of his plans, how he would give their sons work.

Thus began the career of America's strangest refugee

For a while everything went well * * *. Bata's * * * lawyer arranged to bring into the United States Czech "experts" and "instructors" for the Bata plant. Then one summer morning some had their first doubts about Bata. Every member of the graduating class of the high school in Aberdeen got a booklet entitled, "Bata, Key to Success." It said Bata wanted inexperienced boys and girls. He would teach them not only how to make shoes but aviation and "mechanical, chemical, and electro-engineering." After working all day, they would go to his school at night. Under the Bata plan, they would have "as little unutilized leisure time as possible," and would live at the plant under the command of tutors who would supervise their private lives. For this Bata would take back all but \$2.47 of their \$12.60 weekly salaries. Parents must promise not to interfere with the school's methods. They

must agree in advance to their children's being sent anywhere in the United States or "to various * * * remote parts of the world." The six-page application even demanded personal information; property holdings, income, politics and personal data about close relatives.

"See the world with Bata," said the booklet, but the countryside thought the plan rather Hitler-like. "Bata, Key to Success" or "Key to Bata Success," they wondered.

Their protests reached the town council and Bata was forced to give up the idea of regimenting local youth.

By this time Bata employees, forced to labor longer than the law permitted, for small pay on a fast assembly line, tried to organize a branch of the shoe worker's union. Union organizers who came to Belcamp from Washington were threatened.

That's how the story of America's strangest refugee came to the attention of the Government. The union representatives made formal charges against Bata. Several investigations were ordered. He was charged with infractions of child-labor law—the first case of its kind in the State; of repeated violation of the wage-hour law, and compelled to pay back wages and fines; and of abusing the immigration laws.

These investigations, never made public outside of official proceedings, developed some startling facts. They show that Hitler gives Bata complete freedom from Nazi domination in the conquered lands and helps him in all possible ways. They show that although Bata pretends to be an American concern and exploits the power and prestige of our Government, he actually serves Hitler's interest. In the course of so doing Bata uses powerful connections high in the business and political life of our Nation.

The author has conducted his own investigation of Bata and has found that his claims, almost without exception, are fraudulent. Government files, especially those of the State, Labor, Justice, and Commerce Departments, are full of information about him. These documents should see the light of day. Some are here reproduced.

Bata's claim of poverty is false. He is the unquestioned dictator of a tremendous industrial empire sprawling through 46 countries on 5 of the 6 continents. Find a place of strategic military importance—Singapore, Malta, Panama, Hawaii, the Philippines, the Indies, Indochina—and there you will find Bata. His retail stores total 10,000. A conservative estimate of the value of his many operations is \$300,000,000. Although footwear is the basic product, they also make rubber and rubber products (such as automobile tires), gas masks, synthetic yarns, machinery, lime, cement, hosiery, and motion pictures. No; Bata is not poor. His empire is one of the world's wealthiest.

There is nothing American in Bata's conduct. His numerous and repeated violations undermine our laws. His sweat-shop labor practices and cut-throat competition are a menace to both labor and industry. Both condemn him. His contempt for Americans is shown by his reason for having Czechs unpack machinery; if United States citizens did the job, he'd have gotten "junk, not machinery."

The worst mistake we could make about Bata is to believe him a refugee from the Nazis.

Ordinary people go to concentration camps for taking a few marks out of the German territory. Not Bata. From his European holdings, regulations notwithstanding, he brought \$2,500,000 into the United States in 18 months.

The Nazis have been pushing machinery exports to get foreign exchange. Bata admits that 95 percent of his machinery at Belcamp comes from his plants abroad or from the Moenus Co., a Nazi outfit.

No Nazi product is too small for Bata to use. Recently he used German-made "ersatz" heels.

Some of Bata's activities have been scrutinized by the Department of Justice in connection with immigration matters. * * * About 100 [Czech workers] entered the country, many with their families, while bona fide refugees starved in Europe. The first 23 to present themselves at Ellis Island hadn't even complied with the terms of the permits. * * * They became visitors to the World's Fair. They then attempted to legalize their entry by calling themselves "inventors, engineers, executives, and experts."

Each of these Czechs, who were to instruct Americans, was supposed to have 5 years of experience. Nonetheless, among 71 who arrived in August 1939 was a 16-year-old girl, 2 were 17 years old, 2 were 18 years old, 44 were under 30, and all were under 40.

Some of these aliens have left. The Department of Justice recently ordered 59 others deported because they were workers, not teachers.

All of this has had a profound effect on Belcamp. The simple folk who welcomed Bata as one of them are now against him. Bitterly they point to issues of the local paper—Bata's—and show where he advertises his miserable salaries. One week the best-paid "girl" got \$15.88 and the best-paid "boy" \$16.68.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (Republican, of Massachusetts) denounced the company as un-American. Her life was mysteriously threatened. Department of Justice agents, concerned about the same thing, concluded Bata was "very much persona grata" to the Nazi top dogs, but "not at the present time" engaged in activities that could overthrow our Government. It is clear that Bata is a menace. He has Nazi affiliations. Something ought to be done about it.

A year ago legislation authorizing an investigation of Bata was demanded, but it was pigeonholed. Such an investigation is necessary. To any authorized committee Click will gladly present copies of the documentary evidence supporting this story.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CONSTRUCTION OF CARGO VESSELS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am convinced that the national interest demands that immediate steps be taken upon an emergency basis to provide against the effect upon the United States of a possible world shortage of cargo vessels.

Therefore I feel that there should be undertaken with the least possible delay the construction of not less than 200 steel cargo vessels, suitable for use in the present emergency and of such type and design as will permit of their most rapid construction.

Such a program of emergency shipbuilding should be entirely distinct from the long-range construction program with which the United States Maritime Commission is proceeding under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, and interference with that program, as well as interference with the naval construction program, must be avoided. Additional shipways and other necessary shipyard facilities for the building of these emergency cargo ships should therefore be provided,

so far as necessary, specifically for that purpose, in the simplest possible manner and in the shortest possible time. Title to such special facilities should in most instances vest in the Government, but the managerial abilities of private contractors must be utilized to the utmost in the construction of facilities and ships. By making use of the experience and administrative facilities of the Maritime Commission and by clothing that agency with appropriate authority, the contemplated emergency program can be handled most effectively and expeditiously, and without the creation of any new or special governmental agency.

Because of the urgency of the situation, and after consultation with the Office of Production Management with respect both to the necessity for immediate action and to the coordination of this ship construction with other phases of the national-defense program, I have already allocated to the Maritime Commission the sum of \$500,000 from the emergency fund for the President contained in the Military Appropriation Act, 1941, and have authorized the Commission to enter into contracts for these purposes to the extent of \$36,000,000 under the contractual authority contained in said appropriation. An immediate appropriation is necessary for the payment of such contracts, and the proposed resolution provides that the appropriation contained therein shall be available for their liquidation and other expenditures pursuant to this program.

The Commission estimates that the total cost of this program will be \$350,000,000. The \$313,500,000 provided in the attached joint resolution, together with the \$500,000 allocated from the emergency fund for the President, and the \$36,000,000 which will be available on July 1, 1941, for the payment of obligations incurred under authority already provided, will make up this amount.

In view of the emergency, I ask your immediate and favorable consideration of the attached draft of joint resolution.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 16, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order granted, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONGRESS SHOULD ADOPT A POLICY THAT WILL STOP THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT FROM ISSUING INTEREST-BEARING SECURITIES AND THEREBY SAVE OVER \$3,000,000 A DAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] made a very interesting statement a while ago about the per capita debt.

