

permit clerks of courts to issue copies of naturalization certificates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

338. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Consumers' Counsel Division in the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, covering the period from July 1, 1939, to October 31, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

339. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the year 1940 (H. Doc. No. 14); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

340. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate in the amount of \$7,000,000,000 to carry out provisions of H. R. 1776 of the Seventy-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3617. A bill making supplemental appropriations for national defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 245). Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3291) granting an increase of pension to John G. Heck, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 3968. A bill to impose additional duties upon the United States Public Health Service in connection with the investigation, treatment, and control of tuberculosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 3969 (by request). A bill to provide for a Pan American plaza and a site for an office building for the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEAVY:

H. R. 3970. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the control and eradication of noxious weeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3971. A bill providing that soldiers, sailors, marines, and members of the Coast Guard may send letters through the mail free of postage, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3972. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3973. A bill to improve the facilities for transcontinental motor transportation; to provide additional facilities for the national defense; to aid in the relief of unemployment; to promote the public safety; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3974. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to adopt an official seal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3975. A bill to fix the maximum rate of interest on loans secured by veterans' life-insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3976. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to negotiate contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 3977. A bill to abolish diplomatic immunity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to provide suitable vessels for the use of certain State nautical schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact laws regarding conservation, development, and production of petroleum resources of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3978. A bill for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Bell Henderson, his wife; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 3979. A bill for the relief of Jose Pena y Garcia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 3980. A bill for the relief of M. Brown and S. H. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

450. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the City Council of the City of Warwick, requesting an amendment of the provision of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, or a change of procedure (if possible under the present act) which will permit registrants to be examined and passed by Army doctors before notice is given of their selection for training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

451. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of Jack T. Hetrick, secretary, and members of Central Townsend Club, No. 2, Sunbury, Pa., requesting enactment of House bill 1036, the Townsend bill, as a defense measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

452. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Butler Camp, No. 33, Department of Pennsylvania, United Spanish War Veterans, and its Ladies'

Auxiliary, to suppress all strikes and all sabotage, sedition, and treason, or attempts thereof, by prompt and drastic action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

453. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of J. T. Davis, president, Townsend Club, No. 1, Gramplan, Pa., and 350 members of the club, urging immediate consideration of House bill 1036, the Townsend bill, as one of the most vital problems before the American people in this generation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

454. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Insular Council of the Unions of the Construction Trades, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to promote a wage scale referred to as the Puerto Rican building-trades wage scale; to the Committee on Labor.

455. Also, petition of the national board of management of national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to use influence to bolster morale of our boys in military camps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

456. Also, petition of the St. Stephens organization of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the lend-lease bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1941

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

Eternal God who art Spirit and Truth, whose wisdom is not wisdom but omniscience, whose power is not power as we conceive it, but omnipotence, whose love beyond all human reckoning is everywhere: Help us both in spirit and in truth to worship Thee in every place at every time and in all we do and say. Be with us in our work and in our rest, in our laughter and our tears, and in loneliness and fellowship indwell us with Thy Presence.

When the eyelids of the morning open to reveal the beauty of another day, grant us the true vision of Thyself. As the sun dips behind the shadow and the chill of evening comes and then the dark, do Thou comfort us with the knowledge that Thy love is a sun that never sets and never sinks, but is always, always at its noon-day glory in the hearts of all Thy children, in the splendor of which Thy mercy ever waits to bring us home to that ne'er ending life of light and love. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

ELMER THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 10, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Pius L. Schwert, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of the foregoing resolutions, the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROMJUE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BEITER, and Mr. ANDREWS members of the committee, to join with such members of the Senate as may be appointed, to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1776) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 3, and 4 to the bill (H. R. 3155) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 3325) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to the bill with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3617) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H. R. 2110. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain lands situated in Duval and Brevard Counties, Fla., to the State of Florida for highway purposes;

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 380; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 21), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint additional acting assistant surgeons in time of national emergency;

H. R. 2113. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States;

H. R. 2495. An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac

River at or near Sandy Hook, Md., to a point opposite in Virginia;

H. R. 2953. An act extending the provisions of the act approved August 27, 1940, entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes";

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Joseph S. Albis, Jr.;

H. R. 3004. An act for the relief of John W. Young;

H. R. 3297. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 22 of the act of February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1210); and

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that, under authority of the order of the 10th instant, during the adjournment of the Senate the Chair signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1776) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

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

DAMAGES DUE TO MILITARY OPERATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriations to pay a claim for damages due to military operations, amounting to \$1,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGES INCIDENT TO OPERATION OF NAVAL VESSELS (S. DOC. NO. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, amounting to \$1,057.70 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 25)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, amounting to \$4,327.74 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 26)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to \$18,830.67 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT (S. DOC. NO. 27)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, record of judgment rendered against the Government by the United States District Court, amounting to \$5,400 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 28)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to

law, estimate of appropriation for the payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$67.20 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 29)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$327,877.15 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULE OF CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$292,153.74 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR THE FOREST SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 31)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries and expenses, Forest Service (national forest protection and management), Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1941, in the sum of \$50,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LANDOWNERS UNDER THE UTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, UTAH

A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, enclosing the report of an investigation made pursuant to the act of June 22, 1936, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause an investigation to be made to determine whether the owners of non-Indian lands under Indian irrigation projects are unable to pay irrigation charges, etc., together with a draft of proposed legislation to provide relief for and to promote the interests of such landowners under the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of that Agency and its constituent administrations, etc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, including reference to certain national-defense activities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 6

"Senate joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for a more adequate system of farm-to-market roads as a part of the defense program of the Nation

"Whereas a program of national defense has been inaugurated, the objection of which is to utilize various important functions of our economic life to the end that the best interests of all be served; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has adopted an extensive preliminary program for the defense of the Nation, and as a part thereof has made appropriations for the construction and reconstruction of highways designed for the direct use of military units, but has overlooked all consideration of the basic industry of agriculture and the making of an appropriation for improving secondary or farm-to-market roads as a part of such defense program; and

"Whereas agriculture is a basic industry in supplying foodstuffs, fiber, and the raw materials and finished products which must be immediately available as an essential of national defense; and

"Whereas the benefits which may be derived from and the usefulness of agricultural products are in direct proportion to the facility with which such products may be transported from farms and ranches to the points of consumption, and an adequate system of feeder roads from farms and ranches to markets must be provided if agriculture is to take its proper place in any measure for defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress be memorialized to make an adequate appropriation for the immediate construction and the improvement of farm-to-market roads for the rapid transportation of agricultural products to the place of use as a part of the national defense; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Senate of the United States, and to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Nevada congressional delegation, and to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as the authorized national-defense agency, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency.

"STATE OF NEVADA EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

"Approved March 10, 1941.

"E. P. CARVILLE, Governor."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"HOUSE OF DELEGATES,

"February 27, 1941.

"EDWIN ALEXANDER HALSEY, Secretary,

"United States Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR MR. HALSEY: I submit to you the following resolution, offered by unanimous consent by Mr. Ross (of Mercer), in regular session of the house of delegates on February 26, which was taken up for immediate consideration and adopted:

"House Resolution No. 38

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act

"Whereas the chief industry of West Virginia is the mining and producing of bituminous coal; that more people are engaged in and dependent upon this industry for a livelihood than any other industry of the State; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House Resolution No. 101 and Senate Resolution No. 32, the object of which is to extend for a period of 2 years from the expiration date thereof, April 26, 1941, the terms and provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act, commonly known as the Guffey Act; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the membership of this house that the terms and provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act should be extended in order to promote the bituminous coal industry: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That we recommend to the Congress of the United States that the terms and provisions of the Coal Stabilization Act be extended as pro-

vided by said Resolution Nos. 101 and 32, and that we respectfully recommend that the Members of Congress from the State of West Virginia support the terms and provisions of said resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

"I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the records in my office, regularly adopted by the house of delegates on Wednesday, February 26, 1941."

A resolution of the Senate of Oklahoma; to the table:

"Senate Resolution No. 12

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the lease-lend bill now before it; repealing the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act of 1939, and urging full cooperation with President Roosevelt's national-defense program and his all-aid plan to Great Britain and her allies

"Whereas the British Empire and her allies, Greece and China, are facing a most crucial moment in their struggle and fight against the totalitarian powers of Europe which are endeavoring, through force and tyranny, to overrun and enslave all free peoples of democracy; and

"Whereas the vital security of our United States of America and this hemisphere, with its freedom and American way of life, are directly involved in the victory of Britain and her allies; and

"Whereas Great Britain and her allies are in dire need of war materials; guns, airplanes, bombers, battleships, submarines, trucks, tanks, gun powder, bullets, and food to carry on their magnificent fight against the barbarous dictators of Europe and their ruthless mechanized armies; and

"Whereas, the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act of 1939 are restrictive legislation which hampers this Nation in its freedom of action when it would cooperate with the nations defending themselves from attack by nations at war in violation of treaties with the United States and international law, and its further effort to keep America safe from war; and

"Whereas personal and political influences appear to be interfering with a part of our national-defense agencies provided for the protection of this Nation; and

"Whereas there is now before Congress in session what is known as the lease-lend bill, calculated to give the President of the United States certain powers and authority to cope with the national crisis, which is so necessary in this day of rapid developments and 'blitzkrieg' war; and

"Whereas slow process of the democratic form of government in this present world-wide crisis and emergency vitally affects the security of these United States of America, thus making it of paramount importance that the lease-lend bill now before Congress be passed in order that our President, our leaders of Government, and our armed forces may make decisions and act quickly; and

"Whereas various labor unions of these United States are calling strikes in national-defense plants, which are hampering, interfering, and delaying our national-defense program and the policy of this country in its effort to give all practical aid to Great Britain, and those allies allied with her in their fight for freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the State Senate of the Eighteenth Legislature of Oklahoma, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to lend its wholehearted support to our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt's national-defense program and our foreign policy, which requires these United States to double its efforts in its production and manufacture of war planes, battleships, anti-aircraft guns, tanks, and other weapons necessary to modern warfare, and in quanti-

ties and quality appropriate to equip the high quality of men in the armed service of this country, and in sufficient quantities to give immediate aid to Great Britain and her allies, which are so sorely in need of all the war material we can furnish them; be it further

"Resolved, That we memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States to speedily enact the lease-lend bill in order that Great Britain and her allies may be given immediate assistance in their fight for freedom against the ruthless dictators of Europe, and that all credit be extended the British Empire and her allies sufficient for them to make the necessary purchases of war materials in this country, to enable them to carry on their courageous fight against totalitarianism and tyranny; be it further

"Resolved, That we memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States of America to speedily repeal the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act, which restrictive statutes hamper this Nation in its freedom of action when it would cooperate with the nations defending themselves from attack by nations at war in violation of treaties with the United States and international law; be it further

"Resolved, That we do here and now commend and congratulate our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, for his courageous message to Congress on January 6, 1941, and we urge the Congress of the United States of America to support the legislation which he has requested to carry out the policies announced in his great speech to the peoples of America and the world on December 29, 1940; be it further

"Resolved, That we memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States that, unless industry and labor can assure the President and Congress and our National Defense Board that no further strikes will be called in our manufacturing plants and industries, which are directly or indirectly assisting in our national-defense program, the Congress speedily enact proper legislation which will prohibit labor strikes in our factories, industries, and plants of these United States which are engaged directly or indirectly in manufacturing, supplying, and furnishing war materials, planes, and other equipment so necessary in our national-defense program, and provide penalties therefor; be it further

"Resolved, That we memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States to stand uniformly against isolationism, appeasement, and defeatism; that it reaffirm what the President has said, 'that the vital security of our country is directly involved in the victory of Britain and her allies; that it stand against any dictated or so-called negotiated peace before the aggressors are defeated'; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the senate be instructed to forward forthwith a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

"Adopted unanimously by the senate the 3d day of February 1941.

"JAMES E. BERRY,
"President of the senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Illinois, requesting the United States to refrain from any action designed to repeal, circumvent, or modify the Embargo Act of 1927, relating to the importation of dressed meats and meat products from foreign lands in which the foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. (See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. Brooks on the 10th instant.)

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring utilization of the professional projects division of the Work Projects Administration in connection with the Federal defense program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the City Council of Baltimore, Md., requesting Congress to make provision for the construction of a tunnel under or a bridge over the Patapsco River at Baltimore City; to the Committee on Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the Councils of the Cities of Lowell, Mass., and Duluth, Minn., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Oakes and family, New Brunswick, N. J., remonstrating against involvement in war; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Kansas City, Kans., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Fowler, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in or near Army and Navy training camps, and to suppress vice in the vicinity of such camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2

"Resolution memorializing Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance

"Whereas it appears by section 2 (a) of the Social Security Act that this State on July 1, 1941, will be required in determining the need of applicants for old-age assistance to take into consideration any other income and resources of such applicants; and

"Whereas this requirement will force this State to amend section 2020 of the Welfare and Institutions Code to remove the right to certain exempt income now accorded to persons receiving old-age assistance; and

"Whereas this action will force a reduction in the income of those persons receiving old-age assistance who are still able to supplement assistance from the State by gardening or other light labor suited to their age: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Social Security Act to remove this requirement therefrom in order that this State may be eligible to receive further Federal funds for the financing of the old-age security law of this State without the necessity of amending section 2020 thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States by the secretary of state."

By Mr. WHEELER:

A house joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial No. 11

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America urging the elimination of certain deferments now authorized by the present conscription law

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled in the Seventy-seventh session:

"Whereas the last assembled Congress of the United States, in its wisdom, in an attempt to further the defense of the Federal Union, and in its attempt to further national defense, did enact into law the Burke-Wadsworth bill, now known as the conscription or selective-service law; and

"Whereas the selective-service law does authorize the drafting into Federal military service definitely specified age groups of the male citizens of the Nation; and

"Whereas the selective-service law does specifically place in deferred classification of able-bodied male citizens those who are at this time either elective or appointive officers of the Federal and State Governments; and

"Whereas it is the belief of this body that such deferment is, in effect, a discrimination against those persons who are ready and willing at all times to serve for the good of the common weal; and

"Whereas this deferment does, in effect, set up a privileged class; and

"Whereas it is one of the most basic principles of a democracy, founded upon the theory and fact that it is an institution of the people, by the people, and for the people, and whereas it is a furtherance of that principle that all shall assume responsibilities as well as enjoy the equal rights derived from citizenship in a democracy; and

"Whereas it has been amply and unquestionably demonstrated on the recent battlefields of Europe that in modern warfare education and experience are far better criteria for selecting men for military service than youth or physical fitness; and

"Whereas it is the belief of this legislative body that all male citizens, regardless of age or position in civilian life, are ready and anxious to perform their part in the common defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the house and the senate concurring, That we do hereby memorialize the National Congress to immediately take such steps as may be necessary to amend the present selective-service law, in such passage as may be necessary, when such passages either in fact or in inference set up such deferments that can be construed as having any tendency whatsoever, either by age groupings or positions in civilian life, of creating a privileged class or classes in the United States of America, regardless of the fact of whether these classes are or are not voluntary; and be it further

"Resolved, That the draft boards can, when warranted by the common purpose of national defense, defer from time to time, as deemed necessary by the board, any or all of such persons referred to above; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the Secretary of State, Sam Mitchell, of the State of Montana, to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America; to Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; to C. A. Dykstra, Selective Service Administrator; to Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER, Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, and the Honorable JEANNETTE RANKIN.

"Approved March 4, 1941.

"SAM C. FORD,
Governor."

By Mr. NYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

"House Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to enact the Capper bill establishing a Division of Cooperatives in the United States Department of Agriculture

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas cooperation has proven beneficial to both producer and consumer and through years of successful operation in all democracies has established itself as a useful economic unit of well-ordered society; and

"Whereas Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, has introduced a bill (S. 650) to establish a Division of Cooperatives in the United States Department of Agriculture, the purposes of which are to serve as a source of information and cooperation to producers and consumers in cooperative buying and selling; to conduct research and assemble statistical data; prepare publications on co-

operative subjects, which will be placed on the distribution lists of Members of Congress; and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish cooperative relationships between this Division and those other branches of the Department that carry on services in the cooperative field; and

"Whereas Hon. Henry A. Wallace, as Secretary of Agriculture, and many officials of outstanding farm and cooperative organizations have endorsed the provisions of the Capper bill as beneficial to agriculture and cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, That we petition and urge Congress to take early and favorable action on the Capper bill, S. 650; and that it be enacted into law during the present congressional session; and be it further

"Resolved, That attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution M

"Resolution memorializing Congress to construct the proposed Missouri River diversion project

"Whereas very extensive surveys and investigations have been carried on in connection with the Missouri River diversion project during the past year by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Bureau of Reclamation; and

"Whereas the Missouri River diversion project is for the purposes of lake and ground-water restoration, municipal and industrial water supplies, sewage and waste disposal, stock watering, irrigation, and other agricultural purposes; and

"Whereas the Missouri River diversion is a project of immense magnitude and is not only of great benefit to the State of North Dakota, but also to the States of South Dakota and Minnesota, and is of great importance to the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the project is recognized as being sound and practicable from an engineering standpoint and a series of drought years and economic studies have shown there to be a most urgent need for the project and that very extensive benefits will be derived from its construction and operation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House concurring therein) petition the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to enact and approve such legislation or to carry out such measures as will provide for the immediate construction of the Missouri River diversion project; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Congressmen from North Dakota."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

A resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution N

"Resolution requesting Congress to investigate conditions on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, and relieve needs existing there

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring):

"Whereas upon petition of the Sioux Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation, who testified at a joint hearing of the senate indian affairs and house federal relations

committees that the general situation on the reservation is bad, and that the ration system as used on their reservation has failed, and recommend that monies appropriated by the United States Congress for rations be disbursed through State relief channels, as for white people, who take their grocery orders to the merchant, selecting from staple foods authorized, the legislature, by resolution (H. Con. Res. G), authorizing an investigation of the conditions existing in that area of the reservation lying within the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas a special joint committee visited Fort Yates, Cannonball, and Porcupine Sub-agency, examined witnesses, and personally saw the deplorable, wretched conditions under which these Indians are existing, and as shown by report and testimony on pages 235—243 of the Senate Journal for February 8, 1941, which report is incorporated herewith by reference thereto and hereto attached, and also by photographs of a few of the cases referred to in the committee report attached hereto and made a part of this resolution; and

"Whereas the report of this committee indicates that many of these unfortunate people live on food allowances of the value of \$3.45 per month, and families of four on a double ration, amounting to \$6.90 per month, with perhaps occasional surplus commodities, inequitably distributed; green coffee; and no fruit, dairy products, nor milk for children; with only a very limited amount of dead cottonwood and willow timber and driftwood for fuel, burned in stoves not worthy of the name; wholly inadequate medical facilities; inability to contact the Superintendent; school children with no other garments than one dress, a coat, stockings, and shoes; old women gathering their own wood; and many entire families huddled in poor, leaky tents, with no furniture and inadequate bedding, nearly freezing in sub-zero weather; and that many other intolerable conditions were found to be the rule and not the exception; and many of the most miserable tents and huts were within a stone's throw of the beautiful brick office and residential buildings of the agency at Fort Yates and the subagencies at Cannonball and Porcupine; and

"Whereas such living conditions are demoralizing to both the younger and older Indians, and it appears that this situation is not known to Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request Congress to authorize an immediate and thorough investigation of the conditions that exist on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; and that adequate food, clothing, shelter, fuel, medicine, and other urgent needs be supplied at the earliest possible moment to these destitute, hungry, and homeless Indians and American citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to Senator ELMER THOMAS and Representative WILL ROGERS, chairmen of the Senate and House Indian Affairs Committee; to Senators NYE and LANGER and Representatives BURDICK and ROBERTSON; and to the press."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution F

"Whereas the United States of America is now engaged in an extensive rearmament program in order that the Nation may have adequate means of defense against possible attack from powerful forces that appear to seek world domination; and

"Whereas the State of North Dakota has available certain resources that should be of material aid in furthering the national-defense program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota now in session, That we urge that North Dakota be granted an opportunity to participate in the present defense program; and we further urge that a survey be made with a view of making our vast stores of low-cost fuel, as well as other natural resources, favorable sites for airfields and training camps, skilled labor, etc., available for building an adequate defense against possible aggression.

"It is hereby directed that copies of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Representatives and Senators from the State of North Dakota, now in Washington, D. C."

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted on March 10 by the Kansas Legislature memorializing Congress to enact legislation that will provide an adequate and uniform old-age pension. I am glad to say that I am in hearty accord with the stand taken by the Kansas Legislature for an adequate and uniform old-age pension for the aged citizens of this country, and will support such a program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance, under the rule, and printed in the RECORD.

House Resolution No. 21

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a law which will provide adequate national old-age pensions

Whereas there is great need for adequate old-age pensions for aged persons of this country; and

Whereas it would be more practicable for such pensions to be paid on a national basis rather than a State basis; and

Whereas if such national legislation were enacted it would provide an adequate and uniform old-age pension for the citizens of this country which is so urgently needed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to carefully consider such legislation as will provide an adequate and uniform old-age pension on a national basis and enact such legislation as will provide an adequate and uniform old-age pension on a national basis; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to have copies of this resolution engrossed, and send a copy of the same to each member of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Adopted March 10, 1941.

OLD AGE AND SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks upon old age and our senior citizens.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. DAVIS. I merely desire to put an article in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; I thought the Senator was starting to make some remarks at length. We have not as yet finished the morning business.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the respect which age has for youth should

have its just return in increasing regard of youth for age. Our children are the object of constant affection, and this is well. It is not less desirable, however, that youth should come to a growing interest in the problems of the aged. In our day this is especially important as the number of the aged in this country becomes increasingly a larger percentage of the total population. Some of our senior citizens have established places of security and trust; others, unable to make readjustment to changing conditions, find themselves in misery and want. It is of these unfortunate ones that we should constantly be thinking and planning in order that provision may be made for their needs which are a part of the common need of us all. There are men today who during depression years were displaced, and yet who are now being called back to industrial service because of their skills and long-time experience. I have supported legislation which has this objective in view; I expect to continue to support measures of this kind so that the inequities of life shall be eased and the burden of social responsibility shall be more justly distributed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks an editorial from the San Francisco (Calif.) Argonaut of February 14, 1941, entitled "Age and Achievement," which, in my judgment, is one of the most encouraging statements which have come to my attention in many years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Argonaut of February 14, 1941]

AGE AND ACHIEVEMENT

We have long been of the opinion that the usefulness of men—the value of their service to society—is determined, not by their age, but by their mental outlook, the degree of their enthusiasm, and their desire for work. Whether a man is young or old is of little consequence if for him living and working have purpose. There are countless men in the business life of America in industry, science, medicine, the professions, and the arts who are old only in the number of their years, for their ability is as great and their spirit is as lively as ever. At this very moment, as America faces the most serious crisis of its history, it is revealing to find that older men have been called upon to assume the leadership of many of the Nation's most important industries and that they responded nobly.

Even a swift glance at the records of history show us outstanding achievements by men past 40, 50, 60, 70, and even past 80. Pilgrim's Progress was written by Bunyan when he was past 50; Robinson Crusoe by Defoe when he was 58; and Paradise Lost by Milton at the same age. At 75 Washington Irving was a busy writer, and Oliver Wendell Holmes was a best seller at 83. Dryden did his very best poem at 83, and William Dean Howells produced his best essay at 82. David Starr Jordan won the peace prize when he was 75. Lyman Abbott was a leading editor at 86. Charles W. Elliot was ranked well at 92. Grotius is said to have done his best work when past 80. Gladstone was Prime Minister at 83. Jefferson was President at 66. Marshal Pétain is an active patriot at 84. Dr. Douglas Hyde is President of Eire and more than 80. Elihu Root and Clemenceau were doing a full day's work when four score and

more. Tennyson wrote Crossing the Bar when 83. Endlessly we could record the accomplishments of hundreds of men whose youth was but a memory.

In this vein, we may quote to advantage these lines from Longfellow's Morituri Salutamus, a poem read on the fiftieth anniversary of the poet's graduation from Bowdoin College, and which expresses eloquently this very thought:

"* * * nothing is too late

Till the tired heart shall cease to palpitate;
Cato learned Greek at eighty, Sophocles
Wrote his grand Oedipus and Simonides
Bore off the prize of verse from his compeers
When each had numbered more than four
score years;

And Theophrastus at four score and ten
Had but begun his characters of men.
Chaucer, at Woodstock, with nightingales
At sixty wrote the Canterbury Tales;
Goethe, at Weimar, toiling to the last,
Completed Faust when eighty years had
past."

INHUMAN TREATMENT OF POLES BY SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a communication which I received from Richard T. Mokrzyński, president of the Polish Central Council, 185 Church Street, New Haven, Conn., and one from Joseph Theodore Klick, secretary of the organization of the United Polish Societies, Middletown, Conn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communications will be printed in the RECORD.

The communications are as follows:

POLISH CENTRAL COUNCIL,
New Haven Conn., March 3, 1941.
HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The members of the Polish Central Council of New Haven have been inexpressibly shocked and horrified at the information which has reached them concerning the treatment and condition of the Poles who have been deported to the innermost parts of Siberia and there almost literally left to die. Extreme cold, acute hunger, and the onslaught of wolves and other wild animals have been and rapidly are taking a toll of these unfortunates who have no means by which to clothe or feed themselves. Often they are forced to do hard labor such as only animals should be compelled to do. Their situation is the more deplorable because of the fact that Soviet Russia will not permit them to receive aid either through the agency of the Red Cross or through donations by private individuals or organizations.

It is the unanimous belief of the members of the Polish Central Council of New Haven that in the name of humanity something should be done to alleviate the fate of these unfortunate people. In the hope, therefore, that you will use your influence in Congress to this effect, we earnestly request you to either initiate or support a movement designed to bring pressure through diplomatic channels upon Soviet Russia to desist from further such deportations and to allow aid to be sent to those already deported, either through the medium of the Red Cross or through the sending of packages of clothing and food by individuals and organizations here in the United States. We further request you to use your influence to have an official or semi-official mission sent to Russia to investigate and report upon the condition and treatment of those Poles who have been deported to Siberia.

We are confident that the spirit of fair play that exemplifies all public action on the part of our great Government will motivate

you to take positive and active steps to effectuate this result.

Very truly yours,

POLISH CENTRAL COUNCIL OF NEW HAVEN,
RICHARD T. MOKRZYŃSKI, President.
STANISLAW DLUZNIŃSKI, Secretary.

ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED POLISH SOCIETIES,

Middletown and Vicinity, March 11, 1941.
HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the United Polish Societies on February 26, 1941, it was related by one of our members who had just returned from Europe of the horrible mistreatment being given to the Polish citizens of Europe. It appears that the Government of Soviet Russia, upon taking over the Polish territory, has interned thousands of Poles in concentration camps and sent thousands of others to Siberia to suffer the miseries, humiliation, and mistreatment not even fit for the lowest of animals.

It was voted that I write letters to our Connecticut Senators and Congressmen and ask them to use whatever means are at their disposal to alleviate this situation. Even a conquered people has a right to be treated as human beings.

We will be grateful to you for your cooperation and indebted to you for your services.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH THEO. KLICK,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 10th instant, the following reports of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were submitted on the 12th instant:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 326. A bill to amend section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, relating to the definition of agricultural commodity; without amendment (Rept. No. 98).

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3546. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of George S. Geer; without amendment (Rept. No. 100);
H. R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Edith Platt; without amendment (Rept. No. 101); and

H. R. 3441. A bill for the relief of Daisy Fitzpatrick, without amendment (Rept. No. 102).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1076. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke; without amendment (Rept. No. 103);

S. 657. A bill for the relief of certain United States commissioners; with an amendment (Rept. No. 104); and

H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of William F. Kliewe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 105).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 911. A bill for the relief of William J. Furey; with amendments (Rept. No. 106); and

S. 931. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Ayers; with amendments (Rept. No. 107).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1022. A bill for the relief of Richard Gammon; without amendment (Rept. No. 108); and

S. 681. A bill for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin; with amendments (Rept. No. 109).
By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2703. An act for the relief of the estate of Joe L. McQueen; without amendment (Rept. No. 111).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 533. An act to amend section 4 (f) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide for extra compensation for overtime of inspectors in charge and radio inspectors of the Field Division of the Engineering Department of the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 110).

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers:

Fifteen lists of records transmitted heretofore to the Senate for examination and recommendation by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest.

THE DENVER & RIO GRANDE WESTERN RAILROAD CO.—RESOLUTION RE- PORTED AND REFERRED

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Senate Resolution 82, relating to the abandonment and dismemberment of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex. (submitted by him on February 13, 1941); without amendment (Rept. No. 112); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 11, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 189. An act for the relief of William Boyer; and

S. 251. An act for the relief of John Mulhern.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Ray C. Wakefield, of California, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1940.

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Joel David Wolfsohn, of Illinois, to be Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, vice Mrs. Antoinette Funk, resigned.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Charles M. Miller, of Arkansas, to be assayer in charge of the United States Mint at New Orleans, La., in place of Hugh T. Rippetto.

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Finance:

John Bright Hill, of Wilmington, N. C., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C. (reappointment).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Finance:

William H. Burke, of Little River, Kans., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kansas, to fill an existing vacancy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRO- DUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1086. A bill to permit Koreans who have been temporarily admitted to the United States as students to remain in the United States until there is a change in political conditions in Chosen (Korea); to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1087. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Griffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make analyses of fiber properties, spinning tests, and other tests of the quality of cotton samples submitted to him; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1089. A bill to extend the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1090. A bill to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds; and

S. 1091. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Convertible Door Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1092. A bill for the relief of Robert O'Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1093. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to provide for a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in maintenance of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1094. A bill to amend section 8c (12) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, relating to the approval or disapproval of orders by cooperative associations on behalf of their members; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1095. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of The National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1096. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the District of Columbia; and

S. 1097. A bill to enlarge the powers of the property clerk of the Police Department of the District of Columbia to dispose of property coming into his possession; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. HOLMAN introduced Senate bill 1098, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 1099. A bill for the relief of Leslie Charteris (Leslie Charles Bowyer Yin) and Patricia Ann Charteris; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1100. A bill to authorize the issuance of service medals to members of the American Expeditionary Force who participated in the occupation of Siberia in 1918-20; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of Robert Spears; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Farcher;

S. 1103. A bill for the relief of Ruth Floyd Jacokes; and

S. 1104. A bill for the relief of William A. Wheeler; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1105. A bill granting a pension to Anna Marie Flautt;

S. 1106. A bill granting a pension to Juliette Reilley Hughes; and

S. 1107. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1108. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to negotiate contracts, and for other purposes; and

S. 1109. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy certain land known as Ward's Bank Training Wall and the right-of-way adjacent to the south jetty at the entrance to the St. Johns River, Fla., and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a title in fee simple to the Ward's Bank Training Wall and the south jetty property, Fla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1110. A bill to amend section 1118 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against enlistment in the military service of the United States of any person convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1111. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1112. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California," approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602);

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokees;

S. 1114. A bill to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California;

S. 1115. A bill in aid of the construction of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project, Oklahoma;

S. 1116. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States;

S. 1117. A bill authorizing a suit in the Court of Claims of the United States by certain members of the Wisconsin Band of Potawatomie Indians;

S. 1118. A bill to provide for the payment of certain Creek equalization claims, and for other purposes;

S. 1119. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to effect an exchange of certain land of the Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, Calif., for other land of equal value; and

S. 1120. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. Davis introduced Senate Joint Resolution 51, which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution defining and classifying gratuity expenditures allowable as offsets in favor of the United States and against the Five Civilized Nations or Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PURCHASING POWER OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, confronted as we are by the ever mounting national debt, the constantly augmenting expenses of Government, and the increasingly critical condition of the domestic affairs of the American people, it seems to me inevitable that sooner or later the creation and control of money is going to be recognized as of paramount importance, and it will demand further consideration and intensive study by the

Congress, and reformatory action by our Government.

In my search for authoritative information on this subject from a reliable source, I have been directed to former Senator Robert L. Owen, who, at my request, has addressed a letter to me which I shall request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Robert L. Owen, former Senator from Oklahoma, was a Member of this body for 18 years, and voluntarily retired, never having been defeated. He was founder of the National Popular Government League, and at present is its President emeritus. He was elected to the Senate, taking his seat in 1907. Within 90 days—on the 25th of February, 1908—he made a speech on monetary stability, demanding the guaranty of bank deposits, the ability to convert United States bonds into money, the control of the stock exchanges, the prevention of banks lending money for purely speculative purposes on the stock exchanges, demanding legal-tender money, and governmental control and regulation of the value of money. On March 25, 1908, he urged the National Monetary Commission to study the question of banking and currency. He demanded the establishment of the Banking and Currency Committee in 1913, and was made chairman of that committee, and framed the Federal Reserve Act, with the assistance of his associates in the Senate, giving the United States Government supervisory control of the Federal Reserve System.

I ask that the letter of former Senator Owen be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 12, 1941.
HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HOLMAN: Answering your request, I enclose a copy of my letter to Congressman BRENT SPENCE, showing the loss in national income of \$247,000,000,000 from 1929 to and including 1939, under the depression caused by mismanagement of our monetary system. The Senate Document No. 23, Seventy-sixth Congress, a study of our national economy and banking system, sets forth quite fully the causes and the remedy for this condition. Using Loeb's Chart of Plenty (based upon the disinterested study of experts), our potential loss of income for the same 10 years amounted to about \$380,000,000,000. Loeb's Chart of Plenty is worthy of the study of statesmen. I also call your attention to another book which I regard as of vital importance in this connection. It is Monetary Progress by Carl Strover, 155 North Clark Street, Chicago.

The Constitution in article I declares that Congress shall have power to coin and regulate the value of money. The failure of Congress to discharge this constitutional duty is the greatest tragedy in the history of the United States and directly responsible for the terrible evils of periodic booms and depressions due to indefensible expansion and indefensible contraction of the medium of exchange upon whose stability the stability of property values of all kinds is based.

The President today calls for \$7,000,000,000 of money to meet international dangers. There are two ways to raise this money. One is to borrow it of private individuals and privately owned banks and pay interest for the loan of individual credit, or, on the other hand, to use the national credit of 130,000,000 people and their productive power to create

the money required without interest through non-interest-bearing bonds deposited with the Federal Reserve banks subject to future amortization from taxes. It is notorious that the interest on public debt frequently is equal to the debt itself before liquidation takes place. The Federal Reserve banks are public institutions with extraordinary powers given by the Congress. This great organization should be exclusively employed in the interests of the people of the United States to stabilize the value of property and of services and of employment through the stability of the debt-paying purchasing power of the monetary unit.

The Federal Reserve System has the power under a congressional mandate to expand and to contract the money supply, particularly demand deposits, to the extent necessary to furnish an adequate supply of the medium of exchange without excess and without undue lack. Its powers can thus be employed through regulating the volume of money to regulate the value of money, to regulate the purchasing power of money, and thereby regulate the value of all forms of property and of services.

The books to which I call your attention will abundantly set forth the proof and statistical evidence upon which these simple truths are based.

You must not forget that there is in existence monetary forces that are opposed to the congressional regulation of the value of money, and who fill the public press and the mails with propaganda discreetly distributed throughout the United States, which serves the purpose of preventing congressional action by confusion of thought and by creating the impression that the matter of regulating the value of money is difficult to understand. It is as simple to understand as the law of supply and demand, with its bearing upon the exchange value of commodities.

It will give me pleasure to answer any specific question which may occur to you in your study of this problem. But I urge you to carefully study Carl Strover's book.

When Congress performs its duty of regulating the value of money, it will end unemployment, double the production of commodities and services in the United States, make it easy to balance the Budget by increased national income, and it will end involuntary poverty in the United States and set a standard by which the people of the world can achieve superabundance of the comforts and conveniences of life by following the wise example which we know how to establish.

Yours very respectfully,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, in connection with this discussion, and as a step toward accomplishing the reform which I should like to see brought about, I introduce a bill for restoring and maintaining the purchasing power of the dollar, which I ask to have appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1098) for restoring and maintaining the purchasing power of the dollar was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and concurred in by the Senate of the same State, which I ask to be printed as a part

of my remarks and referred to the Committee on the Library. This resolution memorializes the Congress of the United States to designate December 15, 1941, as a national holiday commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights embodied in the Constitution of the United States as the first 10 amendments. In accordance with this resolution, I am introducing a Senate joint resolution to provide for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights and for the appointment of a commission to be known as the Bill of Rights Sesquicentennial Commission, which I also ask to be printed as a part of my remarks and referred to the Senate Committee on the Library. As the resolution from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania so ably presents, this date, which is ordinarily significant, assumes unusual importance at this particular period in the history of our Nation and of the world, when those fundamental rights as incorporated in the Bill of Rights are threatened by totalitarian forces abroad and their sympathizers at home. It is proper and fitting that we as a nation reaffirm and remember the importance of the Bill of Rights, which is truly the creed of our individual rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania, will be referred to the Committee on the Library and be printed in the RECORD under the rule and the joint resolution introduced by him will likewise be referred to the Committee on the Library and printed in the RECORD.

The resolution adopted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is as follows:

Whereas December 15, 1941, will be the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights embodied in the Constitution of the United States as its first 10 amendments; and

Whereas this date which is ordinarily significant assumes unusual importance at this particular period in the history of our Nation and of the world when those fundamental rights are threatened by totalitarian forces abroad and their sympathizers at home; and

Whereas the American Legion, Spanish American War Veterans, and Veterans of the World War, and other veterans' and patriotic organizations and citizens have petitioned this General Assembly to urge suitable action to encourage the promotion of widespread observance of the anniversary: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the general assembly memorialize the Congress of the United States to designate December 15, 1941, as a national holiday and authorize the appointment of a Bill of Rights Sesquicentennial Commission to sponsor appropriate ceremonies and celebrations upon that day; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the House to the President of the United States, each of the presiding officers of the two branches in Congress, and to each United States Senator and Member from this Commonwealth.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) to provide for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, was read twice by its

title, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 15th day of December, 1941, is the day on which occurs the one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas such day assumes unusual importance and significance during the present critical period in the history of our Nation and of the world, when the fundamental rights of free people, as set forth in such amendments, are being threatened by totalitarian forces abroad and their sympathizers at home: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order that the one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States may be duly commemorated, the 15th day of December, 1941 is hereby declared to be a national public holiday throughout the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of providing for appropriate ceremonies and celebrations on such day, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Bill of Rights Sesquicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of seven commissioners, as follows: Three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, and shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among their number. If any vacancies occur in the membership of the Commission, such vacancies shall be filled in the manner provided for the original appointments.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Commission to sponsor appropriate ceremonies and celebrations to be held throughout the United States on December 15, 1941, in commemoration of such anniversary.

SEC. 4. The Commission is authorized to make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out its functions under this joint resolution as it may deem advisable, but no expenditure shall be made except for the purposes authorized by a majority of the members thereof. Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid upon the presentation of vouchers approved by the chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 5. The authority of the Commission under this joint resolution shall cease and terminate on June 30, 1942, at which time the Commission shall make a report of its expenditures and activities under this joint resolution to the Congress.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000, to be expended by the Commission for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. GUFFEY, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) making applicable to certain coal deliveries the prices established by the National Bituminous Coal Commission, and it was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PRINTING OF LAWS, ETC., RELATING TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86),

which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the manuscript of the laws, agreements, Executive orders, proclamations, etc., relating to the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, passed and proclaimed from 1890 to 1938, inclusive, to be known as Laws Relating to the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, 1890 to 1938, prepared under Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed 80 additional copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and 30 additional copies for the use of the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD ON NATIONAL UNITY IN WAR AND PEACE

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on March 8, 1941, on the subject of national unity in war and peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

T. V. A. DAM AND FLOOD CONTROL

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch from Knoxville, Tenn., under the heading "T. V. A. set-up able to cut flood crest," which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTION ACTIVITIES OF PACIFIC COAST UTILITIES

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pacific Coast Utilities Pollute Elections," written by Albert H. Jenkins and published in Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENTIMENT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF., AS TO LEASE-LEND BILL

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Mrs. Charles H. Clark, of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the sentiment of radio listeners regarding the so-called lease-lend bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

WALES AND THE WELSH—EDITORIAL FROM THE SCRANTONIAN

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Scrantonian of February 16, 1941, relative to the national anthem of Wales and the spirit of loyalty of the Welsh people, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS ON YOUTH BY MOST REV. JOHN A. DUFFY, D. D.

[Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. MEAD) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on youth, delivered on February 22, 1941, by the Most Reverend John A. Duffy, D. D., bishop of the diocese of Buffalo, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MISS DORA MAXWELL ON CREDIT UNIONS

[Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. MEAD) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on credit unions, delivered in Buffalo, N. Y., by Miss Dora Maxwell, northeastern representative of the Credit Union National Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST ON GOVERNMENT FINANCE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 15, 1941, entitled "The National Heap," which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY WALTER WHITE ON EXCLUSION OF NEGROES FROM DEFENSE JOBS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, on the exclusion of Negroes from defense jobs, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREMIER CHURCHILL'S STATEMENT AS TO UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from Scribner's Commentator, entitled "When Churchill Said, 'Keep Out,'" and three articles from the New York Enquirer regarding the same matter.]

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR THE NAVY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3155, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

March 11, 1941.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 3, and 4 to the bill (H. R. 3155) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to said bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. WALSH], who is necessarily absent, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment in disagreement, ask for a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3325, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

March 11, 1941.

Resolved, That House agree to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 3325) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to said bill with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert:

"The provisions of section 8 (a) of the act approved June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671, 76th Cong.), shall be applicable to naval public-works projects authorized by this and all prior acts."

Mr. TYDINGS. Likewise, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. WALSH], I move that the Senate insist on its amendment in disagreement, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEASE-LEND BILL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last week I was requested to broadcast over a national hook-up an address upon the lend-lease bill. Just before entering upon the address to the invisible audience a Western Union boy appeared and identified himself and advised me that he was charged with the responsibility of singing a telegram to me. Like a good soldier I acceded to the demands of this youth and stood there and listened to the lyric tenor voice of this messenger for about 2 or 3 minutes.

As I listened to the messenger and tried to follow the contents of the jargon that had been put down in script, I speculated upon the type of fellow who would be responsible for this kind of a telegram. I wondered what kind of a man he was. I wondered if he was a businessman. I speculated as to whether he was truly interested in this cause or whether he was a publicity seeker, or whether he was someone who was truly an American patriot, or whether he was merely one of those blundering show-offs who do things before they think. I have been thinking about the matter since. I took no pains, however, to make any investigation as to who this man in Chicago might be, but yesterday my curiosity was satisfied. I received a letter from a very prominent lawyer in the city of Chicago telling me about this individual. I thought perhaps I should make this statement and read into the RECORD a certain portion of this letter, showing just who Frank E. Brightman, author of the telegram, is:

This lawyer says, among other things:

I note that you were harassed by a singing telegram; and the Chicago papers state that it was sent by Frank E. Brightman, who paid \$8.70 therefor, and claimed he got his money's worth. It would be interesting to know who actually paid for this telegram, as I know that Mr. Brightman went into bankruptcy in 1936, and that I took a judgment against him for \$2,700 last year, which remains unpaid, and that he filed a schedule claiming no assets.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate merely that it may know just the type of fellow and the kind of individual who did this sort of thing—a man who is bankrupt so far as assets are concerned, a man who is a dead beat and refuses to pay his honest creditors—yet he

can find \$3.70 somewhere in order to do the thing that he did.