He stated that the per capita debt was approximately four or five hundred dollars—I do not recall exactly the amount at this time. The last time I investigated the per capita debt I also investigated the per capita wealth of the country, and I discovered that the per capita wealth was about ten times, or was at that time, the per capita debt. So this poor child that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] spoke so feelingly about, who would be born today and have a \$400 debt upon its back immediately, will not be in such terrible con-

dition, after all, if it inherits at the same time \$4,000 in per capita wealth with which to pay that \$400 per capita debt.

And the poor married couple starting out in life with a per capita debt of \$500 each, whatever the amount was, or \$1,000 for the couple, if the couple inherited ten times that amount, \$10,000, at the same time, would not, I believe, be in such terrible or horrible condition as the gentleman from New York describes.

I agree with the gentleman from New York that we should keep down expenditures as much as possible and should certainly prevent waste and extravagance, but I do not believe that the national debt has reached such a great and staggering proportion as he has endeavored to outline to us.

Regarding the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] awhile ago, let me comment upon that briefly. He said that the Government should pay the same rate of interest that other people pay for money. When I asked him for a reply as to what amount the rate should be, he finally said that he believed 4 percent would be a fair rate. I am sorry that I find myself in disagreement with my friend from Massachusetts, but, as he told you, we have often differed on the committee upon which both of us sit. He believes one way and I believe the other way, and I believe that we are both honest in our views. The reason that I say the Government should not pay interest upon its obligations is this: We have farmed out to a private corporation the greatest privilege that exists. Of course, it is not called a private corporation and many people believe that it is owned by the National Government, but it is not. I refer to the Federal Reserve Banking System, and we have given to that System the great power of issuing money on the credit of the Nation. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have the power to issue money and regulate its value, but away back over 100 years ago a policy was established, and has been continued ever since, by which this great privilege—the greatest of all privileges—worth billions of dollars a year, has been farmed out to institutions that are owned by private commercial banking institutions. That did not amount to a great deal when our national debt was a million dollars or \$2,000,000 or even a hundred million dollars. It was insignificant; it was nothing; but during the World War our debt became quite large, and now our national debt is much higher than it ever was before. So that now it is a big problem because we are paying \$3,000,000 a day interest upon our national debt every day in the week and Sunday, too.

If I am correct in my assertion that it is wrong for the Government to pay interest upon its national debt, or to issue interest-bearing obligations of this Government, then we are spending \$3,000,000 a day foolishly and uselessly.

In other words, we are extravagant and wasteful to the extent of \$3,000,000 a day. Let me pursue that argument a little further. The Federal Reserve Banking System issues to the banks the money that they need. How will the bank obtain or secure these Government

bonds that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] says the Government should pay interest upon, amounting to 4 percent? Let us say that a sale of bonds is going to be made and the commercial banks all subscribe. One bank subscribes for a million dollars' worth of those bonds and the Government sells to that bank a million dollars' worth of United States bonds. Does the Government collect a penny? Not a penny in the world. Does the bank pay anybody for those bonds? No. The commercial bank gives the Government credit upon its books for a million dollars and thereby creates a million dollars out of thin air or by a bookkeeping operation. That is exactly what happens, and if there is anyone in my presence who wants to dispute that I shall be glad to yield now.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois rose.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman want to dispute that statement?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to dispute the gentleman's first statement.

Mr. PATMAN. But I am talking about that statement.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Would the gentleman take them up one at a time?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, take the one I have in mind. I want the gentleman to take the one that the bank credits a million dollars on the books of the bank in favor of the Government and thereby creates a million dollars. Is that right or wrong? I yield for that purpose.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But I am not going to give the gentleman an answer on that, just on that question.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, I shall challenge that statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is not the bank that creates that credit, but it is the policy of the Treasury Department to create that credit.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the bank gives the Treasury credit upon its books for \$1,000,000 and it thereby creates \$1,000,000 which is good as either credit or money. If the bank wants the money for the \$1,000,000 in bonds it can take the bonds right back to the same Government it got them from and get the money for it. What kind of money? Federal Reserve notes. Who guarantees payment of Federal Reserve notes which circulate all the time as money? The Government of the United States. A Federal Reserve note is a mortgage upon everybody's property.

I know in times gone by people would present a logical argument that we should pay interest on our national debt. Because it would probably have a tendency to keep Congress from spending too much money. If Congress appropriated too much money and issued too much in bonds, the bonds would depreciate in value, it was claimed. People would not buy the bonds and therefore Congress could not appropriate any more or so much money.

They considered that such a policy would retard Congress in an extravagant program. A rather logical and reasonable argument they made; but that ar-

gument does not apply now, because in recent years we have passed laws which provide that the commercial banks can take those bonds to the Federal Reserve banks and get their money issued on the credit of the United States Government, 100 cents on the dollar. So it is not possible for them to lose on depreciation of the bonds as in the past. Therefore the argument that has been made in the past that all obligations should be interest bearing does not apply at this time. I would not for a moment advocate that we should pay our entire national debt with new money or new credit, but I do say that we should commence a policy which will result in the national debt eventually being paid in just that way. It will take a period of time or a period of years to do it. If we were to do it quickly or suddenly, it would upset our economic and financial system, but we can do it gradually and eventually and serve the interest of the people and save at least the \$3,000,000 a day in interest that we are now paying.

Up until the World War we did not have a high national debt. The debt was low. So when Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States he said to Congress:

As you create these debts, as you spend this money to prosecute this war, it is your duty to levy taxes sufficiently high to cause the people who profit by this war to pay the cost of the war.

That is what Woodrow Wilson said, and the Congress passed laws providing excess-profits taxes and other taxes which would have resulted in the profiteers of the last war paying the cost of that war. But when our friends on the minority at this time, came into power, as the majority on March 4, 1921, the argument was made openly and boldly that we needed a large national debt; that the insurance companies and estates and banks all needed a backlog of good Government bonds in which they had invested their surplus funds; and that we would be serving the public interest by keeping our national debt high. For that reason they advocated reducing the taxes, cutting the taxes heavily, leaving the national debt high, in order to serve the public interest. I have presented in the RECORD a number of times a table—

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will just wait until I finish this statement, I will yield.

I have presented a table which shows that if these taxes had not been repealed, which were put on under the guidance and supervision of President Woodrow Wilson, the entire national debt would have been paid by June 30, 1927. But there was no desire to pay it. It was thought then, as I have said, that the public interest would be served by keeping a high public debt.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall now be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that the then minority to which he referred—

the majority that the gentleman referred to—

Mr. PATMAN. I hope I did not make that mistake. I intended to say the minority now, who were then in power.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will remember that the party represented by the present minority in the House that was in charge of governmental matters during the period of which he speaks managed to reduce the national debt approximately \$1,000,000,000 a year for 10 years.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not agree that you managed to reduce it. You could not help but reduce it. The taxes were so high and the amount brought in was so great that you had to apply the excess on the public debt.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. But does the gentleman realize that after each reduction of taxes the Treasury receipts grew higher?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, not all the time. I do not agree to that and I do not think the record will show it.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I recommend to the gentleman that he investigate the record.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman has information along that line, it would be very enlightening to the country. I know it would be to me.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I refer the gentleman to the records of this Government.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, the question is, Should the Government pay interest on its obligations? This Government can issue two kinds of obligations. One kind is the noninterest bearing and the other kind is the interest bearing. Each obligation, whether it is interest bearing or noninterest bearing, has backing or securing it exactly the same property or the same security. There is no difference between the two.