Mr. President, this is just another one of those fellows who seek a lot of publicity. I want this idler, this Micawber of song, this fat boy of the street, to know that we of the Senate are familiar with this type. I want the country to know that while he was vitally concerned about saving the Nation he followed every dishonorable trail to save himself from his creditors.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT AS TO PEANUTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3546.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after part V of subtitle B thereof the following new part:

"PART VI—MARKETING QUOTAS—PEANUTS "LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

"Sec. 357. The production, marketing, and processing of peanuts and peanut products employs a large number of persons and is of national interest. The movement of peanuts from producer to consumer is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce, and, owing to causes beyond their control the farmers producing such commodity and the persons engaged in the marketing and processing thereof are unable to regulate effectively the orderly marketing of the commodity. As the quantity of peanuts marketed in the channels of interstate and foreign commerce increases above the quantity of peanuts needed for cleaning and shelling, the prices at which all peanuts are marketed are depressed to low levels. These low prices tend to cause the quantity of peanuts available for marketing in later years to be less than normal, which in turn tends to cause relatively high prices. This fluctuation of prices and marketings of peanuts creates an unstable and chaotic condition in the marketing of peanuts for cleaning and shelling and for crushing for oil in the channels of interstate and foreign commerce. Since these unstable and chaotic conditions have existed for a period of years and are likely, without proper regulation, to continue to exist, it is imperative that the marketing of peanuts for cleaning and shelling and for crushing for oil in interstate and foreign commerce be regulated in order to protect producers, handlers, processors, and consumers.

"MARKETING QUOTAS

"Sec. 358. (a) Between July 1 and December 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall proclaim the amount of the national marketing quota for peanuts for the crop produced in the next succeeding calendar year in terms of the total quantity of peanuts which will make available for marketing a supply of peanuts from the crop with respect to which the quota is proclaimed equal to the

average quantity of peanuts harvested for nuts during the 5 years immediately preceding the year in which such quota is proclaimed, adjusted for current trends and prospective demand conditions, and the quota so proclaimed shall be in effect with respect to such crop. The national marketing quota for peanuts for any year shall be converted to a national acreage allotment by dividing such quota by the normal yield per acre of peanuts for the United States determined by the Secretary on the basis of the average yield per acre of peanuts in the 5 years preceding the year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as may be found necessary to correct for trends in yields and for abnormal conditions of production affecting yields in such 5 years: *Provided*, That the national marketing quota established for the crop produced in the calendar year 1941 shall be a quantity of peanuts sufficient to provide a national acreage allotment of not less than 1,610,000 acres, and that the national marketing quota established for any subsequent year shall be quantity of peanuts sufficient to provide a national acreage allotment of not less than 90 percent of that established for the crop produced in the calendar year 1941.

"(b) Not later than December 15 of each calendar year the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of farmers engaged in the production of peanuts in the calendar year in which the referendum is held to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to marketing quotas with respect to the crops of peanuts produced in the 3 calendar years immediately following the year in which the referendum is held, except that, if as many as two-thirds of the farmers voting in any referendum vote in favor of marketing quotas, no referendum shall be held with respect to quotas for the second and third years of the period. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of the referendum within 30 days after the date of which it is held, and, if more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum vote against marketing quotas, the Secretary also shall proclaim that marketing quotas will not be in effect with respect to the crop of peanuts produced in the calendar year immediately following the calendar year in which the referendum is held. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota with respect to the crop of peanuts produced in the calendar year 1941 and shall provide for the holding of a referendum on such quota within 30 days after the date upon which this act becomes effective.

"(c) The national acreage allotment shall be apportioned among States on the basis of the average acreage of peanuts harvested for nuts in the 5 years preceding the year in which the national allotment is determined, with adjustments for trends, abnormal conditions of production, and the State peanut-acreage allotment for the crop immediately preceding the crop for which the allotment hereunder is established: *Provided*, That the allotment established for any State for any year subsequent to 1941 shall be not less than 90 percent of the allotment established for such State for the crop produced in the calendar year 1941: *Provided further*, That for the second or third year of any 3-year period in which marketing quotas are in effect the acreage allotment for each State for such year shall be increased above or decreased below the allotment for the State for the immediately preceding year by the same percentage as the national marketing quota for such year is increased above or decreased below the national marketing quota for the preceding year.

"(d) The Secretary shall provide for apportionment of the State acreage allotment for any State through local committees among farms on which peanuts were grown in any

of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined. Such apportionment shall be made on the basis of the tillable acreage available for the production of peanuts and the past acreage of peanuts on the farm, taking into consideration the peanut-acreage allotments established for the farm under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs. Any acreage of peanuts harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm until the third year following the year in which such excess acreage is harvested and the total increases made in farm-acreage allotments in any year based on such excess acreage shall not exceed 2 percent of the national acreage allotment for such year. In the distribution of such increase of 2 percent preference shall be given to the claims of new producers. The amount of the marketing quota for each farm shall be the actual production of the farm-acreage allotment, and no peanuts shall be marketed under the quota for any farm other than peanuts actually produced on the farm.

"MARKETING PENALTIES

"Sec. 359. (a) The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty of 3 cents per pound, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section. Such penalty shall be paid by the person who buys or otherwise acquires the peanuts from the producer, or, if the peanuts are marketed by the producer through an agent, the penalty shall be paid by such agent, and such person or agent may deduct an amount equivalent to the penalty from the price paid to the producer. The Secretary may require collection of the penalty upon a portion of each lot of peanuts marketed from the farm equal to the proportion which the acreage of peanuts in excess of the farm-acreage allotment is of the total acreage of peanuts on the farm. If the person required to collect the penalty fails to collect such penalty, such person and all persons entitled to share in the peanuts marketed from the farm or the proceeds thereof shall be jointly and severally liable for the amount of the penalty. All funds collected pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States and such amounts as are determined, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to be penalties incurred shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury of the United States. Amounts collected in excess of determined penalties shall be paid to such producers as the Secretary determines, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, bore the burden of the payment of the amount collected. Such special account shall be administered by the Secretary and the basis for, the amount of, and the producer entitled to receive a payment from such account, when determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall be final and conclusive. If, in the course of marketing, any peanuts produced on one farm are falsely identified by a representation that such peanuts were produced on another farm, or, if there is a failure to make a report of the disposition of peanuts available for marketing from any farm, each person participating in the false identification of the peanuts or failing to make a report of the disposition of such peanuts as required by regulations issued by the Secretary shall be subject to a penalty of \$25 for each acre, or fraction thereof, of peanuts harvested in excess of the farm-acreage allotment for the farm on which such peanuts were produced and such penalty shall be in addition to any other penalty due hereunder.

"(b) Payment of the penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the marketing of peanuts as

provided in subsection (a) above will not be required if such excess peanuts are delivered to and marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such agency for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary, or for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established under any peanut-diversion or peanut-loan program operated by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered under this subsection producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts the market value thereof for crushing for oil as of the date of such delivery, less the estimated cost of storing, handling, and selling such peanuts. Any person who acquires peanuts for crushing for oil under the provisions of this subsection, and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for purposes other than for crushing into oil, shall pay a penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and the operations of any agency designated to receive and market peanuts may be separate from or combined with operations of other agencies.

"(c) The provisions of this part shall not apply to peanuts produced on any farm on which the acreage harvested for nuts is one acre or less.

"(d) The word 'peanuts' wherever used in this act means peanuts which are picked and threshed by mechanical means, whether such peanuts are picked and threshed before or after marketing by the producer.

"(e) If, in any referendum carried out pursuant to subsection (b) of section 358, marketing quotas with respect to peanuts are opposed by more than one-third of the farmers voting in such referendum, no peanut-diversion program or peanut loan shall be in effect with respect to the crop produced in the calendar year immediately following that in which the referendum is held. If quotas are approved by not less than two-thirds of the farmers voting in such referendum, either a peanut-diversion program or a peanut-loan program, or both, shall be in effect with respect to the crops of peanuts produced in the 3 calendar years immediately following the year in which the referendum is held. The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to make available loans upon peanuts during any marketing year in which marketing quotas are in effect. Such loans shall be made only to producers, farmer cooperatives, and farmer associations, only on the marketing quota for each farm, at rates not less than 52 percent and not more than 75 percent of the parity price of peanuts as of the beginning of the marketing year (which parity price shall be on the basis published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in *The Agricultural Situation*, vol. 25, No. 1, January 1941), and the peanuts shall be the sole security for such loans. If a referendum is held in 1941 with respect to the crop produced in 1941, the provisions of this subsection shall apply as though such referendum had been held in the calendar year 1940. If a referendum is held in 1941 with respect to the crop produced in 1941, the provisions of this subsection (e) shall apply as though such referendum had been held in the calendar year 1940.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1941, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes set forth in this part and for the expenses of administering this part.

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply to nor interfere with the inauguration or the operation of any program approved by the Secretary pursuant to authority contained in existing law designed to establish new uses for peanuts and peanut products or expand markets for peanuts and peanut products."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) (B) of subsection (b) of section 301 of subtitle A of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately following the word "cotton" the words "or peanuts."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of section 301 of subtitle A of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(C) 'Market', in the case of peanuts, means to dispose of peanuts, including farmers' stock peanuts, shelled peanuts, cleaned peanuts, or peanuts in processed form, by voluntary or involuntary sale, barter, or exchange, or by gift inter vivos."

SEC. 4. Section 361 of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the comma following the word "cotton" the word "peanuts" and a comma.

SEC. 5. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 371 of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are amended by inserting after the comma following the word "rice" the word "peanuts" and a comma.

SEC. 6. Subsection (a) of section 373 of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the comma following the word "rice" wherever it appears in the first sentence thereof the word "peanuts" and a comma, by striking out the word "and" following the word "producers" in such first sentence; and by striking out the period at the end of such first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "all brokers and dealers in peanuts, all agents marketing peanuts for producers, or acquiring peanuts for buyers and dealers, and all peanut growers' cooperative associations, all persons engaged in the business of cleaning, shelling, crushing, and salting of peanuts and the manufacture of peanut products, and all persons owning or operating peanut-picking or peanut-threshing machines."

SEC. 7. Subsection (b) of section 373 of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the comma following the word "rice" the word "peanuts" and a comma.

SEC. 8. Section 374 of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the comma following the word "cotton" the word "peanuts" and a comma.

SEC. 9. Subsection (a) of section 375 of subtitle C of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the comma following the word "rice" the word "peanuts" and a comma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, House bill 3546 proposes to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 for the purpose of establishing marketing quotas with respect to peanuts.

Peanuts is a \$50,000,000 agricultural crop. It is of great importance to about 14 States. Heretofore, the Department of Agriculture has had a program under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act with reference to peanuts whereby the Department has undertaken to handle the surplus by means of a diversion program.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does this bill deal entirely and only with peanuts?

Mr. RUSSELL. It affects only peanuts.

Under this diversion program, the price of peanuts has been kept at approximately 50 percent of parity. However, due to the fact that some sixteen million acres have been taken out of cotton under the cotton program, there has been a very large increase in the production of peanuts; and the Department served notice on the producers and all others interested in the peanut business that after the present year the Department would not undertake to carry on the diversion program as it relates to peanuts on account of the increasing cost of the program, due to the increasing production, unless marketing quotas were put into effect.

This bill, therefore, undertakes to fix marketing quotas, and to limit the acreage which may be planted to peanuts which may find their way into the edible trade. I may say that peanuts are also crushed for oil. The bill limits the amount which may go into the edible trade, providing a penalty of 3 cents a pound on all peanuts produced over and above the allotted acreage that finds its way into the edible trade. It provides that in any year when the Secretary fixes the allotments, the allotment of no State shall be reduced by more than 5 percent of that established in the bill, which amounts to 1,610,000 acres, divided between the States on the basis of the acreage planted in each State for the past 5 years.

Very exhaustive hearings on the bill were held by the House committee. The peanut producers from all of the States engaged in that type of farming appeared before the committee and approved the measure we are considering. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry conducted hearings on the bill for a day, and heard representatives of the peanut producers of each of the States approve the terms of the measure.

It is essential, if the price of peanuts is not to fall far below the cost of production, that these marketing quotas be established, and it is left to the farmers, just as it is in the case of cotton, wheat, corn, and the other basic commodities. A referendum is provided for, and unless two-thirds of the producers of peanuts vote in the affirmative, of course the provisions of the act will not take effect.

I do not think that any lengthy explanation of the measure is necessary, inasmuch as the same plan already provided for cotton is, in essence, established by the bill for peanuts.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. What appears on page 22 of the bill indicates that loans are to be made "to producers, farmer cooperatives, and farmer associations * * * at rates not less than 52 percent and not more than 75 percent of the parity price * * * as of the beginning of the marketing year," and so forth.

Can the Senator tell us how much this program will cost?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot tell, because the cost will in large measure depend upon the market price of peanuts.

Mr. DANAHER. Can the Senator give us an estimate, some minimum figure, upon which we can dwell as we contemplate this measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. For the last year of which we have any record, the program cost approximately \$699,000. This year's program will cost more than that, on account of the increase in acreage, and that is why this bill is before us, to restrict the acreage. This year 1,900,000 acres, using round figures, were planted to peanuts. That will be reduced to 1,610,000 acres. I am sure that the bill will not cost nearly as much as the programs affecting other agricultural commodities, which are not nearly as important, have cost.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator know how much it will cost to operate under subsection (f), appearing on page 22, wherein we authorize to be appropriated "such sums as may be necessary for the purposes set forth in this part and for the expenses of administering this part" of the act?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is merely the language that is carried in all of these agricultural bills. It is not proposed to seek any appropriations for this purpose, but to use the funds which are allocated under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, derived from the tariff duties or any other appropriation made available under the act.

Mr. DANAHER. As I understand the Senator's explanation, as cotton acreage was withdrawn from production, peanut production increased. If peanut production is reduced under the operation of the terms of the proposed act, I assume there will be a new divergence into yet some other crop; for example, let us assume it might be peas, or tomatoes, or some such product, which in turn would be a glut on the market. Does not this proposal open up a new chain in a series of surplus production in yet other fields, hitherto untouched and uncontrolled by the quota system?

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt that we will ever see the day when we will not be burdened by surpluses in some kinds of agricultural crops, because, for one thing, it is not possible to regulate the weather. Some years there will be favorable conditions all over an entire area devoted to the production of one commodity, and in other years there will be crop failures in one section or another. But I do not think this bill will bring about any great transformation.

Heretofore there has been an allotment to peanuts, under the Domestic Allotment Act, of 1,610,000 acres, the same amount provided in the bill before us for marketing quotas, but the only penalty that was visited on the farmer was the loss of soil-conservation payments. This bill provides a penalty of 3 cents a pound on all peanuts produced in excess of the allotment provided by the measure.

Mr. DANAHER. Under existing law we have applied the quota system, first to tobacco, then to corn, to wheat, next to cotton, finally to rice, then ultimately we come to the present situation, and are asked to extend it to peanuts. I am merely wondering where we are to stop, if we are to stop anywhere, or whether or not there is some well-ordered plan which would apply generally to this type of production.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is taking me rather far afield in that suggestion.

Mr. DANAHER. I know I am.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can only say that, so far as I am individually concerned, I think it is going to be necessary to resort to some price-fixing and production-limiting plan for every agricultural commodity produced in the United States, if we are ever to deal out even-handed justice to the farmer. But that question is not involved in connection with this measure, and I do not think it is exactly relevant to the measure.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator for his forbearance.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think the able Senator from Connecticut is laboring under a misapprehension, as I understand the measure before us. I confess I have no acquaintance with it other than from a reading of it this morning as I found it on my desk. This does not come within the purview of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or the Soil Conservation Act. This does not make peanuts a basic commodity.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It merely provides for taking advantage of section 358 of the Marketing Act under which no parity payments or benefit payments are made. Hence peanuts do not fall in the category of wheat or cotton or rice or any of the so-called major products mentioned in the Soil Conservation Act. But there is a section in the bill which provides for a marketing agreement, and quotas to follow, and anyone who raises in excess of the quota will not be entitled to the marketing benefits. That is what the bill provides, and it does not come within the general provisions of the Soil Conservation or the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon has a record in this body in handling farm legislation which will stand for a long time, and in a few words he has explained the pending measure much better than the Senator from Georgia has been able to do in four times the length of time.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the kind personal reference. Is not this a matter which goes further than most of the marketing acts, in that it makes peanuts eligible for commodity-credit loans?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. And not on a parity basis; but there is an oscillation between 52 percent and 75 percent. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the provision of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand the bill, it also authorizes a diversion program as well as a loan program.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does; and, as is well known by my colleague, he being familiar with peanut production, and living in an area where they are produced in considerable quantities, the diversion program is much more easily adapted to any surplus of peanuts than any loan program; and I apprehend that the Department will plan a diversion program.

Mr. GEORGE. The diversion program may not be an exceedingly expensive program in connection with this rather important crop.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any question that if the bill is enacted into law, and the program is approved by the farmers, it will reduce the amount it will cost the Department of Agriculture in dealing with the peanut program next year, because it would reduce the acreage by about 300,000 acres.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received several letters regarding the matter now under discussion, and the temper of them has disturbed me. The curtailment of cotton acreage and corn acreage and other acreage has caused the farmers to divert their lands to peanut growing. One farmer from my State, in an area which seems to be peculiarly adapted to peanut growing, says that under the terms of the pending bill, as he never grew peanuts, he could not plant them, but would be shut out. The State has allotted a certain acreage, and those who have planted for 3 or 5 years previous have the opportunity of availing themselves of this allotment, while this man and others, who have gotten disgusted with the manner in which cotton has been handled, want to stop growing cotton and plant peanuts, but under the terms of the pending bill they would be shut out.

They can and they can't,
They will and they won't.
They'll be damned if they do,
And damned if they don't.

Mr. President, they are all mixed up, their minds are confused; they do not know what to do.

I have just been looking over the bill to see to what extent such a condition would prevail. On page 17, under subdivision (d), we find the following:

The Secretary shall provide for apportionment of the State acreage allotment for any State through local committees among farms on which peanuts were grown in any of the 3 years immediately preceding.

Under that provision I do not know how a newcomer could receive any benefits. I do not know whether he would be penalized if he planted peanuts and attempted to sell them on the open market. I was not able to attend the meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and hear this measure discussed, and, if I had been able to attend, perhaps this particular phase of the matter would have escaped my attention.

Mr. President, it is a very serious thing, especially in America, to say to a man,

"You own land, but you cannot plant so and so. If you do you will be penalized." Somehow that phase of this program does not appeal to me. I do not plant peanuts personally, though I may be a "peanut politician"—a designation which will perhaps apply to us all. It is a serious thing that the Department of Agriculture will allocate a certain acreage for the entire Nation for the purpose of the market; then break it down to a certain acreage for the State; then provide that those who have planted 3 years previously may enjoy the benefit of this allotment, but no one else need apply. I may be wrong in my judgment; I do not know. I have not had time to study the bill critically, but it seems to me there ought to be some leeway allowed for those who wish to enter upon the growing of peanuts, without being obliged to suffer any more privation than the farmers of my class suffer.

What does the Senator from Georgia have to say about the provision to which I have called attention?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate who has any agricultural interests whatever in his State knows that this problem of the new producer has been one of the trouble spots of the entire farm program. We have encountered it in connection with cotton, and we have encountered it in connection with every other agricultural commodity. The language in the bill, as it relates to the producers of peanuts, is in substance the same as that contained in legislation dealing with cotton and tobacco.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if we do in the case of peanuts what we have done for cotton, farmers will quit; they will not want to plant peanuts. A farmer does not want to plant something at a dead loss every year. For 6 or 8 years the inertia of habit has projected us on in cotton production. There is not a cent in cotton production. Of course, it may be that some large dealer in cotton may figure on paper that there is a fortune in growing cotton, but that man does not farm. When a man attempts to grow cotton to be sold for 8 cents, 9 cents, 9½ cents, or 10 cents a pound, he has started on the road to the poorhouse; there is no doubt about that. Cotton production is expensive.

Mr. President, to illustrate what I am driving at, let me say that my overseer wrote to an official in the Department of Agriculture and wanted to know about planting pepper. A large income was received last year from the growing of pepper. The official in the Department wrote to my overseer and said, "I am sorry, but you cannot plant any pepper, because you did not plant pepper in preceding years. Therefore you are out."

Though he has splendid soil for the growing of pepper, my overseer is arbitrarily told that he cannot plant pepper. If he does, what he grows will be confiscated, or he will not receive any benefits.

Mr. President, I wanted to inject this thought in order, if it is possible, to cause Senators to think. I am afraid most of them would die of apoplexy if they

should; but I believe it is about time for us to get down to fundamentals and know where we stand. The proposed program will mean that those who have planted peanuts for a period of 4 or 5 years before the plan goes into effect will have a monopoly of the acreage and the growth. I should like to have some little encouragement held out to a young man who is fool enough to get married and who wants to start on a farm. He will not be able to plant any cotton; he will not be able to plant any peanuts, and, according to the trend, he will not be able to raise any stock for fear he will come in competition with stock raisers who have a monopoly of stock raising. We have put our seal on any further expansion in the way of new homes and new farms.

Mr. President, we should concentrate on what to do for those who want to plant peanuts, cotton, rice, and tobacco. We have simply shut the door on those who wish to engage in those forms of agriculture. I was not aware of the situation until I read this particular portion of the bill today. I do not know what to do about it. Georgia is a great peanut-producing State. I want her to receive every bit of profit she can from raising peanuts. My State is sort of around the fringes in the matter of raising peanuts. We plant a very small acreage of peanuts.

Mr. President, I tell the Senate the problem is a serious one. Of course, we have learned farmers in the Department of Agriculture. They know more about cotton than I do. I think they would know a cotton stalk from a jimson weed; they might; but they can tell me how to grow cotton. One man in the Department asked me why I did not plant the kind of cottonseed which would produce middling. God help us. The weather and the manner in which it is picked determines the grade. The man who asked me that question did not know that. Fortunately, I did.

Mr. President, we are sailing along, but I do not know where we are going to end. However, I wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Georgia and other Senators to the matter of acreage allotment and the benefits accruing therefrom.

When the people used to support the Government we did pretty much as we pleased, but now that the Government is supporting the people, the amount of its resources is rather limited, and we must cut the pattern according to our cloth. We do not have enough cloth to go around.

This whole situation is puzzling to me. I do not know how we will get out of our difficulties. I simply wished to make a suggestion. I know the Senator from Georgia is as worried as I am about the matter of denying to a man the right to use his land, but that is what is being done now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, the question of the new producer, and freezing the commodity and the land on which it has been produced, are two of the objectionable features of the entire agricultural program. However, there is no way on earth to eliminate them if we are to have any marketing quota pro-

gram. In this case we are faced with two alternatives. We may either continue to plant all the peanuts we please and sell them at the oil price, around \$35 a ton, which is far below the cost of production, or we may allow the acreage allotment of peanuts on 1,600,000 acres to go into the edible trade, bringing at least half of parity, and at least the cost of production to the farmers who produce them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sorry I did not know that this bill was coming up, because I should have liked to ask the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to have included beans in the provisions of the bill. There is a very distressing situation insofar as beans are concerned. In Colorado the Surplus Marketing Administration has purchased 250 cars of beans. It was thought that that would take the surplus off the market, and it was intended to distribute the beans to the poor. Hundreds of cars of beans were bought in other States, and still there is a burdensome surplus. I have taken the matter up with the Surplus Marketing Administration in the hope that we could obtain for the farmers a loan on their beans so that they could hold them. The administration has turned down the request, on the ground that unless there were acreage control, loans would only add to the difficulties.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that the administration took the same position with reference to peanuts, and that is the reason why this bill is before us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Our case is parallel.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator desires to introduce legislation affecting the bean industry, I am sure the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will give him a sympathetic hearing. However, I hope the Senator will not delay this bill in order to attempt to deal with beans in the same measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want to delay the pending bill, but I do feel that the bean growers should have the same consideration that the peanut growers have, because their case is exactly parallel. There is distress, and we are having great difficulty. We do not want to be regimented either. We do not like to have our acreage curtailed, or be told what to do; but if we cannot sell the beans we have, we are in such a situation that such a thing as regimentation is much preferred to an absolutely demoralized market. That is precisely our position.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has stated the sentiments of the peanut producers who came before the committee. They realize that they cannot have their cake and eat it too. They cannot produce unlimited quantities of peanuts and produce them at a profit. For that reason the peanut producers of the entire Nation have joined and recommended the passage of this bill. I know that when the law is put into operation there will be a great many complaints from

those who say they are not receiving the allotment they should have. There will be complaints from the new producers who wish to get into the production of peanuts, particularly if the bill should stabilize the price of peanuts. But, viewing the matter in its larger aspects, for the good of the largest number of farmers in the States now producing peanuts, I am confident that without this measure the entire peanut-growing industry will be demoralized, if not wiped out.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am wondering about the mechanics of the bill. If a certain number of acres were allotted, say, to a given State, and a certain acreage were allotted to a certain county, why could not the bill be so framed that anyone who wanted to grow peanuts in that county could make application to the committee and be treated equitably? I think the position of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is sound. I really feel that the bill should not in its essence operate so as to create a monopoly for those who have previously grown peanuts. If 50 acres of peanuts were allotted to a particular country, everyone who applied would receive his equitable priority. I wonder why such a system could not be written into the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill is not so harsh in its provisions as one might be led to believe. It provides that each farm shall have an allotment of not less than one acre of peanuts. One acre is fixed as the minimum allotment. There is a provision in the bill for new producers. Two percent of the total quota is set up after a period of 3 years, and the bill specifically provides that the new producers shall have priority in the distribution of 2 percent of the total allotment. So, while the bill undoubtedly would prevent a new producer from planting all the peanuts he might choose to plant this year, under the terms of the bill he could eventually establish an allotment on his own lands.

With reference to awarding the acreage to a county and letting the county committee distribute it without regard to whether or not a particular farmer had ever produced any peanuts, I cannot conceive of anything that would cause more confusion or resentment against the bill than a provision of that kind. Of course, in dealing with a measure of this kind we must take into consideration the claims of the several States. The acreage allotment of each of the States is based upon the average they have produced for the past 5 years. The allotment goes down to the county. When the State receives its allotment each of the several counties within the State is awarded its allotment on the basis of what the county has planted to peanuts in the past 5 years. When we come down to the individual farmer, the allotment is awarded to the individual farmer on the basis of the peanuts he has produced in the past 5 years; and if we should change that system, in effect the Government would be saying to a man who had been producing peanuts for many years, "You must stop produc-

ing peanuts." I submit that it would be more inequitable to make a man stop producing peanuts than it would be to say to someone who had never planted any peanuts, "You cannot market your peanuts under the terms of this act and cause loss to farmers who have been growing peanuts for many years.

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Wednesday, March 12, with respect to sugar. I quote therefrom as follows:

UNITED STATES OFFICIALS PREDICT INCREASE IN SUGAR QUOTAS—RISE OF AT LEAST 200,000 TONS BELIEVED NEEDED TO MEET DEMAND—MAY SET HIGHER PRICE CEILING

WASHINGTON.—An increase in sugar quotas is practically inevitable this year, officials of the Department of Agriculture said yesterday.

On the basis of figures available on October 30, 1940, quotas this year were reduced below last year's final determination to 6,616,817 tons. Sugar consumption last year was raised to over 6,900,000 tons, and by December 31 stocks were seriously depleted, sugar division officials said. A further reduction in sugar stocks took place in January.

If consumption continues at the present rate, the total for 1941 will be well above 7,000,000 tons, these officials believe, and "there might well be a shortage by the end of the year."

An increase of 200,000 tons in the quotas, together with present stocks, might be enough to meet this boost in consumption, although a still larger increase may be necessary, they said. These officials reported that the policy board is making a study to determine whether or not to increase the quotas, but they would not predict when the change will be made.

Rising sugar prices also may force the Department to increase quotas. The sugar division has interpreted the Sugar Act to mean that supplies must be regulated so that prices to consumers do not go above the level necessary to maintain the domestic sugar industry. Normally, officials said, this means that if the price were to go as high as 3.65 cents a pound—the ceiling indicated by Senator ELLENDER—quotas would be increased.

Mr. President, I am very much disturbed lest the Department should take the steps indicated in the article. I believe that all of us would agree that facts must have been produced to show that there is an ample amount of sugar available throughout the sugar-producing areas of this country, because no later than 3 or 4 weeks ago the Department of Agriculture saw fit to cut the acreage of beet-sugar-producing States by about 26 percent. The reason assigned for that action was that there was too much carry-over of sugar. Now there is talk about increasing the total continental sugar quota because there is allegedly a shortage in sugar. It is my belief that there is no actual shortage of sugar, but simply a theoretical shortage caused by the inability of some off-shore areas, particularly the Philippines, to fill their quota allotments because of a shortage in shipping bottoms. I contend that if anything is to be done with respect to the sugar quotas, we ought to have a redistribution, as it were, of the over-all quotas, so that domestic producers of sugar would have the right to produce and market more sugar in this

country. Certainly, any deficiency in these offshore quotas should be reallocated to the continental producers rather than increasing the over-all quota.

I believe, and I have contended for this proposition ever since I have been in the senate, that continental producers—that is, producers of sugarcane and sugar beets in the United States—ought to be permitted to produce at least 40 percent of our consumptive requirements. We are faced at this time with the situation that because the price of sugar has gone up a few points in the past 2 or 3 weeks, it is desired to stop the rise in price.

When the Sugar Act of 1937 was considered, it was my understanding, and the understanding of many Senators who supported its enactment, that it would produce a condition whereby raw sugar would sell for between \$3.35 and 3.65 per hundred. To my knowledge it has never reached that point since the fall of 1939 when war was declared in Europe. On the contrary the price of raw sugar has been held down, somehow, to as low as \$2.60. The price of raws was disastrously low during the fall of 1940 when the Louisiana sugarcane farmers were marketing their crop.

As I understood the bill, just about enough sugar was to be permitted to enter the country so that, when added to the amount we produce, the supply would be equal to our demand, and in that way prices would be maintained at a reasonable and fair level. However, it does not seem to have worked that way. Always more sugar than we could consume has been permitted to enter the country, and as a result, sugar prices have remained at abnormally low figures.

As I have just indicated, because of an increase in the price of sugar, a proposal is now under consideration, so I understand from this article, to let more sugar come into the United States, in the face of an abundance of sugar already on hand, and a further curtailment by the Department of continental sugar acreage. That does not make sense.

Mr. President, I believe that under the act as it is now written, if there be a shortage of sugar, because of lack of facilities to transport it, the Department could well make at this time a reallocation of sugar quotas, allotting the deficiencies of Hawaii and other domestic areas to continental producers, thereby giving the beet-sugar farmers of the West an opportunity to plant their full acreage this year, as they have done in the past; and, by the same token, the sugarcane-producing States should be permitted, and could be permitted, to plant and harvest more acreage in sugarcane. If that cannot be done under the law then it should be amended without delay. Certainly a reallocation of the Philippine quota should be made in accord with the provisions of a bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

Last December the Department of Agriculture fixed 6,616,817 tons as the 1940 consumptive requirements of this country. That amount was distributed according to the formula set forth in the act, so that the domestic beet-sugar pro-

ducers were allotted 1,549,898 tons, and the mainland cane producers 420,167 tons. Lately, as I have just indicated, because of the large carry-over of sugar that the beet-producing area has on hand, a curtailment in 1940 sugar-beet acreage has been ordered. Colorado has been cut, I think, about 26 percent and—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator has stated the case exactly. This cut is going to bring about the closing of perhaps four of our factories in Colorado, with a resultant complete upset of the whole community's economic situation, which in that State is built entirely around sugar. We have built our farming and our whole community right around the production of sugar; and yet we shall be compelled to close perhaps four factories and to curtail and shorten the season for all the other factories in Colorado.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in sympathy with your farmers and you can depend on me to help to the best of my ability.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The same situation exists in North Dakota. Our production has been cut 17 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is too bad. I hope Senators will take serious note of the situation. Let us get together at some time soon and consider a bill so that continental producers will obtain at least their just share of the sugar production necessary to meet our requirements. Why, Mr. President, under the present Sugar Act, the little islands of Hawaii, a group of islands you can almost jump across, get an allotment of 938,037 tons, and in addition to that the islands are permitted to produce 30,410 tons for local consumption. By the terms of the act continental producers are denied similar rights.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator said "the island of Hawaii." Does he mean the island of Hawaii or the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to the Hawaiian Islands as a group.

Mr. TYDINGS. Most people who go to Hawaii go to Honolulu, which is on the island of Oahu; but the island of Hawaii is the largest island in the group, and it is not so small that you can jump over it. It is a tremendously large island. While I am not taking issue with the Senator, nevertheless there are a number of good Americans living on those islands. They have rather fertile land, and they had that sugar business long before the Hawaiian Islands became part of the United States of America. When we annex a territory which we did not theretofore own, along with the advantages we perhaps must take the disadvantages, too; otherwise, the people of the Territory would not be so keen to ratify a treaty of annexation if it were to be a one-way treaty whereby we would get all the

benefits but would not accept any of the liabilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am inclined to agree with the Senator. But they are Americans, and there are no earthly reasons why they should be given a preferred status in the production of sugar.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to direct the Senator's attention to what was reported to me. I am not familiar with the sugar business, except as I eat sugar. Recently I was in Florida and I had occasion to go near the famous Everglades. I think one of the most complete sugar factories in the country is located there. That soil, which I was informed was not very hard to clear up, is anywhere from 6 feet to 15 feet deep, and I was told that it would produce cane of unusual perfection. I said: "Well, why don't you clear up this land and expand your sugar business?"

The reply was: "The Government will not allow us to do so."

Here we are importing sugar and having the facilities for growing it, and yet we allot our people a certain percent and we hand out the good-neighbor things. I suspect there are two or three "niggers" in this woodpile.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have been advocating a more equitable distribution of sugar production for continental United States ever since I have been in the Senate; and I believe conditions today are such that Senators ought to take heed of them, and that we should get together sometime soon and pass a bill to accord to our island possessions referred to by the Senator from Maryland treatment more nearly equal to that our own continental producers are receiving. I am not jealous of the Hawaiian Islands and Puerto Rico, and I want them to continue to share in our sugar market. But they are populated by Americans, and when we consider that under the quota Hawaii is permitted to devote more than 30 percent of her cultivable land to sugarcane, and Puerto Rico 23 percent, while the beet area is permitted to use only about 1 percent of its cultivable land for sugar beets, and the Louisiana-Florida area only about 13 percent of the land that can be put into cane, I contend that that is unjust. An adjustment should be made, and now is the time to do it.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, practically, the situation as to the islands is that their sugar quotas are as large as their production and exportations have ever been. On the other hand, as to the beet areas, their production is being forced down by regulations far below what it has been. In other words, there has been no quota taken from the islands, but in the case of the beet areas, this year the number of acres upon which sugar beets may be produced is being reduced from 980,000 to 820,000. That reduction was made upon the theory that there was in the warehouses of the United States an abnormal carry-over of sugar, and, in order to equalize that, the beet areas were told, "You must cut your production." Yet there is no cut in the

quotas or production of the islands; and particularly is it true of Puerto Rico that her sugar production has more than doubled in recent years. Hawaiian production has been going on about even, but I think, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] knows, Hawaii is producing almost to her maximum production, due to her land and water situation; so that if we were to say to Hawaii, "There is no quota imposed upon you," it would not make much change in Hawaiian sugar production.

Mr. ELLENDER. I intended to cover that point at some other time. I do not care to discuss the sugar situation at length this afternoon, but I desire simply to call attention of the Senators to this newspaper article and the effect of the proposal, if it should be carried through, on our own continental farmers.

As I pointed out to the Senator from Maryland awhile ago, in addition to the Hawaiian Islands being allotted 938,037 tons of sugar—

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I wanted to refer to.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are permitted to produce 30,410 tons of sugar for their own domestic consumption. With respect to Puerto Rico, the inhabitants of that island are permitted to produce 797,982 tons and, in addition to that amount, are permitted to produce 69,052 tons for their own domestic consumption.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue with the Senator. What I am trying to point out to him is, whether the division is right or wrong, there has to be a comprehension of the whole picture. What I desire specifically to call to the attention of the Senator is that of the more than 6,000,000 short tons of sugar used in the United States and its possessions, 1,000,000 tons, in round numbers, come from the Philippine Islands. That is about 16 or 17 percent of the total. The Senator knows we have already agreed on a policy affecting the Philippine Islands.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and as I recall, the Senator from Maryland was the author of the bill providing for the independence of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was; and of course we cannot, while they are still under our flag, cut their sugar quota, for so long as they are a part of the United States they have a right to their proportion of sugar. I do not say this is the right proportion, but they are entitled to share in the general picture.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not deny that; I am not questioning that, but—

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish. However, in 1946, unless we change our policy, the Philippine Islands will be as foreign to the United States as, in a sense, occupied or unoccupied France may be today. They will have no rights in our market whatsoever unless we change the policy we have already adopted, making them free in 1946. When that day comes, there is going to be a void of 1,000,000 tons of sugar that will either have to come from the Philippine Islands after the payment of tariff duties to enable it to get into the

United States, or we will have to get it from some place in the United States or from some place that is now supplying sugar which will have to produce more.

The next thing I wish to point out to the Senator is that of the 6,600,000 tons produced in the United States and elsewhere for our consumption, 1,869,000 tons, or nearly 30 percent, of it comes from Cuba, which is not a part of the United States. So long as we allow the sugar to come in from Cuba—and I am not saying that it should not come in from there—then what remains must be prorated among the people of outlying as well as the continental parts of our country. There is no other way it can be done fairly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator that proration should be made, but the difficulty is that the offshore producing areas have obtained the most of it in comparison to the producing areas of continental United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Cuba has most of that.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Referring to what the Senator from Maryland has said, if we are going to prorate sugar, why not prorate the sugar that is raised in foreign countries and let the people of this country produce all the sugar they can?

Mr. TYDINGS. I can answer that.

Mr. NORRIS. Everybody knows that if all those in the United States who can produce sugarcane and beets produced all they could, there still would be a shortage of sugar. In other words, fundamentally, we are wrong in trying to prevent our people from producing a commodity of which we know there is bound to be a shortage of production in the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a great deal in what the Senator from Nebraska says. However, when one attempts to go down that road, here is what is said, "Cuba is a great customer of American goods, and, therefore, unless we take her sugar she cannot buy our goods which we send there, and of which we likewise have a surplus;" but in these abnormal times we have still another hurdle to get over, because we are using money and will use more money to buy agricultural surpluses all over South America as a means of stabilizing defense in the Western Hemisphere. So, in normal times, if we were doing what the Senator from Nebraska suggests as one possibility, that would be one thing; but we are not only permitting the sugar to come in now but probably are going to buy more of that sugar as a means of relieving them of their surplus and in order to solidify the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. NORRIS. That is just what we have been doing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and we are going to do more of it.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize that, but it does not seem to me to be right; indeed, it seems to me to be fundamentally wrong, since we have in our own country thousands of people who are clamoring for the right to raise beets and cane, in order to produce sugar, but who, because of the quota arrangement could not sell

it if they produced it, and hence do not plant it. So as a practical proposition, today the beets are not planted, and there is an allotment of the number of acres which may be planted. If we had produced in the United States more sugar than we could consume, I could see the logic of prorating the amount of production of any State, of any factory, or any farm, but that is all out the window. Everybody knows if every farmer in our country produced without limit all the sugar which he could produce we would still be short more than half the sugar we consume.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in that connection, I doubt if we could produce in any event more than 50 percent of our consumptive requirements.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think we could produce that much.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think we could.

Mr. NORRIS. We are producing about one-third at the present time.

Mr. ELLENDER. To be exact, we are permitted to produce about 28 percent.

Mr. NORRIS. And it is admitted by everybody that there would be much more produced in the United States if the growers had the right to sell and the right to plant it. In the western part of this country there are thousands of acres on which farmers prefer to raise sugar beets to anything else. They have the proper kind of soil and everything there except an opportunity to plant beets and harvest a crop, which they are not allowed to do under the quota system.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, Mr. President, of all the large acreage in the West that could produce beets for sugar, about 1 percent of the land is now being utilized for that purpose, whereas Puerto Rico and Hawaii are permitted to utilize 23 and 31 percent, respectively, of the land that is available on those islands for the production of sugar. The proration is out of line and something should be done about it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that while the production of sugar beets in the United States is being restricted by our Government, our Government is lending money to Cuba to increase the production of sugar in Cuba. That is hardly consonant with the furthering of a basic American industry.

The Senator from Louisiana knows that we have an opportunity temporarily to meet this distressing situation by reason of the fact that freights probably are not available from the Philippine Islands for bringing in their quota; and there is pending before the Finance Committee a bill which would change the existing law. The existing law provides that if the Philippine Islands fail to market their quota of sugar, the deficit shall be distributed not among American domestic producers but among foreign producers. The bill pending before the Finance Committee merely changes that arrangement so that if there is a deficit, the deficit shall be divided among the American

producers in whom we should have the greater interest.

I have been very hopeful that the Finance Committee would have a meeting at an early date and take up this matter. The subject has been taken up with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and we had assurances that there probably would be an early hearing before the Finance Committee. Now that the pressing matters before the Senate have been disposed of, I understand that the Senator from Mississippi, who is not well, is away from the city. I sincerely hope the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is now in charge of the Finance Committee, will take over the problem of looking after the poor stepchildren in the sugar business, and will have a hearing and let us present the situation, and endeavor to relieve that pressing problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. I respectfully suggest that the Finance Committee hold hearings at once so that the Senate can act. As the Senator from Colorado knows, when he introduced his bill on the subject some time ago, I advocated its passage. I repeat that rather than increase the over-all quota, which would have the effect of forcing the already low prices of sugar to drop still lower, and making it so that farmers could not make any money on the production of sugar, I believe something ought to be done at an early date to redistribute the presently existing quota.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to refer again to another vice that is inherent in the situation against which the Senator is correctly complaining.

When the Department of Agriculture reduces our sugar quotas this year 26 percent, that may result in a 100 percent reduction. This is what I mean: Sugar-beet farmers cannot raise sugar beets unless there are factories to process the beets. The factories cannot run unless they have enough acreage to make it profitable to run. What the Department of Agriculture has done in the State of Michigan is to make it almost impossible for any sugar-beet factory to run as a result of this final curtailment of the acreage. Therefore, the Department makes it impossible for any farmer to raise sugar beets. So while the curtailment is a 26 percent curtailment mathematically, on the face of things, it may become a 100 percent curtailment; and I think it is without the slightest justification. I completely agree that a decent consideration for agriculture ought to require the Senate to act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I sympathize with the condition of the beet growers. I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from Michigan has just said. My State of Louisiana and the State of Florida have been suffering in like manner for the past 3 years. Our production has been curtailed to such an extent that it has been extremely difficult for the average farmer in those States to produce cane to advantage. I do admit that the small,

one-horse farmer has not suffered much because of curtailment, but the medium-sized farmer has been subjected to tremendous cuts. In like manner the large producers have suffered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. It seems to me the Senator from Louisiana has correctly stated the situation. I feel that he is right in his conclusions. I desire to make a suggestion to him, because I think it is an equitable consideration that should go into the picture.

We have been talking today about sugar beets and sugar obtained from cane. Certainly one of the primary reasons for allotting as much sugar as we have allotted to Hawaii and to Puerto Rico is because they need in their economic current the money that will come from the sale of their sugar.

I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in these challenging times we are about to expend \$100,000,000 in Puerto Rico on the defense program. We shall spend probably two or three times that amount in Hawaii. We are stationing our fleet there, which is the same thing as putting into that area thousands of the best consumers in the world, who drop their salary checks into that community. We are taking money out of the economic current of the West, out of States like my own State, the State of Michigan, and the Senator's State of Colorado, in order to send it to Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Now that we have sent millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to those sections, it seems to me it is time for us to think about our own folks.

In my own community, a small town of 10,000 people, the policy has resulted in the shut-down and demolition of a sugar-beet factory, putting out of seasonal employment 300 persons. It has meant a loss to the community in taxation and in wages. As a result, it seems to me we are like the man who is always seeing the greener pastures away off instead of taking care, as the Scotsman says, of "our ain folk." "Our ain folk" should have the first consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I have been very much interested in the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] relative to the apportionment of any excess sugar that will not come into this country from the Philippines. A few days ago I made a statement on the floor of the Senate calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that the sugar-beet acreage of the West is being reduced, and that as a result of that cut the price of sugar is likely to skyrocket. Since I made that statement the price of sugar has gone up. There is a considerable surplus of sugar, but if the Philippine sugar cannot come into this country, the price of sugar will continue to go up.