One draws interest and the other does not draw interest. If we were to adopt a policy of issuing non-interest-bearing obligations we would adopt a policy which would eventually lead us to the use of what is known as the Government's credit, and would at the same time take away the money-issuing privileges from the private commercial banks of the country.

The charge that I desire to have the Government issue worthless printing-press money is untrue and is a red herring. I propose that the Government issue the same kind of money and credit that it now issues. The only difference would be that the Government would not pay the private commercial banks an interest rate for the use of the Government's own credit. Why should the Government pay tribute to any group for the use of its own credit? Such a thing is idiotic and although tolerated for a long time I predict it will be changed because it is so clearly wrong.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is advocating, then, more spending and greater facilities in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing so we can print the necessary money to take care of this spending spree?

Mr. PATMAN. Not one dollar more would be printed. This has no reference

to spending at all. I hope the gentleman does not take the attitude that it is perfectly all right for the great privilege of issuing money on the credit of the Nation to be farmed out to the commercial banks of the country, that it is perfectly all right for them to collect interest on it and keep it themselves in their own pockets and pay nothing to the Government for the use of that credit, but that it is absolutely wrong for the Government to issue the same kind of credit or print the same kind of money on the same printing presses for its own use and pay nothing for it.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe the Government should go on the extravagant route it has been. At the time this administration came into power the national debt had been whittled down to sixteen billion. Since this administration has come into power it has spent each year over \$3,500,000,000 more than it has taken in.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe I get the gentleman's point of view. Now, let me proceed.

Mr. RICH. I call the gentleman's attention to the President's Budget message in which he says the deficit this year will be six billion.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is getting off the subject entirely.

Mr. RICH. And that it will be nine billion next year. Every year since it has been in office it has advocated that. Is the gentleman advocating that?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am not advocating that; but I will say to the gentleman that while he is always talking about waste and extravagance why does he not point out what things are wasteful and extravagant, point them out when these appropriation bills come in, point them out on the specific items saying, "Of this item so much is wasteful and extravagant." Why does not he give us the facts so there will be no generalities?

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I called attention to that fact not less than 40 times in the Interior Department appropriation bill last year, but the gentleman voted for every one of them. [Applause.]

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know of any that the gentleman himself did not vote for. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD, in connection with the remarks I made this morning, three paragraphs of a letter I received yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Gladly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEALEY, by unanimous consent, was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

RADIO PROPAGANDA

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder that we here and our people at home can maintain any sense of balance, any clarity of vision, any ability to analyze facts clearly, amidst the deluge of propaganda that descends upon us on all sides.

Many persons rely upon the supposed impartiality of radio news commentators in the hope and belief that these, at least, are not propagandists. But now I find that the very eminent and widely heard H. V. Kaltenborn admits to being a propagandist. I submit here the text of a post-card reply from him to a respected constituent of mine who wrote him, complaining of the unneutral attitude taken in his news broadcasts:

DECEMBER 31, 1940.

MY DEAR MRS. HAYWARD: Station KFI has forwarded to me your protest against the absence of neutrality in my speeches. You are quite right; I am not neutral. Neither is the United States, of which you and I are citizens. Nothing I have ever said went as far as what the President of the United States himself said on Sunday evening. In the war between dictatorship and democracy, the United States is not neutral and no true American can be neutral. But I hope I will never become intolerant. That is the crime of which Fascists, Nazis, and Communists are guilty; and since you are fortunate enough to live in a democratic country, you have the right to tune in or tune out any broadcast you please.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. KALTENBORN.

Mr. Speaker, H. V. Kaltenborn, whose full name is Hans von Kaltenborn, is evidently paid to present his views of the news. He is paid, therefore, by his own admission, while he propagandizes the American radio public. While he is evidently an active anti-Nazi in his views, a position with which we are nearly all in accord, yet his position is such that he can easily inflame the American people into the war spirit, a position with which we are not nearly all in accord.

Mr. Speaker, the radio is a terrific instrument for swaying the public mind. Orson Welles demonstrated that to the nth degree. It seems to me that paid broadcasters should restrain themselves or else be restrained within the limits of impartial presentation of facts. When a Government official or private individual is given time on the air he is not paid to speak, and the radio station disavows responsibility for his views. But a radio company or an advertiser evidently may sponsor and pay for the emission of propaganda. In these times, when, above all, we here need to be clear-headed and the mass of people in our country need to be clear-headed, it would seem that paid news broadcasters and commentators should take special pains to eliminate all aspects of propaganda and confine themselves to facts impartially told.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having gotten that much off my chest, I wish on behalf of my constituent, who is a very highly respected woman with ancestral roots deep

in the historic and glorious past of our great country, to actively resent the indirect implication by Hans von Kaltenborn that anyone who may follow the advice of George Washington and be impartial among foreign countries or be imbued with the belief that the United States should keep out of wars in Europe is a Fascist, or a Nazi, or an appeaser, or a "fifth columnist," or any such creature with a name that has come to have a sting in it. I join in deep resentment to having such names applied by inference or otherwise from Hans von Kaltenborn, husband of Baroness Olga von Nordenflycht, or anyone else.

The blood of 10 generations of Americans who have fought to make this country free and great boils up within me in opposition to those who either directly or indirectly apply such terms to American citizens with views differing from their own.

I am happy to know that Hans von Kaltenborn is not intolerant toward others, but there are also many others who are not intolerant and are neither Fascists, Nazis, or Communists. They are solid American citizens who love and cherish their country and fear for the safety and preservation of its institutions under the impact of war, which they fear will be brought upon them by the unneutral words and deeds of others who may be equally certain that this country must save itself by joining in war abroad and who have the talent for and access to the most powerful means for propaganda yet designed—the radio.

For the RECORD, I looked up Mr. Hans von Kaltenborn in volume 21 of Who's Who, and find that he styles himself as editor, radio commentator. He states he was born in Milwaukee, Wis., July 9, 1878, the son of Rudolph von Kaltenborn and Betty (Wessels) Kaltenborn.

He received the degree of bachelor of arts, cum laude, from Harvard in 1909, and doctor of laws, University of Wisconsin, 1939. Hans von Kaltenborn married Baroness Olga von Nordenflycht on September 14, 1910. Among other experiences in his very active and eminent life, he was Harvard-Berlin exchange professor in Berlin, 1907-1908, and was traveling tutor for Vincent Astor in Europe and the West Indies, 1909-10. As radio-journalist commentator, he has covered the world. He was first sergeant, Company F, Fourth Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, Spanish-American War, 1898-99.

He is listed as being a member of the following clubs: Heights Casino; Harvard Club, Long Island, president; Harvard Club, New York; Dutch Treat Club, New York; Westside Tennis Club, Forest Hills, Long Island; Old Field Club, Stony Brook, Long Island.

Visited as correspondent, Russia and Far East, 1926-27.

Member Russian-American Chamber of Commerce delegation in Russia, 1929-34.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We have just heard read a message from the President of the United States requesting an authorization of an appropriation for the building of 200 merchant ships. Are these ships to be used for the transport of troops into the world conflict, or are they to be used for the transport of goods into war zones which will be followed by the transport of troops?

Mr. TINKHAM. We will attempt in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is now holding extensive hearings, to find that out and answer the honorable Representative from New York.

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

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we continue our present course some will have to be used to take over caskets to bring back these Americans, will they not?

Mr. TINKHAM. It might be so.

Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull have plotted against the peace and safety of the United States. They have purposely created a war hysteria and they are now projecting the United States into war. Their conduct is disloyal and traitorous.

President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull have plotted against the peace and safety of the United States by knowingly and designedly committing the United States in advance to active participation in the present wars of Europe and Asia.

As long ago as 1937 they repudiated neutrality and committed the United States to war anywhere in the world that suited them. In 1938 they committed the country to the pooling of the United States Fleet with that of Great Britain in case of war in Europe. In 1939 they committed the country to a political alliance with Great Britain in the Pacific Ocean. Shortly thereafter they took aggressive action in relation to Japan by giving notification of the abrogation of our commercial treaty with her, an abrupt and deliberate step in a program which is now leading the United States to war with Japan.

Their betrayal of the United States in committing the country to war was progressive and furtive. The American people seem yet unaware of their perfidy and treachery.

The first overt act was committed by President Roosevelt at Chicago on October 5, 1937, when, having promised the American people prosperity and finding dead ashes in his hands, and having already torn up the Neutrality Act by refusing to apply it in the Asiatic war, he stated that he proposed to "quarantine" aggressor nations all over the world. This was a further repudiation of the Neutrality Act and made war for the United States inevitable ultimately.

The second overt act was revealed by Winston Churchill in Parliament on March 7, 1938. On that date he disclosed that an agreement had been made for the pooling of the American and British Fleets in case of war in Europe. Mr. Churchill stated:

Owing to the excellent relations which have grown up with the United States of America and the fact that the United States Navy is not being allowed to fall behind British naval expansion in any way, we are, I think, entitled to measure our naval power against the naval power of European countries. We are, therefore, in a far stronger position on sea relatively to any navy in Europe, or to any likely combination of navies in Europe than we were with the much larger fleets we had in 1914.

This statement of Churchill's is taken from Hansard, official record of Parliament.

The third overt act came to light with the announcement on April 6, 1939, that the United States and Great Britain had entered into a political alliance in the Pacific by assuming "joint control" over the strategically located Enderbury and Canton Islands.

The fourth overt act was the notification given Japan on July 26, 1939, by Secretary of State Hull of the abrogation of our commercial treaty with Japan to be effective January 26, 1940.

In the meantime President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull have been at work on a propaganda campaign of hate and fear. It is they who are largely responsible for the unreasoned war hysteria which now grips the United States and which is driving the country to war and a totalitarian dictatorship.

Such war hysteria and its progression have been admirably described in the following language:

I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful, as usual, will shout for the war. The pulpit will, warily and cautiously, object—at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the Nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, "It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the antiwar audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still as one with those stoned speakers, as earlier, but do not dare to say so. And now the whole Nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.

My mouth is one that shall not "cease to open" as long as breath remains in my body. I oppose this carefully planned involvement of the United States in war, the cynical flouting of international law on the plea of expediency, and the totalitarian dictatorship bill just proposed to Congress by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State

Hull. The whole conduct is reprehensible. I charge that President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull have betrayed the American people and have been disloyal and traitorous to the United States, its integrity, its Constitution, its institutions, its traditions, and its safety. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND THE WAGE-HOUR LAW

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the objectives of the Wage Hour Act was to limit the hours of employment so as to lessen unemployment. It was thought, too, that the the health and the efficiency of the workers would be promoted if they were not continuously employed an excessive number of hours. There is merit in both of these objectives.

These two objectives of the act are rendered difficult of attainment if a practice now followed in the District with reference to the operation of motor vehicles is continued. The practice to which reference will be made also endangers the safety of the public.

Information from the Hack Inspector's office of the Metropolitan Police Department, received this morning is to the effect that around 75 Federal or District employees, men who have regular jobs, are under license operating motor vehicles in the city of Washington.

The press has called attention to the appalling number of serious accidents and deaths which have recently occurred in the District because of the negligent operation of motor vehicles.

At least two of the three members of the Board of Revocation and Review of Hacker's Identification Licenses have endeavored to stop this practice but the Board of Commissioners of the District has on several occasions caused a license to be issued after the Hacker's Bureau had rejected the application.

All realize that the driving of a motor vehicle in the traffic of Washington requires full possession of the faculties, good judgment, and a high degree of skill. It matters little what skill may be possessed by a driver or how good his judgment if his senses have been dulled, his body fatigued by work performed prior to the driving.

It is difficult to understand how a District or Federal employee can work at his regular job 6 or 8 or more hours per day; then, when the time comes for him to relax and rest, take on the extremely difficult nerve-racking job of driving a taxi or motor vehicle through the streets of Washington.

Young men vigorous and in good health may be able to do it for a short time but, if they drive continuously, Mother Nature will catch up with them and the result is quite likely to be an accident or some other driver forced into a course which results in an accident.

This practice of giving men who receive their compensation from Federal funds the opportunity to hold a job which some unemployed man might hold or to come in direct competition with Washington taxi drivers, who at the best earn little enough and which also creates a source of danger to the public, I regret to say is sanctioned and apparently approved by the Railroad Retirement Board; by the Federal Works Agency; by the United States Post Office; by the executive office of the President; by the United States Government Printing Office; by the United States Department of Commerce, and by the United States Department of the Interior.

I attach hereto copies of letters on the subject.

If an accident by any one of these drivers for whom this Federal employee or official of the United States Government stands sponsor occurs because the man so recommended as a licensee for the driver of a motor vehicle is overworked, a degree of responsibility rests directly upon the public official giving such endorsement.

A bill introduced by me today will aid in promoting the efficiency of the licensed drivers of motor vehicles and the safety of people within the District.

The letters above referred to are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, December 16, 1940.

Sgt. R. A. WALKER,
Chief Hack Inspector,
Department of Vehicles and Traffic,
District of Columbia, 462 Indiana
Avenue NW.

DEAR SIR: Work after office hours would in no way handicap Mr. Alexander Bolker for work in this Bureau and if compatible with rules and regulations it would be satisfactory to grant him a license to operate a taxicab.

G. B. WETZEL,
Chief, Division of Machine Tabulation.

NOTE.—The above applicant was required to appear before the Board of Revocation and Review of Hacker's Identification Licenses. The Board rejected his application on a vote of 2 to 1. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia reversed the ruling and a license has therefore been issued to the said Alexander Bolker.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,
BUREAU OF GENERAL CONTROL,
Washington, December 7, 1940.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that the Railroad Retirement Board has no objection to Mr. Ernest H. Boggs, an employee of the Board, driving a taxicab and holding an identification card therefor.

W. C. TOWER,
Director of Personnel.

NOTE.—The above applicant for a license to operate a public vehicle was required to appear before the Board of Revocation and Review of Hacker's Identification Licenses. The Board voted to reject his application, the vote on same being 2 for rejection and 1 for approval. The Board of Commissioners

reversed the recommendation of the Board in this case, and a valid license to operate a public vehicle is now held by the applicant.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1940.

Mr. CHARLES M. SOMMERVILLE,
Public Buildings Administration.

This is to notify you of the following action concerning your employment:

Nature of action: Permission to accept outside employment.

Position: Guard and special policeman.

Grade: CU-3

Salary: \$1,260 per annum.

Division: Office of building manager.

Section: Arlington group.

Headquarters: Washington, D. C.

Departmental or field: Departmental.

Remarks: To drive taxicab in spare time.