I took up the matter with the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture made the cut of the beet acreage in January, at a time when it looked as

though we should have a surplus of sugar that must be disposed of in order to give the beet growers and the cane growers a fair price for their sugar next year. I think his intentions on the subject were good; but since that time boat space has become scarce, and the cost of shipment from the Philippines has increased, until now—while I have not the exact figures—instead of \$6 a ton I understand it costs \$20 or \$30 a ton to bring sugar in here, if the space can be obtained at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. It costs \$30 to bring it in from the Philippines.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Yes.

I took up the matter with the Secretary of Agriculture, urging that he rescind the cut on sugar beets this year, and stating that if we had a surplus next fall, with the defense program we have on, such action would simply be an insurance to the sugar-consuming public that they would not have to pay exorbitant prices; but I was unable to get any results.

I have no criticism of the bill which has been introduced for the reapportionment of sugar. The point I am making is that the farmers in the sugar-beet areas will start to plant their beets in about 30 days; and by simply a stroke of the pen rescinding that cut the Secretary of Agriculture could again let us grow the amount of sugar that we grew last year; but, I have not been able to get any action on that matter. It will not take legislation to get immediate action on it.

As to the immediate urgency of securing legislation, I quite agree with the Senator. Last year we spent nearly all winter trying to get some kind of sugar legislation to take care of the situation, but we were not able to do it. All we were able to do was to get simply an extension of the present act. At this time it seems to me it is very important that the persons interested in the sugar industry get together and sponsor a program and urge action on it, so that we can finally get something done that will relieve the situation.

In conclusion, I desire to add that if the present sugar-beet policy of the administration is continued, we shall very probably not have any sugar industry left in this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated a few moments ago, I intend to go into more detail with respect to the subject of sugar at some future time. I rose this afternoon merely to call the attention of Senators to the article appearing in the Wall Street Journal. I feel that if the Department of Agriculture is unable under the existing law to make a proper distribution of this overall quota which was fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture in December 1940, then Congress should act at once.

There is no shortage of sugar. The rise in price has not been due to a scarcity of sugar. There has been an increase in ocean freight rates, and some difficulty in transporting sugar to this country from the Philippines, Hawaii, and other off-shore areas, because of tension in the Far East and a shortage in shipping bottoms. But on the other hand, there is an excess of sugar in the

hands of continental producers, to such an extent that acreage has been drastically reduced by the Department.

I contend that if the Department takes action, because of the apparent scarcity, to increase the over-all quota by 200,000 tons, it will result in a decline in the price of sugar again. I do not feel that the Department is justified in taking action along those lines so long as raw sugar remains within the price range of \$3.35 to \$3.65, and until the deficiency of these off-shore areas has been reallocated to our continental producers. I believe the understanding we obtained from the Department in 1937, when the Sugar Act was passed was that the act would have a tendency to keep the price of raw sugar ranging from \$3.35 to \$3.65, and that that price was regarded as an equitable price to the farmers, and a just price to the consumers.

As I have stated, I hope that instead of increasing the quota the department will attempt to remedy the situation by the reallocation of the present quota, and if additional legislation is needed, let us get behind a bill whereby our over-all quota can be distributed so that our own producers will be allotted a more equitable amount of sugar acreage.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is it not also true that the question of transportation enters into the consideration of this matter? We do not know what is to happen in the Far East. The Philippines furnish somewhere in the neighborhood of 16 or 18 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States, and are we not likely to get into such a situation, in view of what may happen in the Far East, that there will be a tremendous sugar shortage, the importations from the Philippines all being practically cut off, and that it will take 7 or 8 or 10 years to overcome that shortage?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the war continues and curtailment of continental production is continued, of course that result will follow. As the Senator from Michigan pointed out a few minutes ago, the further curtailment of production might sound the death knell of beet-sugar production in the West.

Mr. President, we in this country could easily survive on a 40-percent sugar ration if it became necessary, and that is why I have advocated since 1937 that by all means our continental sugar producers should be permitted to produce at least 40 percent of our requirements, and let the rest, the 60 percent, be distributed among offshore producers. I would, of course, favor and advocate that our island possessions be accorded a fair and just allotment of sugar production.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, apropos of what the Senator from Louisiana has been discussing, I have understood that about 80 percent of all the vessels bringing sugar from the Philippine Islands to the United States are under the registry of countries which within the past year have been subjugated by the Axis Powers. So that there would be only the few vessels which we might build or might charter from other countries to

bring sugar to us from the Philippines. That is something which we cannot now help. But I have always contended, and I know most of my colleagues on this floor interested in the production of sugar have contended, that continental United States should at some time put itself on a self-supply basis.

As has been said here today, about one-third of the sugar consumed in the United States comes from Cuba. We are always anxious to do all we can for that country, but it seems that if we try to accommodate or safeguard the other sugar-raising countries, our sugar growers will never be able, under our present program, to become self-sustaining, as they certainly should in order to safeguard this important food supply.

Sugar is a universal food. It is one of the most important foods we consume. It is a food which produces energy and is just as essential in time of war for the soldier and the sailor as is gunpowder.

Mr. President, I hope that at the present session some program will be presented and adopted which will be more equitable and fair to the sugar growers of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 3546) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3617) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL-DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS. I submit the conference report on House bill 3617, making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes. I ask

unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3617) "making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
GERALD P. NYE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. May we not have a brief explanation of the report, and the reasons for the action on the part of the Senate conferees?

Mr. ADAMS. The appropriation bill as it came from the House provided for approximately \$1,400,000,000, divided between the Army and the Navy. The Senate made eight amendments to the bill. The conference committee agreed to all but one of the amendments, and the House has approved the action of the conference committee. The amendment on which the Senate conferees were unable to secure agreement was one offered by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] providing for the creation of a plant site board for the selection of sites for naval activities within the country. The House conferees would not agree to that amendment, but all other Senate amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Colorado and the other Senate conferees on having gained such an overwhelming victory. I regret that the only casualty sustained in the conference was the amendment which I offered, and which was unanimously approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, the amendment merely provided that none of the funds which were appropriated in the bill for the use of the Navy for the construction of factories and industries, should be expended unless the site had been selected and approved by a board composed of the

Director of the Office of Production Management, Mr. Knudsen, the Associate Director, Mr. Hillman, and the Agricultural Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Commission, who happens to be Mr. Chester C. Davis. I was not wedded to the language of the amendment, and I apprehended that the conferees would perhaps go into the matter and change the language of the amendment with respect to the creation of that committee. But I do regret that the Congress has been so swept off its feet by the hysteria of the defense movement that we continue to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars, and turn the money over to the departments of the Government, who are in turn working in some nebulous, uncertain way with the Office of Production Management in the location of these plants.

Mr. President, there will come a day of reckoning at some time concerning the manner of the expenditure of these funds. I hope there will be no waste, and I am sure that every effort is being made which can possibly be made to prevent any graft, or prevent any of these funds being used for purposes for which they were not intended to be used. But I do know that there should be somewhere in this Government an agency to which the Members of the Congress and the people of the United States can go and discuss the question of locating these sites.

Mr. President, I happened to notice a publication which the Defense Commission issues weekly which stated that in 1 week these departments had provided for the enlargement or construction of 285 different industries, producing everything from cords and ropes to the highest and most specialized instruments, such as compasses, field glasses, and other very important but highly specialized products that are essential in modern-day warfare. I know that many mistakes are being made in the location of these industries. They are all being piled up and centralized in sections which already have the major part of the industries of the country, and certain other sections of the country are receiving absolutely no consideration, and there is no place to which the Representatives from those sections can go to discuss these matters. Today we find the greatest "buck passing" contest in the world going on between the War Department and the Navy Department and the Defense Commission as to who does have any authoritative say-so with respect to the location of these plants.

The very least we could have done was to create some board with authority so that people who have been woefully discriminated against would at least have a place to go and present their problem. As it is now, there is not a Senator who knows where to go to discuss the location of these plants which are being paid for by all the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, as I said, what is being done is to continue to pile industries on top of each other in sections which today already have most of the industries of the country. From States such as my State, and 15 or 20 other States of the Nation, all the skilled labor we have is being drawn out. When the program is

completed we shall have an economic problem and a relief problem in connection with these stranded populations which are being piled into these areas now, that will make the unemployment problem in 1933 and 1934 look like a Sunday-school picnic at which everyone had a full basket.

Mr. President, I do not know who was back of all the opposition to my amendment, but I do know that the officials in the Office of Production Management and the officials in the War Department and the Navy Department ought to welcome having some committee charged with responsibility for handling this important matter.

Mr. President, even though the amendment has been lost in conference I do not intend to stop the fight, and I shall offer similar amendments to other appropriation bills providing hundreds of millions of dollars for the building of every kind of factory on earth that anyone in the War Department and the Navy Department can even think of. The people of the United States are entitled to have some place to go to submit their problems. Those persons in the Government who are reaping all the glory of the great work they claim to be doing in preparing for defense ought to be willing to accept the responsibility for the location of these factories.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Georgia to know that a very earnest effort was made to keep his amendment in the bill. The House conferees were quite insistent. There was general agreement on the part of the conferees on both sides that the basic contention of the Senator from Georgia was sound and that there should be some source both of responsibility and of information. The House conferees insisted that the form in which the amendment was presented would not meet the situation, and they supplemented that statement by pointing out that this is a deficiency bill, which contemplates only the control of expenditures up to the end of the fiscal year. It was the understanding that an effort would be made to work out a program along the lines and for the purposes which the Senator from Georgia has in mind. Representative WOODRUM, who was chairman of the House conferees, said he would be very glad to make a statement on the floor of the House along that line at the time the conference report was taken up. The House conferees agreed to cooperate in that respect. I can only say to the Senator from Georgia that we regret that we were not able to retain his amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I supported the Senator's amendment, and I am sorry it was eliminated, but it seems to me an effort should be made to have a general provision applying to all appropriations affecting defense, so that it would not be necessary to put such a provision in each separate bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have introduced a general bill, but the Senator from Kentucky knows the difficulty we are encountering in seeking to secure the passage of such legislation. Practically all the funds for defense are being provided in deficiency appropriations. I am

not impressed with the argument that because this is a deficiency appropriation the proviso should not be inserted, because it happens that all the funds that have been appropriated for the construction of factories all over the United States, running into billions of dollars, have been carried in supplemental bills and in deficiency bills. Only very small amounts have been carried in regular departmental appropriation bills.

This is one of the unfortunate cases in which everybody agrees with the theory of the proposition that in a democracy there should be some responsible agency to determine every detail of the expenditure of such huge sums of money. Everyone favors it but votes against it when it is presented in the conference report, but no one has offered anything in substitution for it.

I intend to continue to carry on this fight.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Georgia say that he will carry on the fight. I am not thinking simply in terms of today or tomorrow when I think of what centralization is doing to our country. I am also thinking in terms of what our problem will be tomorrow, or 10 years from now, when the dove of peace comes over the horizon.

Some of us in Washington see the menace of centralization, not only in power but that form of centralization which drains the hinterland of men who should be producers in their own sections and who should be spending their money there. All over this country there are communities which have been drained of individuals who have been called into other sections. The best example of centralization in America today is the city of Washington. There are communities throughout the land which would be prosperous if they could have the pay rolls of their residents who have come to this city. The result is that in many communities the economic current has become stagnant, and as a result the economic problems have multiplied manifold. Business values have gone away down. Homes which in Washington cost \$15,000 to \$20,000 can be duplicated in many communities throughout this land for \$2,000, \$3,000, or \$4,000. Homes are lying idle, taxes are unpaid, and businesses are unable to carry on because we have drained into the eastern part of the country not thousands or tens of thousands but hundreds of thousands of people who should be back home.

It is said it is necessary for defense. That is a superficial view of defense. As I have said, the lifeblood of many communities has become stagnant and business values have gone, all because of the lack of vision. Not by centralization but by decentralization can we get the lifeblood of those communities back to normal, and, what is more, Mr. President, get the production which this country now needs. It is production that we need. We know that we shall appropriate \$7,000,000,000. That does not fool Hitler. The only thing Hitler is afraid of is production; and we cannot get production without going back to

some basic rules. First, we had better get back to work. I think that was suggested by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. Next, we cannot produce in a 40-hour week what England produces by working the week around. Not by centralization but by decentralization can we maintain values—material, economic, and spiritual.

This is not theory. England, in her magnificent program whereby she not only rejuvenated the spirit of the nation but multiplied her efficiency and her production many hundredfold, has seen the imperative need of decentralization.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate long, but I wish to say that in speaking of decentralization I do not consider simply human values. I consider also material values. I do not consider simply the matter of men coming to Washington. I consider the need of putting factories all over the land. England did so. If she had not done so, she would be out of the running today.

A few days ago I had occasion to talk to the head of one of the departments. The Government has taken materials away from factories in my State, claiming that such action is necessary in the defense program. That material furnished jobs for men. In one community, because material has been taken away from it, 300 men are out of work. Three hundred men out of work means what? Unless some substitute can be found, it means bankruptcy in that community. The monthly checks of those 300 men determine the economic health or sickness of the community.

I said to the head of one department, "The Government is taking material away from the local community but is not putting anything in its place. Have you ever thought of the need of sending some expert out there to cooperate with local industries to see what those industries can turn to?" No; the authorities have not thought of that. I asked, "Do you not think there is an obligation on the part of the Government to do something of the kind?"

What is this thing called defense? Is it simply guns and airplanes? No. The main things in defense are the courage and morale of the people. When we take the bread out of the mouths of the people so that they cannot eat, and take their economic sustenance away from them, there is not much morale left. So we had better think in terms of building the Nation.

Mr. President, I rose simply to second the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Georgia when he spoke about centralization in the East.

My State of 3,100,000 people has not had one project put into it. We have had some war materials in some of the factories. There we are in the great Middle West region, right at the top of the backbone of America. For 10 years our farmers have been going down, down, and down, and we have not been able to solve their problem. Now we are taking out of my State, to put into communities on the eastern seaboard, men who once helped to consume dairy products. Our consumers are going away from us and

the economic current is being lessened—and that is called defense. We had better do a little thinking, and we had better get a bird's-eye view of the meaning of defense.

Mr. President, when the amendment suggested by the Senator from Georgia, or a bill embodying the same idea, comes before us, I shall be for it 100 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brown in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are only two nominations on the Executive Calendar. As in executive session, I ask that they be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the nomination of Ruby G. Holt to be postmaster at Oil Center, N. Mex., and the nomination of Arthur F. Ellis to be postmaster at Cambridge Springs, Pa., were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

ABANDONMENT OF BRANCH OF DENVER & RIO GRANDE WESTERN RAILROAD CO.

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 82, relating to the abandonment and dismemberment of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, early today Senate Resolution 82, authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the proposed abandonment of the branch of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex., was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and was then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. That committee has now reported the resolution with an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,000" and to insert "\$3,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Whereas authentic reports indicate that all of the pertinent facts were not disclosed in the hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission following which an order was entered on January 22, 1941, by a division of the Interstate Commerce Commission ordering the abandonment of the narrow-gage

railroad between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex.; and

Whereas national defense, with which the American people are vitally concerned, demands that this railroad line be not abandoned but that it remain serviceable during the present emergency for the transportation of military supplies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make and to report to the Senate the results of a thorough and complete investigation of the proposed abandonment and all pertinent facts, including the practices, the methods, and acts or omissions to act, of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. in the operation of the narrow-gage branch of said the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to obtain such facts as other Government agencies may have, and to secure the assistance of other Government agencies in the investigation hereby authorized.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, either in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and subsequent Congresses, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think this is the resolution the purpose of which was stated to me by the able Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution provides for the gathering of information by the Committee on Interstate Commerce concerning the proposed abandonment of a branch of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

UNITED STATES BASES IN THE WEST INDIES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I see present on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], who is chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and who, I suppose, has information on an issue in which I have deep interest, and in which I know other Senators have, as well. There has been a great deal of consideration and much talk concerning the possibility of the United States taking or receiving possession of certain British

possessions in the Atlantic. I wonder if the Senator from Maryland in his studies has found any objections to the thought of exchanging for the favors we are showing Great Britain, or of receiving in exchange therefor, some of her island possessions. It has occurred to me that perhaps there is an inheritance that might be ours in these islands if we were to pursue that course. I am extremely anxious to know what is the thought of the Senator from Maryland on that score.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of general talk and, without wishing to reflect on anyone, I might say loose talk, about acquiring all the islands in the West Indies. With respect to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the former of which we acquired in the war with Spain, and the latter shortly before our entry into the World War, I know the Senator is aware that when we acquired them we not only sought the land but actually we acquired the populations as well. The cost to bring those populations up to something like an American standard of living has been tremendous. The figure—I venture to say that the amount which it has been necessary for our Government to pour out in order to sustain those congested areas which have come under the American flag runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

In the islands where we have bases, such as Bermuda, Trinidad, and in other islands that have so far been designated, it would be a fine thing if we owned, as American territory, the property upon which the base itself rests—not the whole island and the whole population of the island, but only that part of the island where our port and base are located. If we owned that in fee simple, if that were American territory, I should say that would be a wholesome thing, and that the exchange would be a fine one. But to take over all the Bahama Islands would mean, in my humble judgment, that we would take over a population which in many respects would become a charge on the Treasury of the United States.

Further than that, such possessions would be very difficult of administration. There is nothing that I know of in our Government more difficult of administration than the affairs of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. First of all, Puerto Rico has the most congested population in the Western Hemisphere. I have forgotten what it is, but I think it is approximately 450 people to a square mile. One is never out of sound of a voice or out of sight of a person while he is on that island. In the Virgin Islands we have had a great deal of trouble. Governors do not hold their tenure of office very long in either of these two places, and it is very difficult for them to be popular with personnel. Not long ago, following a violent insurrection, in an attempt by some of the inhabitants to set up a free country in Puerto Rico it became necessary to conduct a trial.

So the question of taking over the West Indies in toto, for example, in exchange for the aid we will give to Great Britain, does not afford as promising and rosy a prospect as it would seem at first blush.

If we could own in fee simple, and have under American sovereignty, instead of leasing for 99 years, the bases which we will actually occupy on those islands, in my judgment that would be a wholesome thing. I hope that will come to pass, because we will expend many million dollars on the particular part of each island on which there is a base; and therefore to own the location in fee simple would be better than to control it under lease.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Maryland concludes his discussion of that phase of the subject, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will come back to it, Mr. President, but I do not want to forget what I am about to say. There is another angle to consider. How about the people living in the West Indies? They may not want to become American citizens; they may prefer to remain subjects of the British Crown. They are entitled to a hearing, too, because, after all, they are people. We must not assume, as quite often we do, that the problem is simply one of acquiring real estate. We would acquire not only real estate, but all the debts and the human problems and disabilities that go with congested tropical islands which have very little in the way of wealth.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] stated that he desired to ask a question.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Maryland has answered the question I had in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Is not this really the desideratum that we should own under the American flag those islands which the Army and the Navy decide are necessary for national defense?

Mr. TYDINGS. As the Senator asks the question, I do not believe I can answer in the affirmative. I would answer in the affirmative if the question were framed something like this: Should we not own that part of the island or islands where we now have a base leased from Great Britain?

For example, consider Bermuda. We do not have to have the whole island. We want a certain part of it. All the inhabitants of that part will be moved off. So if just that part were United States soil, I believe it would be advisable, because there we would have the land, with none of the problems of population—and the same thing would be true with respect to the other islands.

However, it seems to me that taking over an entire island, such as Jamaica, with all its human problems, merely in order to get a port in Jamaica, is of questionable wisdom, a matter which should have more consideration than we have ever given it in the generalities of debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate fully the factors which are involved in the Senator's statement. I think my question applied to islands the Army and Navy decided were necessary for our defense.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator means merely the portions of the islands used for bases?

Mr. WILEY. If the Army and Navy officials decided that was all that was necessary, yes; but if they felt, from the strategic standpoint and as a matter of life insurance to America it was necessary to have more than that, then, it seems to me we should not only have title in fee, but the island should become part of the United States soil in that respect. That is what the Senator means, does he not?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think, as the Senator says, if the Army and Navy officers were to say that we needed a whole island, that might be such a case that we should have that one island in toto, but generally, particularly in the case of the large islands, I should not look with favor, unless the Army and Navy strongly urged otherwise, upon doing more than acquiring in fee the portions of certain islands we are actually going to use for bases.

Now, let us go back to an hour ago, when we had here a debate on the floor about sugar. The Senator from Louisiana and various other Senators complained about how the islands of Cuba and Hawaii and Puerto Rico and others were making inroads on the possible sugar production of American farmers. If we should take over an island such as Jamaica or many other of the West India islands we would acquire very good farming territory, so that we would have an agricultural problem as well as a human problem of need, because the people of the islands must produce things which already, to some extent, we produce in our own country. So I think it is very wise before any of us are carried away with the idea that we want the West India Islands in toto to examine a little more carefully into the matter and consider what it is we do want. In my humble judgment, what the Army and the Navy and the present administration want is not all the West India Islands, but certain parts of the West India Islands, which we already have leased for 99 years, upon which land, sea, and air bases may be constructed. If we can get that, in my judgment, we shall have gotten what we want without taking over liabilities and problems which are more ramified than any of us can possibly imagine.

I should like to see us own these bases in fee simple, that is, that part of the islands on which we are actually going to build forts or airfields or naval bases, even though they are only small portions of the islands in question.

Mr. WILEY. And have them under the jurisdiction of America.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, have them under the jurisdiction of America. I am not, however, in favor of holding a pistol at the breast of England and forcing her to divest herself of her property in toto. I do not believe our request for bases and ports for the Army and Navy and Air Force in the West Indies is unreasonable. I think, on the other hand, in view of what we are doing here every day, that the British would feel that our request

is reasonable, and we have already demonstrated that it is reasonable. But I should like it to go further, so that when we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to build these air bases and naval bases and land bases we would own the land itself in fee simple, provided the English would, without too much disagreement, consent to transfer it to us. Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. NYE. The Senator has done so most fully.

Mr. TYDINGS. In conclusion, I merely wish to say that there is much more to acquiring the West Indies than the mere acquisition of valuable land that might be used for air, naval, or land bases. There is the population question, the economic question, the question of governmental administration, and, finally, the overlapping in certain of these areas of agricultural production which is similar to that already being prorated and cut down in the United States proper.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SCHWERT, OF NEW YORK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 141

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

UNITED STATES,

March 12, 1941.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRED L. SCHWERT, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of four: Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], I send forward a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 88) was considered and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRED L. SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair

appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative the Senators from New York [Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD].

Mr. BARKLEY. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Member of the House of Representatives, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 17, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13, 1941:

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. E. L. Compere to be State Director of Selective Service for the State of Arkansas, under provisions of section 10 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The compensation to be paid General Compere will be in excess of \$5,000 per annum, in accordance with his rank as brigadier general in the National Guard of the United States.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Robert Royce Gideon, Jr., Cavalry (first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY
Capt. Roy W. Ryden to be a rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of October 1936.

The following named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Valery Havard, Jr., November 23, 1940.

Mannert L. Abele, December 1, 1940.

Gerald D. Zurmuehlen, December 1, 1940.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Jack C. Titus to be a lieutenant in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of October 1940.

The following named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 3d day of June 1940:

John S. Slaughter

John D. Miller

Francis C. Rydeen

Gordon G. Matheson

The following named commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Arnold J. Isbell, July 1, 1940.

Nealy A. Chapin, July 13, 1940.

Arthur DeL. Ayrault, August 1, 1940.

Daniel V. Gallery, Jr., August 16, 1940.

Norman O. Schwien, September 1, 1940.

Charles J. Maguire, October 1, 1940.

William L. Rees, November 1, 1940.

Jesse H. Carter, November 23, 1940.

Pay Director Frederick G. Pyne to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of rear admiral, to rank from the 16th day of October 1930.

The following named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Albert F. Ryan, Jr., November 23, 1940.

Donald O. Lacey, January 1, 1941.

The following named electricians to be chief electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 15th day of December 1940:

Edwin H. Wallace

Earl W. Sloan

Radio Electrician James A. Mets to be a chief radio electrician in the Navy, to rank

with but after ensign, from the 20th day of October 1940.

Machinist Morris Schoenberg to be a chief machinist in the Navy to rank with but after ensign, from the 20th day of October, 1940.

Machinist Harry O. Reynolds to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of November, 1940.

The following-named captains to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Francis E. M. Whiting, July 1, 1939.

William H. P. Blandy, August 1, 1939.

Thomas S. McCloy, August 1, 1939.

Lyell St. L. Pamperin, August 1, 1939.

Herbert R. Hein, August 1, 1939.

George B. Ashe, August 1, 1939.

Robert P. Hinrichs, August 1, 1939.

Pat Buchanan, August 1, 1939.

Carlos A. Bailey, August 1, 1939.

Wallace B. Phillips, August 1, 1939.

Harry D. McHenry, August 1, 1939.

Eugene T. Oates, August 1, 1939.

Robert B. Simons, September 23, 1939.

Robert M. Hinckley, September 23, 1939.

Samuel J. Zeigler, Jr., November 1, 1939.

Rivers J. Carstarphen, November 1, 1939.

Virgil C. Griffin, Jr., November 1, 1939.

Benjamin Perlman, November 1, 1939.

Alfred E. Montgomery, November 1, 1939.

James C. Clark, November 1, 1939.

Robert A. Hall, November 1, 1939.

Guy C. Hitchcock, November 1, 1939.

Anton B. Anderson, November 1, 1939.

Schuyler Mills, November 1, 1939.

Robert S. Haggart, December 8, 1939.

Clarence Gulbranson, December 8, 1939.

Carroll M. Hall, December 8, 1939.

Campbell D. Edgar, December 8, 1939.

Ingram C. Sowell, December 29, 1939.

Paul S. Theiss, December 29, 1939.

Charles S. Alden, December 29, 1939.

Otto M. Forster, December 29, 1939.

James C. Jones, Jr., January 1, 1940.

Daniel E. Barbey, February 1, 1940.

Elmer L. Woodside, April 1, 1940.

Glenn B. Davis, April 13, 1940.

Palmer H. Dunbar, Jr., May 1, 1940.

Thomas M. Shock, May 1, 1940.

Adolph V. S. Pickhardt, May 29, 1940.

George D. Hull, June 1, 1940.

The following-named commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from August 1, 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Raymond E. Farnsworth

Norman E. Millar

Hermann P. Knickerbocker

Scott E. Peck

Cornelius V. S. Knox

Emil B. Perry

Karl Schmidt

Harvey R. Bowes

John B. McGovern

Joseph W. McColl, Jr.

Thomas J. Bay

Paul L. Mather

Floyd J. Nuber

Jackson R. Tate

Arthur W. Peterson

Clarence H. Pike

Benjamin C. Purring-ton

Anton L. Mare

John D. Murphy

Cyril E. Taylor

Laurence Bennett

Sumner C. Cheever

Lewis R. McDowell

Abel C. J. Sabalot

Calvin M. Bolster

Henry S. Nielson

Marion E. Crist

William H. Galbraith

Alexander J. Couble

Warner W. Angerer

Walter H. Roberts

Robert D. Threshie

Lewis Corman

Robert E. Melling

Robert E. Robinson, Jr.

Frederick C. Sachse

Karl J. Christoph

Jack E. Hurff

John P. Vetter

Harold C. Fitz

Royal W. Abbott

Rockwell J. Townsend

Richard R. Hartung

The following-named commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Alph O. R. Bergesen, September 1, 1939.

Maurice E. Curtis, September 23, 1939.

Jesse F. Donovan, Jr., November 1, 1939.

Jennings B. Dow, November 1, 1939.

Dixwell Ketcham, November 1, 1939.

Cato D. Glover, Jr., November 1, 1939.

Harold F. Flick, November 1, 1939.

John F. Crowe, Jr., November 1, 1939.

John E. Gingrich, November 1, 1939.

Paul W. Steinhagen, November 1, 1939.

Francis P. Old, November 1, 1939.

Forrest M. O'Leary, December 8, 1939.

Benjamin P. Ward, December 8, 1939.

John F. Rees, December 8, 1939.

Charles B. McVay 3d, December 8, 1939.

James B. Carter, December 29, 1939.

John B. Mallard, December 29, 1939.

James L. Wyatt, December 29, 1939.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of August 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Frederick N. Kivette

Jesse C. Sowell

Ira E. Hobbs

Edward L. Schleif

William O. Gallery

Harold O. Larson

Harry F. Miller

John O. Lambrecht

Thomas Burrowes

Donald C. Varian

Harry H. Henderson

Charles S. Weeks

Kenneth C. Hurd

William L. Wright

Rex S. Caldwell

John H. Griffin

Russell S. Smith

Albert E. Jarrell

Howard T. Orville

Oliver F. Naquin

Thomas H. Tonseth

William L. Benson

Waldeman N. Christensen

Everett E. Mann

Hunter Wood, Jr.

John J. Laffan

Joseph H. Wellings

William R. Headden

Barton E. Bacon, Jr.

Paul C. Crosley

James M. Hicks

George J. Dufek

Edward L. Beck

George A. Leahey, Jr.

William A. New

William H. Standley, Jr.

Frank P. Tibbitts

Fred R. Stickney

Warren P. Mowatt

Phillip S. Creasor

William P. McGirr

Charles A. Ferriter

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of November 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Lermond H. Miller

Alwin D. Kramer

Richard H. Gingras

George E. Fee

Douglas E. Smith

Harry A. Simms

John D. Reppy

Glenn M. Cox

Herbert P. Rice

Carleton C. Hoffner

Lee F. Sugnet

Warren W. Johnson

William L. Turney

James H. Carrington

Malcolm D. Sylvester

Roland B. Vanasse

Aubrey B. Leggett

Watson T. Singer

John G. Bianche, Jr.

Raymond R. Lyons

William H. Truesdell

William W. Graham, Jr.

John F. Goodwin

Cornelius M. Sullivan

Fremont B. Eggers

Adolph Hede

Reuben T. Thornton, Jr.

Walter S. Mayer, Jr.

Linwood S. Howeth

George F. O'Keefe

Herman E. Schieke

Cecil L. Blackwell

Harry L. Ferguson, Jr.

Roland B. Vanasse

Aubrey B. Leggett

Alexander C. Thoring-ton

John G. Bianche, Jr.

Raymond R. Lyons

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Joseph M. Carson, December 8, 1939.

William S. Howard, Jr., December 8, 1939.

Hamilton L. Stone, December 8, 1939.

John B. Brown, December 8, 1939.

William S. Veeder, December 29, 1939.

Joseph H. Nevins, Jr., December 29, 1939.

Thomas C. Parker, December 29, 1939.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy to rank from the 1st day of August 1939, to correct the date

of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Paul H. Grouleff	Charles C. Gold
Joseph C. Wylie, Jr.	Stephen M. Archer
Anthony H. Dropp	Theodore H. White
Francis M. Douglass	Richard V. Gregory
William L. Richards	John M. Grider
Francis D. Foley	Earl P. Finney, Jr.
Scott K. Gibson	Alfred L. Cope
Paul H. Harrington	Richard C. Williams,
William M. Ryon	Jr.
William I. Bull	Robert H. Kerr
Levering Smith	Edwin C. Woodward
William R. Willson	Max Silverstein
Leon S. Kintberger	Charles M. Sugarman
John R. Leeds	Charles J. Oden'hal,
Thomas M. Fleck	Jr.
John Munholland	Robert E. Vandling
Louis J. Kirn	Ray M. Pitts
William B. Short, Jr.	Jack I. Bandy
Earl T. Hydeman	Travis R. Leverett
John R. Van Evera	Norman E. Blaisdell

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

William T. Zink, Jr., September 1, 1939.
 William P. Schroeder, September 8, 1939.
 George E. Hughes, September 23, 1939.
 Ernest M. Snowden, September 23, 1939.
 Maximilian G. Schmidt, September 23, 1939.
 Alvin W. Slayden, September 23, 1939.
 Herbert J. Campbell, September 23, 1939.
 George W. Kehl, September 27, 1939.
 John R. Spiers, October 1, 1939.
 John Corry, October 1, 1939.
 Ralph M. Wilson, October 1, 1939.
 Jacob C. Myers, October 1, 1939.
 Wallace H. Weston, October 1, 1939.
 Paul E. Emrick, October 1, 1939.
 Robert O. Beer, October 1, 1939.
 Daniel L. Carroll, Jr., October 1, 1939.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of November 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

William L. Tagg	Samuel F. Quarles
William Outerson	William H. Grover-
John D. Andrew	man, Jr.
Robert C. Young	Edwin C. Asman
William A. Stuart	Frank D. Latta
Alfred R. Matter	William W. Vanous
William E. Kenna	John S. Lewis
Bruce McCandless	Charles S. Hutchings
Robert J. C. Maulsby	Thomas D. F. Langen
William R. Cox	Marcus W. William-
Burdette E. Close	son
Allen B. Adams, Jr.	George W. Pressey
Richard S. Craighill	Robert P. Walker
Mason J. Hamilton	Theodore S. Lank
Salem A. Van Every,	Harmon T. Utter
Jr.	George O. Hobbs
James G. Craig, Jr.	John H. S. Johnson
Henry C. DeLong	Daniel C. Goodman
George R. Luker	

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

George E. Pierce, December 8, 1939.
 Max C. Mather, December 8, 1939.
 Daniel S. Gothie, December 8, 1939.
 Jack W. Wintle, December 8, 1939.
 Charles F. Brindupke, December 29, 1939.
 Alton E. Parker, December 29, 1939.
 Arthur H. Vorpahl, December 29, 1939.

Paymaster Philip White to be a paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of November 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Hugh L. Hendrick to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 23d day of September 1939, to

correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1941:

POSTMASTERS

NEW MEXICO

Ruby G. Holt, Oil Center.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arthur F. Ellis, Cambridge Springs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1941

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

Grant unto us, our Father in heaven, that faith in Thee, that hope through Thee, and inspiration by Thee by which we shall grow into the fullness of those virtues which are highest and best. We pray that the divine truth may inspire knowledge, fidelity, obedience, and honor that will lead us to carry in ourselves a rich portion of the Spirit from above, enabling us to cultivate those experiences which shall indeed make us worthy to be called the sons of God. We rejoice that at the center of power, high above sight, high above sense, and high above human understanding are eternal light and peace, the cause of that rest which is the purest, the divinest, and the most compassionate. Ever blessed Lord, be very gracious to our President, our Speaker, and the Congress and through them grant that Thy will may be established throughout the world. In the holy name of our Saviour. Amen.

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

FOURTH NATIONAL DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3617) making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3617) "making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

C. A. WOODRUM,
 LOUIS LUDLOW,
 J. BUELL SNYDER,
 EMMET O'NEAL,
 GEO. W. JOHNSON,
 JOHN TABER,
 R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
 W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
 CARTER GLASS,
 KENNETH MCKELLAR,
 CARL HAYDEN,
 JAMES F. BYRNES,
 GERALD P. NYE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3617) "Making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1 and 2: Appropriates \$71,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,000, as proposed by the House, for Fleet Training for the Navy.

Nos. 3 and 4: Provide for 40 passenger automobiles at \$600 each for the Navy, as provided by the Senate, instead of 36 such vehicles, at \$600 each, as provided by the House.

No. 5: Strikes out the amendment, inserted by the Senate, proposing the creation of a Plant Site Board to pass upon the size and location of industrial facilities for the Navy.

No. 6: Appropriates \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate for salaries and expenses of national-defense activities of the Civil Service Commission.

No. 7: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of funds in the bill to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. This section is identical with similar provision made by the House in the First Deficiency Appropriation Bill, 1941, passed by the House on March 7th last.

C. A. WOODRUM,
 LOUIS LUDLOW,
 J. BUELL SNYDER,
 EMMET O'NEAL,
 GEO. W. JOHNSON,
 JOHN TABER,
 R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
 W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a complete report by the conferees on the fourth supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, 1941, and the House managers' statement, which has just been read from the desk, explains what the conferees have done.

There are one or two more or less small amendments inserted by the Senate which were concurred in by the House, including a small additional amount for the Civil Service Commission and the reinsertion of an item of \$60,000 for the Navy which had been stricken out

by the House. The principal matter—and possibly except for which the bill would not have been sent to conference—is amendment No. 5, put in by the Senate and known as the Russell amendment. Amendment No. 5 sought to set up a Plant Site Board, composed of the Director General and the Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management and the Agricultural Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Commission, whose duty would be to pass on the location and size of all industrial facilities provided in appropriations in the bill for the Navy. The reason for this amendment, so the conferees were told, was that there had been considerable difficulty experienced by members of both bodies in finding anyone in these departments who had definite authority, who were supposed to make final decision and who did make final decisions, and to whom they might go for definite and specific information about these projects. This complaint seemed to be quite general among Members of both bodies, and therefore this amendment setting up a Plant Site Board, as contained in Senate amendment No. 5, was put in by the Senate.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. From the statement we had this morning on the naval appropriations it appears that there was a plant being built in San Francisco at a cost of \$4,500,000 or \$5,000,000, and as soon as the emergency is over they have contracted to destroy these buildings. Do you not think they ought to have a commission of this kind, so that if any plant of this sort is built and could be used in the future for some other purpose, they would not have to make a contract whereby they would destroy such a plant before it had even been put into operation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The particular project which the gentleman refers to is one where they wanted to build a shipbuilding plant on some property owned by a railroad, and the railroad would need the property and did not want to give it up, and would not turn it over to the Government unless there was a provision whereby, when the Government finished with it they would remove the buildings from that site.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The kind of a board they proposed to set up was a board composed of Sidney Hillman and a couple more about like that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania would not suggest that the House should agree to that kind of a performance?

Mr. RICH. The only thing I may say here is that I do not agree with many of the Board, but let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact. When these appropriation bills leave the House, as mountainous as they are and as tremendous a burden as they are on the people

of the country, they then go to the Senate and the Senate increases them. Is not that the fact?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They often insert additional items, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The fact is the Senate hikes every appropriation bill that we pass here in the House, and by the time it gets through the Senate it is always larger.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, the gentleman knows that such items could not stay there unless the House finally agreed to them.

Mr. RICH. Now the gentleman is getting to the point that I want to make. Why in the world does not the House of Representatives try to cut down in view of the fact that we were informed this morning that by the time we get through with the appropriations for 1941 and 1942 we will have appropriated about \$28,000,000,000? I ask the gentleman from Virginia, Where are you going to get that money?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will tell the gentleman that if these defense expenditures accomplish what we mean for them to accomplish—saving this country from war—it will be the best money the Congress ever spent.

Mr. RICH. This Congress is only sticking its nose under the tent, so that you are going to get into war before you get through with it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think we are sticking more under somebody else when we come to the dictators over there and when they look at these expenditures. Mr. Speaker, so far as the Senate amendment is concerned, the Senate conferees agreed to yield, and the amendment went out of the bill. It was recognized, however, that perhaps some action of some kind ought to be taken by the regular committee when we come to consider another bill, providing some means in these departments whereby some person or division may have definite and specific information, and I stated to the conferees of the Senate that I would make a statement of that kind on the floor of the House today.

Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman desire time?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I care to say very much. The difference involved between the House and the Senate is only \$187,400, and they were for items that the pressure of things right now seem to make it necessary for us to yield in respect to. It is not very much, considered with the totals.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman moves the previous question, will he yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I do not want the gentleman from Virginia to think that I am personally making reference to him, because I think this administration has the most capable man in the House that they could get to assume these burdens here.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Would the gentleman like a little more time? [Laughter.] I would be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. RICH. I do not see how the gentleman stands up under it, I do not know how he does it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SCRUGHAM, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill H. R. 3981 (Rept. No. 247), making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and together with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

TIME IN WHICH TO FILE REPORT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report upon the bill S. 262.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What bill is this?

Mr. STEAGALL. So that the gentleman may understand, it is the bill that deals with the cotton-storage problem.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are minority views to be filed at the same time?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know whether the minority intend filing views or not; but if they do, I ask unanimous consent that they have until that time also.

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

There was no objection.

LEASE-LEND BILL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the so-called lease-lend bill has been approved by the Congress. The act has been signed by the President. It is now the law of the land.

President Roosevelt is now vested with powers unparalleled in the history of this Nation. He is vested with powers vastly greater than ever were entrusted to any other President in the history of this Nation. He gets those powers at the beginning of his precedent-shattering third term. The destiny, the economic and social security, the lives, the health, and the happiness of the men, women, and children of this great Nation now depend entirely upon the desires, the judgment, the discretion, and the temper of one man—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Thus in a few short months has a completely new chapter been written into the history of a people and a country which began as a free Nation.

I voted against the original so-called lease-lend bill. I voted against it because I believed it would be an act of abdication by the Congress, because it would clothe one man with vastly more powers than a good man would want or a bad man should have, because such vast powers vested in one man, no matter how sincere he might be, could be ruinous to a nation and a people if that man should be sincerely mistaken.

I voted against the bill as it came back to the House of Representatives as amended in the Senate. I did so because I was convinced that the bill was not changed in its essentially dangerous character, that the Senate amendments did not cure its inherent evils, that the bill still vested all the power in one individual that was intended in the original measure.

I have no apologies to offer for my votes against this measure.

The Congress of the United States has seen fit to adopt this policy of thus abdicating its powers, and of clothing the President with vastly new and enlarged powers to embroil us in war, to give away our national defense mechanism, to hand over to other nations billions of dollars worth of our materials, and finally to determine the fate of this Nation.

Since the act is the law of the land, since the Congress has seen fit to adopt this policy, it now becomes not only the duty, but the part of wisdom for all citizens wholeheartedly to earnestly and without reservation get behind the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and as the individual who has been vested with such enormous powers, in order to help him exercise these unparalleled powers wisely.

Every man, woman, and child in this Nation had better pray from now on that the President does exercise these powers wisely.

Wholehearted, unreserved support of this new policy and of the President, wholehearted and unreserved unity in an effort to take our Nation through these perilous times without becoming involved in armed conflict, if possible, must now be the foremost objective of all our people. This wholehearted support and unity of purpose and action do not mean, however—yet, at least—blind acquiescence in anything proposed, or in any action contemplated, by the Chief Executive, if such action is dangerous to the welfare of the Nation. Such support and such unity do not mean that honest criticism must be silenced; that the lips of honest and sincere men must henceforth be sealed; that the two-party system must disappear from our American way of life; that a complete censorship under a pall of absolute secrecy shall descend upon all the acts of the Government while the people are kept in the darkness of ignorance concerning them.

Even earnest, sincere men can be mistaken. In this case, mistakes could be utterly tragic and disastrous to this Nation and its people.

The American people must now cooperate to their fullest capacity and ability, but that cooperation must not be the cooperation of a driven people. It must be the cooperation of a free and informed people if this Nation is to survive and constitutional government is to live. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and insert a newspaper article dealing with the defense activities in the great State of New Jersey.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a short newspaper article.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, when the House considered the lend-lease bill, I was absent because of a sudden indisposition caused by an abscessed tooth. I was not able to be in the Capitol Building that day. Had I been present I would have voted for the passage of the lend-lease bill, with the Senate amendments. I regret that my name is not in the roll of honor of those in this House who voted on final passage for H. R. 1776, which I have consistently supported both by vote and by speech. I know we are taking a desperate chance, but we are doing what seems necessary to assure that Anglo-Saxon civilization, which has meant so much to the human race, shall not pass from the face of this earth. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Examiner under the caption "Dies committee. Permanent need of group seen."

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

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered before the Daughters of the American Revolution by Dr. R. J. Dorsey.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. 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. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, by spending \$132,000,000 to purchase the capital stock of the central Federal Reserve banks from the private

member banks Congress would do the following things for the American people:

First. Acquire an accumulated surplus of \$183,850,000 now held by these banks.

Second. Reduce the public debt immediately by \$2,184,000,000, the amount of United States bonds now held by the central banks, and bought with credit on the books of the banks created for that purpose.

Third. Restore to Congress its constitutional duty and right to issue the Nation's money and regulate its value. The Federal Reserve banks are now the bank of issue of America. As such they should be—they should always have been—an agency of Congress and the property of the American people.

Fourth. Place our Nation in the position of being able to answer the problem of interest-bearing public debt.

Fifth. Silence once and for all the charge that international banking interests are in any way influencing the policy of our country.

Sixth. Finally, the purchase by Congress of the 12 central banks would mean that the Nation could earn its way out of debt. At present the Federal Reserve Board from time to time purchases outstanding Government bonds from member banks in order to expand the volume of money and credit in circulation. The Board buys these bonds with credit on its books. It buys them because an expansion of production and business has indicated a need and justification for more actively circulating money and credit. If the central banks belonged to the Government, then when the Board bought bonds they would belong to an agency of the Government and would in effect have been retired without the necessity of any tax revenues being used to do so. Interest upon such bonds would, of course, be saved. Hence by increasing their production the people of the Nation would, if only the 12 central banks were a Government institution, be able to earn their way out of debt.

If Congress does not do this, we will have to account to the Nation for our failure to do it. We will have to tell our people why we marshaled all other resources for national defense but left control of the Nation's own credit in private hands. We will have to tell them why we failed to take this constructive action, even when the welfare of a nation was at stake. We will have to tell them we deliberately decided to afflict them with an interest-bearing debt when we might by a simple act have avoided doing so.

The success of our defense program, the protection of our Nation's future against a gigantic public debt, and consequent probable inflation, and, above all, the establishment of a means whereby, without increase in debt, we can keep our active monetary supply in line with our power to produce—all these depend on constructive action on this matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short clipping recently appearing in the Washington Post, entitled "What Washington Would Do if He Were Here."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the Legislature of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief press report on the new Navy cook book.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief statement by Dr. Robert A. Millikan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial on Americanism, from the Shreveport Times of March 11.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTEREST-BEARING BONDS CAUSE TAXPAYERS TO PAY \$2 FOR EVERY \$1 BORROWED

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if a State borrows money it is perfectly all right for the State to pay interest, because a State does not have the power to create money. But it is not right for the sovereign Government of the United States to issue interest-bearing bonds because it is unnecessary, and when we appropriate \$7,000,000,000 for national defense or to aid England we will, if we pursue the old custom, not only have to pay the \$7,000,000,000, but we will also pay \$7,000,000,000 in interest, or \$14,000,000,000 in all. One-half of that is absolutely wasteful, extravagant, and unnecessary. Instead of having a debt of \$65,000,000,000 at the end of this year we will have a debt of \$130,000,000,000 on account of the interest. So there is no reason for the people paying interest on the obligations when the sovereign Government itself has the right to create the very money that they issue bonds to acquire.

DEFINITE PROPOSAL TO SAVE \$2,000,000,000 A YEAR TO BE DISCUSSED

So I ask that you give the question serious and careful consideration at this time.

Next Saturday night, March 15, 7:30 to 7:45 p. m., eastern standard time, I expect to discuss over the Mutual Broadcasting System radio hook-up, a definite proposal which, if adopted, will save the taxpayers \$2,000,000,000 a year in interest charges and will thereby enable us to pay the entire \$65,000,000,000 public debt in 25 years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the mine-inspection bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a joint resolution from the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MANUFACTURERS' SALES TAX

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill providing for a manufacturers' sales tax, which will be a substitute, partial or whole, for the property tax. This bill, if enacted into law, will reduce the farm owners' and home owners' taxes to the extent of at least two-thirds of what they are now paying. I believe it will go further in solving the plight of the farmer and home owner than any legislation thus far enacted. Our tax system, so far as the farmer is concerned, is still in the "horse and buggy" days. You know he cannot hand his taxes on. It is time that it be streamlined so to place the tax burden upon those best able to bear it. The bill I am introducing in substance is following the Canadian system for raising revenue for the Dominion. I hope the Members of Congress will give this bill serious thought. I have spent years in studying some plan to relieve the farmer and home owners of the disproportionate burden of taxes they are required to bear, and this seems to me to be the best answer to the problem. I will at a later date try to explain this bill in its entirety. The first bill of its kind was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts in 1935. My bill is an amendment of his bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement on the bill H. R. 1776.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CLEVINGER and Mr. COFFEE of Washington were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years I have been trying in every way to get the reservoir and dam constructed at Blakely Mountain.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including Senate Resolution No. 5 of the State legislature with reference to this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by the Interior Department, Bureau of Reclamation, concerning the Grand Coulee Dam.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MINE INSPECTION BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 135 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 135

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2082, a bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

DEMAGOGUERY OR PATRIOTISM?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan will state his personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. On the 28th of January 1941 there appeared in the Grand Rapids Herald, published at Grand Rapids, Mich., with a circulation throughout western and northern

Michigan, an article which, in part, is as follows:

Sharp protest of the labor attitude of Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN (Republican), of Allegan, and a suggestion that he be removed from office were voiced Monday by the Grand Rapids Federation of Labor (A. F. of L.).

In a resolution drawn up by a committee appointed to investigate HOFFMAN's alleged antilabor attitude and passed by the union, the organization called HOFFMAN a reactionary demagogue, and urged that his constituents remove him and seek a new Representative.

The resolution read, in part:

"Your committee is of the opinion that Congressman HOFFMAN, of Allegan, is of that type of reactionary demagogue whose minds still live apparently in the old oxcart days; who fail to realize that the Civil War is over and that slavery no longer exists in this country.

"Is his patriotism real and sincere, or is it just flag-waving and blatant oratory? Your committee is of the opinion that we should hold in contempt men the likes of Mr. HOFFMAN.

"We feel that the constituents of Mr. HOFFMAN would be better off if they removed him from office and sought the type of Representative they are entitled to."

This article reflects upon the integrity and the patriotism in his official capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and raises the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that that part of the resolution which asks:

Is his patriotism real and sincere or just flag-waving and blatant oratory?

does raise the question of privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about the reactionary demagogue part?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated that the gentleman has raised a question of personal privilege, and the Chair quoted at least enough of the resolution to sustain the Chair's opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My only purpose in making the inquiry was that I did not want to be held out of order in replying to the charge that I am a reactionary demagogue.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be rather liberal with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from contemporary correspondence and newspaper articles, it is quite evident that this resolution of the Grand Rapids local of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, division of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, grew out of H. R. 1408 and H. R. 1814, the first introduced on the 6th of January and the second on the 10th of January, both having been offered in the prior session of Congress.

H. R. 1408 was an attempt to provide legislation for a more equal distribution of the cost of national defense. It was, however, by certain groups construed as an attempt to reduce the salaries of Federal employees. Typical of the complaints received is this one from Stephen C. Fenwick, vice president of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, division of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, where the resolution to which reference has been made originated. Vice President Fenwick wrote me as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1941.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: It is inexplicable to clerks in the Post Office Department to comprehend the fundamental reasons for your introduction of H. R. 1408. Your stated purpose to effect a saving for the Government to offset the defense demands boomerangs on all Government employees.

The men in the ranks of the Service are proud of the position they have maintained in promoting the Service to its high peak in efficiency. We have been commended by the Postmaster General for our cooperation in handling a larger volume of mail at a decided saving to the Department. And for this you would reduce our salaries at a time when the cost of living is multiplying.

Paradoxical as it may seem, that is your position, Mr. HOFFMAN. You are waving the flag of patriotism, but you are reviving that hatred of the Revolution that free men shall not tolerate unfair taxes. If Government employees are your pet prejudice, if you cannot be fair—it will be better for liberty and justice that you do not aspire to the halls of government. Your position is untenable, you have not the confidence of an electorate.

In fairness, I ask you to reconsider H. R. 1408.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. FENWICK.

I replied to him as follows:

DEAR MR. FENWICK: Certainly glad to have yours of the 17th.

Our people want to extend aid to Great Britain. I presume you do. That cannot be done except as we all make a sacrifice—you know that just as well as I do.

No one is reducing your salary. Do you realize that Federal employees get their money every month; that they have practically no loss of time; that they get 45 days' pay each year for days they are not working; that people in private industry are subject year in and year out to deductions and withdrawals?

Are you so unpatriotic that if it is necessary to defend ourselves by extending aid to Great Britain you, an employee always sure of his job, always sure of his pay check, will agree you are not willing to pay your fair share of defending the country?

The bill which I introduced imposed a tax upon everyone with an income of more than \$1,000. Why should you and other postal employees be exempt? Now please answer me. Under the bill I introduced the tax ranges from 10 percent on salaries of \$1,000 up to 35 percent on salaries of \$10,000 and over, and it hits everyone alike.

Just why should you squeal when you are asked to contribute no more than everyone else receiving equal compensation must pay?

Read this letter at the next meeting of your organization and give me an answer. I should think you would be ashamed of yourself trying to shirk your share of the burden.

Every 2 years I have to fight for my job. Your job runs on automatically. Every 2 years I have to spend a rather large sum in a campaign. Your job is yours for life, or until you reach a certain age. Now, brother, what is your kick anyway?

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Mr. Fenwick evidently is a patriotic gentleman who believes in fair play for, to my letter of the 22d, he made the following reply on January 27, 1941:

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am very glad that you answered my letter, for it allows me an opportunity to continue this correspondence. You were very correct in censuring the attitude I had assumed that your bill, H. R. 1408, was

directed principally toward Government workers.

Mr. HOFFMAN, the articles that I had read concerning your bill emphasized this point: H. R. 1408 is a pay cut for Government employees. Under the spur of the moment, without reading the text of your bill, I wrote the letter to you. I have taken time today to read the full text of your bill, and while I may not agree with you on the necessity of the measure, I sincerely wish to amend my position.

For those passages of my letter in which I caustically berated you for exercising prejudice against Government workers I sincerely apologize. Far be it from me to insist that a Congressman in his honest attempts to establish his concepts of legislation, that for this he should be censured. I realize, Mr. HOFFMAN, that my position and not yours is untenable.

I am happy to assure you that the letter stating your position in the matter will receive the publicity you request. I also wish to assure you that my friends in the Service will be pleased to know that the previous articles we read were in error as to your position.

I am very regretful that I erred in following the information, and I wish to assure you that you have my respect and admiration for the letter you sent me. I shall be very pleased to hear from you and hope that this unassuming beginning may result in an understanding friendship.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN C. FENWICK.

It is regrettable that a greater number of those who criticize us are not equally willing to reconsider their first conclusions relating to Congressmen and their activities.

H. R. 1814 of which this resolution of the American Federation of Labor at Grand Rapids complains does not in any way prohibit strikes. It does not in any way interfere with the right of collective bargaining. It does not affect any provision of the N. L. R. A., the wage-hour, or any other so-called labor legislation. The bill does provide that it shall be unlawful to require any person performing services or furnishing materials in connection with any work or contract affecting in any degree the national-defense program to either pay a fee or join an organization as a condition precedent to furnishing materials or rendering services. In short, the bill, if it became a law, would give protection to any man, whether he belonged to a union or whether he did not belong to a union, to work for, or furnish materials to, his Government in connection with the national-defense program.

Now, I ask you as one Member to another, and I ask you, you the officials of the C. I. O., and you the officers and agents of the A. F. of L., whether a man who stands on the floor of Congress, representing his people, union men and nonunion men, is a demagogue, a tricky politician, when he offers legislation which would enable a man to earn a livelihood for himself and his family without paying or being required to pay for a work permit from a union organization?

NATIONAL DEFENSE OR COLLECTION OF DUES?
PATRIOTISM OR UNIONISM?

We are asked to appropriate \$7,000,000,000 for aid to Britain and national defense, and Congress will undoubtedly do it. We are extremely generous with

other people's money. Because of the propaganda which has swept the country, we have lost all sense of value.

Our hard-working constituents, the clerk and merchant behind the counter, the workman at his bench, the professional man, the farmer toiling from sunrise to sunset, each and all working to pay the tax which we so quickly vote upon him, must be amazed when they learn that we permit the whole program to be delayed by the representatives of union organizations.

Loyal union men are aghast at the lack of patriotism, at the greed, of their officials who stand in the way of the Nation's efforts and insist that we shall have defense only when and if their demands are met.

The press yesterday carried the statement that 32 strikes were holding up production in defense industries. Why talk about patriotism, about sacrifice; why appropriate billions of dollars so that aid to England may be extended, so that production for national defense may be increased and accelerated; why boast of the power of our Navy, of our Army, of our ability to, if necessity demands, destroy the Axis Powers, when here at home, because of the strangling grip of a few politicians in high places, the Army and Navy are unable to cope successfully with a minority pressure group headed by greedy racketeering union officials and red Communists stalling for Stalin?

Why grow eloquent in behalf of the democracies, so-called, of the Old World, while Stalin's emissaries throughout the country and 14 business agents of the A. F. of L. here in Washington defy the Navy, hurl challenge at the Army, and successfully stop work on Government projects?

Neither group would last 15 minutes if politicians who control the Army and the Navy would get their dirty, traitorous fingers from the throats of Army and Navy officials.

Here in Washington, almost within the shadow of the Capitol itself, these business agents who place loyalty to their union above loyalty to their country have stopped the work on the Medical Center at Walter Reed Hospital.

The work there has been divided into three parts. Skinker & Garrett have been awarded the contract for the superstructure on seventeen 63-men barracks. The Army itself is building the mess hall and some other buildings. Sam Merando Co. has the contract for the construction of the neuropsychiatric ward.

Sam Merando is the head of the Merando Co. Sam was born here in Washington, of Italian parents, and proud indeed would I be to have him as a son. Slender, slight of stature, I wish you could have seen him last Saturday, when, in the offices of the Washington Building Trades Council, on Connecticut Avenue, like a true American, unafraid, he faced across the room 14 business agents of the A. F. of L., 13 of them "big buys," all of them "tough guys," each and every one of them by his attitude stamping himself as a man who placed his private interest above his country's need, and told them he had a contract with his Government to complete defense work and defied them

to stop him; and to our shame be it said that Mr. Sheehan, contact man for the Conciliation Service, uttered neither protest nor offered aid.

The spokesman for the 14 business agents said to Sam and his contractors—in substance—over here on the other side of the room—there were 8 of them—"you will either have every man on this job, Skinker & Garrett's men, the Army's men"—over whom Sam has no control—"and your men pay dues to the A. F. of L., every man who works on the job from the foundation to the shingles on the roof, or the job won't go on." Sam stood up and said, "All right; I have a contract with my Government to complete this job, and you fellows can go"—to that place I will not name—"if you wish, but the job is going on;" and the job, thanks to Sam, is going on, union wages are paid, all laws are obeyed, and no man pays the A. F. of L. for the right to work. I say more praise to Sam. [Applause.]

Oh, for more Americans like Sam Merando, who will insist that the God-given right, the Constitution-guaranteed right to work, shall not be taken from any American citizen. Do we intend to let Sam Merando and his subcontractors fight alone? Do we intend to desert them and leave them to the tender mercies of the A. F. of L. and its business agents?

The A. F. of L. business agents have demanded that all of the employees of the Merando Co. and of the seven subcontractors working under it shall buy work permits of the A. F. of L. Sam and his subcontractors—and all praise to them—have stood their ground, and, because they did, last week the union teamsters refused to deliver material to Merando, and the business agent of the teamsters, who recently escaped indictment because the Supreme Court held that the provisions of the antitrust law did not apply to labor unions, made the announcement that no material would be delivered to the Merando Co. nor to Skinker & Garrett until the Merando Co. and its subcontractors compelled their employees to join the A. F. of L.

Think of it. Here are 14 business agents of the A. F. of L. who demand, without protest from a single Government official, from either the conciliation service, from the office of Secretary of Labor Perkins or the Department of Justice, that Merando and his subcontractors force their employees to join the A. F. of L.

That demand is a demand that Merando and the subcontractors violate the express provisions of the N. L. R. A. Yet it is made, not by an employer but by officials of a labor union.

Turn that thought over in your mind. The law which this Congress passed to forward the cause of collective bargaining, to protect employees, is being used by the very organization which sponsored it, for its own selfish purpose and, in its drive for members and for the collection of dues, it is asking that the law which it begged Congress to enact be violated. Neither principle, respect for the law, nor patriotism stands in the way of these men.

Skinker & Garrett belong to the Master Builders Association of Washington,

who deal with the unions. Skinker & Garrett operate a closed A. F. of L. shop.

Now, note what the American Federation of Labor is doing to them. The American Federation of Labor cannot call a strike on that part of the work which is being constructed by the Army. It cannot call a strike against the Merando Co. But, to stop construction on the whole job, the American Federation of Labor calls a strike on its own closed shop part of the work and throws pickets around the whole job. The American Federation pulls its men off the Skinker and Garrett job because Merando, working more than 300 feet away, on an entirely separate and distinct part of the job, a part which has no physical connection whatever with the work of Skinker and Garrett, employs men who are not willing to pay the union \$57.50 to exercise their right to work.

The American Federation of Labor business agents, like all tyrants drunk with power, penalize the company which has submitted to their demands. It throws a picket line around the company which employs none but members of the American Federation of Labor, and the picket in front of the Merando job wears a placard, "Merando"—and they print the word in red—"unfair to American Federation of Labor."

Sam Merando not only defies the American Federation of Labor but he makes them look ridiculous. The American Federation of Labor picket appearing to Sam to be lonesome, Sam puts on a picket of his own to keep him company. Sam's picket carries a sign on which is printed, "American Federation of Labor unfair to Merando and this defense project."

The photographers flocked around; there was laughter and there were jeers, and the American Federation of Labor pulled off its picket. In the Washington News of this noon you will find a picture of Sam's picket, but the American Federation of Labor picket had disappeared. The American Federation of Labor could not stand the publicity; the disclosure of its unpatriotic efforts.

Yesterday I charged that there was a rumor that the War Department was considering calling upon Skinker and Garrett to complete their contract or get off the job. The Evening Star carried the statement that "At the War Department it is denied this afternoon that any such move was anticipated."

Well, the Army called upon Penner Corporation, a contractor at Wright Field, at Dayton, Ohio, to complete its contract or take the consequences. The Army officer in charge of the Chicago ordnance district called upon Allis-Chalmers to assume responsibility for the delay at its plant, and I challenge the Army officials to let me call from the War Department and cross-examine witnesses to ascertain whether or not they have not had under consideration such a move. If they have not been contemplating such a course, then they are not performing their patriotic duty.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman mentioned the Allis-Chalmers strike. That strike is now going into its eighth week while \$45,000,000 of defense orders are being held up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why is it going into that eighth week? Tell me. Do you know? I think you know. I will tell you why it is going into the eighth week. It is because Sidney Hillman, the paid agent of the C. I. O., the vice president of the C. I. O., the man who draws his pay from the Garment Workers Union, is on the Defense Council, but serving in the interests of the C. I. O. He has not the nerve to tell his man John Owen, who is misinterpreting the agreement signed by the union and by the company. That agreement does not mean that Allis-Chalmers has to submit to a closed shop. That is why that strike is continuing, and we will have those strikes all over this land of ours in all of these defense industries just as long as you have on that Defense Council a man who is more interested in an organizing drive than he is in national defense.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Army is trying to force the contractors off the Medical Center job who employ nonunion labor and is telling them either to go to work or get off the job? In other words, they are trying to force them to take on union men?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Army, as it has a right to do, is calling upon the contractor to proceed with his job and the contractor cannot proceed with his job as long as the A. F. of L. men tie it up. Here is what they are doing. It is not the officials, it is not the Quartermaster out here at the Medical Center, who is to blame, it is not the Quartermasters who are engaged in this other construction work, it is not the officials of the Navy who are at fault. It is the dirty, traitorous politicians higher up, maybe not more than a half-dozen, who block this thing, and if you will call in your Army officials before your Military Affairs Committee and go right through from the bottom up you will find that what I am charging is absolutely true.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I say that, in my opinion, the continuation of the strike at the Allis-Chalmers factory is indefensible, and that such strikes throughout America, whether in the District of Columbia or in any of our States, are indefensible when defense contracts are at stake. May I say further that, in my opinion, when Mr. Hillman states that the strike situation is front page and is not critical, he is not making an accurate statement. I have supported legislation to aid labor, and will continue to do so. I speak as a friend and not as an enemy of the worker. The Congress of the United States has the highest responsibility at a time like this to see that we bring appropriate action to cover a very serious situation. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine, and that applause which came from the Democratic side is welcome, but it does not mean a thing unless you bring in a bill to stop the practice. What is the use? Do you want defense? Do you want aid to Britain? You are going to tax the people of this country \$7,000,000,000 for national defense. Do we lack either the ability or the courage to remedy the trouble? Which is it? Or is it both? Which is it, gentlemen? Is it the ability or the courage to bring out a bill? It would not take us 48 hours to pass legislation here to stop it. What is it we lack? Do we not know how, or do we lack the courage? Are you afraid of the labor unions and their votes? Why do you sit here? Join up on this side. There ought to be enough patriotic Members of Congress to stop this thing, which we all admit is ruinous and is interfering with national defense—may in the end destroy us as it destroyed France.

Why talk of sending aid to Britain to destroy the Axis Powers when here in Washington the Army, engaged in building a mess hall and other buildings, is told by an American Federation of Labor teamsters' union that it will not deliver needed material to continue with the job?

The fault does not lie with the quartermaster in charge of construction at the Medical Center. The responsibility for the humiliation forced upon the Army because of the open, notorious defiance by the A. F. of L. teamsters lies directly on the shoulders of a few, a very few, labor politicians and high Government officials.

The union teamsters have refused to deliver cement to Merando. They have refused to deliver steel to the Army itself. The Army and Merando have both been forced to send out their own trucks to obtain the necessary material to carry on the work, and now the threat is by these union organizers that the A. F. of L. men who make the brick, who fabricate the steel, will be called out on strike to gain their point.

When the folks at home learn, as they will learn, if they do not already know, that we are appropriating billions upon billions of dollars for this task; that we are permitting an organized group, as well as Communists, to close production in factories throughout the land and that here in Washington the condition to which I have just referred exists and that we must be fully cognizant of it, what will be their opinion of our intelligence, our ability, our courage or lack of it?

When our home folks know of the existing situation, will they not be driven to the conclusion that each and every one of us who sits here in this Hall days after day is either lacking in ability or in courage, because of our failure to remedy the situation?

Earlier this week, the House in its wisdom voted down a resolution to appoint a committee to investigate the progress of our national-defense activities. It is matter of common knowledge that the opposition of certain committees, which thought that their prerogatives were being interfered with, had much to do with the defeat of that resolution.

Is it not about time that we lay aside our personal ambitions, our petty jealousies and consider again the public need?

It is true, too, that some Members, before the vote was taken, were called from the floor by representatives of labor unions, and that both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. opposed the passage of that resolution. Perhaps some Members yielded to the arguments of these unions, desiring to please the local affiliates of these organizations.

To obviate that difficulty, to lay bare before the public the whole disgraceful situation, I am offering today a resolution to appoint a committee to investigate the activities of the labor unions here in the District of Columbia. The activities of the committee, by the resolution itself, are limited to the District—this for the reason that it was thought that Members might feel more free to vote for an investigation to expose groups and racketeering here in the Nation's Capital, if such investigation did not touch their home districts.

When that resolution has been referred to the Rules Committee, I will ask for a hearing and endeavor to get a rule to place before the House an opportunity to vote on the question of learning for ourselves who has been selling work permits, how much money has been collected for that purpose, how long the men who have paid have as a rule remained on the job, what has become of the money and why it is that here in America men cannot work until they have bought a work permit from other than a Government agency.

This resolution of the Grand Rapids A. F. of L. charges that I am a "reactionary demagogue." I care nothing about their charge nor about the publication of it. As a matter of fact, it gives me an opportunity to speak on the floor of the House and to expose some of the unpatriotic, racketeering methods and practices of some of their affiliates, who at the present time are hanging like vultures and hyenas on the outskirts of the national-defense program, seeking an opportunity to pick the bones of honest, patriotic American workers.

If the Grand Rapids local of the A. F. of L. wishes—and apparently it does—to stand back of the practices of some union organizers and racketeers who have been exposed in the public press, who are seeking to fatten their pocketbooks by shaving the pay check of fellow workers, that is their privilege. As for me, I want none of it.

You and the people of the country who may be interested are the ultimate judges; not the biased, the prejudiced, the self-seeking officials who mislead the members of their organization into strikes against defense industries.

Let us have a few definitions of a demagogue. A demagogue is—

A speaker who seeks to make capital of social discontent and gain political influence.

One skilled in arousing the prejudices and passions of the populace by rhetorical, sensational charges, specious arguments, catchwords, cajolery, etc., especially a political speaker or leader who seeks thus to make capital of social discontent and incite the populace, usually in the name of some popular

cause, in order to gain political influence or office.

An orator or leader who seeks to influence the people by pandering to their prejudices and passions.

An unprincipled politician.
A leader of the mob.

Now, I leave it to you and to those who may care to take cognizance of the controversy whether I am a demagogue or whether those who passed this resolution come nearer to adopting the practices of a demagogue.

Is a man a demagogue because in the Halls of Congress he protests against the practices of requiring American citizens who are in need, who must work if they would live, to pay a fee when the payment of that fee will work a hardship upon them or their families?

Is a man a demagogue because in the Halls of Congress and wherever he may be heard he insists that the father of the boy who has been conscripted and sent to a camp for training shall have the right to work in that camp to build a shelter for his son?

Is a man a demagogue who urges his fellow Members of Congress to end the practices of greedy collectors who stand outside the gates of our Army cantonments or with the Government's permission roam throughout those cantonments demanding the discharge of every American citizen, no matter how needy, who refuses to pay the sum demanded by the union agent?

Am I a demagogue because here in the well of the House I demand that Sidney Hillman, the paid agent of the union, the vice president of the C. I. O., cease his coercive activities, which have for their purpose the compelling of all employees of the Allis-Chalmers, all employees of the Ford Motor Co., to join a union? And that union the union of which Hillman is vice president? Is Hillman working for the Government or the union which pays him?

Is a man a demagogue when, knowing that the National Labor Relations Act provides that no coercion or intimidation shall be used by employers to force employees to join a union, he protests against the efforts of officers of one union to compel employees, members of another union, to forsake their organization and join a different union?

Is a man a demagogue when he protests the action of Sidney Hillman in his efforts to force the employees of the Ford Motor Co. into the C. I. O. by demanding that the War Department withhold contracts from the Ford companies?

Is a man a demagogue who protests when employees of the Allis-Chalmers Co. are kept from their work by picket lines and the question of a settlement and the ending of the strike is submitted by a ballot which reads:

Shall the bargaining committee's recommendation to reject the company's proposals and to give the bargaining committee the right to call a strike be rejected? Yes or no.

Is a man a demagogue because he protests when pickets at Gary, Ind., keep men and women from their jobs, beat up girls, and defy officers charged with the enforcement of the law?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert in the RECORD two advertisements from the newspapers of Gary and two letters and a reply.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wish you would read the RECORD tomorrow and determine whether a man is a demagogue when he chooses patriotism rather than unionism; whether we shall have in this country national defense or whether we shall have men joining the unions at the request, or rather, at the demand, of these fellows.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question.

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

Mr. RICH. With regard to what I understood the gentleman to say a few minutes ago concerning the strike at the Walter Reed Hospital, may I ask if it is in the power of the Committee on Military Affairs to make an investigation of that situation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Representatives of that committee said so here the other day. They would not let the Cox committee be created because they are doing that work themselves. That is all right with me; I do not care who does it.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. What does the gentleman think of the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins' statement that the C. I. O. has a right to strike and that it is paramount to the welfare and safety of the Nation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We all have an answer to that.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman, of course, is objecting, probably rightly so, to the use—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just probably?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is just my opinion, and, of course, I am not speaking for the House as a whole; but I thought it might be well to have the House have the exact definition of a demagogue; and if the gentleman will permit me, I will read it from the dictionary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to, because I am going to put it in the RECORD. You do not need to take my time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would be helpful to the Members of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Everybody can read the dictionary and the Bible, too, if they wish. Anybody who does not understand what a demagogue is may read the definition I put in.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Under the provisions of the lease-lend bill, is it not the gentleman's opinion that the powers conferred upon the President, if he de-

sired to use them, could settle this whole situation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Beyond doubt, much of our trouble could be settled if the President would make one—just one—of his fireside chats and speak in favor of the enforcement of law, of the right of a man to work. If the President would say, in unequivocal language, that these undermining and unpatriotic interferences with our national-defense program, with aid to England, must cease, and that he proposed to see to it that they did cease, that would end practically all of our trouble.

In my judgment, if the law-enforcement officers of the United States would take a firm stand against violence, we would have but little trouble. I think we should amend the restraint-of-trade acts, the Clayton and the Sherman acts, requested by the Attorney General, so that conspiracies such as are going on in Washington today can be, and will be taken care of by the Department of Justice.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. My question is, Does the gentleman not think the President could, under these powers that have been granted to him?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, he is the chief law-enforcement officer. If he had the patriotism and the courage of a Cleveland, of a Coolidge, he could end all this. He does not need even this last act. If he would perform his duty under the Constitution to insure due process of law, the protection of property, the exercise by every man of the right to work, given by the Constitution, we would not have this trouble.

Is a man a demagogue because he breaks into speech when law-enforcement has broken down to such an extent that independent workers at Gary, Ind., insert in the Post Tribune of that city, on March 7, 1941, an ad which reads:

ATTENTION AMERICANS

Defenseless girls have been slugged, mistreated, and deprived of the God-given right to walk peacefully along an American highway. Womanhood is being crucified by a dictator who snarls that "you join—or else!" And you, Mister Nonunion American, may be next. Where is your pride, your decency, your honor, your American love of freedom, and of justice and equality for all? Wake up before it is too late. Organize with the honest, decent law-abiding citizens of Gary to protect womanhood. Protect your sacred right to work and to live in peace. Protect your America against traitorous interference with national defense.

An organization is being perfected by loyal Americans to protect their rights. For further information consult any of the following:

- (1) Any nonunion worker at Gary Works Roll Shop.
- (2) Cecil Cole, 304 Harrison Street, Gary, Ind.
- (3) Any maintenance electrical engineer, Gary Works.
- (4) Any of the courageous tin-mill girls who were slugged.
- (5) E. J. Freundt, box 748, Gary, Ind.

Is a man a demagogue because he does not agree with the sentiment of Van A. Bittner, who, on the 28th of February, at the Bethlehem plant, boastfully stated that the Government "did not believe we could close the plant, but we did"?

Is a man a demagogue because he believes from the bottom of his heart that no individual, no organization, should be able to block our defense program? Because he believes in the necessity of, and offers and urges the passage of, legislation which will forward our national defense?

Is a man a demagogue just because he refuses to remain silent when wreckers like Bittner, with their goon squads, defy the courts, violate the laws, beat up workers, and, in spite of the Government, shut down production in industries producing the materials which we need for adequate national defense?

Is a man a demagogue who, when he learns from the public press that violence and rioting at the Lackawanna plant of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation was so great that all available Buffalo police, squad cars, and men, were called to the scene—when he learns that the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, the only adequate source of the Government for heavy armor plate, has been compelled, because of the violence of the C. I. O., to ask for governmental intervention in order that its work may go on, calls upon Members of Congress to enact legislation which will end the activities of those who are making it impossible for us to carry on?

Is a man a demagogue because he insists that the policy of those who, at Fort Sheridan and at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, will not permit American citizens to work as carpenters until they have paid \$122 initiation fee, deny employment to laborers until they have paid \$42, be ended?

Is a man a demagogue because he does not sit silent when C. I. O. pickets tie up the Government's source of tin at the Calumet-Illinois Corporation in Gary and block the gates of other plants?

Is a man a demagogue when he joins the Undersecretary of War and seeks to curb strikes in defense industries after that official has declared that the strikes are causing rearmament officials as much concern as would a shortage of basic materials?

Is a man a demagogue because he does not agree with the policy of R. J. Thomas of the U. A. W. A.-C. I. O., who unpatriotically intending to hold up work on national-defense material, said on January 13, before the Genesee County Bar Association—

I won't guarantee to anyone there won't be a strike at Ford's. I'm going to try to cause one.

Is a man a demagogue because he insists that this same R. J. Thomas get a dose of law enforcement when he attempts to carry out the threat made when he said—

I'm going to do everything I can to stop production at the Ford Motor Co.

That was his statement on January 29, 1941.

Who is this man, R. J. Thomas, who threatens to stop the production which will give the Army the tanks and cars it needs? Is he the paid agent of Hitler, or is he working in behalf of the Communists, or is he just a common grafting racketeer, a parasite living on the dues collected from honest workingmen?

Is a man a demagogue because he cannot go along with Frankenstein, who is now doing what he can to keep the Allis-Chalmers plant closed and who said on another occasion that Ford would "either recognize the union or he won't build automobiles," this when we know that Ford is building automobiles for the Army as well as for commercial buyers?

Is a man a demagogue when he protests the leadership of Powers Hapgood, who again is making trouble in industries producing for national defense, when he remembers that Hapgood was a moving spirit in an organization which John L. Lewis said was "doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and to transform this union into a Communist organization"? Hapgood, the man whom Lewis himself characterized as a "fakir, a traitor to the unions, a purveyor of every falsehood, slander, and deception."

Is a man a demagogue because he asks for legislation which will prevent slow-downs, when he knows that at the International Harvester Co. strike one of the union organizers and leaders—I think it was Bittner—stated that even though the strike was settled there would shortly after the settlement be a slow-down?

Is a man a demagogue because he contends that here in Washington we should have legislation which will enable those working at the Medical Center and the Army as well, which is doing a part of the work, to get the material needed to continue construction?

Is a man a demagogue because he does not join hands with those who insist that no man can work for his Government, in defense of his home and fireside, until he has paid the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L.? Has the time come when unionism is more important than patriotism? When membership in a union is required as a condition precedent to rendering service to the country?

Is a man a demagogue because he asks for legislation which will enable the Navy, whose demands were defied at Detroit, which will enable the Army, whose reasonable requests are denied here by labor organizers, to successfully combat those unpatriotic demands?

Is a man a demagogue because he insists that the biblical admonition that no man can serve two masters shall be applied here in Washington and that Sidney Hillman be required to decide whether he will serve the C. I. O. or the Federal Government; to make his choice between the master who pays him and the one who asks his unswerving loyalty?

Is a man a demagogue because he claims that the C. I. O. has no right, at Milwaukee, in the Allis-Chalmers controversy to demand that that company violate the law by discharging employees because they belong to the A. F. of L.? Or condemns the demand of the A. F. of L. at Wright Field, in Dayton, Ohio, that the contractors there be compelled to refuse to accept the work of four C. I. O. electricians who have been employed in New York on subcontract work?

Is he a demagogue because he joins an Army officer who testified that the cost at Fort Meade had been increased by 40 percent because of poor leadership, inefficient workers, in asking that we have

more efficiency, less domination by unions?

Is a man a demagogue because he protests when men on relief are denied work as carpenters unless they kick in \$57.50 for a work permit?

Is he a demagogue because he says it is un-American, unpatriotic, when C. I. O. men refuse to cut logs into lumber, A. F. of L. teamsters refuse to deliver finished lumber to Army cantonments, for the erection of buildings necessary to protect draftees and enlisted men from a flu epidemic?

Is a Member of Congress a demagogue when he joins the C. I. O. in protesting that the A. F. of L. is racketeering when it collects \$350,000 from workers at Fort Grant, Rockford, Ill., for work permits and dues?

Is a man a demagogue because he objects to the activities of these unions when he learns from the Labor Department figures that, during the last half of 1940, 3,904,922 man-days were lost because of strikes? That the increase for the last half was 1,500,000 man-days over those lost during the first half of the year.

Day before yesterday at St. Louis, Mo., the largest small-arms plant now under construction, a \$117,000,000 project, was tied up when A. F. of L. building laborers were called out on strike because Earl Jennings, business agent of Local 42, was denied a permanent permit to enter the project at will.

Stowell, superintendent of the Fruco Construction Co., said that, under Government order, permanent passes to the grounds are limited to the officials and men actually engaged on the job. When he was not able to get the rule modified as requested by the union, they pulled off their men.

Stowell said that when he referred the union demand to the Army officials at St. Louis they took the matter up with Washington, and "the final order came through that business agents would have to obtain special passes every time they desired to come on the job."

What right has a business agent on a Government small-arms plant job? With the unions infested with Communists, it is about time that we here in Washington demonstrate to these unions and their business agents that Uncle Sam is engaged in a defense program; that we will not tolerate for one moment their unreasonable demands; that we make them realize that they are servants of the Republic and that the defense program was not devised to afford them a source of revenue.

The task of Congress is not half completed. We shall follow in the disastrous footsteps of France if we fail to put our house in order. Her army, heralded as the best, her fortifications proclaimed to be the strongest in all the world, were swept away as is dust before a hurricane.

To meet the mighty blast of a united, powerful foe was a people torn by selfish groups, their every effort rendered futile by lack of devotion to the common good, to France as a nation.

Here in America, while we add to the taxpayer's burden, mortgage our Nation's future, conscript the youth of the land,

and prepare a devil's brew which we compel our people to drink, we protect and further the cause of those whose activities hinder and delay both national defense and aid to Britain.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on all afternoon, and cite instances of sabotage. I shall not bore the Members further, but I say this, that just as long as I am here and can get the floor, every day or every other day, at least two or three times a week, you gentlemen on the Democratic side are going to have this matter called to your attention, and it is going to delay your progress once in a while on some legislative program unless you take it in hand and solve the situation. I know that you are patriotic, that you have the ability, but I do not know why in God's name we have fussed along and dodged this issue as long as we have.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to state to the gentleman that I do not think there is any demagoguery in the position that he has taken here, in the fight that he has been making along that line, that ought to be talked through. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine. I love that, and I hope the home folks will get it, but over and above that, may I not appeal to the gentleman, and to his associates to really do something about that, to get us out a bill, and come on and join with us in the fight to save America for Americans—get your committee to bring a bill on the floor of the House and get a roll call upon it, and I believe we will not find 50 men who will vote against it. [Applause.]

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

INVESTIGATIONS IN COAL MINES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois for 1 hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] does not use his great ability in behalf of legislation rather than to continuously harp upon organized labor.

I fear that the gentleman is suffering from "open shopnitis." While I agree that there are some abuses on the part of some unions, I feel that these labor organizations on the whole have performed a great deal for the cause of labor; and though I dislike to observe strikes at this time, the labor organizations should not be held responsible at every turn for bringing them about. Strikes are to be deplored, and as a friend of organized labor I again urge that the organizations and factions cease their bickerings and to take advice from the level-headed men of their organizations in striving to eliminate frictions in the future. It has taken years to build up these organizations, and it will be deplorable indeed if, due to the acts of a few unions, the advantages they have gained will be taken from them.

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

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield. I feel that the two large labor organizations should get together to eliminate friction and jurisdictional disputes. I think it would be most helpful and beneficial; but as to legislation, only a few days ago—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order the gentleman from Illinois is not speaking to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed in order, and I think I am. For the present I shall not say anything concerning the United States Chamber of Commerce and the United States Manufacturers Association having passed resolutions and gone on record against any legislation in respect to strikes, or against labor organizations; but in view of the fact that I wish to bring before the House the bill H. R. 2082 which this rule that I have reported makes in order, let me state that this legislation has been sought for many years. Unfortunately, last session, due to the press of defense legislation, it was impossible for me as chairman of the Committee on Rules to report a rule for its consideration. Even though 215 Members of the House at that session had signed a petition to discharge the committee from further consideration, which under the rules of the House called for the consideration of the bill by the House itself, it was too late in the session to consider the measure.

Therefore I am glad that the Committee on Rules has been able at this time and so early in the session to report a rule for this deserving and meritorious bill. This action was made possible when the members of the Committee on Mines and Mining appeared before the Rules Committee and agreed to eliminate section 2 of the bill to which objections had been interposed as originally reported by their committee and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is further authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made the inspections provided for in section 1 of this act at other than annual intervals at any time in his discretion when the making of such inspections or investigations in the mine concerned will be in furtherance of the purposes of this act.

The agreement of the Committee on Mines and Mining to submit the amendment as a committee amendment from the floor enabled the Committee on Rules to take expeditious action the following day in reporting out the rule and I am happy that we have the bill before us for consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2082 provides for the inspection of coal mines annually under the direction of the Bureau of Mines. The purpose of these inspections is to obtain information as to health and safety conditions, to ascertain the causes of accidents involving injury or loss of life, and the causes of occupational diseases. The bill provides that it shall be the duty of the Bureau of Mines to prepare studies and statistics of these conditions and to report to the Congress and to the Bureau of the Census. It further provides that the

Department shall cooperate with State agencies and shall utilize their services, and shall furnish them with their materials and reports. The bill, in brief, merely provides the right of inspection, recommendation, and report. I shall leave to the able chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, and to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY], to explain in detail the provisions of the bill.

Before I conclude I must state that Mr. FLANNERY, and the Democratic whip, Mr. BOLAND, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. SMITH, of West Virginia, and the other gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH, and a great many others, have been endeavoring for a long time to obtain action on this legislation, and I feel that they are entitled to the thanks of the House, which can now legislate for these thousands and thousands of men who have been subjected to hardships and have suffered tremendously in years gone by. The inspection which is provided for in this bill will eliminate from 1,500 to 3,000 deaths in mines in the United States, and will afford protection to thousands of others from ravaging diseases.

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

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This bill comes in with a unanimous report?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Illinois in giving credit to those responsible happened to mention all Democrats. I suppose, in view of the fact that the bill comes in with a unanimous report, some others on that committee may have had something to do with it.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but the others were most insistent and persisted that action be taken.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman tried to be fair, I know.

Mr. SABATH. I said it was a unanimous report. The objection to section 2 came from the Democratic side. Some Members on the Democratic side objected to that. I am always appreciative of the minority whenever they join the majority on legislation that is helpful and beneficial to the country and to the preservation of life.

I shall not detain the House, this being a unanimous report. I do not think there will be any objection to the rule whatever.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SCHULTE. Does not the gentleman think that a great deal of credit should go to our colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. FLANNERY, because of his untiring efforts in bringing this to the attention of the country?

Mr. SABATH. I have so stated. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] is also entitled to some credit, because he was one of those who has importuned me to grant a rule. I could mention many other names.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who, I know, will also advocate the passage of this broad and liberal rule that will give Members a chance to offer amendments and improve the bill, if that is possible. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is a humane and humanitarian piece of legislation aimed to safeguard the lives of American miners by providing for inspection of safety and health conditions in the mines throughout the Nation. It comes to the House with a unanimous report from the Committee on Mines and Mining and also from the Committee on Rules. Republicans and Democrats are united on both of those committees in favor of this legislation.

However, I do not believe it is quite fair to the membership of the House or to the public or to those who work in the mines to try to make out that this bill will put an end to these tragic accidents that have been occurring for years, and particularly during the last year.

Approximately 1,500 miners lost their lives in tragic accidents last year. The purpose of this bill is to empower the Federal Government, through the Department of the Interior in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines to investigate safety and health conditions in the coal mines and make recommendations. The bill provides no authority or power to enforce those recommendations. It is hoped that the inspections and the recommendations will be made in cooperation with the various State mine-inspection bureaus and that if anything is wrong, the people of America will be advised and that the searchlight of pitiless publicity will be directed against unsafe and unhealthy conditions that endanger the lives of those who work below the ground.

Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood that this is a unanimous report and that it is not a political one; that both parties are combined to further this humane legislation which has for its main purpose the safeguarding and protecting of the lives of the miners. It simply provides for Federal inspection and recommendation.

We do not want it to go out throughout the country that this bill is more than it really is. All it does is to provide for inspections and recommendations. It will not prevent accidents or guarantee that there will not be any future explosions and accidents. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this opportunity to say a few words in favor of this mine-inspection bill which is a very worthy piece of legislation. The life and safety of human beings is one of the first responsibilities of government. Ours truly is a Government for the people.

Anyone will be surprised when he looks into the matter to find that coal is produced in so few localities in the United States and in such a small area as compared to the total area. I dare say of the 48 States there is not 1 pound of coal produced in more than half of them.

About 90 percent of all the coal produced in the country is produced in 10 States. Pennsylvania is the greatest producer of coal of any of the States. West Virginia is next, while Kentucky is third, Illinois is fourth, and Ohio is fifth. Tennessee, Alabama, Colorado, Indiana, and Michigan also produce some coal. The coal produced outside of these States named is a negligible quantity in comparison to the total amount produced.

In my great State of Ohio, coal is produced only in probably 20 of the 88 counties, but in these counties where coal is produced practically all of the great tragedies happen. Mr. FISH, the distinguished gentleman from New York, who has just preceded me, stated that there is no chance that the passage of this bill will prevent all these great accidents. We do not claim that it will prevent all such accidents but if it will prevent one accident such as the one that occurred in my district at Millfield, Ohio, about 10 years ago, it will have justified itself many times over. Or, as far as that goes, if it will save the life of one man it is worth our consideration.

While there will be no serious objections to this bill, if any are advanced they will be in one of two categories. Someone may say that this bill will be an additional cost to the Government as it is an additional activity of the Government. Let me answer that argument. It is an additional activity of the Government, but it is so insignificant from the standpoint of its expense that that is no argument against the measure. The committee has so amended the bill now that it provides it must be administered by the Bureau of Mines. This will prevent setting up a new agency, and the only expense will be the actual expense of carrying the benefits of the law to the people. In behalf of the Bureau of Mines let me say there is no finer activity of the Government. It has done a wonderful work and it can be trusted to do a good job in this instance. The same may be said of the bureaus of mines in the various States. Pennsylvania, no doubt, has a fine operating organization. Ohio has a fine operating organization. These State organizations can be depended upon to cooperate with the Federal agency to the fullest extent. In spite of the fact that Ohio has a fine organization, Ohio had 4 or 5 terrific accidents within the last few years. Only about 8 years ago in my district I witnessed the terrible scene of seeing 80 bodies brought out of a mine as a result of a terrific accident for which not one of those poor men was responsible. They were not responsible for it in any way. That was a scene that I shall never forget. The sight of 80 bodies lying in rows in the empty loft of a store was one that would shock the most stout-hearted. Then to witness the anguish of the wives and children of those whose lives had been snuffed out was a trying ordeal. I hope that I shall never have to see such a sight again. What was the cause of this terrible disaster? It cannot be placed on the shoulders of the dead. It did not happen as the direct willful negligence of the operating company. This accident happened in one of the largest and most

modernly equipped mines in Ohio. It is one of the hazards of the most hazardous industry in the country. There were probably 800 or a thousand men employed in that mine. They were down under the surface of the earth probably 400 feet, and a great explosion took place. They had no warning. They were busy earning a living for their families. They had a right to put their faith in the mine owners and in their State and National Governments that they would be protected, and until we, as their representatives in the State and National Governments, do our utmost to protect them, we have not done our full duty. In an effort to do my full duty I propose to do all I can to secure the passage of this bill. These men had no means of escape; they had no chance to save their lives. They call upon us from their graves to see to it that others are not sacrificed as they were.

The scene that I have described is only one of many similar disasters. Just last year another terrible disaster happened at St. Clairsville, within probably 75 miles of where the one happened that I have just described. A few months ago another accident happened in that community that, although it did not result in the death of as many miners, it was terrible in that for days they were unable to recover the bodies of those who had died at their post of duty.

Mr. Speaker, in all solemnity and all seriousness, I again repeat that if we can here today do something that will save the life of one miner or prevent any one of these great disasters that will happen in spite of the greatest care, we will have done a good day's work.

Now, let us see if the State organizations are sufficient. I maintain that they do fine work. Probably the greatest disasters have been the result of conditions beyond the experience of the inspectors. In other words, quite frequently an accident will happen from new causes. If we can get the cooperation of the best minds in the Federal service and of the best minds in the State service and furnish them with proper equipment I am sure we will show a lessening of these disasters.

I remember an accident that happened near my city where one Monday morning 80 men went down to work in a shaft 600 feet below the surface of the earth. Each and every one of those 80 men was asphyxiated and had to be brought out by rescue crews. Thanks, however, to the skill and efficiency of the rescue crews, they were able to save the lives of every one of those 80 men.

But a goodly number of them are drawing State compensation because of their injuries, and will continue to draw as long as they live. They did not draw any compensation for some time as it had not been determined what was the cause of the accident. No blame was attached on the company for any willful or careless negligence. Still the men had been injured and were entitled to consideration. I took up this with the Workmen's Compensation Department of the State of Ohio to determine what was the real cause of the injury. We had a great fight to convince the department that this accident was one for which compensation was allowable. After months

of hearings—mostly medical—we were able to show that although this was such an accident as to be beyond the experience of people generally, still it was one over which the men had no control, and they should be compensated. We were able to show that these men were afflicted by reason of a poisonous gas caused by the burning of rubbish down in the mine at a monthly or semiyearly clean-up of the debris in the mine, and by reason of the failure of the fan operator to start the air fan soon enough in the morning before the men took their places at work. The doctors showed that carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide had been generated by that great bonfire of rubbish, and that the men suffered by the failure to remove that gas. That accident gave reasons for the mine disaster experts to be on the lookout in the future that such an accident should not occur again. The ordinary workman does not know the difference between carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide, but the gases are equally poisonous, and one kills or injures just as effectively as the other. While it did not make any difference to the miner which it was caused him the suffering or loss of his health, still it did make a big difference in knowing how to prevent like occurrences, and how to deal with them when they occur in the future. That mine, well equipped as it was, was not equipped to show the difference between carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide, but surely the Bureau of Mines here in Washington is equipped and qualified to make such a determination if it should ever be necessary. Those who work in mines live in constant terror of these terrible gas explosions, and we hope that they can be prevented.

In this connection it is interesting to compare the mining of today with mining of 40 years ago. Forty years ago more people worked in the mines than work in the mines today, but they had fewer accidents and fewer fatalities than now. Why? I will tell you why. We produced coal by different methods in those days. Today it is produced mechanically; today it is produced by high explosives; today it is produced by crews working day and night; today it is produced by crews of men, each doing a different part of the job. They work under high pressure. We have one group of men doing one thing—another group doing another thing. In a modern mine you will see men going in and coming out at all hours of the day—some technically equipped, some skilled in every respect, and others who do the manual work. So mining has gotten to be quite a science. Engineers, technical men, chemical men, and men skilled in all trades must be employed in carrying on the work. It is often that this high-pressured mechanical way of mining is the cause of the production of conditions from which these explosions occur. The equipment intended to provide pure air does not have time to do its work after one turn has worked until another comes on.

Now I want to compliment those on the committee who were wise enough to suggest that this bill be put together under terms that would admit of the

finest administration. There need be no jealousy—no lack of cooperation between the State agencies and the Federal agencies under this law. The Federal agency need not project itself unnecessarily or unduly into the functions and provinces of the State organizations, and I am sure they will not; but whenever 50 or 75 men are trapped in a mine and no one knows just what to do, I do not think it would be improper in the least to have a delegation from the Bureau of Mines in Washington hasten by airplane or the fastest means of transportation available to the place of the disaster to assist in saving the lives of those who need assistance. The most hazardous work is that of mining, and mining requires more courage on the part of a workman than any other line of employment.

How many people have been killed in mine accidents in the last 40 years? I heard Mr. John L. Lewis testify before our Ways and Means Committee 3 or 4 years ago that 79,900 miners had been fatally injured in the past 37 years and 14 times as many had been injured, many of them injured terribly and permanently. I dare say that by today there have been 90,000 fatal accidents in the mines of the country. When you think of 90,000 people having been killed in the small area of the few States in this country where coal is mined you can see that the fatality is terrific in proportion to other industries. Then, you must add to that 14 times that number to give you an idea of the terrible toll of life and happiness this industry takes. The kind of injuries the miners suffer are most distressing, injuries that come from explosions—blindness and disfiguration frequently the result. And then there are the injuries that come from the breathing of these poisonous gases that bring about such a decrasia of blood from which the miner never recovers. He might possibly recover to the point of being able to walk around but never to the point of being able to engage in gainful employment.

I want to compliment those who with myself have been responsible for this bill and bringing it to the floor. From my district will come to you assurances that your work is greatly appreciated. To those of you who support this measure I can bring assurance that you will have the eternal gratitude of the man who goes down into the pits of darkness and danger to bring to you the coal that brings to you and your family warmth and safety. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad indeed that the Federal Government is at last going to undertake supervision of the mines throughout the United States in order that something may be done to coordinate the work of the various States to prevent the disastrous catastrophes which menace the lives of all those who go down into the bowels of the earth to earn their daily bread. Anyone who has ever been around a pit mouth following a mine disaster and watched the anxious, sorrowful, prayerful crowd of women,

children, and friends gathered around there, wondering each time a body is brought up whether their loved ones would be brought up dead or alive, or, indeed, wondering many times if they would ever be brought up at all, can appreciate what this bill does.

It certainly is encouraging for us to believe here that something is about to be done that will tend to eliminate these accidents, which occur from a great many causes. They occur because of unguarded wires, because of insufficient hangers on these wires, because of exposed electrical equipment, because of inadequate track bonding, because of loose rock and poor timbering, black-damp, foul air, lack of rock dusting, because of the lack of proper braddish work, and a great many other causes. In my district, in drilling for natural gas, we quite frequently strike wells which produce as much as 500,000 cubic feet of natural gas daily. This gas, when properly mixed with air, is highly explosive.

With the coming of mechanical equipment, electricity is coming into more universal use in the mines, and this is a contributory cause of a great many of the disastrous explosions in the mines, partly because the sparks from this electricity may ignite the gases almost always to be found in mines. Then, too, this machinery makes a great amount of coal dust which, if not properly rock dusted, is highly explosive. In the past a great many operators, a great many districts, and a great many States have cooperated in mining laws and have enforced them most loyally, but this should be required to be uniform throughout the Nation, because if one company, district, or State goes to the expense of putting in the most adequate and the most far-reaching safety measures it puts that company, State, or district under a differential as against those States, districts, or companies that do not comply with all of the precautionary measures. This is, therefore, an attempt to bring about a uniform procedure in this matter and will result in a more even distribution of the costs of production.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the committee on bringing in this piece of legislation. I congratulate everyone who has been active in forwarding it; and I want to express the sincere hope that no Member in this House will feel called upon to vote against the measure which is designed to prevent the unnecessary loss of life in the mining industry.

This legislation does not interfere with the mining regulations of the various States but attempts to make sure that they work in a more efficient manner. I believe the bill is so framed as to preclude it being prostituted to any unworthy purpose.

I hope the bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, this measure is fair both to the operators and to the miners. The mining of coal is a basic industry, vital to the life of the people from the standpoint of its use in

their homes for heating purposes, in their industry, and in our national defense.

The mining of coal is a hazardous calling, one of the most hazardous callings in which men who labor must engage. This is due to the nature of the operation. It involves the removal from underneath the surface of the earth of the coal that is mined, which is a progressive operation. As the coal is withdrawn, the support of the overlying top is withdrawn and in order to make the operation safe, the top must be properly and continuously supported by timbers properly set. In addition to that, in order to carry a proper amount of pure air to those engaged in the operation, airways must parallel the entries of the mine as the operation proceeds underneath the mountain and underneath the earth.

Most of the coal in large mines is undercut with mining machines, which operation produces a large amount of fine dust. The circulating-air currents suspend this dust in the air, and, as a result, much of it settles upon the props and sides of the mine and is suspended in these circulating-air currents. Many of the accidents which occur in mines are caused by falling slate and coal, due to a failure to adequately timber the top. The most devastating loss of life grows out of the periodic explosions in the mines of the country.

In my district in 1902 there occurred an explosion in the Fraterville mine which cost the lives of 184 men and boys. Again in 1911 in the Cross Mountain mine in Anderson County an explosion occurred which cost the lives of 84 men and boys. Within the history of the mining business of this country more than 84,000 lives of those who go down into the bowels of the earth have been lost, and more than 500,000 men and boys have been maimed and crippled in mine accidents.

I know about these operations because they are carried on in a number of the counties of my district. Most of the mine explosions that occur are in reality dust explosions. The dust accumulates, and then a pocket of gas is formed, which is ignited by a spark from a wire or from the light of a miner's lamp, which produces a gas explosion and this in turn operates as a percussion cap, exploding the mine dust itself that has accumulated in the mine. The devastating aftermath of an explosion is due to the creation of poisonous and deadly gases and by fire which results from the explosion, and, as has just been stated on the floor by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], a mine accident is one of the most disastrous things that may befall men who work.

This measure is not a police measure, it is not in any sense regulatory; it simply gives the Bureau of Mines the right to select from qualified lists men who have had engineering experience and who are qualified as mining engineers, and who have had as much as 5 years' underground experience in mining to conduct annual examination of mines throughout the country and other examinations when they are necessary. The purpose of this investigation is to ascertain the kind of methods that are employed in the mines

and to detect dangerous practices and dangerous conditions.

Mr. Speaker, last year 1,420 miners lost their lives in mine accidents in this country. That cannot be explained, in my opinion, upon any other hypothesis or theory than that there must be some mines in operation which are inherently dangerous, because I know the operators do not want to see this loss of life. They are humanitarian men in sympathy with their employees and anxious to safeguard their life and limb. The operators and the men are friends. Many operators began life as coal miners.

In addition, the operator has an incentive to carry on his mining operations in a safe and lawful manner because of the fact that in each of the States where coal mining is conducted there is on the statute books a workmen's compensation law which makes the operator liable to any injured employee regardless of the negligence of that employee, unless it was willful and akin almost to an attempt to commit suicide. So there is the incentive to the operator to carry on a safe operation not only from a humanitarian standpoint but because he knows that if an accident happens resulting in injury or death he must respond in damages in an amount fixed by the workmen's compensation law, regardless of the contributory negligence of the injured party or regardless of the negligence of a fellow servant.

This bill is designed to enable the Bureau of Mines to send experienced mining engineers, experienced miners, into every coal mine in the country to investigate and report the facts. This investigation will disclose the conditions and methods of operation, and will result in everybody connected with the operation being on tiptoes all the time in an effort to conduct the operation in the safest manner possible.

I found out last year from the head of the Bureau of Mines that the Bureau has in its employ and had at that time only 24 mine inspectors. There are more than 6,000 coal mines in active operation in the United States, so that you can see the utter futility and impossibility of an adequate inspection being made by the Bureau of Mines with only 24 inspectors.

In each coal-mining State, and in mine especially, we have a very far-reaching regulatory statute with respect to the inspection of mines. It has teeth in it. It gives the State mine inspector the right, through court proceedings, to shut down any mine which his investigation shows to be dangerous, and, in addition, our Tennessee mining law requires that coal-mine operators employ a certificated mine foreman who daily is required to go into the mines and make an inspection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is it not true that under the provisions of the Guffey Coal Act the Commission handling the activities under that particular piece of legislation already has the power to do everything this proposed bill would permit anyone to do?

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not think so. I was under that impression, but upon in-

vestigation I have found that the Bituminous Coal Commission has taken no step, in the face of these widespread mine disasters, to set on foot any movement to inspect mines.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does not that legislation, however, give the Commission the right to do that if it sees fit to do so?

Mr. JENNINGS. I think it does, but I do not think it goes as far as this bill. Under the law at this time, the representatives of the Bureau of Mines have no right to go into a coal mine to conduct an inspection over the protest of the owner.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that at no time in the testimony before our committee was it admitted that any Federal bureau inspector had ever been denied admittance to a mine in the last 15 or 20 years.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am not saying that anyone has been denied the right to enter a mine, but I am saying that under the law as it is now the inspector does not have the right to enter the mine, nor has the Bureau of Mines the right to publicize and open to the public the findings made by their employees as a result of their inspections.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We recognize the fact that under the Guffey Coal Act the authority is there to make the inspections, but we who represent practical miners do not want administrative officials to conduct inspections; we want actual miners such as are employed by the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is right. What would men who have never been in a coal mine know about whether it was a safe or unsafe operation?

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

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

Mr. FLANNERY. Is it not a fact that the Guffey Coal Act has no reference whatever to the huge anthracite industry?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is also true.

In addition to the inherent danger of the operation and the vast numbers of casualties that are suffered as a result of this danger, there are certain occupational diseases that go hand-in-hand with the mining of coal, such as anthracosis, silicosis, and occupational pneumonia.

I know the coal miners. I have lived among them. There is no finer body of men in this country than those who go down into the mines and bring forth coal from the bowels of the earth. They are fine citizens, and they are patriotic. I mentioned a few days ago on the floor of this House and I want to mention

again that in Morley, a little mining town in Campbell County in my district, where there are only 20 families, 40 of their boys of military age, old enough to get into the armed services of the country, have volunteered. They did the same thing in the World War. One of the outstanding heroes of that war was Bob Slover, a coal miner of Coal Creek, who when his battalion was held up by machine-gun fire and a number of squads that had been sent against the German machine gunner had been killed, finally got permission from his captain to crawl out on his belly through no-man's land, and being a squirrel shooter from the mountains of Anderson County, before it was over with he had shot the last German machine gunner out of the trees from which they were dealing death to our forces. The coal miners are a patriotic people and they are in need of this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the mining industry is the most hazardous one, and is it not also a fact that it requires more courage to follow mining than any other occupation?

Mr. JENNINGS. Absolutely. A man engaged in excavating coal has his life constantly in his hands, for the reason that in the very nature of the operation he is constantly rendering a safe place dangerous. He is taking the coal from beneath the roof of the mine, and as he progresses we have what we call horse-backs and kettles, pieces of slate that are up in the top and that fall without any warning. The work must be conducted by men skilled in the calling, and it must be conducted under the constant supervision of men who know the hazards incident to coal mining. This measure is designed to preserve the health of coal miners and to save them and their loved ones from a recurrence of the disasters that in 1940 cost the lives of 1,420 coal miners. I favor its passage and shall vote for it. It is an enlightened and humane measure that will result in benefit to the mine owners and to the coal miners and to all the people of this country.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not a fact that once you are a miner you are always a miner?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; when they once get into that calling they are inclined to stick to it. They go in a mine on a hot day and find it cool, and they go in on a cold day and find the temperature just what they want it to be. They are a people peculiar unto themselves. They do not like to do anything but dig coal when once they have entered that calling, and, as I said awhile ago, we have no finer or more patriotic body of men beneath the flag than the men who mine our coal, and this is a needed step which will throw around them the protection of the law and which will give them a Nation-wide and a uniform inspection,

and also an ascertainment of facts which will lead, if necessary, to the enactment of legislation which will make their calling a safer one. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a statement made before our committee by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

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

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF MINES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when I mentioned some of the gentlemen who have been after me to report out this bill I failed to mention the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY], as being among that number, and I now take pleasure in yielding to him 6 minutes.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, coming from the State that produces more bituminous coal than any other State in the Union, of course I would naturally be for this bill. I am for it because I believe it will be a great benefit not only to the miners but to the operators and owners of the mines. Of course, we have our own mining laws in West Virginia and they are good ones, too, but our mining laws are not adequate to meet the situation of taking care of the mines properly. Probably our laws are like the laws of the rest of the States in that they only require for their mine inspectors an experience of so many years of working in the mines, probably 8 years, and I submit that this is not sufficient to make a real mine inspector. I have always advocated that a mine inspector should be a mining engineer. This bill provides for the inspector to be a mining engineer appointed by the Government and I believe that one reason alone is sufficient reason for the enactment of this legislation.

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

Mr. RAMSAY. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I shall not take any of the gentleman's time. I simply want to make the observation, if I may, that the bill we are at present considering does not provide that mining engineers shall make these inspections, but I may say to the gentleman that I intend to offer that as an amendment to the bill because I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAMSAY. I certainly appreciate that.

Of course, we all know that the miners have the most hazardous occupation of any men employees in our country. While we have been considering this bill in the Congress there have been explosions that have occasioned the death of some four or five hundred men. So you can see the importance of such legislation. This legislation would not guarantee safety in the mines, nor can any other similar legislation. Mining is a hazardous occupation. Sometimes there are as many as 1,500 men working per-

haps 1,500 feet down in the bowels of the earth and, probably, back from any opening in that mine 8 or 10 miles and when an explosion occurs, you can see what little chance there is for any of these men ever reaching the surface. They have to go through the black damp, through the gases that have accumulated and caused by the explosion and then come back to the opening of the mine, either to the drift mouth or to the shaft opening. Therefore it is a hazardous occupation.

I do not regard this bill as a challenge to the mine owners, neither is it a challenge to the State mining officers. It is an offer of aid, an offer not only to the miners, but to the State officers and to the operators of all the skill and all the knowledge that our Federal mining experts may have. We owe this to them and we owe it to every man who offers his services to delve down into the earth and bring out these treasures for the American people. We could not operate the industry of this country and we could not live in this country without their work. It is a necessary work and they are entitled to everything we can offer them in the way of aid and advice in order to make these mines not only safe for the men who work there, but safe for the employers as well. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the State of Ohio has 25,000 coal miners, and I know that they will rejoice over the passage of this coal inspection bill. At first glance there may be some criticism, as this seems to be a duplication of effort. We all know that the States have their own mine inspection services, maintained by the State governments, but I believe that in a thing that affects so closely human life, some duplication will be helpful. A multiplicity of counsel will not be harmful. One inspection service will check the other in assuring safety to the workers.

I am very optimistic about the future of the operation of mines with respect to accidents, for the reason that we now have on the statute books the Guffey Coal Act, under which a fair price is insured for the sale of coal by the mine owners. In the past the coal mining industry has been by and large not a profitable business. It has been beset with deficits, and possibly some of the accidents have come about through financial inability of the owners properly to equip the mines with safety devices. But under the Guffey Coal Act, assured as the mine owners are of the cost of production of their products, there is no reason why there should be any future parsimony in providing the necessary safeguards in the mines. That is one of the great things that ought to flow from the Guffey Act.

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

Mr. THOM. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. On the point of the Coal Stabilization Act, that is, the Guffey measure, of course we know that it is vitally necessary that that be kept in operation. It expires in April, and certainly this Congress cannot allow the advantages of that act to be discontinued.

Mr. THOM. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now for a few pertinent facts about what happened in the State of Ohio in 1940: We had two disastrous coal-mine explosions. The first occurred at Neffs, Ohio, in which 100 persons lost their lives; and after that terrible accident an Ohio coal miner, whose name I shall insert in this RECORD because it is worthy of being preserved in the RECORD. D. Cunningham, secretary of Local 283 of the United Mine Workers of America, wrote a letter on behalf of the miners in a mine located near Cadiz, Ohio, the Nelms mine. In that letter Mr. Cunningham asked for joint inspection by the Federal and State Governments of his particular coal mine, and in the letter he stated that it was the feeling of the miners there that dangerous conditions existed, and that preventive measures were far from adequate.

That request was directed to both the State mine division in Ohio and the Bureau of Mines in the city of Washington. The Bureau of Mines in Washington responded with the statement that it could not participate in an inspection of this mine unless it was invited to do so by the State division of mines. That invitation was never forthcoming. The Ohio Division of Mines responded by saying that the thing was so urgent that it could not spare the time to invite the cooperation of the Bureau of Mines in Washington. What happened? I am sorry to say that the same thing that occurred in that mine at Neffs, Ohio, occurred in November of last year at the Nelms mine in Harrison County, costing the lives of some 30 men. If joint inspection had been made, perhaps dangerous conditions would have been eliminated and lives saved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a real coal operator, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the operation of coal mines is my business. I have been in it for 30 years in some capacity, from a laborer to an executive position, to an owner. I firmly believe that this piece of legislation is an essential thing to promote the safety of the miner. It is a great step in that direction. The operation of mines is entirely different from that of any other industry. Mining operations are all carried on underground, in dark subterranean passages, where the men are not grouped together, where they work in two's or three's. Therefore, inspections and investigations become a paramount issue, because their activities are not subject to the scrutiny of their fellowmen and foremen except when those foremen enter the place in which they work. I have been a firm believer in, and I think experience will prove, that the increase of efficient inspections decreases the frequency of accidents. This is what this bill will do. It will increase the inspections.

It has another great purpose. It will bring, in an efficient and adequate manner, to the operators and to the miners, a vast fund of scientific and engineering

information which is in the hands of the Bureau of Mines, which is not freely accessible to the operators and miners today unless they request it. Here it will be brought to them by these inspectors and by these investigators. It is a matter of education and dissemination of information.

There is not a State nor a mining company that has the laboratory facilities for carrying on the scientific experiments that are necessary to carry on this program successfully. Over many years, the Bureau of Mines has done this work and has accumulated most valuable information. It is our duty to see that this same information is carried to the mines.

Many years ago when coal mining began in this country, it was done in a haphazard fashion with no attention paid to engineering and scientific principles involved. Today many mining operations are carried on in the same way, haphazardly. Even in the mines that are using the best scientific skill, there are large portions of them that are mining coal which was developed with haphazard methods and these portions present additional hazards. In later years, of course, the larger and more wealthy mining companies developed their mines along sound engineering principles, using the best equipment and the most advanced safety methods. But there still remains much that could and should be done even in these mines. The great number of accidents that occur indicate that great improvements can be made. The great majority of mines are owned and operated by smaller companies that do not possess the organization to study sufficiently nor with the complete knowledge that which is essential for the reduction of accidents. Many of them are under economic pressure and cannot do the things which are necessary for low-accident rate. The responsibility for low cost is placed upon the operating officials in the mine and in order to bring about this, they are inclined to "cut the corners" and increase the hazards.

Federal inspection and investigation of mines cannot nor will not bring about the elimination of all accidents, but as time goes on and the activities of the Bureau continue to become more effective with the scientific experimental work, gradual reduction in the accident rate will be apparent. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to represent the Twenty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, situated in the heart of the bituminous-coal fields of the great Keystone State. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for H. R. 2082 in the interest of human life.

The mining industry in Pennsylvania is over 100 years of age and to date more than 13,000,000,000 of tons of anthracite and bituminous coal have been mined in our State. This amount of coal, if taken from a single opening having dimensions 8 feet by 20 feet, would form a tunnel 400,000 miles in length. It is authorita-

tively stated that mine gas, commonly called fire-damp, expelled from the mines in Pennsylvania each year equals one-half the volume of all natural gas used in the United States for heating, lighting, and every other purpose.

Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-sixth Congress the so-called Neely mine-inspection bill died in committee. The present bill, H. R. 2082, introduced on January 13, 1941, is similar in some respects, but is a modification of the Neely bill to such an extent that today it appears the membership of this House is unanimous in their support of it.

During the calendar year 1940, 1,420 coal miners lost their lives in mine accidents. If the provisions of this bill will be instrumental in saving one human life, congressional approval will have been more than justified.

We who live in the great coal fields of Pennsylvania are alive to the hazards that confront the coal miner. We know him as a patriotic American citizen and one who loves his home.

To me this bill is nothing more than a mandate from the coal miners of the Nation that every possible precaution be given them in the pursuit of their hazardous occupation.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize my whole-hearted approval of this humane legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in support of H. R. 2082.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], who was chairman of the committee that investigated some of these unfortunate mine disasters in our country.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Times and to revise and extend the remarks I shall make in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

THE HUMAN COST OF COAL

Between July 1938 and the end of January of this year coal-mine disasters in the 6 States of Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, and Tennessee took the lives of 310 men. Many others were injured. The list is probably not complete. Certainly, no one who can imagine these tragedies—who can visualize what happens underground and what takes place at the pit mouth as the dead and wounded are carried out—would oppose any honest attempt to prevent mine accidents.

The principal way to prevent them is to use constant vigilance. Experience has shown that this cannot be assured except by outside inspection by a governmental agency. It has also shown that State inspection is inadequate. To remedy this situation the Flannery bill, which has been reported out of the House Committee on Mines and Mining, authorizes the United States Bureau of Mines to make "annual or necessary inspections" as to health and safety conditions in coal mines. These inspections may be made other than annually when an accident has occurred, or on petition of the majority of workers in a given mine or the request of their authorized representative. The findings will be reported to Congress and made available to the public.

There may be details of the bill which need amendment. The principle is sound. Coal mining is inextricably linked with interstate commerce. Safety in the mines is properly a Federal concern. There can be no good argument, in law or in humanity, against any measure which will reduce the risks and hardships inherent in the essential and heroic occupation of mining coal.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this particular bill is more or less a composite bill embodying the ideas of many, after hearings. As stated by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, I was chairman of a subcommittee that investigated the disaster at St. Clairsville, Ohio. Men familiar with the industry today have portrayed to you the dangers in mining and the horrors of those disasters, and of the need for inspection.

The bills which had previously been before the committee embodied various things that are not in this particular bill. Some of us desired to pursue a sort of middle ground, one that would provide for adequate inspection and yet not conflict with the jurisdiction of State mining authorities, and to secure full cooperation between the Federal and State authorities rather than conflict therewith.

When the new bill was drafted, as I have stated, it embodied new features which eliminated many of the objections in previous bills. I felt, and other members of the committee felt, that we should definitely place this under one of the old established agencies of the Federal Government—namely, the Bureau of Mines—instead of setting up a new bureau, and the committee still further amended the bill. There will be offered to the House, with the approval of the committee, verbiage throughout the bill definitely fixing the duties and responsibilities of the inspection upon the United States Bureau of Mines.

I have heard that there has been some criticism of the chairman of this committee because of delays. No such criticism is well founded. He appointed a subcommittee. Complete studies and hearings were held. He has been an active, splendid chairman. He has been fair in dealing with this one great problem. I pay tribute to him, the distinguished chairman of the Mines and Mining Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The bill that is before you today creates no new bureau but fixes the responsibility in the United States Bureau of Mines, an old established Bureau, which has the respect and confidence both of the workers and of the operators. We feel that the bill as now reported is one which is worthy of your support. I hope the rule will be adopted, and from the sentiment expressed here today I feel that this bill is what we might term a "middle-of-the-road bill." Members from coal-mining districts have been diligent to present to the Congress a bill which would safeguard the lives of men working in the districts.

I come from a district that has no coal mines. I try to look at the matter dispassionately and at long range. I am always fearful of invasion of States' rights and presented a number of amendments which were adopted. I believe that in embodying the ideas presented

from all sides the committee has worked out a bill which it can present to the Congress with complete confidence.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. It has been brought out, has it not, that the bill which we present today is an entirely different bill from that which was before the committee last session?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Entirely different. It eliminates certain conflicts with the State mining authorities. It fixes the responsibility not in a new agency but in an old established agency. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2082), relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2082, investigations in coal mines, with Mr. COFFEE of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is entitled to 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT] is entitled to 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY]. [Applause.]

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, as the sponsor of this bill, I want to express my appreciation to the members of both the Committee on Mines and Mining and the Committee on Rules for the conscientious and earnest consideration which the problem has received, and so that there may be no misunderstanding, I might add from the Members on both sides of the House.

The history of this legislation has been fraught with many unhappy differences in the past. There was a bill previously before the Congress, the story of which is well known to every one of us. The bill presented here, sponsored by me, is a new bill and it has had new consideration. The chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining was very fair and very generous and very earnest, and the entire membership of his committee has worked in a spirit of cooperation, aid, and assistance. As a result we have before the House today what I conceive to be a fair bill which treats the problem in the most effective fashion in

which it can be handled at the present time. I should like to explain the bill very briefly.

The bill provides annual or necessary inspections of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the purpose, first, of discovering the causes of accidents; second, to prepare and distribute information, and third to report to the Congress and to the Bureau of the Census. I said accidents, but I include also occupational diseases. Under the bill the inspection may be made annually or at the discretion of the Bureau of Mines. The Bureau will be then authorized for the first time by law to enter into the mine workings and make such inspections, and the law imposes the obligation upon the operator to afford that permission. The only regulation in the bill is that refusal on the part of the operator to permit such an inspection to be made is made a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or not more than 90 days in jail. That is the only regulation contained in the bill.

There are no standards of safety described.

There is no conflict with State authority, there is no division of authority, there is no division of jurisdiction. The States are not relieved of the responsibility of regulating mines and mining, but for the first time in the history of this industry light is let into the dark, dim, underground recesses of the mines, and the Bureau may bring before the American public the conditions they find actually to exist. Any operator who objects to this, it would seem to me, is unreasonable or, it might be inferred, has something to hide; but in any event, the Bureau having made this inspection under the law, as I have said, shall report to the Congress, shall report to the Bureau of the Census, and may publish its findings.

In order to insure the positions of the States in the problem it is provided in the bill that there shall be cooperation with the State mining inspectors, and the bill also provides that State agencies may be utilized in the carrying out of the work. There is one phase of this proposed legislation to which no reference has been made to which I should like to call your attention briefly.

An advisory committee without pay may be set up representing the operators and the miners. Another provision I regard as important is that these inspectors shall come under the civil service and shall be, as the bill provides, mining engineers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. FLANNERY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What becomes of the State laws so far as they affect the inspection of mines, if this bill is enacted?

Mr. FLANNERY. The State laws are the laws under which the mines shall still be governed and the laws with which they must comply.

Mr. DONDERO. What becomes of those laws in the event the pending bill is passed? Would they be superseded?

Mr. FLANNERY. I tried to explain that painstakingly. They are not superseded. There is no conflict of authority, there is no regulation whatsoever in this act. We have carefully avoided that.

The conditions have been very thoroughly discussed and I am not going to dilate on them at any great length. It has been explained that there were approximately 1,500 deaths last year and the ratio of nonfatal accidents to fatal accidents is 50 to 1, but nothing has been said of occupational disease, "miners' asthma." Let me assure you it is pathetic to see these men aged and broken before they reach 50, men whose lungs have been filled with coal dust. They suffer a condition of asthma which leaves them helpless in their middle years—industrial waste. They are casualties of the industry and incurable. It is a condition for which there are no statistics.

We all agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] that this bill does not guarantee there will be no more accidents, but as someone has said, if it saves one life or if it improves conditions so that accidents are lessened or eliminated to any degree, it will have been a great success. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill and will vote for the same.

The Committee on Mines and Mining has given a great deal of thought and study to this measure, and, in my opinion, has made a workable measure of the same, and it should prove of benefit to the coal miner, coal operator, and the general public.

In its original form there were many objections to the bill, but as the result of the deliberations and care with which the measure has been amended, all parties concerned are in complete accord, and the bill was reported in its final form unanimously by the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The amended bill places the responsibility of mine inspections and recommendations for safety measures on the United States Bureau of Mines, a bureau of the Government that is held in high esteem by the public, and is completely qualified to take charge of the important subject of safety measures for the protection of mine workers. The bill as now drawn does not give the opportunity to scatter authority through various bureaus of the Government. The coal-mining industry presents many hazards that baffle science and the best of endeavors to prevent mine accidents. The opportunity that this measure gives to the Bureau of Mines to make studies and apply its facilities to the subject should produce results that will make coal-mining operations safer and at the same time prevent great property loss. Perhaps nothing is more appalling than coal-mine accidents, and I believe that this bill will render a marked service for the protection of those who earn their daily bread working in coal mines and also give the operators the benefit of the studies that can be made by no other agency in this subject as ably as by the Federal Bureau of Mines.

The amendments that will be offered to perfect the measure were unanimously agreed upon by the Committee on Mines and Mining of the House, and I urge the adoption of the measure by the House. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of our subcommittee has told you, our subcommittee last year held hearings on this legislation for a period of 5 weeks or longer and made an effort to be eminently fair in considering this legislation which is so important. May I say to the members of the committee right now that in so doing we realized that not only our subcommittee but the entire Committee on Mines and Mining in the House were under constant pressure not only from the miners, represented by the United Mine Workers, but also from the operators group. I think that this bill today brings to you, as the chairman of the subcommittee has said, as the result of that investigation, a middle-of-the-road bill, as pointed out to you by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]. Every member of that subcommittee approached this important problem with the idea of trying to promote safety in the mines and with an open mind absolutely. The chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining are to be congratulated on their fairness and on their diligence in trying to bring forth a bill which helps rather than hinders everybody in the mining industry.

We must remember that when the last bill was brought before us in the Seventy-sixth Congress the statement was made by certain people in this country that that bill was designed not solely to promote safety and healthy conditions in mines but to regulate and supervise the mining industry. Our committee felt that we should bring in legislation to the House which would not be designed to regulate and supervise the mining industry but which would accomplish, if possible, an improvement in the safe operating conditions of the mines. This bill is the result of that effort.

Mr. FLANNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLANNERY. Has there been any effort on the part of the sponsor of this bill in that direction?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. With respect to regulation and supervision, there certainly has not been. This bill is designed solely to promote safety in the mines. I intend to support the legislation because we have put the responsibility in the hands of the Bureau of Mines where it belongs. In view of some statements which perhaps may have been misleading this afternoon, may I tell you some of the work that has been done by the Bureau of Mines. I am going to give you some facts and figures, if I have the time, to substantiate this claim.

We must realize that the Bureau of Mines today has been getting an annual

appropriation of approximately \$350,000 to promote health and safety in the mines. With that they have been able to put in the field only 60 men, 30 of whom are competent mining engineers or mining inspectors—technicians, if you please—and 30 of whom are safety educators, one might say, or instructors in safety and in safe practices.

I want to get it clearly before you that only 60 men are now in the field sent out by the Bureau of Mines Health and Safety Department. In the State of Pennsylvania alone they have an annual appropriation of approximately \$400,000 and they have 50 men in the field to cover that one State. These 60 men in the Bureau of Mines, as has been pointed out earlier, are charged with promoting safety in some 6,000 to 10,000 coal mines in the United States, while the 50 men in the Pennsylvania department are charged with responsibility only for that State.

What will be needed in the way of appropriations when this bill goes through? It is estimated by the Bureau of Mines that it will require some \$2,600,000 annually to make this bill effective. It will require a staff of approximately 300 men in the field. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not point out to the country right now that you must not expect any panacea to come from this bill overnight, because these inspectors must be trained men of long experience. It will require one full year at least to train these additional fieldmen, regardless of their competency when employed as inspectors. Conditions in mining change all over the country from State to State and mine to mine, and these men must constantly educate themselves in learning the causes of disasters in every unfortunate accident that occurs in this country. This they can only do by studying voluminous reports on various accidents as they occur in various parts of the Nation, under various conditions and from many various causes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Why should the Federal Government assume this burden that apparently should be borne by the respective States?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I will answer the gentleman in this way. While I fully appreciate the fact that many States have been accomplishing splendid work with their State mining services, still, I believe the Federal Bureau of Mines has better facilities for conducting investigations and better laboratory facilities for going into the causes of accidents and explosions.

In justification of the expenditure of \$2,600,000, may I say that the indisputable figures issued by the Bureau of Mines show that for the 32 years the Bureau has been in operation it has been responsible for saving at least 1,000 lives a year. If you value a life at \$5,000, and that is a mighty small valuation, there is a saving of \$5,000,000 a year in cost to the operators. At least there is that much tangible saving in compensation.

In addition, on the average, there have been some 50,000 nonfatal accidents prevented per year. If you estimate the cost of these at \$100 each to the operators, there is an additional saving of \$5,000,000 a year there, or a total saving to the operators of over \$320,000,000 over the past 32 years.

As to the value of this Bureau to the workers, the average age of the workers who have been killed in the mines is 35 years. Let us assume that the worker should have a normal expectancy of at least 20 years more of working life. Assume that his average wage will amount to \$1,000 a year. The Bureau of Mines then has been responsible for saving to each man whose life it has saved, and to his family, some \$20,000 of income. Over a 32-year period this amounts to a total of \$640,000,000 saved to the miners themselves and a total to the Nation and to the industry of nearly \$1,000,000,000 over the past 32 years. Who will deny \$2,500,000 a year to the Bureau of Mines? [Applause.]

It is an undisputed fact that the operators and miners alike—and even some State officials—who appeared before our subcommittee last year joined in recommending increased appropriations for the Bureau of Mines for its Safety and Health Division.

If this bill does nothing more than to insure adequate appropriations for the Bureau of Mines to continue its humanitarian efforts to bring about more healthy working conditions and safer operating conditions in the mining industry of this country, certainly the vote of every Member of this House is justified in favor of this particular bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have previously stated, our committee last year was made the target of much abuse from various sources, and much misleading information was then given out to the public, and much misinformation is still being given out to the public, which would lead one to believe that safety in mining is on the decline, when, as a matter of fact, the records compiled by the Federal Bureau of Mines prove conclusively that conditions are constantly being improved in the mining industry and accidents are decreasing, rather than increasing, as a general thing, despite the unfortunate set-back of 1940. Let us therefore look at the record. I call your attention to table No. 1, which I include in my remarks at this point and which lists the number of men killed in coal and metal mines in the United States from the year 1906 to the year 1940.

TABLE 1.—Number of men killed in coal and metal mines in the United States

Year	Anthracite mines	Bituminous mines	All coal mines	Metal mines
1906	557	1,581	2,138	-----
1907	708	2,534	3,242	-----
1908	678	1,767	2,445	-----
1909	567	2,075	2,642	-----
1910	601	2,220	2,821	-----
1911	699	1,957	2,656	695
1912	601	1,818	2,419	661
1913	618	2,167	2,785	683
1914	595	1,859	2,454	559
1915	586	1,683	2,269	553
1916	555	1,671	2,226	697
1917	382	2,114	2,496	852
1918	551	2,029	2,580	640
1919	635	1,682	2,323	468
1920	491	1,780	2,272	425

TABLE 1.—Number of men killed in coal and metal mines in the United States—Con.

Year	Anthracite mines	Bituminous mines	All coal mines	Metal mines
1921	547	1,448	1,995	230
1922	300	1,084	1,384	344
1923	509	1,953	2,462	367
1924	496	1,906	2,402	418
1925	400	1,834	2,234	371
1926	453	2,065	2,518	430
1927	489	1,742	2,231	352
1928	447	1,729	2,176	273
1929	482	1,705	2,187	350
1930	444	1,619	2,063	271
1931	383	1,080	1,463	158
1932	249	958	1,207	107
1933	231	833	1,064	95
1934	268	958	1,226	116
1935	274	968	1,242	164
1936	244	1,098	1,342	199
1937	215	1,198	1,413	219
1938	225	880	1,105	156
1939	211	867	1,078	(¹)
1940	182	1,238	1,420	(¹)

¹ Not available. Estimate.

You will note that in the 5-year period preceding the establishment of the Bureau of Mines, namely from 1906 to 1910, there was an average of 2,658 miners killed per year. And you will note, as shown by table 2, which I shall include shortly, that the fatality rate during this 5-year period was 5.89 persons killed per million tons of coal produced. Now, let us jump down the table a bit. Let us take the year 1918, during the last World War, when there were 678,000,000 tons of coal produced, and we note that in that year, there was a total of 2,580 fatalities, with a fatality rate of 3.80 deaths per million tons of coal produced. Let us jump down to 1923 when there were 2,462 persons killed with a fatality rate of 3.74, and approximately 658,000,000 tons of coal produced. Look at 1929, the famous year of prosperity, when there were 2,187 fatalities with a rate of 3.59, and, incidentally, you will notice in that year that there were only some 609,000,000 tons produced. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the record for the last 4 years, when some measure of prosperity had returned to the country, and we will note that our accidents have materially reduced, as has the fatality rate. As a matter of fact, you will note that the rate in 1939 was the lowest in the history of the country, and at this point I might say, also, that had it not been for the six major accidents of 1940 that year would have been the safest by far in the history of coal mining in this country; and even including those major catastrophes, you will note that the 1940 rate was materially lower than ever achieved prior to the year 1931. And so I say to you that the Bureau of Mines has been accomplishing very worthwhile results and there has been material progress made in the reduction of fatal accidents in the United States; and when fatal accidents are reduced, nonfatal accidents are reduced in a like manner.

TABLE 2.—Fatalities and fatality rates per million tons of coal mined, 1906-38, inclusive

Year	Number of fatalities (anthracite plus bituminous)	Deaths per million tons of coal produced	Tonnage (anthracite plus bituminous)
1906	2,138	5.27	405,055,888
1907	3,242	6.78	477,892,536
1908	2,445	5.97	409,309,857

TABLE 2.—Fatalities and fatality rates per million tons of coal mined, 1906-38, inclusive—Continued

Year	Number of fatalities (anthracite plus bituminous)	Deaths per million tons of coal produced	Tonnage (anthracite plus bituminous)
1909	2,642	5.73	460,807,263
1910	2,821	5.62	501,596,378
1911	2,656	5.35	496,371,125
1912	2,419	4.53	534,466,580
1913	2,785	4.89	570,084,125
1914	2,454	4.78	513,525,477
1915	2,269	4.27	531,619,487
1916	2,226	3.77	590,098,175
1917	2,096	4.14	651,402,374
1918	2,580	3.80	678,211,904
1919	2,323	4.19	553,952,259
1920	2,272	3.45	658,264,932
1921	1,995	3.94	506,395,401
1922	1,384	4.16	476,951,121
1923	2,462	3.74	657,903,671
1924	2,402	4.20	571,611,400
1925	2,234	3.84	581,869,890
1926	2,518	3.83	657,804,437
1927	2,231	3.73	597,858,916
1928	2,176	3.78	576,093,639
1929	2,187	3.59	609,816,788
1930	2,063	3.84	536,911,136
1931	1,463	3.31	441,750,978
1932	1,207	3.36	359,565,093
1933	1,064	2.78	383,171,877
1934	1,222	2.93	416,536,313
1935	1,242	2.925	424,632,005
1936	1,342	2.73	491,138,762
1937	1,413	2.83	493,792,928
1938	1,105	2.79	395,696,632
1939	1,078	1.241	448,131,000
1940	1,420	1.282	503,331,000

¹ Tentative, as estimated 1940, by W. W. Adams, Employment Statistics Section, Bureau of Mines. These figures are likely to vary but slightly from the final figures which will not be available for several months.

Mr. Chairman, the figures clearly prove that the major disasters in the coal industry do not by far represent the total fatalities in this industry. It is true, of course, by reason of their very spectacular nature, that these major catastrophes do receive considerable publicity, which, unfortunately, is only natural; and, as a matter of fact, it is the unfortunate major accidents which have occurred in the past year, which undoubtedly caused so much totally unjust criticism to be heaped upon our committee, and particularly upon our esteem chairman of the Mines and Mining Committee, Mr. JOE SMITH, of West Virginia. But let us look at the record of the major disasters in coal mines of the United States for 1906 to 1940, which I include at this point:

TABLE 3.—Major disasters in coal mines of the United States, 1906-40, inclusive

Year	Number of major disasters	Number of fatalities	Number of fatalities per major disaster	Maximum fatalities in any one major disaster
1906	17	235	13.8	35
1907	18	918	51.0	361
1908	11	348	31.6	154
1909	19	498	26.2	289
1910	19	485	26.1	83
1911	15	413	27.5	123
1912	13	254	19.5	81
1913	8	464	58.0	263
1914	11	316	28.7	181
1915	11	352	32.8	112
1916	11	154	14.0	30
1917	9	262	29.1	121
1918	4	54	13.5	21
1919	9	201	22.3	92
1920	8	61	7.6	12
1921	5	34	6.8	11
1922	15	285	19.0	90
1923	11	301	27.4	120
1924	10	449	44.9	171
1925	14	270	19.3	53
1926	16	348	21.7	91
1927	9	162	18.0	97
1928	14	326	23.3	195
1929	7	151	21.6	61
1930	12	225	18.7	79

TABLE 3.—Major disasters in coal mines of the United States, 1906-40, inclusive—Con.

Year	Number of major disasters	Number of fatalities	Number of fatalities per major disaster	Maximum fatalities in any one major disaster
1931	6	56	9.3	28
1932	6	145	24.1	54
1933	1	7	7.0	7
1934	2	22	11.0	17
1935	4	35	8.7	13
1936	5	37	7.4	10
1937	6	101	16.8	34
1938	5	78	15.6	45
1939	2	33	16.5	28
1940	6	276	46.0	91

We will note that a tremendous reduction has been made, both in the number of major disasters, the number of fatalities, and, aside from last year, in the number of fatalities per major disaster. As a matter of fact, I think everyone will agree with me that the record of the past 10 years has been one of outstanding accomplishment.

The question naturally arises as to just what may have caused the alarming increase in major catastrophes last year, which took the lives of 276 miners. We know that explosions are the principal cause of most major disasters, and the fact that nearly all of the worst coal-mine-explosion disasters of the past 4 years, and especially last year, have been in mechanized loading or so-called mechanized mines is significant. In 1940, 213 of those fatalities occurred in mechanized mines; or, in other words, nearly more than three-fourths of the fatalities for major coal-mine disasters in 1940 came from mines which produced less than one-third of the country's coal. Yet it is significant that none of the major explosions during these past 4 years have occurred in the mechanized mines in Illinois and Wyoming, where mechanization was first established on a large scale, and whence comes the largest output of coal from these mechanical mines. This would prove that while mechanization itself may be increasingly more hazardous, nevertheless, by proper precautions, proper inspection, proper regulation of ventilation, blasting and ignition agencies, as well as in the safe handling of the increased dust hazard by wetting or rock dusting, these mines can be operated equally as safely as any other mine.

Mr. Chairman, prior to coming to Congress, I had been for a number of years closely associated with safety work in an industry allied to mining. Because of that association, I am thoroughly convinced that one cannot legislate safety. Safety can be brought about best by cooperation of everyone concerned with safety, by education of the workers, and the instilling in the workers a safety consciousness. The constant study of the causes of accidents leads to the improvement of safety devices and the creation of safer operating equipment. The study of every accident invariably brings about some determination of the cause and a possible preventative remedy. Inspection is required and education is required to see that similar causes are located elsewhere and where possible preventative

measures employed to eliminate a repetition of an accident. I think we are all agreed that no one seeks to cause accidents and everyone hopes to avoid accidents. However, try as we might, accidents are bound to occur. We can never hope to eliminate them, but we can hope to prevent them, and I repeat that the first step in preventing accidents is to make everyone connected with the industry safety conscious.

The Bureau of Mines can and does study all new safety appliances and make their recommendation to the operators and place their stamp of approval upon machinery and other mining equipment which they deem to be safe. I know from experience that this information readily is made available to the operator, and, likewise, I know that in many instances these recommendations are promptly put into practice.

Likewise, I know from experience the Bureau of Mines has been doing splendid work in safety education. However, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately they have not been receiving the proper cooperation from the miners themselves, and in this I think that the miners' representatives have not been as fully cooperative as they might to inspire in their membership a desire to acquire safety consciousness. I have been told that on numerous occasions the Bureau of Mines has made safety lectures, and even courses, in safety practice available to the miners only to have a disappointingly small attendance at these meetings. Surely no one should be more interested in his own safety than the miner himself, and the leaders of these miners are very much remiss in their duty when they do not go out of their way to help instill a safety consciousness in the men themselves.

The Bureau of Mines, and many operators, to my knowledge, issue safety bulletins acquainting their men with safe operating practices. In too many instances this information is not read by the men, but there is one publication which every miner in this Nation reads, and reads constantly, and that is the official publication of the United Mine Workers. I ask, then, why the editors of this publication, and the officials of the United Mine Workers, have not been in the past more safety conscious themselves and contributed more to the publication of safety and safety practices in their official journal. I am glad to report, Mr. Chairman, that I understand the United Mine Workers have been doing this recently, and I sincerely hope this practice will continue on an ever-increasing scale. Likewise, I sincerely hope that after the passage of this legislation, that the leaders of the miners themselves will encourage greater attendance at these safety lectures and safety courses. The motion pictures are, perhaps, one of the finest ways to put across a safety lecture that I know of, and I sincerely hope that the Bureau of Mines will enlarge their scope in this field. It is an unfortunate fact—but a fact nevertheless—that safety must be sold to the public, to the operator, to the miner, perhaps even to the Congress. Only one interested in safety realizes the absolute truth of that statement.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention, and the attention of the membership, to one thing more. Everyone realizes that whenever an inspection is made of a piece of operating equipment, that equipment usually must be shut down and taken out of production as well as its feeder units. Likewise, when an inspection is made of any part of a mine, production must cease in that part of the mine. I feel that adequate inspection, be it by a Federal or State inspector or by the mine boss himself, is absolutely necessary if we are to improve safe operating conditions. However, I caution you, it is conceivably possible that too frequent inspections can border on the badger game, and used as a weapon to completely stifle production. This would be a tragedy at this time when we realize that 90 percent of our defense industry is energized by coal. When we had our hearings last year on the bill then before us, the danger was frequently pointed out that an ever-enlarging inspection service might be created, and in fact was contemplated, by which it might be possible to seriously hinder our coal production in this country, due to too frequent and unnecessary inspections.

This undesirable possibility has been eliminated from this bill in that it is reasonable to assume that the Director of the Bureau of Mines will exercise his discretionary powers granted under this bill, to see to it that inspections are not made when not necessary. As a matter of fact, it would be physically impossible for the Bureau of Mines to make such "too frequent inspections" with the staff of inspectors contemplated under this legislation. I know that this was not the intention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY] when he drafted this bill. This explains his readiness and his willingness to amend section 2, as will be done later this afternoon. But I am disturbed, Mr. Chairman, by the following demand, submitted by the international policy committee of the United Mine Workers of America to the operators' committee, with whom they are now in conference in New York, under date of March 11, and which reads as follows:

The mine workers propose that in this contract there be written a clause that will give the right to a safety committee of mine workers to inspect any mining operation, and when dangerous and menacing conditions are found to authorize the men to refrain from work until conclusive inspection and findings are made by the State and Federal authorities. In addition, this clause shall permit the international union, United Mine Workers of America, to authorize mourning periods for the dead in our industry, during which period such coal production shall cease.

Mr. Chairman, if the miners insist upon that clause being written into the contract now being negotiated, then I fail to see why they should insist, as they are, upon the passage of this bill. Likewise, if that clause is agreed to, then I sincerely hope that the miners will exercise good judgment—and I do not wish to impugn anyone's motives—in not demanding more inspections by the officials of the Federal Bureau of Mines than they can adequately provide. You can readily see that in passing this bill today, and if this

clause is agreed to, that you are setting up the legislative machinery for providing for one or more Federal inspectors for every single mine in the United States, if you carry this point to absurdity. I know that that is not the desire of this Congress in giving its approval to this legislation.

After all, let us use judgment in safety, as in all else, for the welfare of our fellow man. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], a member of the committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I think it appropriate to say that the principle of this legislation was first embodied in the bill presented by the present distinguished Governor of West Virginia, M. M. Neely, then a Member of the Senate of the United States. I think it also appropriate that it is another West Virginian, our own sincere chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, who brings this measure with a unanimous committee report to the floor of the House.

Let us remember that during the Seventy-fifth Congress this measure, in different form but with the same principle embodied in it, passed the Senate of the United States unanimously. There was a sincere effort by Members of this body to bring the measure to the floor during the last session. At one time or another there were as many as 215 Members of this House who signed the petition which was on the Speaker's desk.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] has spoken about his shortcomings. May I say that I am certain that one of those is not that he is not fair, because I have found him, as I have found the chairman of our committee, desirous of bringing out legislation which will in the last analysis aid in the solution of what we know as a very serious problem in the mining industry of the United States.

I believe that on both sides of the aisle we should remember that in the final stages of the consideration of this legislation the Republican members and the Democratic members sat all day long, from morning until evening, refining this measure, which comes today very logically, may I say also, under the sponsorship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY], who has given a great deal of study to this subject.

In the United States there are approximately 437,000 bituminous-coal miners and approximately 93,000 anthracite-coal miners, making a total of some 530,000 coal miners in the United States. The figures of 1939, which are the last authentic ones we have, indicate that in the State of West Virginia at the present time there are about 104,000 bituminous-coal miners.

That mountain domain is first in the production of bituminous coal in the United States. In 1940 we had a tonnage of approximately 127,000,000 that was brought from the earth to the surface to go into industry, commerce, and business; to turn the wheels of an America that we know increasingly today is being tuned to our national-defense program.

Coal is playing a vital part in the defense industries of the country. Coal certainly is basic in times like these. Any action this Congress can take looking toward the increased safety and health of the men who labor in the mines, those individuals who go beneath the surface of the earth to work in highly hazardous employment, will be commendable.

As has been said, in 1940 about 1,400 coal miners lost their lives. This figure was larger than that in the year 1939.

In taking my seat, I once again compliment the chairman of the House Committee on Mines and Mining and all those who have worked with him, including the present sponsor of the bill. There is brought to this House a measure which we know ultimately will be for the benefit of those who labor in the mines and of the mine owners themselves. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation can best be shown by reading this Associated Press clipping from this afternoon's paper:

REVLOC, PA., March 13.—Four men were killed early today by an explosion in the Monroe Coal Mine Co.'s mine in this western Pennsylvania community a few miles from Johnstown.

State Mine Inspector William Lamont tentatively attributed the explosion to an accumulation of gas.

I hope the bill before us will be passed unanimously and enacted into law without delay. The need for this type of legislation must be apparent to all. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the State of West Virginia is interested intensely in this bill. West Virginia produces more bituminous coal each year than any other State in the Union. At the same time it has been argued that West Virginia, possibly, has the best coal-mining inspection laws now in existence, although our friends in Pennsylvania have a splendid system of coal-mine inspection.

When this bill was first introduced in May 1939, the argument then used against the measure was that it called merely for a duplication of service already provided by the laws of the different States of the Union in which there were coal mines. At that time, I am frank to say, I thought there was virtue in this argument. I have since revised my opinion. The bill calls for cooperation in a service, not duplication.

The bill was passed by the Senate but was immediately held up in the House committee for many, many months.

If there is any objection I would urge against anything in connection with this measure at the present time, it would be the objection that it was not enacted and written into law within a very short time after it was introduced in the House and within a short time after it was passed by the Senate. I have no criticism, however, to offer of the Mines and Mining Committee of the House. I believe the chair-

man and the members of that committee have been diligent and I recognize the difficulties under which they have labored. We are grateful today that they have succeeded in getting this bill to the floor and I congratulate them upon the result of their labors. I wish to comment, however, upon events which occurred shortly after the measure was proposed.

After this bill was introduced in May 1939, and within a period of 14 months, in my State and the States of Kentucky, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, we had a succession of mine disasters which clearly indicated the pressing need for the passage of this legislation or some other curative and preventative legislation of like character. In my congressional district in the State of West Virginia, within 30 miles from my home town on January 1, 1940, there was an explosion in the mines at Bartley, McDowell County, in which there were 91 miners killed, leaving 70 widows and 154 orphan children. In Kentucky, just a few days or weeks before, at a place called Providence, there was an explosion in which 28 miners were killed, leaving 23 widows and 50 children without anyone to take care of them except, possibly, the charity of the State. At Willow Grove, Ohio, on March 16, 1940, while this bill was in committee, there were 72 men killed, leaving 59 widows and 117 children. At Portage, Pa., on July 15, 1940, there was an explosion in which 63 men were killed, leaving 34 widows and 108 children. And I could go on and on and call your attention to other disasters in this industry, some of which might have been obviated by an inspection such as is provided for in this bill.

Upon the record is the appalling fact that within 14 months after the introduction of this bill, and while it was pending, and while we were debating the advisability of enacting it into law, we had accidents in which over 400 miners were killed; and these unfortunate men left 186 widows and 429 children to be taken care of by the workmen's compensation laws of the States in which these accidents occurred, or, failing this, to be clothed and fed by charity.

I cannot say—no man can say—to what extent the accidents I have mentioned would have been prevented had the pending act been in operation and the mines involved had been subject to Federal inspection. I do say, however, that if this act will serve to prevent in any one year just one accident of the magnitude of any I have mentioned, then its passage will have been fully justified.

There has really been but one argument ever urged against this measure. It has been urged that this act will simply provide for a duplication of the service already rendered by the State mine inspectors. This argument is without foundation. The pending bill specifically provides that the Federal inspectors shall cooperate with the inspection service of the State. Under its terms the State mine inspection service will continue to function independently of Federal control. Once each year, however, or at such other times as a condition or emergency may justify it, the State service will be called upon to cooperate with

Federal authorities in the inspection of a mine. There will be neither usurpation nor conflict of authority.

Mr. Chairman, men who go down into the depths of our coal mines to earn a living for themselves and their wives and children are entitled to every safeguard that we can by law throw around them. Under the best of conditions their lives are filled with dangers and hardship. In these later years we of this Congress have been doing much to make the living conditions of the miners and their families better and happier. We have still far to go. Right now, however, in addition to what we may have done to improve the miner's condition outside the mine, let us pass this bill and improve his chance for life inside the mine. I hope, Mr. Chairman, this bill will be enacted into law. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, the coal mining industry has been marked with a great loss of life because of hazardous conditions. Most of the mine accidents in the coal mines are caused by the fall of rock and the explosion of gas and coal dust collected in the underground workings. Former accidents are attributed generally to a lack of support, a lack of ventilation, a lack of rock dust and a lack of proper mine inspection. Despite everything that has been done by the United States Bureau of Mines and State mining rules and regulations, there were six major explosions in the United States last year. Fourteen hundred twenty miners lost their lives and there were 45,000 injuries in 1940.

The accident record of the coal mines of the United States in 1940 is one which must be given serious thought and relatively quick action if the coal mining industry of this country is to be saved the stigma of a national scandal.

The United States Bureau of Mines has been handicapped in years past. By enacting this mine inspection bill, we will give the Bureau of Mines authority and an adequate number of inspectors and engineers to complete the job.

As a former member of the mine rescue team in the State of Indiana and as a representative from the Indiana coal mining section, I believe a bill of this kind will help reduce the loss of life and the number of accidents in the coal mining industry, and I am happy to accord legislation of this nature my wholehearted cooperation and support.

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

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has made a splendid statement. In Indiana we have a very splendid mine inspection law. In the event of the passage of this bill and its becoming law, would that conflict with the operation of our law in the State of Indiana?

Mr. LANDIS. It would not conflict at all.

Mr. SPRINGER. And upon whom would the responsibility of carrying out the provisions of this law fall?

Mr. LANDIS. The responsibility would fall upon the United States Bureau of Mines to make annual inspections.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I understand the gentleman to say that in the event this bill becomes law and in the event of a mining accident, the responsibility for that accident would be placed at the door of the Bureau of Mines or the Interior Department?

Mr. LANDIS. Not the responsibility, but the Bureau of Mines will have the equipment, and it will have the right kind of mine inspectors and mining engineers, and it will take the responsibility of going into the mines and seeing that they are inspected at least once a year.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Let us put this proposition. Suppose a mine is inspected by both the United States Bureau of Mines and by the State mine inspectors. An explosion occurs or an accident takes place. Then we will suppose action is brought against the corporation owning the mine and it is decided by the court that there has been inadequate inspection. Upon which department, the Federal or the State department, will fall the responsibility for inadequate inspection?

Mr. LANDIS. I believe the United States Bureau of Mines will only be responsible for making annual inspections and reports on its findings.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is there anything in this bill which would indicate that that responsibility will fall upon the Federal Bureau of Mines?

Mr. LANDIS. The authority to inspect. The Bureau of Mines are fully equipped and they know their business, and it is better to use a bureau with experience than some other department of the Government.

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

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. FLANNERY. Might it not be said with propriety that responsibility would lie with the agency that is responsible for enforcement, which is the State, inasmuch as the Federal Bureau of Mines is there in an advisory capacity?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then no responsibility whatsoever would fall on the Federal Bureau of Mines? It is merely acting in an advisory capacity?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

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

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS. The gentleman is on the Mining Committee?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS. And has given a great deal of study to this legislation. Is it not a fact that labor organizations other than the coal miners have endorsed and are sponsoring this legislation?

Mr. LANDIS. Speaking for Indiana, all of the labor organizations in Indiana that I have contacted are willing to cooperate in this legislation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Mines and Mining Committee, I was pleased to favor this measure in the committee and am glad to support it now in final passage. It has been quite properly pointed out that this bill is very different from the bill which we had before the committee in the Seventy-sixth Congress and I think that difference has been made clear. I fear some Members may feel, inasmuch as this is a middle-of-the-road measure, it is not all that is to be desired. I think the gentleman was correct in saying that it is a compromise or a middle-of-the-road measure, and in my judgment it has benefited by a change of character.

Some years ago Congress gave more money to the Bureau of Mines for their work than we have been doing in recent years, and during those former years of greater congressional generosity the Bureau did a splendid safety work, largely educational in character. Recent curtailment of appropriations to that wonderful agency of the Government resulted I think in loss of life. As I view this measure it seeks to restore the Bureau's effectiveness which was lessened by a false economy.

It is true that we are a bit slow when we consider the casualties in 1939 and 1940, but now, at the beginning of this great defense program in which coal plays so large a part, I think this bill comes somewhat timely to prevent many accidents and casualties such as have occurred during the last 2 or 3 years. I hope the House will see fit to pass the bill at once and unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that safety in mining has been increasing each year due to the splendid work of the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, viewed over a long period, but perhaps of late years its possible effectiveness has been lowered by smaller appropriations.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. While it is true there were five major disasters in 1940, were it not for those disasters 1940 would have been the safest year in the history of mining in this country. Incidentally, the month of January this year has the greatest safety record ever recorded in the mining industry.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is the educational feature embodied in this bill, placing the responsibility on the Bureau of Mines, that will still further increase that

safety record. That is one benefit of this measure.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman agrees, then, that safety is pretty much a question of education and cooperation rather than legislation?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that is the sentiment of the committee and is embodied in the measure. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, having been born and raised in the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania, having worked in the coal mines myself, my friends and relatives all being mine workers or dependent on coal mining for a living, it is but natural that I am in favor of any legislation that will benefit them.

I am not going to attempt to tell the membership of this House about the hazards of coal mining. All of you know very well that it is the most hazardous of all occupations. All of you know the terrible calamities that have occurred in the past year or 18 months, with the accompanying toll of death, its resultant increase of widows and orphans, the hardships produced financially and economically by all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of any constructive legislation that will assist and help those who have to go into the bowels of the earth to mine coal. They are entitled to the best laws we can give to assure a limiting of the death and accident rate to a minimum; to raise the standards of safety and health; to prevent, or at least try to prevent, anthracosis, commonly called miner's asthma. I am sure that any of you who are familiar with this terrible disease will agree that it is a worthwhile effort. As a physician I have been called upon to treat injured miners and victims of asthma. No other occupation causing traumatic injuries produces the crippled conditions that come from the coal mines. Only war itself produces injuries that approximate those of the mines. I have had experience with both.

I represent the Thirteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, a district whose entire population is dependent upon anthracite coal mining. I come from a State whose mining laws are acknowledged as the best in the United States. The mine inspectors and their examination are unsurpassed. We do not say that the enactment of this bill will eliminate all accidents, but if it will save one life or reduce other accidents, nonfatal accidents, it will have done a good job. We all have confidence in the United States Bureau of Mines.

I am sure the Bureau of Mines with its capable Director, Dr. Sayers, will cooperate with the various State mining heads. Therefore I appeal to the membership to support us in passing H. R. 2082.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman would want to bring to the committee the feeling that in the administration of this new program not so-called

politically appointed inspectors but men who have qualified by their training and experience will be appointed.

Mr. FENTON. That is correct. I just want to call attention to the news item that my colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] reported, where four men were killed early today by an explosion in the Monroe Coal Mine Co.'s mine in western Pennsylvania. Perhaps this is another reason why this bill should be enacted. Revloc is only a mile or two from the home town of our colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBBOTT.

I am sure that the mining industry as a whole will appreciate the enactment of this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I could spend the 5 minutes allotted to me in talking to you about the hazards of coal mining and telling you about how many widows and children I have seen standing at the mouth of a mine. It is fine for you gentlemen to get up here and make speeches of that kind. I do not blame you for it. I can do the same thing. I have been a coal miner in my early days. I come from district No. 14 of the United Mine Workers of America in the State of Kansas. I want to say to you here and now there is a great deal more to this situation than passing legislation and sending somebody into a mine to inspect it, and especially as it is under this bill. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am for this bill; I am going to vote for it; but I am voting for it knowing when I do that it is not going to stop one single solitary explosion in a mine or prevent the death of one single coal miner unless the coal miners themselves and the operators are willing to cooperate and work with the Bureau of Mines and follow out their findings and their suggestions. I happen to know that coal miner after coal miner has had an opportunity in the United States to go to meetings held by the Bureau of Mines, to study and to read and to learn something about the hazardous conditions under which they are working and the manner in which they can protect themselves. But do they go? No. If you doubt my statement on that get in touch with the Bureau of Mines and find out how many meetings they have attempted to hold in various places and you will find that they have advertised such meetings, sent highly paid experts from the Bureau of Mines to these meetings, capable of explaining conditions to the coal miners, and only two or three out of possibly five or six hundred working in the mine would show up to find out what they could learn to help protect their own lives.

I have been a coal miner. I have worked in the coal mines and I say to you that I know whereof I speak, that a great many of the accidents in these coal mines are caused by the carelessness of the men working in the mines. Until that condition is changed and until a condition is brought about where the coal miner can be made to realize the seriousness of the conditions under which he is working,

you will never stop these explosions by passing legislation.

Let me impress upon you that we are embarking upon something that is going to be a colossal undertaking unless we insist on close cooperation between the various State mine-inspection bureaus and the Federal Bureau of Mines. Unless this is done we shall see every State mine-inspection department start to disintegrate. This bill provides that very cooperation, and I sincerely trust that Members on this floor and Members of the House generally will see to it and insist that their State mine-inspection bureaus are kept intact and that they cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Mines.

In the British Isles, Great Britain, there are 2,000 coal mines. You could set Great Britain within the four boundary lines of the State of Kansas and have a lot left over. Let me remind you, however, that Great Britain has a force of 160 inspectors to inspect the mines in that compact district where the same atmospheric condition affects all the mines and where the mines are all about the same depth, where the mines produce the same kind of coal. These mines are, as I say, in one small, compact district, whereas in this country 26 States produce coal, and there are from 6,000 to 10,000 coal mines. It is costing Great Britain \$1,500,000 a year to inspect the mines in that one little territory. What is it going to do to us if we let these State laws get away from us? We have many State bureaus that are competent, and they are doing a good job. They can do this work as well as the Federal Bureau of Mines, and I am sure if we will all keep in mind the necessity of maintaining the State mine bureaus and the necessity of cooperation between State and Federal agencies we can and will prevent mine accidents from happening; but unless we do the miners are not going to be any better off than they are today simply by the passing of this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I know a little about this matter. I live in a district where we have many coal mines. I want to see those miners have every protection and security that is possible. I also want to call your attention to the major disasters that occurred last year. It was stated today that there were 5 major explosions and accidents during the year 1940. Let me correct that statement by saying that in the first 11 months of the year 1940 5 major explosions occurred in coal mines throughout the United States with a fatality list of 267 men. This of itself should be enough to move this Congress to enact this legislation.

The Committee on Mines and Mining is certainly to be congratulated for bringing this bill before the House for consideration. I feel that it should be passed without a dissenting vote, and

I hope it will be passed without a dissenting vote. I believe it to be one of the most humanitarian measures that has ever been brought before us for consideration. These men go down into mines that are thousands of feet deep. They take their lives in their hands from the moment they enter those cages and are lowered to the places where they perform their daily tasks. This bill will not be excessively expensive for the reasons which appear in the report to which I call your attention. The following in the report of the committee covers the case as to administration:

The bill does not contemplate the establishment of a Federal inspection system superseding or duplicating the work of local safety agencies in those States which have established adequate inspection systems of their own, but on the contrary it provides for full and complete cooperation with these agencies to the end that there may be no wasteful overlapping of effort.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill and will vote for it, as I think it will help to safeguard the lives of our coal miners. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the charge particularly emphasized in the last session of Congress of duplication of services by the Federal Bureau of Mines as against the existing State mine departments in the various States, there occurred to me one point that I do not believe has thus far been brought out. Coal mining is the basic industry of West Virginia. The mine inspectors of West Virginia learned the mining industry by working in the mines of their own State. They are then by the Governor of the State appointed as State mine inspectors. With all due respect to these men, many very high class, honest men, it is more or less human that if a man is inspecting his boss' mine, under whom he learned his profession, he is not going to be very tough on the boss. Federal inspectors will secure their positions under civil service. I believe they will do a more efficient job than the State inspectors. I am, however, happy to see this bill on the floor today and with apparently no opposition to its passage, when in the last session of Congress, although our distinguished present Governor of West Virginia, then our United States Senator from West Virginia, secured its passage in the Senate by unanimous consent, we were never able to get a vote on the measure in this body.

I am mighty glad that it is in this position, because my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining [Mr. SMITH of West Virginia] was criticized and misunderstood about this same legislation in the last session of Congress, and I am happy to see it being passed almost by unanimous consent under his direction.

A few days ago in this House we voted funds and the Speaker appointed a committee to investigate the recent air accidents that have happened in our country. The same condition exists in our mining

industry in this country. I believe there are too many unnecessary accidents in our mining industry, that supervision by the United States Bureau of Mines will greatly remedy the situation, and that the industry will go ahead and prosper with many less accidents.

I want to leave another thought with you. We talk about expansion of the Federal Bureau of Mines, but I think it should be expanded. As has been said before, the State of West Virginia produces more bituminous coal than any other State in the Union, yet there is not a branch office of the United States Bureau of Mines in all the State of West Virginia. There is ample opportunity for excellent work by these skilled men of the United States Department of Mines to function where the coal is being mined. In the new Federal building, nearing completion in Mount Hope, W. Va., space has been provided for a branch of the United States Department of Mines. I have called on the Appropriation Committee to provide funds for this office and shall again appear before that committee in the very near future with more evidence of the necessity for this branch. The location in Mount Hope has been approved by all of the coal associations in that section of West Virginia. There is plenty of safety work to be done in all the territory surrounding Mount Hope. The United States Bureau of Mines has asked for this station. The quarters will soon be available and I feel sure that Congress will provide the necessary funds in the Interior Department appropriation bill so that this most important station, in the heart of the world's biggest and best coal field, may start functioning in the near future in Mount Hope, W. Va.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made annual inspections and investigations in coal mines the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce—

(a) For the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life in such mines, or the causes of occupational diseases originating in such mines.

(b) For the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life in such mines, or the causes of occupational diseases originating in such mines, as a basis for determining the most effective manner in which the public funds made available for the protection or advancement of health or safety in coal mines, and for the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases therein may be expended for the accomplishment of such objects.

(c) For the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life in such mines, or the causes of occupational diseases originating in such mines, as a basis for the preparation and dissemination of reports, studies, statistics, and other educational materials pertaining to the protection or advancement of health or safety in coal mines

and to the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases in coal mines.

(d) For the purpose of obtaining information relating to accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life in such mines or relating to occupational diseases originating in such mines, to be transmitted to the Bureau of the Census for use in connection with the preparation and compilation of the various census reports.

(e) For the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life in such mines, or the causes of occupational diseases originating in such mines, to be transmitted to the Congress for its consideration in connection with legislative matters involving health and safety conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases in coal mines.

(f) The Secretary of the Interior, or any agency of government which he may use in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall cooperate with the Bureau of Mines, or other safety agency, in the respective States and Territories, and shall report the acts of himself, or such agencies, to the State and Territorial bureaus or safety agencies. He, or such agency of government as may be used by him, shall give notice of all inspections to such State or Territorial bureaus or agencies and afford an opportunity for their representatives to assist in such inspections. All inspections made by the Secretary of the Interior, or any agency of government which he may use, shall not be in violation of any State, Territorial, or Federal law.

Mr. MOSER (interrupting the reading of section 1). Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will permit the Clerk to conclude the reading of section 1 of the bill.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. MOSER (interrupting the reading of section 1). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment. If we are going to proceed with the reading of the bill beyond the point where I asked to strike out the last word, we will have passed that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have an opportunity to offer an amendment after the Clerk reads section 1.

The Clerk concluded the reading of section 1 of the bill.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "Interior", insert "acting through the United States Bureau of Mines."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "annual", insert "or necessary."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "mines", insert "whenever such health or safety conditions, accident, or occupational diseases burden or obstruct commerce or threaten to burden or obstruct commerce."

Page 3, strike out lines 17 to 24.

Page 4, strike out lines 1 to 5, all of subsection (f).

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOSER: Page 2, line 15, after "prevention", strike out "or relief."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "or relief"; line 2, after "diseases", insert "among"; after "coal", change "mines" to "miners."

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, the loose construction of the language in this bill is something that we did give consideration to in the Committee on Mines and Mining last year, and wherever the word "relief," as applied in the bill that we kept in that committee was contained, among other objectives it obviously was calculated that the bill instead of preventing accidents in mines and protecting the safety of the men who go into the bowels of the earth and mine coal for the comfort of mankind and the utility of industry was intended for other purposes.

In the month of December, when we were in recess, with that in view, I took the Keller bill and made some changes, which I handed to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH], expecting him to introduce it, which he did not do, and introduced the original Neely bill, as I understand it; whereupon I introduced the altered bill myself, and it happened to be introduced on the same day that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY] introduced this bill. That bill is H. R. 2090.

Now, in the verbiage and language of a bill of this kind, we all know, we all understand, and I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FLANNERY will readily understand that a coal mine is not afflicted with a disease and that occupational diseases are not a part of the real estate and physical property of a coal mine. So I feel that the term "relief" in that bill does not belong in there. I feel that with the Workmen's Compensation Acts that are enacted and in operation in the different States, relief is no part of this bill and should not be a part of this bill, the same as I feel that occupational diseases are not a real affliction, for which I believe my neighbor and colleague and good friend, Dr. FENTON, can find a nostrum. I think we should confine it to the men who dig the coal, and I trust the committee will adopt these two amendments.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after an accident the Bureau of Mines comes in and assists in locating the bodies, removing the bodies, clearing debris and cooperating insofar as possible with the State agency. That is the thought considered in connection with the use of the word "relief."

With reference to the other amendment, anyone who has had any contact with the mining industry knows that anthracosis and industrial pneumonia are very common in their effects upon the constitution and are very devastating and widespread in the industry. I respectfully submit that it is an important part of the bill, and the amendment offered by the gentleman should be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOSER) there were—ayes 4, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made the inspections and investigations provided for in section 1 of this act at other than annual intervals in either of the following situations:

(a) Upon the occurrence of an accident involving bodily injury or loss of life in a mine subject to the provisions of section 1;

(b) Upon the submission to the Secretary of the Interior of a petition signed by a majority of the underground workers in a mine subject to the provisions of section 1, or signed by the authorized employee representatives of a majority of the underground workers in such a mine, or signed by the collective-bargaining representative of a majority of the underground workers in such mine;

if the circumstances of the accident or the facts disclosed in the petition indicate that the making of such inspections or investigations in the mine concerned will be in furtherance of the purposes of this act.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: On page 4, beginning in line 6, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is further authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made the inspections and investigations provided for in section 1 of this act at other than annual intervals at any time in his discretion when the making of such inspections or investigations in the mine concerned will be in furtherance of the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay a tribute to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH], against whom vituperation and abuse was hurled with a number of invectives last year because that bill remained in the Committee on Mines and Mining. The bill was ostensibly designed for other purposes. As I mentioned a minute ago, it was not a bill that was calculated to be of benefit to the people whom I believe the entire Congress would be willing to benefit and help and relieve in any case of distress.

After the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] presented the report of the subcommittee I went to the executive session of the committee, having given to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the assurance that I would move to report the bill out. There was opposition to the acceptance of the report as filed by the gentleman from New York as chairman of the subcommittee, but it was adopted. Immediately a member of the committee moved to report the bill out with the recommendation that it pass. On that the committee deadlocked. The same gentleman immediately moved to report the bill out without

the recommendation that it pass, and the committee again deadlocked.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in no way merits the invectives that were hurled in his direction, nor does any member of the subcommittee that was headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS], nor does any member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, nor does any Member of the Congress of the United States. None of them is in any degree responsible, as was abusively charged by John L. Lewis in some of the intemperate and ill-advised letters he sent to Members of Congress stating that the Members of the Congress of the United States are responsible for the butchery that continues in the coal mines. That kind of letter came to us.

I served as a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining without having solicited membership thereon. I was taken off the Committee on Mines and Mining without resigning or requesting that I be taken off that committee. I know that a great many Members of the House are under the delusion that once you are on a committee you can stay on it until you resign or go to another committee of your own choice. That was my delusion, until I found that I had been taken off the committee. I feel that I know exactly where in Pennsylvania politics to put my finger on the pulse of that situation. However, that is something with which I do not propose to burden the House as a matter of any imposition on my part. Having been placed on that committee without my solicitation, I would have as cheerfully resigned. The opportunity to resign is a courtesy that I believed was accorded to every Member of the House until removal was forced on me in a manner that I resented, for prejudiced reasons.

In absolving the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH], however, may I say that pressure came from an unnamed source in this House to keep that bill in committee. As a member of the committee, I assure you that effort was not given any consideration by the members, as far as I was able to observe, and that pressure did not come from the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining.

I have acted in good faith in offering an amendment which I felt should clarify the language. The committee has decided against me, and I abide by the will of the majority. [Applause.]

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the passage of this legislation today for two reasons. First, I believe it should pass on its merits. Second, I am interested in its sponsorship.

In 1918, when I was discharged from the Army of the United States, I was employed for a time in Carlisle, Pa. Soon after my arrival I hung my hat in a boarding house operated by a charming old lady whom we knew as Mother Schenck. A fellow boarder of mine was a young student then studying law in Dickenson College. We often discussed

the pros and cons of the day. I meet him here today on the floor of this House for the first time in 23 years. He is a Democrat; I am a Republican. His name is HAROLD FLANNERY, sponsor of H. R. 2082. Good luck to you, Harold! [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, or any duly authorized representative of the Secretary, shall be entitled to admission to any coal mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, for the purpose of making any inspection or investigation authorized under section 1 or section 2 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 1, after "Interior", insert "acting through the United States Bureau of Mines."

Line 3, strike out "the Secretary" and insert "such Bureau."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Any owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person having control or supervision of any coal mine subject to the provisions of section 1 or section 2 of this act who willfully refuses to admit the Secretary of the Interior, or any duly authorized representative of the Secretary, to such mine, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 60 days, or by both.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 12, strike out "willfully."

Line 13, after "Interior", insert "acting through the United States Bureau of Mines."

Line 14, strike out "the Secretary" and insert "such Bureau."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to note the spirit with which this legislation is being received by the House this afternoon. Apparently, there is little if any opposition to this just and humane measure.

The coal miners are engaged in an occupation which is, perhaps, the most hazardous of any occupation followed by mankind. It is high time that Congress should insist that something be done for the thousands of workers engaged in this industry toward the elimination of some of the hazards of their occupation. This bill which makes it possible for the Bureau of Mines to inspect the mines, to make reports of unsafe and dangerous conditions, and further to recommend to Congress legislation for the improvement of dangerous, unsafe, and hazardous conditions.

The fatalities in this industry are really appalling, some 1,400 men lost their lives last year, something like 60,000 men suffered disabling and crippling injuries. I am gratified that Congress has at last realized that something should be done about such a situation. I want to pay tribute to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY], who has worked so arduously in this session of Congress and in the

last session also to bring about the enactment of this legislation for the protection for the thousands of men engaged in this hazardous work.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the average earnings of coal miners are less than \$1,000 a year. When one takes into consideration the dangers they are confronted with in this occupation every day in the year we cannot escape the conclusion that they are not overpaid.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to this fact: The coal miners do not work the year round. In other words, their jobs are seasonal and if they get high wages or what appear to be high wages, in the end they do not receive what you would call really high wages, because they are not employed every day.

Mr. HEALEY. I just referred to the fact that the average earnings of the men engaged in this occupation is less than \$1,000 a year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is because it is a seasonal occupation.

Mr. HEALEY. That is true, or because they are not employed steadily.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Every owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person having control or supervision of any coal mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce shall furnish to the Secretary of the Interior, or to any duly authorized representative of the Secretary, upon request, complete and correct information to the best of his knowledge concerning any or all accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life which occurred in such mine during the calendar year in which the request is made or during the preceding calendar year.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 24, after the word "Interior", insert "acting through the United States Bureau of Mines."

On page 6, line 1, strike out the words "the Secretary" and insert "such Bureau."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed—

(a) To report annually to the Congress, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this act, together with such findings and comments thereon and such recommendations for legislative action as he may deem proper;

(b) To compile, analyze, and publish, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this act, together with such findings concerning the causes of unhealthy or unsafe conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases in coal mines, and such recommendations for the prevention or amelioration of unhealthy or unsafe conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases in coal mines as he may deem proper;

(c) To prepare and disseminate reports, studies, statistics, and other educational materials pertaining to the protection or advancement of health or safety in coal mines and to the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases in coal mines;

(d) To expend the funds made available to him for the protection or advancement of health or safety in coal mines, and for the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases therein, in such lawful manner as he may deem most effective in the light of the information obtained under this act to promote the accomplishment of the objects for which such funds are granted;

(e) To transmit to the Director of the Census, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this act, for use in connection with the preparation and compilation of the various Census reports; and

(f) To make available for public inspection, in summary and detailed form, the information obtained under this act immediately upon the acquisition of such information.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 7, after the word "Interior", insert "acting through the United States Bureau of Mines."

Page 7, strike out lines 14, 15, and 16, and insert:

"(f) To make available for public inspection, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained under this act, as soon as practicable after the acquisition of such information."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior shall devolve the execution of the provisions of this act upon any of the existing bureaus or agencies under the Department of the Interior, or may create such new offices or agencies thereunder as he may deem advisable for the execution of the provisions of this act. In the execution of the provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Interior may also utilize the services of any other instrumentality or agency of the Federal Government, or of any State or Territorial Government, authorized to make investigations or inspections pertaining to health or safety in coal mines, if the agency or instrumentality consents to such utilization. The Secretary of the Interior may reimburse any such Federal agency or instrumentality for the services rendered by it out of any funds made available to him for the execution of the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 8, strike out lines 21 to 25, on page 7, and line 1 to line 11, on page 8, and insert:

"SEC. 7. The execution of the provisions of this act shall devolve upon the United States Bureau of Mines and the Secretary of the Interior may designate other bureaus or offices in the Department of the Interior to cooperate with the United States Bureau of Mines for such purpose. In order to promote sound and effective coordination of Federal and local activities within the field covered by this act, the secretary of the Interior, and the several bureaus and offices under his jurisdiction, shall cooperate with the official mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States and Territories, and, with the consent of the proper authorities thereof, may utilize the services of such agencies in connection with the administration of this act. Copies of all findings, recommendations, reports, studies, statistics and information made public under the authority of clauses (b), (c), and (f) of section 6 of this act shall, whenever practicable, be furnished any cooperating State or Territorial agency which may request the same."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, create and establish an advisory committee to exercise consultative functions, when required by the Secretary, in connection with the administration of this act. The said committee shall be composed of representatives of coal-mine owners and of representatives of coal-mine workers in equal number. The members of said committee shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the civil-service laws, and shall receive such compensation for their services as the Secretary may fix, not to exceed \$10 for each day actually spent in the work of the committee, together with such necessary traveling and other expenses as may be allowed by the Secretary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 5, after the word "Interior," insert "acting through the United States Bureau of Mines";

In line 7, after the word "committee" insert "composed of not more than six members;"

In line 15 after the word "laws" strike out the remainder of line 15 and all of lines 16, 17, 18, and 19.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil-service laws, such officers and employees as he may deem requisite for the administration of this act; to fix, subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the compensation of officers and employees so appointed; and to prescribe the powers, duties, and responsibilities of all officers and employees engaged in the administration of this act: *Provided, however,* That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors under this act, the basic qualification shall be the practical experience of the applicant in the mining of coal; and in detaching coal-mine inspectors to the inspection and investigation of individual mines, the basic qualification of such inspectors shall be their previous practical experience in the work of mining coal in the State, district, or region where such inspections are to be made.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 10, line 3, after the word "however" strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 4, 5, and 6 and insert: "That in the selection of persons for appointment as coal-mine inspectors any inspector employed shall be an accredited engineer or the equivalent thereto with the basic qualification of 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan to the committee amendment: Page 10, line 8, after the word "accredited" insert the word "mining."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much of the time allotted to me under the 5-minute rule, more than to say that this amendment will clarify the wording of the bill. This is a mine-inspection bill, devoted to mine safety. Obviously the man who is a trained mining engineer should be em-

ployed for this work. The provision "or the equivalent" permits the judicious employment of the mechanical, electrical, or civil, or other trained engineer who by force of circumstances has, through experience, qualified himself for the job.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, line 12, after the word "mines", strike out "the basic qualification of such inspectors shall be" and insert "due consideration shall be given 'o.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the due execution of this act.

SEC. 11. For the purposes of this act, the term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any other State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any foreign country, or wholly within any Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, or between points in the same State if passing through any other State or through any Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia or through any foreign country. For the purposes of this act, the words "practical experience" as applied to qualifications of inspectors and as used in section 9 shall be construed to mean or include 10 years' experience in a coal mine, 5 years of which shall have been spent in cutting or mining of coal at the face.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 11, line 6, after the word "country", strike out the remainder of line 6 and all of lines 7, 8, 9, and 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

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

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COFFEE of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2082, relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; and, under House Resolution 135, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a sepa-

rate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] has been called away on an extremely important matter to his district, and on his behalf, I call up House Resolution 137, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 137

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3486, a bill to authorize an appropriation of an additional \$150,000,000 for defense housing. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

This is an open rule that makes in order H. R. 3486, to authorize an appropriation of an additional \$150,000,000 for defense housing. At the last session the House passed by nearly a unanimous vote a bill that authorized the appropriation of \$150,000,000 for this purpose, but due to the fact that so many new plants have been ordered to be built in sections far removed from densely populated districts, it becomes necessary to provide housing for thousands of workers. I am pleased to state that due to the aid and assistance of gentlemen on the left, the committee has reported the rule, and that very little time will be used either on the rule or the bill, because an agreement has been reached whereby some of the objectionable features have been eliminated. The Rules Committee spent about 6 or 8 days before reporting the rule. They did not wish to do anything that would be displeasing to the committee that reported the bill; but to enable the Rules Committee to report the bill, we were obliged to obtain a great deal of information that was sought by nearly every member of the Committee on Rules.

I am indeed grateful to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK],

minority members of the Committee on Rules, in cooperating in reporting this rule out. I feel that some may regard the work of the Committee on Rules as an encroachment on the prerogatives or legislative function of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, but the members of my committee felt it necessary, as I have stated, to obtain all information on the best possible housing, on its economic construction, and, at the same time, to receive assurances that sufficient rentals would be obtained from those who are to have the benefit of these housing facilities.

We had before us gentlemen who are in charge of this construction and gentlemen who have made the recommendations and allocations. I am pleased to say that nearly every member of the Rules Committee, after listening to those splendid gentlemen—Mr. Carmody, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency; Mr. Palmer, Housing Coordinator; and Mr. Melick, of the Public Buildings Administration; and others—were satisfied that those gentlemen are endeavoring to do a splendid job to provide proper housing for these hundreds of thousands of wage earners in various sections of the country.

I feel, in view of the agreement reached on the part of the chairman of the committee which reported the bill, and in view of the agreement on the part of all members of the Rules Committee, that the resolution will receive the unanimous approval of the House. It is an open rule. Opportunity will be given, and I understand the chairman of the committee has agreed to offer a certain amendment which will be satisfactory to all.

In view of that, I shall conclude my statement in the hope that the rule will be speedily adopted and that the 2 hours provided for general debate will not be used, because of the arrangements and agreements that have been entered into eliminating the objectionable features.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this rule comes in with a practically unanimous report from the Committee on Rules and from the committee which had the bill under consideration. It simply increases from \$150,000,000 to \$300,000,000 the amount of money to be spent on housing to help the national-defense program.

There are many communities, Mr. Speaker, in which new defense works have been set up, where they do not have sufficient housing facilities to take care of the workers. Therefore this is an emergency measure to provide houses and homes where workers who have been assembled in these big plants, shipyards, and manufacturing units can bring their families to live.

The part that I like particularly is that it provides for homes, for family homes and not for large apartment houses, which, in my opinion, are generally unsatisfactory. This bill calls for the building of small inexpensive homes. Where you have home owners you develop Americanism and taxpayers, and a bulwark to communism, socialism, and radicalism. I would like to see an

enlarged program to build American homes, for I know of no better way to combat the spread of communism than by creating home owners in America.

Mr. Speaker, the only opposition that I heard of to the bill was based upon that section that provided for electric refrigerators in these houses.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to inform the gentleman, if he has not been informed, it has been agreed upon that an amendment will be offered to strike that out.

Mr. FISH. Yes; I understand. The only opposition to the bill urged before the Rules Committee was the fact that the bill provided for electric refrigerators in these homes. Most of the members of the committee were of the opinion that that was highly improper; that it was unnecessary; and that if it was done it would create a situation that amounted to unfair competition with homes and private houses for rent in the community. I am glad, as a member of the Rules Committee, that an agreement has been reached, after very lengthy consideration, extending into days and even weeks, to strike out this provision and to eliminate these electric refrigerators, which many Members of the Congress themselves cannot afford and do not have in their own homes. It was a justifiable complaint that we should not appropriate money for expensive refrigerators in these houses to be rented at \$20 a month as it would be unfair to the local communities and home owners there, because their rents would be ruined if new houses were built by the Government provided with electric refrigerators and other modern appliances which the people of those communities do not have.

I hope now that there will be no opposition to the bill. It is a defense measure, and if those homes are created it will promote Americanism and create additional taxpayers in the Nation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], a very hard working and industrious member of the Rules Committee, 10 minutes, and more if he wants it. [Applause.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as has been suggested, I think we are all very much agreed on this proposal and convinced that it should be adopted. So possibly, under those circumstances, no one should take the time of the House to discuss the proposal or what it seeks to do. On the other hand, I am convinced that at times some of these matters should be talked about and some discussion should be had and something should be put into the RECORD as to what the program is and what has been accomplished under the act and what it seeks to do in the future, because it is yet a matter of some importance to me that we proceed to authorize an appropriation of another \$150,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States.

Just the other day we had before the House a resolution seeking to set up a committee of Members of this House to investigate into the progress and efficiency of the over-all defense or war

effort now being carried on by the country. I undertook to say a few things about that proposal. One of the things I suggested was that every legislative committee of the House has not only the right but the duty to audit the performance of the agencies operating under it, to see to it that the functions of government which have been delegated by it in legislation that it has presented to the House are carried out in line with the will of the Congress. So I believe the legislative committee having this bill in charge should assume a continuing responsibility for the carrying out of the work under it.

Back in September and October of 1940 the Congress enacted what has since become known as the Lanham Act. That act authorized the appropriation of money for, and provided for the setting up of, an administration to build defense housing, to build houses at such locations as might be necessary to accommodate workers or laborers in defense industries, and to house regular enlisted personnel, noncommissioned officers, assigned to permanent and regular establishments of the Army and Navy.

When we passed that act we had in mind some of the experiences of World War I. The Government did not go into the construction of houses then as it is now going into such construction, but our experience at that time proved that the carrying on of defense industry, the manufacturing of necessary war materials, was seriously handicapped by the lack of good housing or sufficient housing. As a result, men did not go there to work, or if they did go there to work they soon became dissatisfied because of inadequate housing. This resulted in an immense labor turn-over and seriously affected the efficiency of the industries involved.

This act seeks to build houses when it becomes apparent that they must be built. It recognizes that first of all private capital should be encouraged to come in and build houses if it can possibly see its way clear to do so. Then the other day we relaxed the provisions of title VI of the Federal Housing Act to the end that the Government might cooperate with private capital in building these houses in some locations where they would be needed. But even after that is done we find there are some of these industries so temporary in nature that it is absolutely impossible to bring about the construction of houses except by the direct use of money out of the United States Treasury.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HARNES. I wonder if any investigation has been made of the program thus far as to whether or not the houses that have been constructed under the act are permanent in nature.

Mr. HALLECK. The Rules Committee, as the chairman has said, conducted hearings for several days. We had before us the different people who have charge of this program. They told us that the type of house being built is 24 by 30 feet in dimension, does not have a basement, that it is heated by a furnace on the

ground floor, that all houses have been of frame construction except in two locations where they used brick. I believe the houses generally are being built in such manner as to make them permanent structures.

Mr. HARNES. Under this program are these houses sold to the workers on contract or are they just made available to them for rent?

Mr. HALLECK. The houses are not sold to the workers, and I do not believe there is any provision in the act that would permit a worker to buy one of them. The provision is for the renting of the properties. As to whether or not they would be purchased I do not know because the same consideration of the temporary character of the work or the length of time work will be available might prevent a worker from buying one of the houses.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The evidence presented to the committee also showed that some prefabricated houses would be built in certain localities far removed from centers where housing can be had. These are intended for use where housing will be used for a short space of time and then they can be moved to some other place. The cost for such housing would be limited.

Mr. HALLECK. As the chairman of the Rules Committee states, that is being done in some places.

We appropriated originally \$150,000,000 for this program. They have allocated the larger part of the money—I do not remember the exact figures—to make provision for something like 33,000 family-type homes and 2,445 units for single persons. Out of that larger figure, 4,904 houses will be built for the accommodation of enlisted noncommissioned personnel of the Army and the Navy.

This bill seeks the authorization of \$150,000,000 more money. They seek to build with this money upward of 44,000 additional family units, 1,400 single units, and about 9,500 units for enlisted personnel.

There is no question but what there is need for defense housing of this sort. Private housing, it has been shown, cannot take up all of the slack. The question was raised in the Rules Committee, and it came into my mind too, as to just what is the responsibility of the United States Government to take money out of its Treasury and build homes in which workers are to live. Normally I do not think there would be any responsibility. The responsibility flows directly from the absolute necessity of doing this sort of building. If we are to bring the workers into the factories and keep them there so they can carry on the work, they must have reasonably adequate housing. The thought occurred to me that, inasmuch as we draft men for the Army, put them in tents, and give them \$1 a day, why should we build houses for defense workers? The obvious answer, of course, is that we do not draft men to work in these factories; they come there voluntarily and can leave voluntarily. Except as the conditions meet their re-

quirements, they are just not going to come. The need originally is determined by the Division of Defense Housing Coordination, headed by Mr. Charles F. Palmer, who appeared before our committee. He has been in charge, along with the Administrator, Mr. Carmody, and his staff, of the carrying out of the program. In order that it may be in the Record, I for one believe that while this program is necessary as a part of our defense or war effort, it ought not to be administered in a wishy-washy, carefree manner. Rather should it be administered in a hard-boiled manner and according to the necessities of national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it should be definitely determined first of all whether or not the housing is necessary. I can understand why any worker would rather have a nice new home for his family in which to live in preference to some other quarters that might be available in the community and which may not be as desirable. But we are in a tremendous effort that demands the best that is in every one of us, and I do not believe that in the administration of this act anything should be sought but the absolute minimum requirements, and I do not think anything beyond this will be asked by the Congress, by the country, or by the laboring people of the country either.

If we reach the conclusion that the houses must be built, then, of course, the question comes along, What sort of houses should we build? The bill itself fixes a limit of \$3,000, which I think has been very effective. An amendment will be offered here today which will tend to keep down some of the things that have been characterized by some as frills. I am frank to confess that in my own home I want an ice box, a refrigerator, and an electric or gas range. When I am home in Rensselaer, I buy them myself as part of my furniture; but when I come to Washington and rent a house here, they are in the house. Whether it is a part of the house or a part of the furniture that one moves in, I do not know, but certainly if the needs of the defense effort can be met without this added expenditure, then the Government should be saved this expenditure wherever possible.

After we get these houses built, how about rents? I want this administration to charge rents that are fair and reasonable and clearly adequate. The law says that they shall have regard to the ability of the occupant to pay, which would have to do with his salary. It has been indicated in the committee they had in mind some sort of a rule that the rent would represent roughly 20 percent of a man's income. I do not know whether it should be that sort of a rule or a rule which would provide that a man drawing a good salary shall pay at least 10, 12, or 15 percent of the cost of the house, which is what most of us have to do who rent a place, but be that as it may, I think the rents should be fair and adequate.

I do not think we ought to be concerned in this program with any aspect of the

problem that has to do with the socialization of housing. I do not believe in the socialization of housing and would not want to see such housing paraded under the guise of this program. Right here may I say that I was very much impressed with the ability and character of Mr. Palmer, the Defense Housing Coordinator, who appeared before us, and I was likewise favorably impressed with Mr. John Carmody, the Housing Administrator. I want them to know that as one Member of Congress I stand with them in what I believe is their sincere and earnest desire to administer this whole program in a businesslike way to the end that it will cost us as little as possible and that when we get through we will not have too many headaches following the program, because in this as in a great many other things involved in this tremendous effort, we see economic dislocations that cannot be helped. We are undoubtedly building houses in places where one of these days there will not be much use for those houses, assuming that the war does not go on forever, and I am convinced it is not going on forever.

Some attention should be paid to ultimate consequences; for instance, to the matter of selling the houses or working them in with the housing program in the particular community in which they are located after the defense effort is concluded. How much attention should be paid to that now as against the necessities of the moment which demand that the job be done quickly I would not undertake to say, but I think the administrators in charge of this program ought to keep those matters in mind. They ought to be looking ahead to the time when we will try to get some money back from the houses, or try to work them in with a slum-clearance program, when permanent uses for them can be found.

In connection with carrying out this program, I asked Mr. Palmer if he did not feel that there should be a growing national patriotism and unity in the country, the development of something of a spirit of sacrifice, the development of a spirit that makes us willing to undergo some hardships and inconvenience in order to carry on the program that is now before the country. He said he felt so, and he referred to some of his observations in foreign lands, where, whether we like it or not, some of these people have developed something of that sort of a spirit. That same sort of spirit can again be kindled in this country, in my opinion. We are starting in with a debt aggregating close to \$50,000,000,000, and it will be added to as we go along day after day, week after week, and inevitably so. But as we go along with that program every one of us should constantly keep before us the idea of cutting out wherever possible unnecessary expenditures, avoiding the use of things that are not absolutely necessary to the success of the program, because, as I intimated a moment ago, when we get through defeating the threat of totalitarianism from without, we will again be at grips with the threat of that system from within, and we ought to preserve every possible bit of strength. We ought to develop, if you please, in the hearts and minds of as many of our peo-

ple as we may a growing desire to think more about what the individual can do for the Government and the country and a little less about what the Government and the country ought to do for them. I believe that the men who are working in these plants are ready to go along with that sort of a program. They will be demanding homes, and they will be the ones who will know first of all where the homes are needed and how many are needed, but they should not be too impatient with a Government that seeks to be a little conservative and a little careful, as I believe the administrators in charge of this program are going to be.

I thank you for bearing with me and listening to me.

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

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Was information furnished to the Committee on Rules concerning how many houses have already been constructed, not allocated but completely constructed?

Mr. HALLECK. There have not been very many as yet completely constructed. I believe I saw somewhere a figure that possibly upward of 2,000 had been either completed or were very rapidly nearing completion. Possibly the chairman of the committee can say.

Mr. LANHAM. I would say in that regard that, of course, this law was not passed until the middle of last October, and all the organization and planning had to be done. The houses are in the course of construction, in the main, and relatively few of them, necessarily, have been completed within that time. The statement has been made by those who do construct these houses through the Public Buildings Administration that they are in a position now for the construction to proceed very rapidly, because all of that preliminary work has been done.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am just wondering whether the chairman is satisfied that they have really been expediting this work. I have heard that they were a little bit slow in providing homes for the defense workers. I wonder whether the committee is satisfied that they are really expediting the program.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman in that regard that before construction can be authorized a very careful survey must be made of all available housing, also a survey of what private capital will do toward furnishing this housing, in order that we may not build any more than necessary. Of course, it takes a little time for that investigation to be made, but considering that, and considering the fact that they have had to organize a plan and get started, I think they have made a very good record and are in a position now to continue that work at much greater speed.

Mr. HALLECK. If the chairman will permit me to supplement his statement, which I believe is a very satisfactory answer, may I say that they also make some determination as to the available labor supply. You may build a new plant in a given location and there may be a lot of people right there, living in homes at that spot, who could come in and work, so that

has to be determined. You have to determine first of all how many new workers are coming in, then what housing facilities will be available for them. It does not necessarily take some time. I do not believe, however, that any particular defense project has as yet been seriously handicapped by any failure to carry on this program expeditiously.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hold in my hand a statement for the week ending March 8, 1941, issued by the Federal Works Agency, Information Division, Defense Housing Construction Bulletin, which states that the total estimated construction cost of units under contract is \$75,-448,063; total dwelling units approved to date, 51,242; total dwelling units under contract 23,847. I assume this refers to this program.

Mr. HALLECK. Perhaps I did not catch it definitely, but there are numerous agencies that are taking part in the defense-housing program. I believe the Maritime Commission has built some houses, the Army has built some houses, and the Navy has built some houses. Different agencies are involved.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman might state that Mr. Palmer told the Rules Committee about that, and he counted for the Rules Committee, 13 agencies that are engaging in this housing program.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. Maybe they are not actually building houses. The F. H. A., for instance, is a part of the whole defense housing picture.

Mr. CRAWFORD. These are the projects under the Federal Works Administrator; defense housing.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. When we conscript soldiers and send the members of the National Guard and Reserve officers into camps, we give them a place to sleep, but if they are so human as still to want to have their families near them, we tell their families to look out for themselves. Can the gentleman explain how we justify putting up homes for the families of volunteer defense workers while we extend no such arrangements to the families of conscripts?

Mr. HALLECK. I believe the gentleman touches on a matter I touched on briefly in my statement. It goes back to the old argument we had about the paying of the bonus and the question of the man drafted in the Army to serve at a dollar a day while the man working in the shipyards got \$15 a day. As I see it the only answer is, first, that we draft men for the Army and do not conscript labor to work in the industries. We operate, as far as our industry is concerned, on the system of private enterprise. I am hopeful, for one, that the job can continue to be done that way, and done efficiently and well. Secondly,

we just have to get the men to work in these locations. If a man does not want to come there and work without his family or a decent place in which to live, he will not come. Therefore, the gun is not built for the man who is in the Army. However, I am frank to confess that the question the gentleman poses strikes at the sense of fairness of any person who has thought about this problem at all.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman, furthermore, that, of course, some houses are built for the families of noncommissioned officers and enlisted men. However, let me call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that the most of the boys who are in the camps for the period of training of a year are single men. These dwellings are being built for industrial workers where the facilities cannot otherwise be provided, at places like shipyards, where they are going to be working for several years because the shipbuilding program necessarily takes considerable time.

Mr. HALLECK. If I may intervene, may I say that the houses that are built as a part of the permanent establishment of the Army are for the regular enlisted personnel and are not in connection with cantonments and camps where the drafted personnel are serving.

Mr. LANHAM. In addition, we do not give these houses to anybody. They are built to be rented at a proper rental and sold, the money to recoup the Government. It is not a matter of giving these houses to the industrial workers.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There is nothing in the law, is there, that requires that they should be sold or rented at a reasonable figure?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, there is.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In the old law, the Coordinator is given authority to do as he pleases about that.

Mr. HALLECK. No, not that.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is wrong. It provides for fair rentals and fair disposition of the property after the period of the emergency is over. The gentleman is wrong in each particular and the law so provides.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I do not know that there is much that I could add to what has already been said. In fact, had I known he was going to make that speech I do not think I would have asked for the time. I think he has covered the situation very well and very fairly and very forcefully and said many of the things that I would like to have said and which I shall not repeat. As he so aptly said, we have come to the conclusion, after careful consideration, that defense housing is necessary. I realize, as you do, that the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], naturally arises

in one's mind. Why should the Government prepare houses for defense workers when it does not for soldiers? The gentleman from Indiana has answered that most fairly and appropriately, but I would like to add this to what he has said. While it is incumbent upon the Government in this emergency to provide housing, I do not think it is incumbent upon the Government to provide luxurious housing for these defense workers. As a matter of fact, after some calculation and after discussing this matter on numerous occasions with Messrs. Carmody, Palmer, and the others in charge of the administration of this law, I see no reason why the Government should not recoup most, if not all, of the money that it puts out on this defense project. To begin with, most of the houses will be occupied by men who draw comparatively big wages in the industrial and shipbuilding plants. Most of the workers in the munition plants, the shipbuilding plants, and other similar industries draw anywhere from \$5 to \$25 a day in salary. I think it would be wrong, I think it would be unjust to the taxpayer for the Government to furnish houses to these people and rent them for a nominal rental. There is no reason why the Government should not get a minimum of \$25, and in many instances they ought to get \$40, as a rental for a house that cost the Government anywhere from \$2,500 to \$4,000. You will find that in every one of these towns where these projects are being constructed the private owners of property are getting such rentals for similar properties, if not inferior properties, to those which the Government is building.

There has been some criticism of the Committee on Rules for going into this legislative feature of this measure. I have heard rumors about the floor that the Rules Committee was going beyond its jurisdiction in this matter. As a member of that committee I do not think that is true and I differ most forcefully with that contention. I think the Rules Committee has done a fine piece of work on this legislation. We have elicited much information that has been helpful not only to the country, but to the administration of the legislation. Congress always intends that these matters shall be administered fairly and that they shall be administered to the best interests of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. And we find that sometimes we get these theories in the administration of the Government and the work is done upon a theoretical rather than a practical basis. For instance, there has been a lot in the newspapers and otherwise about the question of refrigerating units, gas ranges and stoves, as has already been mentioned here. As a result of that investigation, if you want to call it an investigation, by the Rules Committee, there has come an amendment which will be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that will take care of that situation. In

other words, we found that Mr. Carmody and Mr. Palmer were most cooperative and that they were perfectly willing that the intent of Congress should be carried out, and while I think it is necessary that they have some discretion in the administration of this law, yet we have been successful in having such an amendment agreed upon which will be offered here so that the so-called frills will be cut out of the houses that are built in the future for administrative purposes.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the sooner the American people realize the great emergency that faces this country and the sooner we get down to the ground and basic work that is necessary to be done to meet the emergency, the better off this country is going to be. It is absolutely necessary that we get down to the basic facts and prepare this Government for the emergency that is coming, leaving aside the frills of a more abundant life for another day. [Applause.]

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert herein the following statement which I made today before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Chairman Lanham and members of the committee, I have been, as you are aware, intensely interested in this housing legislation from its very inception. Likewise, I am keenly interested in the bill now before the committee for consideration. While I have been convinced all along that it is necessary for the Government, if it is to make a good job of this defense program, to provide adequate housing facilities for the workers in our industrial plants where the local communities do not have sufficient housing, I have nevertheless pointed out repeatedly that these houses should be simple and comfortable; that they should be built with the idea that they might eventually have to be dismantled as surplusage upon the housing market. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it has been my thought all along that since it is necessary to construct these houses due to the large influx of workers in the industrial defense plants they should be economically constructed with the idea always in view that the Government could get its investment back, or as much of its investment as possible, during the emergency. With this in mind I have protested vigorously against the inclusion of such luxurious and unaccustomed articles in unfurnished houses as electric refrigerators, ranges, etc. In most of the communities where these houses are built it is not customary for unfurnished houses to be rented with such equipment. There are many reasons why this should not be done, foremost among which is the fact pointed out before that many of these houses will have to be dismantled and the Government will, therefore, lose money on its investment.

Moreover, I might add that I think such a practice is wrong in view of the discrimination between men drafted into the Army and the industrial workers. For instance, when a man is drafted into the Army he gets the nominal pay of \$30 per month; in many instances lives in a tent with the crudest kind of heating apparatus; and foregoes the luxuries of civil life. Then why should an industrial worker who receives from five to twenty dollars a day be furnished with such luxuries by the Government? I am happy to say that after conferring with the Coordinator of Defense Housing and the Federal Works Agency Administrator, and their assistants, we have succeeded in getting a state-

ment from these gentlemen that such practice in the future will not be followed except in the rarest instances.

RENTAL

In line with this thought, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Government should by all means require an adequate rental fee to be paid. In this respect I am assured by these public officials who will have charge of this matter that it is their purpose to charge approximately 20 percent of the income. I once thought of proposing an amendment that would set out an adequate yardstick for such rental, but after mature reflection I found that this would be a rather difficult thing to do, and that, in the final analysis, some discretion should be left to the Administrator. However, I do think that a house which costs the Government around \$3,000 should not be rented for less than \$25 to \$30 per month.

SALE OF HOUSES

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I think there should be written into this legislation some provision whereby the industrial worker could purchase these houses from the Government, if in fact such power is not already given. Even if the worker were allowed to purchase his house upon a monthly basis in lieu of rent, we would be making much progress toward the solution of this problem. Many of these workers could easily afford to pay from \$30 to \$60 a month toward the retirement of the purchase price of the house. America is a Nation of home owners. Nothing would contribute more toward a happy worker than the fact that he was purchasing his own home. Of course, it is not necessary to mention that this would go a long way toward making him a better citizen of the community in addition to giving him the pride of ownership of his own home.

EQUALITY OF PROVISIONS TO ALL APPROPRIATIONS

And now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call your attention to a most vital matter. It will be recalled that in the haste to get some of this work under construction prior to the passage of H. R. 10412, the original Lanham Act, there was attached to a House national-defense appropriation bill in the Senate an amendment which authorized the expenditure of \$100,000,000 for the construction of defense houses. This was the first legislation of this kind. I understand that all of this money has been allocated and that the houses thereby authorized to be constructed are in various stages of construction. Subsequently, the original Lanham Act, H. R. 10412, authorizing an additional \$150,000,000 for this purpose of construction of defense houses, was carefully considered by this committee, reported out, and passed by the Congress. Under the provisions of that bill, which was much more carefully considered and better written than the Senate amendment, provisions were made for the payment by the Government to overburdened municipalities for a certain percentage of the money thus appropriated to assist these municipalities in caring for the additional burdens of administration occasioned by the construction of new town sites within their borders. This was a very wise provision. And while it did not go as far as the legislation now under consideration, it nevertheless contributed to the relief of the situation. But, unfortunately, the municipalities in which these houses were constructed under the provisions of the Senate amendment referred to were eligible for none of these benefits provided under the first Lanham Act. Of course this inequality, injustice, and discrimination was never intended by the Congress. But it was just one of those things that resulted from hasty legislation. This inequality and injustice is one that should be remedied in this legislation and one, I am sure, that the Congress would readily

agree should be remedied. To that end, Mr. Chairman, I have prepared an amendment which I am submitting for your consideration to cover that situation. I feel sure that it will be adopted as it should be.

H. R. 3486

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to say that I think the committee is doing a very fine and splendid piece of work in the legislation now under consideration. It so happens that in my own community of Pascagoula, Miss., and in the municipality of Hattiesburg, Miss.—within my congressional district—there are located a large shipbuilding industry and a large Army cantonment, respectively. Pascagoula was a town of approximately 6,000 people, and Hattiesburg a town of approximately 20,000 prior to the advent of the shipbuilding industry and the Army cantonment. As a result of the shipbuilding industry at Pascagoula the population has almost doubled, while at Hattiesburg approximately 60,000 soldiers have moved into the Army cantonment. It does not require much imagination to realize the additional tax and burden that have been placed upon these small communities by the influx of so many people. The construction of additional housing units, streets, lighting, sewerage, police and fire protection, school equipment, and additional personnel required to maintain and operate them is all out of proportion with the ability of the communities to finance. The need for some such legislation as this to take care of the unusual activities and the abnormal conditions produced by such a situation is apparent.

In my own home town of Pascagoula, for instance, where 700 additional houses are being built—practically doubling the amount of houses already there—the city is met with an almost insurmountable obstacle in the question of financing additional facilities. As an illustration, the city has just recently completed a \$300,000 school building at the expense of the local taxpayers. It was thought that this building, together with the others already there, would take care of the school situation for 20 years. But now the enrollment will practically double itself when the houses are finished. The same situation prevails at Hattiesburg, as well as in many other small communities where defense industry and Army cantonments have appeared like mushrooms overnight. It is obvious that some Federal assistance is essential to the orderly procedure of community life.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3486) to authorize an appropriation of an additional \$150,000,000 for defense housing.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3486, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use, and I promise to be very brief, because I think there has been very good discussion of the pending measure by those who have spoken under the rule.

Mr. HOLMES. Under the division of time, 1 hour is allotted to this side, is it not?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. The gentleman has 1 hour.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, we all deplore the necessity which makes it incumbent upon us in these trying times to authorize large expenditures of money, but that necessity does exist, and it is a very tremendous one.

With reference to the matter of defense housing, it has been very much enhanced in these times as contradistinguished from the time when this country was actually at war. In the World War we were preparing soldiers to go abroad to foreign fields. We were doing relatively little from the standpoint of the preparation of our own country for defense and little or nothing from the standpoint of furnishing munitions of war to our Allies across the sea. Our efforts now are devoted primarily to preparation for our own defense. This involves great expansion of our industrial operations—industrial operations which have taken workers from many fields and transported them to different fields; taken them from one kind of work not connected with national defense and transferred them to labor primarily connected with national defense. Yet in spite of the fact that the obligation upon us in this regard has been very much multiplied by the seriousness of the times in which we are living, I should like to call attention to the further fact that even in the World War we appropriated \$175,000,000 for defense housing and an additional \$20,000,000 for the transportation of workers to the various projects where they were employed. So by comparison the amounts that we expend now in this extended program are not so considerable as at first sight they appear. These houses are being built for the purpose of renting them to industrial workers in congested defense areas and for a fair rental.

The rentals, as set forth before the Committee on Rules and before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, indicate that they are going to be fair. I should like to say in that connection with reference to an inquiry that was propounded by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorvys] that it is impossible to fix an absolute standard of rentals, because these buildings are not all of the same class, in the first place, and the workers who will live in them do not all receive the same compensation, in the second place. Some of these buildings are located in relatively isolated rural areas, where industries like powder plants are being constructed, and the dwelling units are prefabricated with the thought that they will be subsequently moved away. Others are in suburban areas of cities, where adequate housing is not available, and where they are intended to be sold later to become a permanent part of such cities and towns and occupied by those who will reside permanently in those localities. So you cannot do otherwise than say, as we say in the law, which law has been very generously commended throughout the United States, that fair rentals shall be established in accordance with the

ability of those who occupy the dwellings.

The statement was made before the Committee on Rules that the general basis for charging such rentals is that of 20 percent of the income of the tenant who occupies the dwelling.

Much has been said about the matter of refrigerators and stoves in a great many of these family dwelling units. They were justified by the Administrator on several different grounds. The men who are to live in these defense areas, who will work in these projects, are not low-paid workers; they are well-paid workers and are accustomed to living in a very decent manner. The Administrator made the statement that he could get an increased rental for these buildings in certain instances where these facilities were available and that when the emergency period had ended he could sell the houses for more money if they had such facilities in them.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In the amendment which it has been suggested the gentleman proposes to offer, has the gentleman taken into consideration the possibility of the Government making better disposition, more equitable disposition of the properties, by the inclusion of these facilities in certain cities where it is the accustomed practice to have them?

Mr. LANHAM. The amendment, of course, provides a certain leeway, and necessarily so. Some of these houses are built for families of noncommissioned officers; and, insofar as having these articles in the houses that are built for them is concerned, no objection has been made by anybody; and in certain particular instances it is a matter of good sound economy for them to be included. Although it may at first blush seem that they are putting in frills and extravagances for the type of homes occupied by the men who receive wages of the kind these skilled workers receive, you usually find such homes provided with accessories of this sort; and may I say, furthermore, with reference to some of the things that are being used that formerly were expensive—for instance, bronze fittings—it is a fact that such furniture now is cheaper than with the old-fashioned type of fittings; and in the case of chromium-plated accessories they today can be bought cheaper than the old-fashioned brass. I believe it will be found that the Administrator has been working on a sound, reasonable, businesslike basis when we really understand the particulars of these various cases.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. GORE. We all, of course, want economy practiced, but there is the possibility of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Was evidence presented to the gentleman's committee to show that in the rental of these projects they could get an increase in rent as a result of having these fixtures which would give a fair return from the investment?

Mr. LANHAM. That statement was made to the committee by the Administrator. He stated also that it was the

intention to put them only in those places where by the differential in rent they could be paid for and where it would enable the sale of the property at a higher price after the emergency ends.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand some 9,400 units have been built for families of noncommissioned officers near Army posts and Navy posts.

Mr. LANHAM. Quite a number have been constructed, but the great majority of the dwelling units have been for industrial workers in the defense areas. There have been a number of the kind to which the gentlewoman refers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know some have been constructed near Fort Devins, in my district.

Mr. LANHAM. And I think there has been no objection to having refrigerators in the houses that were built for the particular men to whom the gentlewoman refers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have not heard any complaint from anyone.

Mr. LANHAM. There has been no objection from anyone about that.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the gentleman would point out to the Committee whether any of these units are to be built on Government reservations.

Mr. LANHAM. This is not a cantonment proposition; they will be built off Government reservations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is not this after all an effort merely to give the workmen an opportunity to have a decent place to live similar to what we did under the Federal Housing Authority when we would give the worker the chance to borrow money from the bank to build a home; only in this case the question of time will not let that course be followed?

Mr. LANHAM. It must be borne in mind that the Government is not giving these buildings to any workers. The Government is building these units to be rented with the idea in mind of recouping for the Government later by sale as much of this investment as may be possible.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One further question. Earlier in the debate on this bill the statement was made in connection with refrigerators that we should not forget the little man on the corner who sells refrigerators. Certainly we do not want to forget him. Certainly the people would buy refrigerators from him to put in these houses, but it must also be borne in mind that the Government itself will buy the refrigerators from the little man on the corner to put in these houses, just as they buy things in every community where the Government engages in this type of operation. The man on the corner who sells refrigerators will get the business whether the Government buys the refrigerators or the workman buys them. As a matter of fact, the man on the corner would have better business and be more sure of getting his money back from the Government than he would from the worker.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Recently a committee of workers came to me complaining bitterly of the housing conditions they had to endure. They told me, among other things, that one of the chief sources of trouble and having much to do with strikes are these poor housing conditions. This bill should go far toward helping that particular condition. I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. LANHAM. And may I say to the gentlewoman from New Jersey that, in view of the increased cost of materials and in view of the limitation in the law of \$3,000 as an average for these dwellings, they are not going to be mansions. The object is to have decent dwellings, and the administration has not exceeded the limitations that have been laid down in the law.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HEALEY. Do I understand that the gentleman is to offer an amendment which will eliminate the furnishing of Frigidaires in these homes?

Mr. LANHAM. I will read the amendment, which seems to be agreeable to those who have made complaint with reference to the matter. It still allows for proper leeway:

Provided, That all items of cost shall be separately estimated with a view toward economy, and that no movable equipment shall be installed in such units unless the Administrator shall in any particular case deem such installation to be in the public interest.

After the hearings that have been held by the Committee on Rules and by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I am sure that they will be installed only in those instances where it is sound economically, and where there is a practical reason for their installation.

Mr. HEALEY. That does repose discretion in the Administrator to install these accessories?

Mr. LANHAM. It does, necessarily so, because it is generally agreed that there are some of these dwellings in which they should be placed.

Mr. HEALEY. Does not the gentleman himself concede that from the standpoint of health it would be wise to install refrigerators, particularly electric refrigerators, and from the standpoint of cost and economy?

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman I think it is a very good idea to have the kind of refrigerator installed in these various homes that will use the fuel that is provided in those localities. For instance, it has been brought to my attention that many Army officers who move from one tour of duty to another own their own furniture but they do not own their own ice boxes and they do not own their own stoves, because they may live on one tour at a place where electricity is used, they may live on another tour at a place where gas is used, and on still another tour where coal or wood will have to be used, and there can be no standard equipment to meet the various conditions under which they live.

Mr. HEALEY. Just one further question. Stoves and refrigerators have be-

come recognized as necessary appurtenances and particularly in the instance the gentleman just referred to. But there are many of these defense workers who will have the same difficulty.

Mr. LANHAM. It may also be said that where these defense workers are living in certain areas now in their own homes, and they have labor which will keep them self-supporting, yet they are more needed now in defense areas where these industries have been established, there must be some inducement when they are making a living at home to get them to go out to these isolated regions, in many cases, where they do not have the conveniences that they have in their own dwellings. This is a matter of administration and it is thought that in a great many of these cases it is sound economy to have certain fixtures and that they can be paid for by the differential in rent, and also the values will be enhanced so that the sale value will be increased when the emergency has ended.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In the hearings before the gentleman's committee, was there any evidence that any of these defense installations were placed in communities that did not want them? Was not the evidence that these defense installations in isolated communities, wherever they were, were the result of a lobby, so to speak, by the community that wanted them there? Was there any evidence of any defense plant that is located in a community that did not want it, that was not seeking it?

Mr. LANHAM. As far as I am concerned, I do not know of any under this law. Before any defense housing for industrial workers is authorized in any locality, there is a very intense, careful investigation made in that locality of several things. In the first place, what available housing is there? How many workers will have to be brought in? What labor is available in the locality? To what extent can private capital be induced to do the necessary building? They make a very careful and a very complete investigation in that regard. It is not until the need is absolutely shown that the Federal Government's money goes into the building of these defense housing projects.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Palmer stated before the Rules Committee:

We have, of course, received one or two protests that we have scheduled our housing in cases where private housing could do the job. By far the greater number of protests, however, have been on the other side of the ledger. That is, that we have not scheduled enough housing.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, it is absolutely impossible to suppose that a defense measure of this size and character could be administered without some protest from some places.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand it, this bill does not cover the projects commonly known as defense housing for noncommissioned officers; is that correct, or does this cover that?

Mr. LANHAM. A small part of it does cover the case of noncommissioned officers, but the great bulk of this appropriation is for industrial workers.

Mr. BROOKS. In the case of housing projects for noncommissioned officers, is it not the intent that the housing will be used continuously, even after the emergency, by the Army, and that it is necessary for Army purposes?

Mr. LANHAM. The provisions in the law are rather broad as to the disposition that may finally be made of the property. It provides the property shall all be disposed of when the emergency has passed. It will be sold or disposed of in some way in accordance with the circumstances of each particular case. It may be that it will be advisable to leave some dwellings in relative close proximity to Army centers or Navy centers, but that is a matter that will have to be determined with reference to administration. This is differentiated from various other housing authorities, in that we are not doing this for the purpose of slum clearance, we are not doing this for the purpose of providing permanent dwellings for low-income groups; we are doing it for the purpose of providing temporary dwellings for a group of relatively high-income people who are called into these defense areas, and we rent the property to them, and then we shall sell it when it has served its purpose.

Mr. BROOKS. There was in the 1940 census a special census taken of the housing facilities throughout the Nation. Is the census of 1940 used? Does the Department make a special census to find out whether or not a community really needs a housing project, or does it rely on the original 1940 census?

Mr. LANHAM. They make their own survey and have various local surveys made. If the gentleman could have heard the testimony before the Committee on Rules I think he would find that every member of the Committee on Rules will testify that they make a very thorough investigation themselves.

Mr. BROOKS. It is independent of the census of 1940?

Mr. LANHAM. Absolutely so.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was a suggestion here this afternoon that the average cost of these houses would be about \$3,000.

Mr. LANHAM. The law provides that the average cost shall not be above that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was also suggested that the yardstick for the rent of these homes will be about one-fifth of the worker's pay.

Mr. LANHAM. Not as a universal yardstick.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But that is an average. It has also been stated here this afternoon that some of the men are earn-

ing between \$250 and \$300 a month, which in my locality is way high. Is the man in the low brackets going to be frozen out from renting these houses because the man in the higher brackets may be a better investment?

Mr. LANHAM. No.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can see that if the Government rented one of these houses to a man earning \$100 to \$150 a week he would be a better investment than the man who was earning \$35 a week, and the latter would not have an opportunity to rent one of these houses.

Mr. LANHAM. We are not discriminating against the man of low income and low wages. It is for that very reason that we cannot establish one standard for all these dwellings, regardless of the income of the tenant or the temporary or permanent nature of the house. However, in those sections where buildings of a certain class are constructed, the workers who will occupy them will probably be receiving relatively the same wages, and there could be an average rental.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In a shipyard, for instance, various rates of wages are paid. In a locality where one of these housing projects is being built, wages would be paid that would run from 50 cents an hour to a dollar or \$1.25 an hour. What guaranty is the man getting 50 cents an hour going to have under this bill that he can rent one of these houses?

Mr. LANHAM. I believe the gentleman will find that in the administration of the law an effort will be made to take care of all the industrial workers in the congested defense areas where there is not local housing already available and where private capital will not furnish it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to clarify the answer to that question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Either Mr. Palmer or Mr. Carmody testified that, if they used this 20-percent scale, the really high-paid worker would be paying probably a higher rent than would be justified for that particular house, so he would go out into the town and make his own arrangements for housing, and therefore the operation would take care of the very fellow about whom the gentleman is speaking—the man who is drawing the least amount of pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What if he is located in a locality where he cannot go out and hire the house of his choice, and instead has to take one of these houses?

Mr. HALLECK. There may be a few locations where these houses will be the only houses, but that cannot be said to be true of Boston or Philadelphia or places like that, in which the majority of these houses are being built.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am just raising the question that perhaps some provision should be made to protect the low-wage earner who is located in one of these localities and earning possibly 50 or 60 cents an hour. He should be guaranteed a place to live in, too. The man earning \$1 or \$1.25 an hour can generally go out and, if homes are available, rent one of them from its owner. What I fear is that the man in the low brackets will be frozen out of this program.

Mr. LANHAM. I feel very sure the gentleman will find that in the administration of the program it will all be taken care of properly.

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

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

Mr. HAINES. I simply want to bear out what the gentleman said a moment ago in reference to the census. Last week I had a group of manufacturers come here from the city of York. They believe they are in need of houses. They were advised that before any attempt would be made to build the houses, a survey would have to be completed by their own department to find out whether or not there was actual need. May I ask the gentleman whether under this bill it is proposed to erect permanent homes or only temporary homes?

Mr. LANHAM. We propose to erect each kind. In certain isolated rural areas where there is a temporary project and there would be no need for the houses after the project had done the work scheduled for it, of course those homes will be temporary and will probably be prefabricated and portable so they can be taken somewhere else and sold to the best advantage; whereas in certain areas in towns and cities or in the suburbs of towns or cities, where there is the likelihood that there will be permanent occupants of the homes, they will be permanent, and they will be sold.

Mr. HAINES. Will opportunity be given to local industrial leaders to contribute to the building of these homes under this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know that I quite understand the gentleman.

Mr. HAINES. Will opportunity be given for the local men to make a contribution? For example, the Government would give 10 or 20 percent, and then the ownership would go to the industrial leaders who built the homes?

Mr. LANHAM. Not under this bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is under F. H. A.

Mr. LANHAM. That may be true under some legislation, but that is not true under this.

Mr. HAINES. Under F. H. A. you can only give 80 percent for homes that are purchased.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That has been raised to 90 percent.

Mr. HAINES. I thought perhaps this bill would cover the case where they might acquire 90 percent on homes that are rented.

Mr. LANHAM. No; this is of a different character, where the Government goes in absolutely and builds the houses and rents them and sells them afterward.

Mr. HAINES. There is no contribution on the part of local men?

Mr. LANHAM. No; no contribution.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask one or two questions with reference to the amendment. Does the record clearly show that this equipment, refrigeration and stoves, particularly, when installed by the Government at the time the house

is constructed, can be purchased and installed at that time at a much lower cost per unit than if bought by the individual?

Mr. LANHAM. The testimony is to the effect that they have bought these refrigerators at a cost of \$52 each, which certainly is a very reasonable cost for a refrigerator, and it would not take much of a differential in rent to pay for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And perhaps at one-half of what it would cost the individual if he had to install it in the house.

Mr. LANHAM. I think that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there anything in the amendment which would prohibit the Administrator from proceeding on that basis if the Administrator finds that it is in keeping with the general program?

Mr. LANHAM. May I read the amendment to the gentleman:

That all items of cost shall be separately estimated with a view toward economy, and that no movable equipment shall be installed in such units unless the Administrator shall in any particular case deem such installation to be in the public interest.

If the tenant is going to go to the Administrator and say, "I would like to have these facilities, and I would like to pay more rent in order to get them," I think, perhaps, there would be no difficulty.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In that case it would be possible for him to put them in.

Mr. LANHAM. I think that would be in the public interest because the Government would get the money back. I think this allows a reasonable discretion to the Administrator, and I think, by all means, the Administrator should be allowed a reasonable discretion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the chairman in that respect. Reference was made by the gentleman from Indiana, I believe, to galvanized iron versus copper or brass piping. I know that in certain localities where defense housing is being provided the water conditions are such that within 3 to 5 years galvanized piping will absolutely be eaten up and of no utility whatsoever. There is not anything in the bill that will prohibit the Administration from using copper or brass piping in such cases, is there?

Mr. LANHAM. The only limitation in the law is with reference to the average cost of the dwelling, and I think it should be so because circumstances differ so in the various places that what is feasible in one place, naturally, may not be feasible in another. What costs less in one place might cost more in another.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the chairman in that approach to the matter.

Mr. LANHAM. I had not intended, Mr. Chairman, to consume so much time, but I have been very glad to give such information as I could in response to these questions.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I first want to pay my respects to one of the finest chairmen it has been my privilege to serve under in my short years in the legislature, the distinguished gentleman from

Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who presides over this particular committee. [Applause.]

I want to say personally that I am heartily in accord with this bill. I do want to correct, however, an impression that might be created in the committee by my very distinguished and good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman VORYS, who, most of the time, is 99.44 percent correct, but at this particular time he is using up a portion of that fifty-six one-hundredths percent wherein he is wrong, because this bill specifically gives to the Administrator the right to sell and to collect rent. I want to state that the evidence before this Committee will show that the committee very carefully looked into the matter, that we were not donating anything to anyone, and in reality a portion of this is going to be paid back to this Government. However, we do not want to kid ourselves that we are going to get all this money back, but I know of no portion of the defense program where we expect to get all our money back. We have an emergency where we must have these workers in these various localities in order to rush forward our defense program. Representatives of various localities have appeared before our committee and I believe I am correct in saying that there never has appeared before the committee, one individual or one group of individuals, representing any group or organization that is opposed to this measure. This is due to the fact that we are not going into competition with their own private real-estate agencies. So I say to you that we do consider that we are engaged in a portion of the defense program when we are asking for the passage of this bill, and even though we may not pay back dollar for dollar the money invested, yet the money we lose will be very small in comparison with the necessity for speed in our defense program.

I trust that the Committee will carry the consideration of this bill to a successful conclusion. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD].

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I was in the same position as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] on this proposition. When it first came to my attention I did not see quite eye to eye with some of the other members of the committee. As I gave the matter some consideration, I realized that conditions today are entirely different from what they were in the last war, and that we have to provide suitable housing for the men to work in the munitions and the powder plants if we want them to go there to work, and after listening to Mr. Carmody, the Administrator of this affair, I was convinced that the administration is in fine hands. I believe that if the other departments and agencies of the Government had men like Mr. Carmody there would be no objection or criticism of their work. He is one of the finest administrators in the service of the Government today, and I have the utmost confidence that if this bill is passed and the money advanced, it will be administered in a way that will be satisfac-

tory not only to Congress but to the people of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to make this observation: A few days ago Congress authorized \$100,000,000 additional to provide more housing for the national-defense program. That was under the Federal Housing Administration, and the money will be furnished by local lending agencies—the Government to insure the loans. Today we are adding another \$150,000,000 to a bill which but a few weeks ago granted \$150,000,000 to furnish housing for this same purpose. That makes \$400,000,000 within the last few weeks. All this for defense housing. And the thing that distresses me is the fact that Members of Congress pay so little attention to these vast appropriations. There are but a few Members present; apparently there is no interest. I believe this particular appropriation is necessary. I so believe because I have heard the proof as a member of the Rules Committee. However, because a committee so recommends is no reason why the Congress—the 435 Members representing their people—should leave to committees entirely the power to expend billions of the taxpayers' money just because the appropriation is labeled national defense. I sat through 1 days of hearings in the Committee on Rules. I believe those hearings were profitable. I believe these administrators learned the views of Congress on defense housing. I believe these administrators—some of whom have been bitten by the bug of uplift, the more abundant life, and social reform—find it rather difficult to differentiate between the days when the Congress and the country had lots of money and the days when we must borrow every dollar that we spend, and need every dollar that we can borrow for national defense.

I know that Mr. Carmody is a good man and I know that Mr. Palmer is a good man, but it is almighty difficult for Mr. Carmody acting today on one of these Federal housing uplift projects and acting tomorrow on a necessary defense project to distinguish between luxury and essentials. They mean well, but social reform dreams have no place in the picture at the moment. Congress should be on guard throughout the entire time that these vast sums are being expended, and Congress should never be criticized because it inquires into the question of the necessity for and the advisability of the spending of sums asked for by the administration or by any agency of the Government. It is our duty, it is our function. Our grip on the purse strings is about the last vestige of power retained by the Congress. When we give the President the \$7,000,000,000 he asks for in the defense program where will our control be then?

I doubt whether many here realize that this same Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has been holding hearings, and that within the next few days this same committee is going before the Committee on Rules to ask for a rule for at

least \$150,000,000 more, and for what? To furnish the "facilities" for the housing we are authorizing today. This bill builds the houses. Within 10 days we are going to be authorizing the school-houses to go with the houses. We are going to be providing possibly swimming pools to go with the houses, that is if the uplifters have their way. We are going to be authorizing more hundreds of millions of borrowed money. It is not to impede national defense that some of us call attention to these facts. Our motto must be billions for national defense but not one cent for waste, extravagance, or luxury. We cannot justify providing all the comforts of life for the highly paid defense worker while the boys carrying the guns and wearing the uniform work for \$30 a month, 24 hours a day, and possibly live in tents.

I am not criticizing, but I am calling upon the Congress to assume its full responsibility, come out of its lethargy and by close scrutiny guarantee to the taxpayer a dollar value for every dollar spent, and perform the functions of the body which must keep control of the purse strings of the Government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, is amended by striking out "\$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300,000,000."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 1, line 7, after "\$300,000,000", strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That all items of cost shall be separately estimated with a view toward economy, and that no movable equipment shall be installed in any such units unless the Administrator shall in any particular case deem such installation to be in the public interest."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3486, and pursuant to House Resolution 137, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time to consider the bill appropriating money to carry out the purpose of H. R. 1776 as a general appropriation bill; that debate on the bill be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and confined to the bill, and that said debate shall be concluded not later than the close of the day on which it is taken up.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of that, I would like to say that if this consent is granted it is the purpose of the committee to call up the bill on Tuesday, have the debate Tuesday afternoon, and consider the bill under the general rules of the House for amendment on Wednesday.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the primary object of having the bill treated as a general appropriation bill would be to have the bill read for amendment by paragraphs, so that as to each individual item amendments might be in order rather than to have the whole thing read at one time and considered at one time. It gives a fairer opportunity for anyone who has an amendment which they want to offer in that way.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is all to be considered just like general appropriation bills are considered, with all rights of the Members fully protected.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, is this the \$7,000,000,000 bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it the purpose to bring the bill in as a unit or covering authorizations and the appropriation of \$7,000,000,000, or is this bill to be split up and only such amounts be authorized and appropriated for at this time as have been justified before the committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is the purpose to bring in such amounts as may be justified in the hearings before the committee, but complete frankness compels me to say it will be for the total amount of \$7,000,000,000 cash.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, there will be justification for certain items and a blank check to the Executive for the \$7,000,000,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, not a blank check. Under the terms of the lease-lend bill the funds will be handled by the President through the regular departments of the Government. It will conform exactly to the terms of the lease-lend bill which has become law.

Mr. TABER. Is it not the understanding that these articles will all be procured through the regular bureaus, departments, and set-ups of the Army and Navy?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker,

there has been a general expectation that this bill would be taken up on Wednesday. Several people have left town with that expectation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, general debate will be taken up on Tuesday and the bill would go over until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The vote on the bill would not come until Wednesday?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Not even a vote on an amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. And, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not the purpose of the gentleman to permit the debate to continue just as long throughout the evening as anyone is prepared to talk, so that we may have the full day available for debate?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. And a night session if the House wishes to have it, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be nothing but debate the first day the bill is considered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Debate, however, to be confined to the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. And if this request is not granted, nothing will be gained, because a rule will be granted.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Rudger Clawson, president of the Twelve Apostles of the Mormon Church on Sunday evening, March 9, at the Washington Chapel, where memorial services for the late Senator Reed Smoot were held.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mr. E. B. Crosby, Director of the National Seaway Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may have

permission to revise and extend the remarks he made this afternoon on the mine inspection bill and to include therein certain tables and statistics on mines and mining prepared by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORAND and Mr. HEALEY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written to me by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LARRABEE], chairman of the Committee on Education, in reply to a letter by Mr. Aubrey Williams of January 29, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a short letter sent to me by Robert W. Dunn, executive secretary of the Labor Research Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be permitted to extend the remarks he made this afternoon and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOWARD O. HUNTER

Mr. JONES. 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. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the ill-clad, ill-fed, ill-housed, and the "forgotten man of 1932" are about to be subjected to another abuse. The President has nominated Howard O. Hunter as Administrator of the Work Projects Administration. Let us see what the Washington Post says about his qualifications. I assume that since the Government spends millions of dollars a year for publicity, the Post story is based on what Mr. Hunter's publicity hounds are using to gild his lily. Here is what the Post indicates that Mr. Hunter says about himself; here is what he has to brag about: Twenty years a social worker, mixed with a finger now and then in the community chest. He was born in sunny Georgia and educated in the Pelican State; he attached himself to the relief activities during the tender years of the New Deal's quest for the "forgotten man." Under the maladministration of the Colonel House of World War No. II, Harry Hopkins, he rose to a high place in the administration of emergency relief. When Aubrey Williams became patron saint of Stokowski's orchestras, as N. Y. A. Administrator, Hunter stepped into Williams' shoes as Deputy Administrator of W. P. A. With deep regret I

call to the attention of the public, the Senate of the United States, and the poor victims on the W. P. A. rolls the record of Mr. Hunter as Deputy Administrator of W. P. A.

Read House Report No. 2187 of the W. P. A. subcommittee:

The investigation has divulged many past deeds. Some were known to W. P. A. authorities and nothing was done about them. Some were not known to them, and W. P. A. authorities disputed the findings or defended the practice. * * * The category runs all the way from minor abuses to major offenses.

Mr. Speaker, Howard Hunter was Deputy Administrator at the time these major offenses were committed.

The hearings further show that, in some unexplained way, Hunter managed to make New Orleans—his home from an early age—for holidays, football games, and the like. I quote further from the report:

The worst situation which the subcommittee's investigation encountered was in the State of Louisiana. * * * It is incomprehensible that Federal officials, at least in Louisiana, were not cognizant of the waste and diversion and misapplication of public funds that were taking place there.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any justification for Hunter's charging per diem expenses and traveling expenses to Louisiana, there certainly is no excuse for the maladministration of W. P. A. in that State.

The record shows that Hunter's official travel led the way to Kentucky for the annual derby, and to other places in the United States where important sporting events took place, including the sunny clime of Florida at times when the cold blasts of winter, hail, and snow cut short his northern sojourns.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt that Howard Hunter has not picked up the worst practices of maladministration that have ever been conceived by the chief of all maladministrators, Harry Hopkins, read volume 3, page 578 and the following of the hearings before the House W. P. A. subcommittee. Here, in part, is what the hearings show: Hunter spent 1,416 $\frac{3}{4}$ days as a traveler between August 1, 1934, and January 31, 1940—71.59 percent of the time. How much did he collect? Per diem and traveling expenses, \$8,558.48; and he expended \$9,172.17 for transportation; making a total of \$17,730.65 for the period; and that is not all, Mr. Speaker. He drew a fat, handsome salary during this period.

And that is not all, Mr. Speaker. He issued Government transportation requests for the transportation of his secretary, and the General Accounting Office deducted \$1,764.42 from his expense accounts for the cost of her travel. Then, when these matters were brought to the attention of the W. P. A. subcommittee, Mr. Hunter explained that his secretary was, in fact, his wife, and claimed that she worked for W. P. A. without compensation; which, in the absence of a special provision in the relief laws, Mr. Speaker, is a violation of the general law.

Mr. Speaker, this man who spent the greater part of his time for 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ years traveling at Government expense, in search for the "forgotten man," cannot,

as W. P. A. Administrator, be expected ever to find him. After 8 long years of search for the ill-clad, the ill-housed, and the ill-fed, certainly Howard O. Hunter is not the man to continue the search.

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

ANDREW JOHNSON

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the monumental privileges of membership in the House of Representatives is the fact that every now and then we are accorded opportunities of undoing miscarriages of justice and righting great wrong.

Seventy-three years ago, on March 13, 1868, there occurred under this dome one of the most disgraceful events in the whole history of the world.

This afternoon I would like to briefly recall to your attention that tragic blot on the pages of our history and to beseech the aid of my colleagues in reminding the Nation of one of our greatest citizens and patriots.

On that Black Friday of which I spoke—a day of swirling snow and almost night-like gloom, thousands of people converged on the Capitol, struggling and jostling to get inside. It was like a Roman holiday with the Senate floor for an arena.

Long before noon the galleries and corridors were thronged with a motley crowd. The elite of Washington jostled elbows with petty politicians, discharged soldiers, emancipated slaves, and curious visitors. Overhead and on the side walls gas lights flickered and danced in the drafts, casting weird shadows over the kaleidoscopic scene.

There was tension and apprehension written on every face. This was one of the most solemn days in the history of the Nation, and the seething mass of humanity was not insensible to the tragedy and drama they had come to witness.

Cynosure of all eyes was the crowded diplomatic section, filled with brilliantly garbed, bejeweled, medalled, and ribboned men and women, representatives of most of the nations of the earth.

In the press section famous writers and artists of the day nervously waited and stared at the sea of faces, so expressive of all the gamut of human emotions. There was Thomas Nast with his vitriolic pencil, the pungent Horace Greeley, eager young Georges Clemenceau, later destined to become the Tiger of France but then only a humble news reporter. There were other men whose reports were to inflame the entire country.

Down on the Senate floor, America's greatest tragedy was now unfolding. Impeachment proceedings were being brought against Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States, by a little cabal of black-hearted men, whose names today are anathema to all fair-minded men.

At the time their motives were obscure and cloaked under the false garb of loyalty and patriotism to a Nation bleeding from the hideous wounds of civil war and the problems of reconstruction.

Thank God! History now reveals that cabal as character assassins whose only motives were revenge for fancied wrongs, greed for power, and the extortion of gold and power from the prostrate South.

They are dead and long since gone today but their infamy will ever live after them. Because of their unwillingness to compromise, they were more responsible than any other group for the horrors and sufferings of the Civil War and the drawn-out travail of reconstruction.

You can instantly weigh them by one of the heinous accusations they brought that day—"that said Andrew Johnson had conspired with Booth and Davis to have Lincoln murdered that he might become President."

Of that hideous, soul-searing charge, one historian wrote:

No accusation more deliberately concocted or more wantonly false, in all the annals of mankind, is elsewhere recorded.

To bring such a despicable charge, the cabal stooped to perjured testimony from convicted criminals already in the District jail. Eleven hundred dollars of Government money and the promise of a pardon was paid for "evidence" known to be false.

Small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that for any parallel of cruelty one must compare the trial of Andrew Johnson with that of Jesus.

The difference is that Christ was crucified in the flesh and His agony was comparatively short-lived. Andrew Johnson, noble patriot that he was, suffered mental cruciation that lasted the rest of his life.

In the long, drawn-out days of the impeachment trial Johnson lived life's darkest moments. Lampooned, satirized, dubbed drunkard and even illegitimate, it is small wonder he questioned whether he had a single friend left on earth.

But friends he did have and they must have numbered millions. Thousands of ex-soldiers offered to pour into Washington and fight for him and the principles he stood for.

Many former officers from both the Northern and Southern Armies offered to raise full regiments and march to his defense. You can read hundreds of their wires and letters in the Library of Congress today. It is no exaggeration to say that we came ever so close to a second civil war during that trial. Only Johnson's courage and coolness kept many well-meaning hotheads in check.

Longfellow, in his poem *The Spanish Student*, wrote that, "Out of suffering cometh strength."

If that be true, then we have the secret of Johnson's strength, for no man in our whole history ever suffered more for this country than did he. That suffering was not the agony of a day or a month. It lasted for years, but never once did his proud body falter before herculean odds; never once did he quail before mobs who sought his very life nor from treacherous groups who tried to steal his honor.

No man has a right to judge Andrew Johnson in any respect who has not suffered as much and done as much as he for the Nation's sake—

declared Lincoln, in June 1864, in answer to critics. Later on both Lincoln and Stanton asked the same question of the country:

What man in America has done more for the Nation's life than Andrew Johnson?

What man indeed?

Yet March 13, 1868, was to find this foremost patriot of America brought to bay by a rabid pack of radicals, masquerading as men anointed to save the Nation. Only the presence of stately Chief Justice Chase kept the impeachment trial from being an utter travesty on justice. As it was, Johnson was shown less consideration and respect for his constitutional rights than the vilest criminal who ever entered the dock.

Originally called to start on March 5, Johnson was allowed only 7 days in which to prepare answer to the 11 charges—9 of them based on an alleged violation of the Tenure of Office Act—an act forbidding the President to remove any appointee who had been approved by the Senate.

Filmsy, baseless, and conceived in desperation, those charges have been termed the "products of diseased minds." Unable to find any real basis for impeachment, the cabal fell back on abuse. "Traitor," "murderer," "drunkard," "Nero," "usurper," "apostate," were only a few of their hydrophobic utterances.

One instance, Mr. Speaker, clearly reveals the despicableness of Johnson's accusers. Benjamin Wade, elected head of the Senate when Johnson left to assume Lincoln's office, would succeed Johnson as President if he were successfully impeached.

Yet, not withstanding his interested position, Wade was, by a majority ruling, permitted to vote and make charges against Johnson. With brazen effrontery he cried out "Guilty" when the roll was called on the final day.

Let me give you a few highlights of the terrible issues and events leading up to this infamous proceeding.

For more than half a century historians maligned Johnson and held him up to posterity for everything that he was not. They questioned his parentage, his habits, and his motives. Falsely they dubbed him drunkard.

One thing they consistently forgot: Johnson was probably every inch as great as any President we have ever had. Even Lincoln does not hold peership over him for service to the Nation.

Lincoln, whose place Johnson succeeded to, was the most ridiculed man in our history. But for Booth's bullet, he would undoubtedly have been mentally torn to pieces by the radicals in Congress in his reconstruction program. Assassination, however, made him a legendary figure, and even his enemies were hushed by the Nation's grief.

There is every indication as we study more intimate pages of history than fall to casual eyes, that many of Lincoln's policies were the result of Andrew Johnson's influence. Lincoln was a lonely, suspicious man, but he had a profound belief in Johnson. He knew he was above price and almost fanatical in his respect for the Constitution.

The two men had first met in Congress during the stirring days when the first rumble of the approaching Civil War was heard. Lincoln became impressed with Johnson's stand on State rights and his views on slavery and secession. More than any other man in the Nation, Lincoln knew that Johnson had staved off war for years and that they both stood alike on the question of the inviolability of the Union.

As Senator and later as Lincoln's military governor of Tennessee during the Civil War, not only the President but the entire country were enabled to take the ex-tailor's true measure.

Those military governorship days were the most trying and dangerous of his life. For 4 years there was a price on his head and often he was harried like a wild beast. Time and again, he missed ambush by seconds. Obligated to leave Greeneville, his family were forced to remain behind.

They were harassed and annoyed and would have starved but for food smuggled to them by loyal mountaineers. Their home was seized and condemned, being used first as a hospital for Confederate officers and then as a brothel for colored troops.

Years passed ere Johnson saw his family again. In fact, the war was over and he was President ere the reunion became possible. By then, his noble wife was dying of tuberculosis. Rich literary rewards await the writer who tells the world about her noble sacrifices.

It was this placing of country and Union above self and party that earned him Lincoln's respect and the love of a vast majority of the voters. They knew he was fearless and above reproach. The very multiplicity of his enemies proved his nobility, for the world has not time to hate men of lesser caliber.

As he laid his plans for a second term in the White House, Lincoln wisely and shrewdly chose Johnson for his running mate. Able to control the Republican Convention, it was no impossible thing to have a Democrat selected to run with him.

A life-long Democrat whose patron saint had been his namesake, Andrew Jackson, Johnson nevertheless had ideals which he placed higher than party. Although he perhaps would have fiercely denied it, fate proves that party was but a springboard toward his destiny.

His decisions were ever based on what was best for the masses, according to the Constitution. "I am no party man, bound by no party platform, and will vote as I please," he once thundered out in the Senate, while opposing Federal aid to the Pacific Railroad.

It was this liberalism of Johnson and his refusal to be moved or swayed by sectionalism which created so many enemies for him. Then, too, the disbanding of the old Whig Party brought scores of his former political opponents into the ranks of the Democrats but this new alignment did not reconcile them to him.

Poor Andrew Johnson! Slated to don Lincoln's mantle, he was also destined by fate to drink the bitter cup of hemlock life would have held up to Lincoln's lips

had he lived to fight for his reconstruction plan.

The Great Emancipator's body was not yet cold before the radicals started their campaign against his successor. His body was not yet in the grave ere they were scheming their villainous machinations.

Although many books have been written on the causes behind the quarrel between Johnson and the radical group in Congress it is possible to boil it all down to a few sentences.

The North fought the Civil War on the theory no State had a right to secede from the Union. Neither Lincoln nor Johnson ever deviated in the slightest from this theory. Reconstruction would have been a simple thing had the radicals shared this view. All that was needed was an application of the Golden Rule.

It was the viewpoint of the cabal the Southern States had left the Union and should now be treated as conquered territories. They must be made to don sackcloth and ashes, be ruled by military governors, and their leaders be hanged for treason. Also, there was the question of damages. The radicals demanded suffrage for all Negroes. They also proposed to break up the old plantations and present small farms to all the new voters.

That, in substance, was the *casus belli* which led up to impeachment charges against the tailor President.

Looking back today, it is very plainly to be seen that but for Andrew Johnson's bulldog courage and his unchangeable belief in the sanctity of the Constitution, this mighty Nation of ours today might easily have become a group of small countries with all the squabbles and hatreds so continuously present in Europe.

Johnson believed in suffrage for the Negro but he held it to be a matter of State rights.

It took 2 years of misrule in the South under the reign of the carpetbagger to convince the North that great mistakes had been made.

To a visiting delegation from Virginia in 1868 he outlined his views.

I want the people of the world to know that I stand where I did of old, battling for the Constitution and the Union of these United States. While I dread the disintegration of the States, I am especially opposed to centralization or consolidation of power here, under whatever guise or name, and if the issue is forced, I shall fight to the end.

Perhaps it is well Andrew Johnson is not alive today. He might not like some of the changes time has wrought.

Some of you might not agree with him on his bitter opposition to centralization of power in the Federal Government, but you cannot help but admire him for the stand he took. Nor can anyone help but admire his unflinching courage nor the way he hewed his way upward through trials that would have felled dozens of weaker men.

His whole life is proof of our democracy—that the humblest and lowest amongst us can rise up to our highest office, provided we are willing to pay the price in hard work and possess the requisite qualifications.

In many respects Johnson's life parallels that of Lincoln. Born December 29,

1808, in a humble cottage in Raleigh, N. C., dire poverty and wretchedness were his lot for many years. His father was porter of an inn, his mother the maid of all work.

At the age of 3 his father gave his life to rescue three prominent citizens from drowning. That they were wealthy made no difference in the heroic struggle of Mrs. Johnson to keep herself and two tiny sons alive. By 1822 the struggle became too much, and young Andy, then 14, and his brother were bound out to a tailor. Two years later he was a fugitive from justice, having run away from his master.

By March 1827, after many bitter economic ups and downs, he was established in his own tailor shop in Greeneville, Tenn. Two months later he was married to the noble girl whose influence on his life was to be as great as that of his mother on Lincoln.

Marriage was the making of Johnson. Not yet 22, he was rough, uneducated, fiery, tactless, and inclined to bitterness toward those whom he recognized as belonging to a superior social strata. From earliest manhood, his whole life was to be a fight for the lowly, underprivileged classes to whom he claimed proud allegiance.

Elizabeth McCardle Johnson, his young bride, taught him to read and write and fed his dreams. Soon his tailor shop became a mecca for those who liked a political argument. He joined an evening debating class in a nearby college. A thirst for education burned in him like an all-consuming fire. He spent 50 cents a day from his tiny income to have read to him as he worked the outstanding orations of famous Englishmen.

Although looked upon as an upstart by the town's aristocrats, he was soon a successful candidate for alderman and then mayor. Andrew Jackson, his namesake, became his patron saint, and a friendship sprang up between them which was to forever shape and influence his life. Often, in later years, he was compared and likened to Jackson in flattering terms.

Not the least of the influences which were molding Johnson at this time were the hills and mountains of eastern Tennessee. He never lost an opportunity to commune with nature, and, like the psalmist of old, "to lift up his eyes to the hills from whence cometh strength."

It was on the return from one of these excursions that he wrote the paragraph which was to forever define his planned purpose in life:

Gladly would I lay down my life if I could so engulf democracy into our general government that it would be permanent.

It was Thomas Jefferson who laid down this principle. It took Andrew Johnson to vitalize it and give it true meaning.

Alderman, mayor, elector, State legislator—all these were elective rungs in the ladder up which Johnson was traveling to his goal. Soon he was a successful candidate for Congress, where he served for 5 terms—1843 to 1853. By then his bitter Whig opponents, unable to defeat him by ballots, cleverly "gerrymandered" his district and froze him out.

Those 10 years proved the crucible which molded his future. Thrown into

contact with all the leading characters of the impending tragic era, Johnson learned to know Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, John Quincy Adams, Greeley, Yancey, and many others. His speeches of that period left much to be desired, but definitely the tailor of Greeneville was climbing up.

To quote a historian of that period:

He had pleased his friends and disappointed his enemies.

By now his name was known everywhere.

Despite his lack of academic education and a woefully inadequate vocabulary, Johnson was gradually developing into an orator of unusual power over crowds. Unlike other speakers of that day, he wasted no time on buffoonery, ribald jokes, or lofty rhetoric.

His speeches were based on the presentation of facts, logic, and law. By reiteration, he made the humblest listener grasp his meaning and believe him to be right. He was a terrible foe in debate. He mortified his antagonists, crushed them, and made them flee. His arguments had the devastating effect of naval broadsides and few men ever dared to debate him the second time from the same platform.

His fiery, haughty manner, his piercing black eyes, and fearless poise had a hypnotic effect on individuals and crowds. They sensed sincerity and divine purpose. But many of them resented his tactlessness and blunt mannerisms. Of humor, he seemed to have little. Life was deadly earnest to Andrew Johnson.

October 1853 found Andrew Johnson Governor of Tennessee. Because his was an honest, progressive administration, he was promptly reelected. Next, he was unanimously chosen to the United States Senate, and December 7, 1857, found him back in Washington where he wanted to be.

Those were soul-stirring days and already the hideous shadow of civil war was lengthening over the country from ocean to ocean. Into the thick of bitter forensic war on the Senate floor plunged Andrew Johnson. Fate was already trying, tempering, and shaping him into the stuff from which great heroes and patriots are made.

Times have changed since Andrew Johnson sat under this dome. It was a more serious business being a Senator or a Representative in those days. Members boasted of their gentility, but when verbal attack failed or else stung too deeply, it was not uncommon to produce a pistol or a bowie knife. Challenges to duels were frequent and more than one affair of honor was settled at sunrise in Maryland clearings.

Exactly how Andrew Johnson survived those days is a mystery. Perhaps the angels of fate stood ever at his side protecting him for the days to come. He never minced words nor quailed before an opponent. He never hesitated to sting, blast, or browbeat the thinnest-skinned Senator who attacked or questioned him.

Often challenged, he refused to duel with anything but words, and by now he had become so deadly with them that men thought twice before they tackled

him. More than once, he made speeches with one hand clasped to the butt of a pistol—speeches he had been forbidden to make under threat of assassination.

Once in Tennessee he even overawed a whole company of soldiers sent to break up one of his political meetings. One brief paragraph of logic not only won the crowd to his side but the soldiers as well, and their discomfited officer marched them outside.

Only once in his whole political life can we find any record of his apologizing to a political antagonist. That was to Jefferson Davis when the southerner was still a Senator. Davis refused to make up and insisted that his own insulting remarks be permanently recorded. Johnson was hurt to the quick, but he bore Davis no resentment, as is proven by future events.

The radicals wanted Davis executed when the war ended. Johnson refused. In fact, he pardoned him Christmas, 1868.

Mr. Speaker, into the life of every man there comes a moment when he knows he is face to face with his destiny. That moment came to Andrew Johnson, when as a Senator he sat under this dome on December 18, 1860. All around him was the babble of furious voices from wildly angry men. Blood and secession were in the air. Pistols had been drawn, epithets hurled wildly, challenges to duels made. The galleries were packed solidly with vociferous southern sympathizers.

The State of South Carolina had announced she was withdrawing from the Union. Her sister States were proclaiming themselves ready to join her.

The Northern States were confused and hesitant. Secession loomed up as the apparent solution to the bitter slavery question. "Let the South do what it wished," their leaders shouted. Others faltered.

Andrew Johnson listened as long and as silently as he could. Beyond all men present, he saw that someone had to speak now or the Union would be dissolved forever. Well did he know that on the shoulders of that speaker rested a terrible, hideous burden; that abuse, castigation, threats and challenges, even death, might become his fate. The Tailor of Greenville sat huddled in his seat—sad, lonely; listening to the same voices that had spoken to Joan of Arc.

Slowly he rose to his feet. His black eyes flashed about him; glanced upward at the suddenly-silenced galleries. The chaos around him subsided as the Chair recognized the Senator from the South. For the rest of that day and far into the next one—constantly heckled and interrupted—Johnson spoke, and his extemporaneous words were like the high notes of a bugle, imperiously calling to a nation to follow behind him.

I am of the belief, Mr. Speaker, that was the greatest speech ever made in this building. It echoed from the Atlantic to the Pacific—from the Gulf to Canada. It was even heard around the world.

The effect on the Nation was astounding. It unified the North overnight. It created consternation in the South, but it stiffened their determination. Beyond

all shadow of doubt, it was the thrown gauntlet which touched off the Civil War. By the same token, it was the speech that saved the Union, for it made millions realize that the Union was worth fighting for and dying for, if need be.

His words cracked like rifle shots, crashed like naval guns, reverberated like thunder, and blasted like bolts from the sky. They electrified, terrified, and panicked opponents. They put steel and determination into the minds of others. Here was a speech the like of which Americans had never heard before. Here was a mighty principle which divided them into two lines of blue and gray with muskets belching and sabers flashing.

Tired, lonely, fully aware of his responsibility, yet suddenly metamorphosed into some demigod, Johnson stalked through the scowling, hissing Members from the South and walked to his room in the Kirkwood Hotel. There, as in the Capitol, fresh indignities were showered.

Morning, however, was to tell a different story. By then the clicking, clacking telegraph wires had spread his words to the very ends of the earth. The South was aghast; the North seemed to rise up like one man. The flaming words of the Greenville tailor had made them think in unison.

Letters and telegrams poured in on him by the countless thousands. State legislatures met to pass ardent resolutions of endorsement. The South burned him in effigy countless times; the North sent him innumerable invitations to make addresses and it seemed impossible to supply the demand for copies of the amazing speech.

What had he said? Well, it took him 2 days to say them and I have only time to give you a minute digest of those simple, stirring words which had etched themselves in the minds of an entire Nation—friend and foe alike.

I am opposed to secession—

Was the simple way he began—

no State has a right to secede from this Union without the consent of the other States which ratified the compact. If the doctrine of secession is to be carried out on the mere whim of a State then this Government is at an end. If one State can secede, why may not other States combine and eject a State from the Union?

Both sides in this contest are equally wrong. The North is wrong. The South is equally wrong. Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, bought and paid for by the Union, are now trying to back out of their compact with us.

What is this issue? It is this and only this—we are mad because Mr. Lincoln has been elected and we have not got our man. If we had got our man we should not be for breaking up the Union, but as Mr. Lincoln is elected we are breaking up the Union.

Am I to be so great a coward as to retreat from duty? No sirs. Here I will stand and meet the encroachments upon my country at the threshold.

On and on, went that majestic voice, berating, pleading, wheedling, challenging, and condemning. His closing sentence was to be instantly echoed by millions of northerners—

Senators! My blood, my existence, I would give to save this Union!

For weeks, the southern leaders in Congress, did their best to belittle John-

son and sell the Nation on the idea that secession was the logical and only way out.

Johnson saw that it was necessary for him to now call spades by their name and that unless he further unified the North, all hope for the Union was gone.

On March 2, 1861, he made another speech in the crowded Senate which some people said was even better than the first. Fearlessly he informed both Chair and crowded galleries that he stood among traitors who were even then urging that the flag be fired upon and our arsenals and forts seized. Challenged to name these traitors, he pointed to them with outstretched finger and blazing eyes.

The North needed no further persuasion as to the right course. They called him "the greatest man of the age" and his name was on every tongue.

Up to that day, Abraham Lincoln had been a perplexed man without any definite program except the hope of averting war. Johnson made him see his destiny and steeled his heart to the course he must sail the ship of state.

Forty days later Fort Sumter was fired upon, and the Civil War was under way.

Mr. Speaker, I have not wished to bore you with this review of the past at a stirring time when we are so sadly perturbed about our future.

All I wanted to do was to make you understand a little better this amazing patriot who suffered so greatly for our country that long ago—March 13, 1868. It is true that he was found not guilty, but the margin was by only one vote, and that is almost tantamount to a bar sinister on his proud escutcheon.

He went his way, free of charges, but he had open wounds which were to sting and wound until the hour of his death. His indomitable courage held out until July 31, 1875.

The last official act of his life was to prick the sleeping conscience of the North in the Senate on March 22, 1875. He reviewed the misdeeds of the Grant administration and, amidst vociferous ovations, pleaded for justice to the suffering South.

Now, at long last, through words of his, real reconstruction was to begin. He had nobly served the purpose of his life—to hold together and to defend the Union and the Constitution forever.

Cannot you hear that sonorous voice, with its thrilling cadences, calling out to a distressed and puzzled Nation:

Let us stand by the principles of our fathers, though the heavens fall. * * * I intend to stand by the Constitution as the chief ark of our safety, as the palladium of our civil and religious liberty. Yes; let us cling to it as the mariner clings to the last plank when the night and the tempest close around him.

Sixty years after the infamous impeachment trial the Supreme Court gave the legal world something to think about. October 1926 it handed down a decision that the Tenure of Office Act, under which Johnson had been tried, was an infringement on the constitutional rights of a President.

Andrew Johnson, the tailor President, had finally been proven right, but I am afraid the opinion was small anodyne to

his crumbling bones on a Tennessee hillside.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere in this great Capitol of ours is there a statue or even a bust save the one in the Senate lobby to recall to posterity this champion defender of the greatest document in all this world—the Constitution of the United States. He was our third greatest citizen, yet by some strange oversight time has seen fit to pass him by.

Today I have introduced a bill asking that this oversight be looked into and in a measure rectified, if possible. The bill provides for the appointment of a commission for the purpose of formulating plans for a suitable memorial to him in Washington. In the name of our country and the memory of a great and good man, I ask your support of that bill. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GREGORY, for today, on account of the death of his mother.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2110. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain lands situated in Duval and Brevard Counties, Fla., to the State of Florida for highway purposes;

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 380; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 21), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint additional acting assistant surgeons in time of national emergency;

H. R. 2113. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States;

H. R. 2495. An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission, or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River at or near Sandy Hook, Md., to a point opposite in Virginia;

H. R. 2953. An act extending the provisions of the act approved August 27, 1940, entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes";

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Joseph S. Albis, Jr.;

H. R. 3004. An act for the relief of John W. Young;

H. R. 3297. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 22 of the act of February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1210); and

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to amend the Internal Revenue Code.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 14, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Com-

merce at 10 a. m., Friday, March 14, 1941, to resume hearings on H. R. 3684, freight forwarders.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, March 19, 1941, for the consideration of the several bills relating to the naturalization of alien veterans of the World War. Also for consideration of H. R. 2835, a bill to permit clerks of courts to issue copies of naturalization certificates.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will continue hearings on H. R. 3360, a bill prohibiting issuance and enforcement of injunctions on patents when necessary in the interest of national defense, Wednesday, March 19, 1941, and Thursday, March 20, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

341. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Grouse Creek, Kans., requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted April 13, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

342. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Arkansas River—drainage and levee district No. 2, Conway County, Ark.—requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted February 10, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

343. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bellows Pond and Canada Lake drainage area, Fulton County, N. Y., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved June 28, 1938, and August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

344. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 31, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Wabash River in the vicinity of Hutsonville, Ill., requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted August 2, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

345. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the facts and recommendation in the matter of the claim for credit of Martin F. Gettings, postmaster at Rahway, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

346. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transportation of dependents of Reserve and retired personnel ordered to extended active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

347. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, of the Exchange Stabilization Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

348. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942 for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, involving an increase of \$25,000 in such estimates (H. Doc. No. 140); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

349. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft for proposed amendments to the bill, H. R. 2281, 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 3019. 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); without amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCRUGHAM: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3981. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2685. A bill to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3193. A bill validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way, in the city of Tracy, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in the town of Elk Grove, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356); without amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 250. Report on the disposition of records by Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers; without amendment. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 7. Joint resolution affirming and approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely; without amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 262. An act regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 706. An act for the relief of Blanche W. Stout; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 840) granting a pension to Frank L. Bradley, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3982. A bill providing that certain persons may send letters through the mails free of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3983. A bill for the allowance and payment of certain claims for wages for labor performed in excess of 8 hours per day in national armories and arsenals; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3984. A bill to extend the crediting of military service under the railroad-retirement acts, and for other other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3985 (by request). A bill to authorize compensation for services of Hallie Reeves; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3986. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for additional clerk hire in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes," approved July 25, 1939; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3987. A bill to provide relief for, and promote the interests of, the landowners of the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAINES:

H. R. 3988. A bill granting to clerks in post offices of the third class the status of postal employees and the benefits of annual and sick leave; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3989. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 3990. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special air-mail stamp in honor of the national flag; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 3991. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp commemorating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of California and the west coast; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3992. A bill to repeal chapter 18 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3993. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in western Washington; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3994. A bill to prohibit discrimination by any agency supported in whole or in part with funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States of America, and to prohibit discrimination against persons employed or seeking employment on Government contracts because of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3995. A bill imposing a manufacturers' excise tax, to provide revenue, to reduce property taxes, promote the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3996. A bill granting equipment allowance to postmasters of the third class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SACKS:

H. R. 3997. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3998. A bill to expedite the national defense by clarifying the application of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 3999. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of bridges across the Monongahela River in Allegheny County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 4000. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4001. A bill to create the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission, for the purpose of formulating plans for a suitable memorial to Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 4002. A bill requiring persons engaged in air commerce to equip passengers and flying personnel with parachutes, and to use safety devices similar to those required in the case of military and naval aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. Res. 142. Resolution providing for an investigation of conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 143. Resolution providing for expenses of the investigation provided for in House Resolutor 142; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 144. Resolution providing for an investigation in the District of Columbia of national-defense employment practices; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a law which will provide adequate old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 4003. A bill for the relief of Campbell Holton & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 4004. A bill granting a pension to Arthur Garfield Carter; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 4005. A bill for the relief of Grace Knight, administratrix of Herman B. Knight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 4006. A bill for the relief of A. A. Martinez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 4007. A bill for the relief of Chester J. Babcock; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4008. A bill granting a pension to Jessie Myrtle Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4009. A bill for the relief of J. A. Cearly; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4010. A bill for the relief of Thelma Carringer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4011. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Fain; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4012. A bill granting a pension to Flora Duckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

458. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Warwick City Council of the city of Warwick, requesting either an amendment of the provision of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or a change of procedure be made in said act so that Army doctors pass on the physical qualifications of the registrants before notice be given of his selection for training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

459. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the city council of the city of Pawtucket, R. I., endorsing the efforts of President Roosevelt in his work for national defense and aid to Great Britain; to the Committee on Appropriations.

460. Also, memorial of the City Council of the City of Pawtucket, R. I., requesting passage of the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution, now pending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

461. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the City Council of the City of Pawtucket, R. I., endorsing the efforts of President Roosevelt in his work for national defense and aid to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

462. Also, joint resolution of the City Council of the City of Pawtucket, R. I., requesting the passage of the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. By Mr. GUYER of Kansas: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of Kansas City, Kans., petitioning the passage of the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

464. Also, petition of sundry citizens of various communities in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, urging the enactment of legislation to eliminate conditions of vice, including the sale of intoxicating liquors, from areas surrounding camps at which selectees in the military service of the United States are being trained; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

465. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition supporting Senate bill 860, protection of boys in United States camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

466. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of L. C. Penn, Emhouse, Tex., favoring House bill 3492; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

467. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, Division No. 1, Kings County, N. Y., concerning acts committed, or that might be committed, by any of the belligerent nations which might result in violation of the neutrality of Eire, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

468. By Mr. LEWIS: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, requesting that the War and Navy Departments of the United States and the Emergency Relief Administration increase their purchases of pinto beans grown in the United States so that the consumption of pinto beans can be increased for the benefit of the American farmers who depend upon this cash crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

469. Also, joint memorial of the Senate of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring, strongly urging that the Congress of the United States enact into law House bill 2601, to create a pension system for adult cripples and for aged citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

470. By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Petition of the Board of Trustees of the Town of Cicero, Ill., relative to General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

471. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of O. W. Cline, Jane Oliver, Newby Pratt, F. C. Shillingburg, Eugene Haley, Tommy Beene, Mabel Smith, L. C. McDonald, Lenorah Cook, William Wheeler, Frances Epps, and Gladys Miller, opposing strikes in national-defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

472. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. H. E. Millen and other citizens of Farmington, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 806, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

473. Also, petition of W. A. Hudler, president, and Mrs. E. P. Hudler, secretary, Townsend Club No. 1, Muscatine, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

474. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Whitestone Republican Club, Inc., unanimously supporting the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, of Queens and Nassau Counties, N. Y., in their attempt to have painting on the new barracks being constructed at Fort Tilden and Fort Totten, Queens, by union labor instead of by the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Labor.

475. Also, resolution of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Joe Bailey Lodge, No. 186, of New York, favoring liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

476. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of the Texas Legislature, urging the Congress not to enact laws regarding the conservation, development, and production of the petroleum resources of the State of Texas, or placing same under Federal control or the control of any Federal agency; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

477. By Mr. SACKS: Memorial of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, urging Congress to designate December 15, 1941, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, and to designate that day as a national holiday; to authorize the appointment of a Bill of Rights sesquicentennial commission to sponsor appropriate ceremonies and celebrations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

478. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the town of Cicero, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of the pending resolution before Congress which would proclaim October 11, 1941, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Spera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our most blessed Lord God, we thank Thee that Thou hast made the way plain between Thyself and our souls. When we falter and stumble, Thou dost bear us up into the presence of conscious power, wisdom, and goodness. We bring to Thee only our weakness and imperfection; striving in the midst of temptations, turned hither and thither, O Thou Christ, come with us that our love may be zealous and our aspirations as a burning flame. Do Thou vindicate our visions, defend the reality of our dreams, and restore unto us the chivalrous faith that shall usher in a new day. Almighty God, we glory in our domain, in our riches, and in our institutions, yet may we not look upon the outward, visible things of life, for these pass as a tale that is told, but upon the unseen, eternal, and immutable. Heavenly Father, persuade us that it is the spiritual fiber woven into the warp and woof of a nation's heart which constitutes its greatness. So, dear Lord, we pray for the heavenly gifts more abundantly that our dear land may be great and glorious. For Thine is the kingdom and the glory forever. Through Christ our Saviour and Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3546. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment No. 2 to the bill (H. R. 3155) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with

the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to the bill (H. R. 3325) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3617) entitled "An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the Army and Navy for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 88

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

March 13, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. PIUS L. SCHWERT, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the Presiding Officer had named Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3155) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and insist on disagreement to amendment No. 2.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON of Georgia, DREWRY, and MAAS.