L. C. GARDNER,
Personnel Officer.

NOTE.—The above applicant for a license to operate a public vehicle, Charles M. Somerville, was required to appear before the Board of Revocation and Review of Hacker's Identification Licenses. The action of the Board in this case was to reject Somerville's application to drive a public vehicle. This action was reversed by the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, and the applicant has at this time a valid public vehicle operator's license.

The vote of the Board of Revocation in the above case was 2 for rejection and 1 for approval.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1940.

OFFICE OF THE HACKING INSPECTOR,
DEPARTMENT OF VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is written at your request through one of our employees, Wylie Darris Nelson, who states that he has applied for a hacker's license.

It is our understanding that while a Federal agency is not legally responsible for the activities of its employees outside of official Government hours, such activities must not interfere with the performance of the employees' regular duties nor be inimical to the interests of the Government.

This will advise that there is no administrative regulation of this Board that would prohibit Wylie Darris Nelson being granted such a permit.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. DAKE,
Administrative Assistant.

NOTE.—The applicant named in the above letter, Wylie D. Nelson, was required to appear before the Board of Revocation and Review of Hacker's Identification Licenses due to his criminal and traffic record; and due to the fact that this man's record is not good, together with the fact that he is now gainfully employed, the Board voted rejection on his application, which action has been upheld by the Commissioners, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES POST OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1940.

Office of the Postmaster.

Mr. Squire R. DANIELS,
Carrier, You Street Station,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry of this date you are advised that this office has no objection to your employment as a taxi driver as long as there is no interference with your employment as a letter carrier in this office.

Respectfully yours,

V. C. BURKE,
Postmaster.

NOTE.—The name "V. C. Burke" is stamped to above letter. In the above case, Daniels'

application for a license to operate a public vehicle was rejected by the Board of Revocation and Review of Hacker's Identification Licenses, said action being upheld by the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1940.
Office of the Public Printer.

Mr. JAMES A. BROOKS,
1029 Park Road NW., Washington, D. C.

SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 1 requesting authorization from the Government Printing Office to apply for a hacker's identification card in order that you may operate a funeral car outside of office hours.

Your request is approved with the definite understanding that the above-mentioned private enterprise will not in any way interfere with the performance of your duties as an employee of this office.

Respectfully,

H. H. WRIGHT,
Chief Clerk.

NOTE.—At the last hearing before the Board of Revocation and Review on the application of James A. Brooks for a public vehicle operator's license, the Board voted to reject his application, two for rejection and one for approval. The Commissioners, District of Columbia, upheld the recommendation of the board in this instance.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS,
Washington, November 15, 1939.

Address reply to:
National Bureau of Standards.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am informed that Mr. Stephen H. Bowden, who is a watchman at the National Bureau of Standards, is desirous of securing a cab driver's permit.

I have no objection to offer against the issuance of such a permit.

O. L. BRITT,
Superintendent of Plant.

NOTE.—The above-mentioned applicant, Mr. Stephen H. Bowden, was granted a license to operate a public vehicle in November of 1939 and again in November 1940, after filing an application for the renewal of his license. He is now the holder of a valid license.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 22, 1939.

Mr. WASHINGTON E. BOXLEY,
2304 Champlain Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Reference is made to your letter of March 3, requesting to be advised whether any objection would be interposed to your obtaining a permit to drive a funeral car while not on duty as a guard with the National Park Service of this Department.

No objection will be interposed to your engaging in such employment provided it does not interfere with the proper performance of your duties as a guard on the first relief (midnight to 8 a. m.).

Sincerely yours,

J. ATWOOD MAULDING,
Director of Personnel.

NOTE.—The above-mentioned applicant was issued this license and has since renewed same. He is now the holder of a valid license to operate a public vehicle. For your information, we cannot restrict the holder of a public vehicle license to drive a funeral car only. Once the license is granted, the holder

of same may operate any public vehicle, viz., taxicab, sightseeing vehicle, funeral car, ambulance, and so forth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein speeches made by the gentleman from Texas [LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON] at a banquet last September, at Dallas, Tex., honoring SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to House Resolution 62, adjourned until Monday, January 20, 1941, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

81. A letter from the Acting Commissioner of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a statement showing for each State the names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all employees of the Work Projects Administration whose compensation is at the rate of \$1,200 per annum or more; to the Committee on Appropriations.

82. A letter from the Acting Commissioner of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting the missing names of the supply-fund employees and project employees of the Work Projects Administration to be attached to a previous list of Work Projects Administration employees for Tennessee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

83. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of the Corporation's activities and expenditures for November 1940 (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

84. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill authorizing postgraduate instruction for civilian employees of the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

85. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill awarding a Navy Cross to Hector Mercado; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

86. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal sections 512, 513, 514, 515, as amended, 3744, as amended, 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

87. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill for the relief of John W. Young, Ontario, Canada; to the Committee on Claims.

88. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

89. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act providing for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service for property lost or destroyed in such service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

90. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act approved February 2, 1911 (36 Stat. 895); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

91. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 45 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

92. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of funds used by and donations to the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

93. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases under an act approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

94. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the protection of interests of the United States in matters affecting oil lands in former naval reserves for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to \$25,850 (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

95. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering activities under the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Joint Committee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of Phosphate Resources of the United States. Report pursuant to Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress, as extended by Public Resolution No. 68, Seventy-sixth Congress (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1053. A bill to authorize major alterations to certain naval vessels; with amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Resolution No. 37. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1470) for the relief of Charles J. Anderson. Committee on Patents discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (H. R. 1573) for the relief of Fay Perkins. Committee on Patents discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (H. R. 1727) for the relief of Fay Perkins, Jimmie M. Perkins, Harry Howell, Florence Howell, J. P. King, Eva King, Albert

L. Jones, and Howard L. Perkins. Committee on Patents discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2221. A bill to provide mileage allowance to the authorized attendant of a veteran reporting for examination, treatment, or care, on the basis of the mileage traveled, in advance of the completion of such travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2222. A bill to increase, up to \$50 per month, the amount of pensions otherwise payable to the widows of those deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2223. A bill to pension men who were engaged in or connected with the military service of the United States during the period of Indian wars and disturbances; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2224. A bill to increase, up to \$50 per month, the amount of pensions otherwise payable to the widows of those deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2225. A bill to extend eligibility of 90-day war, campaign, and expedition veterans for pension for permanent total non-service-connected disabilities not due to their own felonious misconduct; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2226. A bill to define misconduct for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 2227. A bill to provide for the establishment of a specialist corps in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2228. A bill to equalize the rates of pay of commissioned officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2229. A bill to establish a board of appeals and reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2230. A bill to extend eligibility for out-patient treatment in Veterans' Administration facilities for non-service-connected disabilities to war veterans who were not dishonorably discharged; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2231. A bill to provide that where the rating of disability of a veteran of the World War as to an arm or leg is equal to the rating for amputation at any level, the loss of use of such extremity shall be considered as established, for statutory award purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 2232. A bill to provide a differential in pay for night work to custodial service employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 2233. A bill to exempt certain State owned and operated carriers and employees of carriers from the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2234. A bill to provide for payments to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax receipts on account of the use of certain land by the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2235. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control projects on Fall River, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 2236. A bill to amend the Social Security Act wherein repayment may be required from recipients of old-age assistance and to prevent requiring the same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2237. A bill to repeal that portion of section 5 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, which precludes payment of the amount of compensation provided for thereunder in the event that the monthly payment of compensation and the monthly payment of insurance is equal to or more than the amount of compensation therein authorized; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2238. A bill to eliminate, as a source of potential danger in case of invasion or threatened invasion, certain gas tanks in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2239. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold by amending the Gold Reserve Act of 1934; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 2240. A bill making the last Thursday in November of each year a public legal holiday in the District of Columbia and in all places within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2241. A bill to reduce from 10 to 3 years the reserve duty liability of persons inducted into the land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2242. A bill to provide for the further development of the fish-cultural station at Spearfish, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2243. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy by providing an appointment for each congressional district on the basis of a competitive examination for sons of persons on active duty with or honorably separated from the military or naval service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 2244. A bill to provide for an increase in the pensions payable under the provisions of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, to dependent widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the World War who at time of death were suffering with any service-connected disability from \$30 to \$40 per month; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CLUETT:

H. R. 2245. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in north central New York; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 2246. A bill to create the National Resources Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2247. A bill to provide for issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to any veteran who establishes that the original has been lost or destroyed, or is being withheld or concealed from him, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 2248. A bill to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2249. A bill to provide for paying to individuals ordered into active service in, or inducted into, the land or naval forces of the United States during the present emergency the sum of \$60 upon honorable discharge or transfer to inactive duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2250. A bill providing for an additional Military Academy in the southern district in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2251. A bill to authorize percentage increases in computing the retired pay of certain retired officers of the Army for active duty performed subsequent to retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2252. A bill to remove limitations on the amount of real-estate loans insured under title II of the National Housing Act which may be made by a national bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2253. A bill prohibiting deficiency judgments in real-estate foreclosures by the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Land Bank Commissioner, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal land banks, and prohibiting an increased rate of interest after maturity, and the filing of the mortgage or obligation secured thereby as a claim against the estate of a deceased debtor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2254. A bill to provide that the priority of the United States in the estates of insolvent debtors shall not apply with respect to loans of money or advances of credit by any agency of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2255. A bill prohibiting deficiency judgments in real-estate foreclosures by Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and prohibiting an increased rate of interest after maturity, and the filing of the mortgage or obligation secured thereby as a claim against the estate of a deceased debtor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2256. A bill to increase the pay of post-office employees in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 2257. A bill to authorize the location, establishment, construction, installation, and equipment of a naval station in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2258. A bill transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter fisheries, from the Department of the Interior to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2259. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Salmon Creek, in the Territory of Alaska, in the vicinity of Juneau, Alaska, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 2260. A bill to extend indefinitely the time before which valid applications may be filed for disabled emergency officers' retirement benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2261. A bill to provide that information as to the number of overseas veterans receiving various classifications of benefits shall be included in the annual reports of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 2262. A bill to require that periodicals sent through the mails or introduced into

interstate commerce contain the name of the publisher, the place of publication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 2263. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument to the memory of former Governor Andrew Pickens; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 2264. A bill to provide for the erection of a shrine or monument to the memory of Gen. Andrew Pickens; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 2265. A bill to protect the cotton growing industry from any possible pest risk involved in the transportation of unfumigated foreign cotton over the railways and highways of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2266. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section authorizing, for the purpose of detecting or preventing crime, any investigatorial agency of the United States, when specifically authorized by the head of the department of which it is a part, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, radio, and any other similar messages or communications; and making such authorizations and communications, and testimony concerning same, admissible evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2267. A bill to lessen traffic accidents within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2268. A bill to provide uniform reciprocal hospitalization in any Army or Navy hospital for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2269. A bill to readjust the allowances of retired enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2270. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works at Council Bluffs, Iowa; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 2271. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors who are required to render military or naval service during any national emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2272 (by request). A bill to provide eligibility for pension, if otherwise entitled thereto, to the widow of any deceased veteran, if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death or if she gave birth to a child by the veteran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 2273. A bill providing for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the line of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2274. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the inclusion of domestic servants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2275. A bill to provide for the increase in certain pensions payable under section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2276. A bill authorizing the city of Keokuk, Iowa, to purchase, construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Keokuk, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2277. A bill to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2278. A bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended by the act of June 8, 1926, so as to decrease the restriction on the number of enlisted men of the Regular Army who may be detailed as students at educational institutions and other places; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2279. A bill to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2280. A bill providing additional pay for aides to the President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2281. A bill to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2282. A bill to eliminate the income limitation as to eligibility for pensions to the widows of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2283. A bill to extend eligibility for pensions to the widows and children of World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 2284. A bill to restrict the exportation of certain Douglas fir peeler logs and Port Orford cedar logs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2285. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2286. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes" approved August 25, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2287. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school district at Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2288. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2289. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2290. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of the World War under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for as to disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 2291. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on obligations of home owners to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to 3½ percent; and to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 20 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2292. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for

payment of benefits with respect to the month in which an annuitant or pensioner dies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2293. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2294. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2295. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia," approved June 22, 1936, as amended, by eliminating the provision that the judge of the district court of the northern and southern districts of West Virginia shall succeed to the office of district judge of the northern district of West Virginia upon a vacancy in the latter office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2296. A bill establishing the Post-Emergency Economic Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2297. A bill to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2298. A bill to provide night differential for certain employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 2299 (by request). A bill to provide liberalized benefits for disabled veterans and the dependents of deceased veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2300. A bill to correct the description of land added to the Bryce Canyon National Park pursuant to the act of February 17, 1931; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2301. A bill to authorize the participation of States in certain revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2302. A bill to adjust the boundaries of the Cedar Breaks National Monument and the Dixie National Forest, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2303. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1895, as amended by the act of March 1, 1919, relating to Government printing and blankbook work; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 2304. A bill to further amend the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2305. A bill providing that soldiers, sailors, and marines may send letters through the mails, free of postage, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2306. A bill to provide for the classification, according to type, of the fingerprints of all veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2307. A bill validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Con-

gress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2308. A bill to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2309. A bill to permit certain civil actions against officers of the United States to be maintained in the district in which the plaintiff resides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 2310. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain married soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 2311. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 2312. A bill to repeal certain powers of the President and Secretary of the Treasury relating to the alteration of the weight of the dollar, the issuance of United States notes, the purchase of foreign silver, and the issue of silver certificates; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2313. A bill relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2314. A bill regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 2315. A bill to provide for the establishment, administration, and maintenance of a Coast Guard auxiliary and a Coast Guard reserve; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2316. A bill to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2317. A bill providing for the establishment of a national-defense commission for the purpose of surveying the national-defense resources and requirements of the United States, including the advisability of adopting a permanent progressive national-defense policy, the establishment of a department of national defense, a national-defense planning board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2318. A bill to remove certain limitations on appropriations for the pay of midshipmen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2319. A bill to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 2320. A bill to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2321. A bill to provide for reduced interest rates on loans made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2322. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 2323. A bill to provide increases in clerical allowances at certain offices of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 2324. A bill to provide for the construction and equipment of a building for the experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Rolla, Mo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to limit reduction in acreage allotments for wheat to types of which there is no surplus; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROWTHER:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution establishing the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic National Shrine Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial building to the memory of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to redeem certain exemption or ginning certificates issued under the Bankhead Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 20 to 26, 1941, as National Humane Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACIORA:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to authorize the admission into the United States of a limited number of refugee children from Poland and other occupied European countries for the duration of the European war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to define the principle of international reciprocity in the protection of American patents, trade-marks, secret formulas and processes, and copyrights by providing a method for assuring the payments of amounts due to persons in the United States from users thereof in countries restricting international payments from their territories; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to amend section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1941, General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution establishing the Post-Emergency Economic Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to request the belligerents to inform the citizens of the United States of their war aims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. Res. 63. Resolution to provide for an investigation to determine the advisability of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes deep waterway; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 64. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to be known as the Committee on Peace; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 65. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1053, a bill to authorize major alterations to certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 66. Resolution providing for the immediate consideration of H. R. 1437, a bill authorizing additional shipbuilding and ordnance manufacturing facilities for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2325 (by request). A bill for the relief of Kazys Motuzas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BATES of Kennedy:

H. R. 2326. A bill granting a pension to Sarah D. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2327. A bill granting a pension to Lettie Creed; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2328. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Jane Branham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2329. A bill granting a pension to Cordie Brandenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2330. A bill granting a pension to James William Branham and Della Branham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2331. A bill granting a pension to Henry Patrick Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2332. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lovena Triplett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2333. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Cooksey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2334. A bill granting an increase of pension to Fred Faulkner; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2335. A bill granting an increase of pension to William Hargis; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2336. A bill granting an increase of pension to William Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2337. A bill granting an increase of pension to Caroline Hockley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2338. A bill for the relief of Samuel Peifrey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2339. A bill granting an increase of pension to James O. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2340. A bill for the relief of Robert Fraley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2341. A bill for the relief of James R. Hess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2342. A bill granting a pension to Ned Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2343. A bill granting a pension to Ollie Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2344. A bill granting a pension to James S. Landrum; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2345. A bill granting a pension to Minnie Allen Lacy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2346. A bill granting a pension to Pharis Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2347. A bill granting a pension to Martha J. Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2348. A bill granting a pension to Jesse Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2349. A bill granting a pension to Cora McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2350. A bill granting a pension to Dora McCallister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2351. A bill granting a pension to Maxie Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2352. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2353. A bill granting a pension to Dora Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2354. A bill granting a pension to Nancy S. Oldham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2355. A bill granting a pension to Daniel W. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2356. A bill granting a pension to Pricy Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2357. A bill granting a pension to Lewis Stamper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2358. A bill granting a pension to Julia Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2359. A bill granting a pension to Mima Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2360. A bill granting a pension to Carrie Stidham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2361. A bill granting a pension to Louise Workman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2362. A bill granting a pension to Lavina Watts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Hoyt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2364. A bill for the relief of Anthoula S. Maskas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of Umberto Danta Annibali; to the Committee of Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Doherty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 2367. A bill granting a pension to Emma Schmitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2368. A bill granting a pension to Leo P. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2369. A bill for the relief of Rachib Shriay; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2370. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Dardas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2371. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Lacour; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COPELAND:

H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Cook; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2373. A bill granting an increase of pension to Hattie C. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2374. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maryette E. Wanamaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2375. A bill for the relief of Rodney Eugene Hoover; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO, JR.:

H. R. 2376. A bill for the relief of Ethel Ray Sowder; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2377. A bill to correct the naval record of Frank Mackin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 2378. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Moyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2379. A bill for the relief of Mary, Ethel, and Richard Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2380. A bill for the relief of Luigi C. Galatioto and Maria Galatioto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2381. A bill authorizing the transfer of land owned by the United States back to the Spring Park Club, of Richfield Springs, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 2382. A bill for the relief of William Cromer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 2383. A bill for the relief of Richard E. Mooney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Burr; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2385. A bill granting a pension to John Henry Epperson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2386. A bill granting a pension to Delia Parmentier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2387. A bill granting a pension to Grace E. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2388. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2389. A bill for the relief of Henry Jefferson Black, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2390. A bill granting a pension to Jessie Meryhew Bowen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2391. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ellen Wornom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2392. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Dearborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2393. A bill authorizing the President to reappoint and honorably discharge David J. Sawyer, second lieutenant, National Army, as of May 11, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2394. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. R. Allmon; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2395. A bill granting a pension to Mary Quirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2396. A bill granting a pension to Emma Sears Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 2397. A bill granting a pension to Albert B. McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2398. A bill granting a pension to Juna Vista Murphy; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2399. A bill granting a pension to John D. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2400. A bill granting a pension to Maria J. Way; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2401. A bill granting an increase of pension to Isabel Postlethwait; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2402. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cleo T. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2403. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mack C. Ratcliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2404. A bill granting an increase of pension to America E. Dye; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2405. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Ella Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2406. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emily L. Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2407. A bill granting an increase of pension to Orrie S. McCutcheon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2408. A bill granting a pension to Margaret E. Clutts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 2409. A bill granting a pension to Mary J. Giace; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2410. A bill granting a pension to Jennie R. Ogden; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2411. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lucy Killinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2412. A bill granting a pension to Annie I. Ritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2413. A bill granting a pension to Lottie Lee Stoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2414. A bill for the relief of Meier Langermann, his wife Friederike, and son Joseph; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2415. A bill for the relief of David Morgenstern; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2416. A bill for the relief of Salomon Georg Kaufmann, his wife Doris Kaufmann, nee Stern, and their child John Michael Peter Kaufmann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2417. A bill for the relief of Milton Mal, his wife Lilli Luise, and daughter Mary Clothilde Mal and Eleonore Mal; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 2418. A bill for the relief of Michael Goetz, Lucile Goetz, and Angus S. Kennedy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2419. A bill for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2420. A bill for the relief of Julia Neville; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2421. A bill for the relief of Seward A. Dean; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2422. A bill for the relief of certain former employees and materialmen of Joseph

P. Casey and the Foundation Waterproofing Co., contractors with the United States of America, under contract No. W 741 eng 1911 for the clearing of parcel No. 1 in the pool of lock and dam No. 18, Mississippi River; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 2423. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 2424. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2425. A bill for the relief of Isaak Silberman and his wife, Sara Perl Pauline Silberman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2426. A bill for the relief of H. B. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARSON:

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of George P. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2428. A bill for the relief of G. F. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOWERS:

H. R. 2429. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Oliver Eppler; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of John Huff; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of Carr China Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2432. A bill granting an increase of pension to Oscar Sheffield; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2433. A bill granting a pension to Cyrus Poe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2434. A bill for the relief of Margaret S. Holton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2435. A bill for the relief of George H. Crow; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2436. A bill for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:

H. R. 2437. A bill for the relief of Fred F. Osgood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 2438. A bill for the relief of Byron A. Guthrie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2439. A bill for the relief of Edwin Charles Bock; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Charles Henry Whitford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Walter Weston Pierce; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2442. A bill granting a pension to Angeline Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2443. A bill granting a pension to Sarah E. Hermanstorfer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2444. A bill granting a pension to Mary B. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2445. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2446. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cordelia E. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2447. A bill granting a pension to Jesse Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2448. A bill granting a pension to Agnes P. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2449. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2450. A bill granting a pension to Henry William Means; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2451. A bill granting a pension to Frank A. Boster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2452. A bill granting a pension to Katie A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2453. A bill granting a pension to Ruth Ann Breedlove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2454. A bill granting a pension to Mary Jane Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2455. A bill granting a pension to Alice L. Stemmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2456. A bill granting a pension to Rachel Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2457. A bill granting a pension to Cathrine Orender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Paul Szeliga; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Arnold H. Sommer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Ruth Steward, administratrix of the estate of Luther F. Steward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2461. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Reynold O. Gilks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2462. A bill for the relief of William Schoeb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

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; 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:

53. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N. Y., opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

54. Also, petition of International Hod Carriers Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, pledging cooperation and support in the national-defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

55. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of the Black Hills Mining Association, protesting against any blanket power to create parks or monuments; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

56. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, Washington District Council, No. 1, representing 15,000 members of organized labor in the maritime and fishing industries of the Pacific Northwest, expressing vigorous opposition to United States participation in war; opposing the lend-lease plan of President Roosevelt; objecting to the use of American warships to convoy vessels to the war zone; opposing selling or transferring American ships to foreign registry; insisting upon complete protection of civil liberties; urging vigorously the legislative protection of all rights of labor; opposing the continuation of the Dies committee;

demanding that Congress resist all amendments designed to weaken the Wagner Act or circumscribing union activities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

57. Also, petition of the Seattle Industrial Labor Union Council, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations in conformity with the position taken by the Congress of Industrial Organizations at its convention in Atlantic City, unalterably opposing United States participation in war; opposing the administration's lending plan; objecting to the use of American warships to convoy vessels to the war zones, and sale or transfer of American merchant vessels to foreign registry; opposing increased tax burdens to finance the European war machine; demanding complete protection of civil liberties and the rights of labor to organize and strike; reaffirming the pressing national problems of unemployment, old-age assistance, and social security; demanding an extension of American democracy, such as the abolition of poll-tax systems, and the more equitable incidence of taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. By Mr. HAINES: Petition of Mrs. Prussia Bowers, of York, Pa., and members of St. Mark's Lutheran Church, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

59. Also, petition of Milton R. Vogel, of Loganville, Pa., and other citizens of that vicinity, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

60. Also, petition of Rev. F. L. Pannebaker, Airville, Pa., and members of his church, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

61. Also, petition of Rev. D. J. March, Dillsburg, Pa., and members of his church, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

62. Also, petition of Rev. R. H. Stetler, Jr., rural route 3, York, Pa., and members of his church, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

63. Also, petition of Rev. S. Benjamin Shaw, Laurel, Pa., and members of his church, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

64. Also, petition of Rev. Edward W. Leech, York, Pa., and members of his church, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

65. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mrs. Jud Collier, chairman of the Women's Committee on Economic Policy for Texas, urging support of the so-called lend-lease bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

66. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution adopted by the membership of the Thor Hendrickson Post, No. 1006, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, approving the bill H. R. 8915, by Mr. GEARHART, of California, which provides for the improvement of the facilities in the Medical and Surgical Hospital, at Fort Miley, Calif., said hospital being maintained by the Veterans' Administration for the use of veterans who reside in northern California, from the Oregon State line to Bakersfield, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

67. Also, resolution adopted by the membership of the Theodore Roosevelt Camp, No. 9, Department of California, United Spanish War Veterans, approving the bill H. R. 8915, by Mr. GEARHART, California, which provides for the improvement of the facilities in the Medical and Surgical Hospital, at Fort Miley, Calif., said hospital being maintained by the

Veterans' Administration for the use of veterans who reside in northern California, from the Oregon State line to Bakersfield, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

68. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Roy J. Lamansky, Isaac A. Ogden, and Walker A. Johnston, members of the county committee, Jefferson County, Fairfield, Iowa, urging their Senators and Representatives in Congress to support the farm program and any other legislation that would be for the good of agriculture and the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

69. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of Monna M. Rogers, of Westerville, and 82 other residents of Delaware County, Ohio, urging the protection of our country, the defense of its institutions, and the preservation of the lives of our people, particularly the protection of our men in uniform from the use of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Appropriations.

70. By Mr. WEISS: Petition of the employees on Work Projects Administration sewing project No. 26961-0214, Buena Vista, Elizabeth Township, Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against the discontinuation of the sewing projects of the Work Projects Administration in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Appropriations.

71. Also, petition of the employees on Work Projects Administration sewing project in the city of McKeesport, Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against the discontinuation of the sewing projects of the Work Projects Administration in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1941

The Senate met at 11:15 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who knowest us to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers that by reason of the frailty of our nature we cannot always stand upright: Teach us to hate the sins that grieve Thee most, and keep us pure in thought and word and deed, that in utter selflessness we may face whatever the future may disclose, confident in the might and power of Thine indwelling. Bless every Member of the Senate, and sanctify the friendships fostered here, fused by the common purpose to labor only for the Nation's weal.

Bless him who in these latter years hath presided over the deliberations of this body, our beloved Vice President. May the benediction of Thy peace be upon him, and the guidance of Thy spirit be with him, wherever he may be. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Him who said, "I have not called you servants, but I have called you friends," even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, January 16, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

RECONCENTRATION OR REWAREHOUSING OF COTTON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, in further response to Senate Resolution 337, Seventy-sixth Congress (agreed to December 2, 1940), requesting the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture to receive no bids and make no contracts for the reconcentration or rewarehousing of cotton prior to action by Congress on such matter, and stating, in part, "I trust that unless we are specifically directed by Congress to pursue some other course of action you will understand our position in proceeding to accept bids on February 1, 1941, when the period of our deferment in response to Senate Resolution 337 will expire," which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON NATIONAL FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the activities of the Department relating to forest roads and trails for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of State, the Treasury (2), the Navy (2), and Agriculture; the Work Projects Administration (2), the Federal Security Agency, the Public Health Service, and the Federal Communications Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. TOBEY members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Oklahoma State Senate Resolution No. 1

Whereas the British Empire, whence came the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the King James version of the Holy Bible, and in which nation the seeds of democracy were sown, nurtured, and brought to full fruition, and which nation has long since been a free people, with a democratic government serving as a bulwark to the free peoples of the earth; and

Whereas the British Empire at this time is engaged in a death struggle to maintain not only its freedom, but its very life and exist-

ence against barbarism and tyranny, which would throw in reverse all the progress of mankind; and

Whereas the United States of America and other free nations are the legitimate offspring and children of this free state of existence, and because of this relationship we as a nation are likewise threatened with a similar death warrant; and

Whereas the President of the United States has addressed the Congress of the United States of America on the state of the Union, and has made recommendations as to the necessary steps to preserve the Nation and to lend all possible aid to Great Britain, Greece, China, and every free nation everywhere withstanding attacks from aggressor nations by supplying tanks, airplanes, ships, and other munitions of war to the fullest possible extent and with all possible haste: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Senate of the State of Oklahoma, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to support President Roosevelt in his program for safety and security of this Nation and aid to other democracies; that the Congress be urged to provide for the delivery of all possible airplanes, tanks, and other munitions of war without delay; and that this body denounce as unsound any program of appeasement or collaboration with dictators and dictatorships; that we here and now reaffirm our faith in democracy and all its institutions and urge upon our Members in Congress the stand of the President in his program for the preservation of democracy in the Western Hemisphere and throughout the world: Be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the senate be directed to forthwith send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; to the President of the United States Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress; to the Secretary of the United States Senate; to the Secretary of State of the United States; and to the Ambassadors or appropriate representatives of Great Britain, Greece, China, and of every other free nation everywhere withstanding attacks from aggressor nations, the same to be transmitted to their respective sovereignty.

Adopted by the unanimous vote of the senate, January 9, 1941.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Council of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, favoring the continuance of the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency, so as to care for the unemployed, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the general executive board of the United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union, New York City, N. Y., relative to the position of labor under the national-defense program, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, reported favorably the nomination of Charles Harwood, of New York, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands, vice Lawrence W. Cramer, resigned.

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

{Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD