

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4219. A bill for the relief of Nora Snow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Snow; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Arrias, also known as Joseph P. Arrias; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

594. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Federal Government of the United States to make available from funds appropriated, or to be appropriated, for defense purposes a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

595. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Eugene Perry Post, No. 332, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Providence, R. I., for the establishment of officers' training school for Negro candidates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

596. By Mr. GERLACH: Resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania, voicing their opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

597. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition of Alice M. Ebricht and 93 others, all residents of Long Beach, Calif., making an appeal to the President and the Congress of the United States, that legislation be adopted forthwith designed to make more effective the laws that will stop the shipment of any supplies to Japan which will in any way aid her in waging her war against China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

598. By Mr. JONES: Petition of the Piqua Townsend Club, No. 4, of Piqua, Ohio, A. L. Brooks, president, and Ed Stengel, secretary, favoring the enactment of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

599. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, petitioning the Federal Government for funds to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

600. By Mr. KEOGH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring Federal funds from funds appropriated, or to be appropriated, for defense purposes, a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State of New York and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

601. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to provide funds for defense purposes, a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

602. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Petition of Hugh Durham and approximately

2,100 other railroad employees of the Third Congressional District of Michigan, opposing St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

603. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend national-recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

604. Also, petition of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Upper Mississippi River harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

605. Also, petition of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to extending the Guffey-Vincent Act for 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

606. Also, petition of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national-defense work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

607. Also, petition of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defense construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

608. Also, petition of the Forward Trinity Valley Association, Romayor, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

609. Also, petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 81, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 220 and House bill 1057, with reference to establishing the principle of longevity pay in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

610. By Mr. MOSER: Petition of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1941

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

O Thou, whose going forth is prepared as the morning, whose judgments are as clear as the light: Draw near unto us, we beseech Thee, and keep us faithful to the trust Thou hast imposed on us, lest our goodness be as the morning cloud and as the early dew that goeth away. Let the blessings of Thy wisdom and guidance be upon our President, Vice President, the Congress, the judiciary, and every servant of the Republic; give us grace sufficient not only to confess our sins but to forsake them; make us strong enough to overcome whatever difficulties may confront us; grant that our cheerfulness may gladden others; give to us faith that will make real the things of God, hope that will remove all anxious fears, and love that will conquer every form of hate.

Help each one of us to realize that life is made blessed, not in doing the things we like to do but in liking the things we have to do if we would help to heal the breaking hearts of those about us and bring courage to those who have been

hurt almost beyond endurance by the dark inscrutable mysteries of life. So shall we be men in the highest and noblest sense, and grow stronger each day in the strength of God's spirit. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1941.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LISTER HILL, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

PAT HARRISON,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon, Mr. HILL took the chair as acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, March 27, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Gerry	Radcliffe
Aiken	Gillette	Reed
Andrews	Glass	Reynolds
Austin	Green	Russell
Bailey	Guffey	Sheppard
Ball	Gurney	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hatch	Smathers
Barbour	Hayden	Smith
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulw	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Byrnes	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McNary	Tydings
Caraway	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Van Nuys
Connally	Murray	Wallgren
Danaher	Norris	Wheeler
Davis	O'Mahoney	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
George	Pepper	Willis

Mr. ADAMS. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr.

WALSH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

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. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4 and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3835. An act to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use;

H. R. 4125. An act to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members and certain members of the Reserve components thereof from selective training and service;

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4183. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

THE LATE SENATOR LUNDEEN OF MINNESOTA—RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have the honor to present two separate resolutions adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii expressing regret at the death of the Honorable Ernest Lundeen, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Almighty God, in His divine providence, on the 31st day of August 1940, did take from this life the Honorable Ernest Lundeen, a Senator in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas the Honorable Ernest Lundeen was an earnest and sincere friend of the Territory of Hawaii, having visited these islands on several occasions and having studied, at

first hand, the affairs and conditions here, and advocating the passing of legislation beneficial to the Territory, and showing in every possible manner, his love and "aloha" for this Territory, and opposing most strenuously every effort to injure and to mitigate against the welfare and progress of this Territory; and

Whereas as a Member of the Senate of the United States, he was a sincere and forceful champion of peace, hewing to this principle in the face of ridicule and scorn; and

Whereas in his untimely death, the Territory of Hawaii has lost a sincere and loyal friend; the American Nation, a loyal and distinguished citizen; his native State, a loyal son, and his family, a kind and loving parent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, does hereby express its sincere and deep regret at the passing of the Honorable Ernest Lundeen; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the records of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1941, and that a certified copy be forwarded to the widow of the late Honorable Ernest Lundeen.

Whereas in the untimely death of the Honorable Ernest Lundeen, United States Senator from the State of Minnesota, the people of the Territory of Hawaii have lost a warm and constant friend, whose interest in the Territory was keen and always friendly, and whose efforts in Hawaii's behalf were always genuine and helpful: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Twenty-first Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii that it hereby expresses its gratitude for the many kind services of the late Honorable Ernest Lundeen, and its profound sorrow in his untimely passing; be it further

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of this resolution be forwarded to the members of his family.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 36)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1941, amounting to \$137,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 38)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1941, for the War Department, for the improvement of existing river and harbor works, amounting to \$663,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 37)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1941, for the Federal Housing Administration, totaling \$1,148,263, together with a proposed provision relating to the appropriation for administrative expenses of that Administration for the fiscal year 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DATA RELATIVE TO INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects for the fiscal year 1940 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PORTION OF GALLUP-DURANGO HIGHWAY ACROSS THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-first annual report of that organization (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A memorial of sundry citizens, members of the Passaic County Units of the New Jersey State Music Project, remonstrating against the lay-off of musicians employed under the W. P. A. music project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A statement of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring an appropriation to provide for the extension of the Upper River Harbor from its present terminus to a point above the Falls of St. Anthony, including necessary and essential alteration of the bridges over the Mississippi River in that area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Tonawanda, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 1036, embodying the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Monongahela Valley Industrial Union Council (C. I. O.), Charleroi, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide more adequate and liberal old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of Local Union No. 1190, United Mine Workers of America, of Ellsworth, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide more adequate and liberal old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens, composing the Finnish Relief Committee, Abel Maki, chairman, of the towns of Chatham, Eben, and Rumely, Mich., praying that the United States grant a loan to Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of East Chicago, Ind., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the board of trustees of the Anti-Saloon League of Louisiana, in session at New Orleans, La., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of Local No. 81, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of Pittsburgh, Pa., endorsing the so-called Mead bill (S. 220) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa memorializing Congress for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs. (See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on the 27th instant.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to repeal or modify the Embargo Act of 1927, relating to importation of meats from foreign lands

"Whereas, as a result of repeated outbreaks in this country prior to 1927 of the dreaded cattle disease known as 'rinderpest,' or 'foot-and-mouth disease,' there was enacted in that year a congressional embargo upon the importation into this country of dressed meats and meat products from any country where said disease exists; and

"Whereas prior to the imposition of the embargo the spread of that disease in this country demoralized the domestic livestock industry, seriously jeopardized the public health and resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars by Federal and State Governments and by the livestock industry for the eradication of that evil; and

"Whereas the wisdom of that congressional embargo, embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, has been indubitably justified as attested by the fact that since January 1, 1927, there has been only one minor outbreak of that disease—in the State of California in 1929—which outbreak has since been traced directly to a violation of Federal regulations relating to the unloading of certain materials; and

"Whereas there is increasing evidence from authoritative sources that a serious attempt is now under way to influence the President of the United States and Congress to circumvent or remove the embargo upon the importation of dressed meats and meat products for the benefit of certain foreign nations in which the said livestock disease is prevalent; and

"Whereas any modification of that embargo would be inimical to the best interests of this Nation and would cause a recurrence of the evils existing prior to 1927 as enumerated above; and

"Whereas the agricultural and livestock industry of this Nation is playing, and must continue to play, a vital and indispensable part in the program of national defense, and nothing would more seriously affect that bur-

den and the program of national defense than a relaxation of the existing barriers to the importation of infected livestock: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in regular session assembled, That we hereby respectfully and earnestly implore the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, for reasons herein stated, to resist any attempts and 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 there is prevalent the livestock foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved March 24, 1941.

"HAROLD E. STASSEN,

"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the Georgia House of Representatives, is interested in the farmers of the South;

"Whereas the cost of producing farm commodities has been raised;

"Whereas industry has been stepped up and has a bright future: Be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States of America support Senator BANKHEAD of Alabama's plan to put a floor under basic farm commodities including tobacco, to bring the farmer's income up to full parity.

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary Wickard, and both Houses of Congress.

"Read and adopted March 12, 1941."

"Whereas it is agreed that the farmers of Georgia are the most talked of group during elections and legislative sessions, and their welfare and plight discussed, and very little, if anything, ever done about the farmers' general welfare: Be it, therefore,

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States now in session take notice of the tillers of the soil, our farmers, and use their very best efforts to enact all legislation for the benefit of the farmers of our State and Nation, and to study the feasibility of enacting some form of legislation, embodying a pension plan for all farmers over 60 years of age who have been real dirt farmers for a period of at least 30 years.

"Read and adopted March 14, 1941."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 13

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the Honorable President of the Senate, and to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in the fifteenth regular session assembled, does most respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Honorable ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, has introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, now in session, H. R. 87, amending the act of Congress approved June 6, 1924, entitled, "An

act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled 'An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes, approved June 6, 1924,' and providing particularly against seizure of boats and gear used in fishing, until the owner or operator shall have been convicted of illegal fishing; and

"Whereas we believe that this bill fairly reflects the views of a large majority of the people of this Territory upon the subject covered; and

"Whereas this subject has been before Congress for a number of years and the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska has memorialized Congress to change the fishing laws so as to permit a person charged with illegal fishing to have his case tried in court before his boat and gear are confiscated, since it is the practice for officers of the Bureau of Fisheries to arrest fishermen on the charge of illegal fishing, confiscate their boats, and then inform them that if they will agree to plead guilty and pay a fine their boats will be released; that the fine required to be paid is not the judgment of a court but is fixed by representatives of the Bureau of Fisheries, and the defendant is informed that, unless such a fine is collected, the boat will not be released; and

"Whereas, because of the very short fishing season in Alaska, it is possible to deprive the fisherman of his entire season's labor and revenue by tying up the said boat and gear during the open season and thereby again penalizing him without giving him an opportunity to be heard; and

"Whereas no good citizen wants—and fishermen, as a whole, are good citizens—to be branded as a criminal, and it is very unfair for any Government officer to, in effect, blackmail such citizens into being criminals by having them plead guilty, when the only alternative is that if they do not so plead they will be unduly penalized by not being permitted to follow their business during the short fishing season; and

"Whereas this question was considered by the Joint Committee on Marine and Fisheries in their investigation of the fisheries of Alaska, which was held during the summer of 1939, which committee has reported favorably to an amendment of the law in this respect: Now therefore,

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, most respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to enact the said H. R. 87, of the present session of Congress, into law.

"And your memorialists will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, March 3, 1941."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 1

"Memorializing Congress to initiate a movement to give silver a standing in the monetary system of the United States of America as a basic money, at a given ratio of silver to gold.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the people of this State and this Nation are interested in procuring some basic money which will freely pass current to help enlarge the trade of the United States with foreign countries; and

"Whereas some foreign countries are depriving the United States of its rightful share of world trade by a system of controlled and managed money and by the use of exchange and barter of the products of such various nations instead of the use of money; and

"Whereas, previous to now, discoveries of gold and silver deposits have been made only where surface indications gave unquestionable evidence of their presence; and

"Whereas if a proper price for these metals is provided through the monetization of

silver, deposits of gold and silver now hidden beneath the surface of the earth will be opened; and

"Whereas all efforts heretofore made in the direction of currency stabilization have been based upon the theories which failed to provide for the remonetization of silver; and

"Whereas in order to relieve the present world-wide depression it is necessary either to provide for extension of debt payments and moratorium on them, or to provide for a managed currency, or to provide coinage of gold and silver in some relation to each other; and

"Whereas the coinage of gold and silver is the best course; and

"Whereas it appears necessary for the purpose of acquiring or retaining trade with various countries by the United States that a system of money be adopted which is readily available to the various countries with whom the United States trades; and

"Whereas the United States of America, over a period of time, has purchased domestically mined silver at a fixed price pursuant to act of Congress; and

"Whereas the Congress has treated silver as a commodity instead of a monetary basis of metallic money; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has, through relief and welfare measures, attempted to alleviate the result of unemployment throughout the United States; and

"Whereas, because of the low price of silver, many mines in the United States have been unable to operate and consequently many thousands of miners have been thrown out of employment and their wives and children and themselves have become dependent on relief; and

"Whereas when the silver mines close down, the smelters, which are the largest consumers of coal within the State, curtail production which in turn materially affects the railroads and their employees. That the families of the coal, silver miners, and railroad employees become dependent upon relief. That local farmers who find a ready market among the miners and the railroad men lose their markets so that the closing of silver mines affects not only the silver miners, but also the coal miners, railroad men, the farmers, and the Nation in general. All classes then become at least partially dependent upon relief and the burden thereby is upon the entire State or States; and

"Whereas the making of silver as a part of the monetary system of the United States at a given ratio to gold would stabilize the mining industry and allow reemployment of miners, railroad men, and lessen the relief load: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That we earnestly recommend the enactment of legislation by Congress for the use of silver in our monetary systems as a basic money, thereby increasing the supply of metallic money for use as a circulating medium and as a base for currency and credit at a ratio to gold as hereinabove provided; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah, and to the Governors of the various States, with the request that the said Governors submit it for action by the legislators of their States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"To the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress for the Territory of Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in fifteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas the Niukluk River is a tributary of Fish River on Seward Peninsula, in the second division of the Territory of Alaska, and is north of 64° latitude and consequently frozen during the greater part of every year; that during the lesser period of the year, when it is open and running, the ordinary state is for the water to be low with numerous bars and shoals; that freight is transported up the river to the community of Council, which is situated on the banks of the Niukluk River about 12 miles above its point of confluence with Fish River; that for such transportation flat power scows are used, but traffic is possible only at certain stages of the water, and auxiliary horse or tractor power on shore is required to cross bars and shoals; and

"Whereas the bed of the Niukluk River, its benches, the beds of its tributaries and their benches, are in a highly mineralized zone and have been the scene of mining operations since the early days of gold discoveries on Seward Peninsula. From the bed and benches of Ophir Creek, a tributary of Niukluk River several miles above Council, Alaska, some of the most phenomenal gold recoveries in Alaska's history were made; and

"Whereas from the time of the first discoveries of gold in the vicinity of Council, Alaska, prospectors and miners have located and held by mineral location much of the area of the bed and benches of the Niukluk River and its tributaries and mined many portions in the firm belief that the locations were proper and the mining, extraction, and disposition of gold therefrom legal and proper; and

"Whereas in 1940 the United States Government, by and through the office of the United State attorney at Nome, Alaska, instituted an action in the district court at Nome to restrain and prohibit any further mining and extraction of gold from the bed of the Niukluk River from its confluence with Fish River to a point about 12 miles upstream; that is, as far as Council, Alaska. Such action is based on the contention that this 12-mile portion of the Niukluk River is a navigable stream and is consequently not open for mineral location nor subject to mining or the extraction of gold therefrom. That as a result of the commencement of such action, or anticipating its commencement, owners and lessees of some mineral claims embracing part of the area concerned have been required as a reasonable business practice to alter their plans for mining; other owners have had their claims mined by third parties, ignoring locations; other owners have had options and agreements abandoned because of the uncertainty created; and other litigation has been instituted in the district court at Nome between claim owners and those ignoring their rights; and

"Whereas any curtailment of mining or avoidable interference with it in the vicinity of Council is to the immediate detriment of the residents of that section and of the Territory of Alaska. The single industry of the Council area is gold mining, and the residents and inhabitants are dependent upon it. The river area concerned has been under mineral location for more than 30 years, mining done thereon, and locaters have expended large amounts of money and much labor in the doing and performing of annual assessment work. That no action was taken by the Government until 1940 to indicate that the rights of locaters were nonexistent and their expenditures and labors futile. The shallowness of the ordinary water of the Niukluk

River, the numerous sand bars, and the frozen condition of the river during the greater part of each calendar year makes it doubtful that the portion of the stream concerned is navigable in the sense intended by law: Now therefore

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that appropriate legislation be introduced and enacted by the Congress of the United States whereby the Niukluk River would be declared a nonnavigable stream.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 6, 1941."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 12

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to provide for payments to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax revenue resulting from the use of certain lands by the United States of America

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"Whereas the United States has acquired either by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, large areas of land in Montana that were once in private ownership and subject to taxation; and

"Whereas the State and county governments have lost all tax revenue therefrom, while at the same time there have been substantially the same governmental expenses for the area of territory where the lands are situate since the taking of such lands off of the tax rolls; and

"Whereas it is the belief of your memorialists that the United States should reimburse the counties for the loss of tax revenue on account of the taking of such lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate and house concurring, hereby does request and petition the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to reimburse each county of the State of Montana for the loss of all tax revenue on account of the use by the United States of all those lands which were once in private ownership and subject to taxation by the State and county governments, and which have been acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, by the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, and that they and each of them be and they hereby are requested to use all means within their powers to bring about the passage of such legislation.

"Approved, March 8, 1941.

"SAM C. FORD, Governor."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Library:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"To the honorable Legislative Assemblies of the State of Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, and the Congress of the United States:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully request and petition as follows:

"Whereas the year 1943 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of

civil government in the West, and the blazing of the Old Oregon Trail from Independence, Mo., to the Willamette Valley in the old Oregon Country by that historic covered-wagon train which won an empire for the United States; and

"Whereas the migration of 1843 and those which followed made imperishable history for America; and

"Whereas all of the States through which the Old Oregon Trail passed are rich in the history and traditions of that heroic period: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby respectfully request and petition that you join with the State of Oregon in a proper observance of the year 1943, that the heroic deeds of the intrepid pioneers who blazed the trail to the Pacific coast may not be forgotten, and that the name of the Old Oregon Trail may be enshrined forever in the heart of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon transmit copies of this joint memorial to the legislative assemblies and Governors of all Oregon Trail States, to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Member of the Oregon delegation in Congress."

A senate resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas the President of the United States of America has called upon all citizens to cooperate in the Government's program of national defense; and

"Whereas in order to carry on the said national-defense program the Government is now called upon to raise large and unusual sums of money other than by way of taxation; and

"Whereas a large portion of the defense program of the Nation must be paid for by the issuance of Government bonds, as heretofore announced by the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1941, That the Senate approves the national-defense program of the Federal Government and calls upon and urges all of the residents of the Territory to support any bond issue for national defense and to purchase said bonds so offered, to the end that the national-defense program may be carried on to its necessary conclusion and that thereby the liberties which we enjoy under a democratic form of government and the "American way" of life, may be guaranteed and secured to the people of the United States; and, be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 9

"Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, through House Joint Memorial No. 5, requested the President and Department of the Navy of the United States to perpetuate the name 'Battleship Oregon' by conferring upon a fighting unit the honor of such name; and

"Whereas the Department of the Navy of the United States has advised that names have been designated for all of the battleships of the United States now under construction and that the name 'Battleship Ore-

gon' is not now available for use as the name to be conferred upon any battleship owing to the fact that a present unit of the naval force is now so named and is classified as a 'naval relic'; and

"Whereas in order that the naval traditions may be carried out by a naval fighting unit perpetuating the fighting name which has heretofore been associated with the name 'Oregon': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of these United States, the Congress thereof, and the Naval Department thereof be memorialized as follows, to wit:

"That the name of the old illustrious battleship Oregon be changed to the name 'Illustrious Oregon,' and that there be conferred upon the first available battleship not heretofore named the honor of bearing the name 'Battleship Oregon.'"

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable John M. Carmody, Federal Works Administrator, and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully submits that,

"Whereas that the large and increasing number of families coming to Alaska to establish permanent homes cannot be satisfactorily located, nor can the use of agricultural and other natural resources be adequately planned until the widely separated communities with their local roads which now characterize Territorial development, are joined together and thus given outlets to ocean shipping ports on the southern Alaska coast by means of a well-conceived system of trunk highways, and

"Whereas the lack of such a trunk system of highways has kept Alaska transportation costs of supplies and equipment used in mining, farming, and other enterprises at fantastic figures which seriously hold in check the settlement of the Territory and the utilization of its natural resources, and

"Whereas the extensive agricultural areas of the Matanuska Valley, the Kenai Peninsula, and the Tanana Valley should especially be supplied with trunk highway transportation that would promote the production of food supplies for use at nearby military bases, and

"Whereas the proposed transfer of the ocean terminus of the Alaska Railroad from Seward to Passage Canal and the abandonment of 66 miles of railroad line as a result of such transfer, will cut off the Kenai Peninsula with an area of 9,200 square miles from any land transport connection with other sections of the Territory and thereby cause a great loss to the town of Seward and other towns and villages, community centers, mining operations, farms, resorts, and miscellaneous enterprises of the Kenai Peninsula, and isolate a \$2,000,000 system of local roads and discourage further settlement, unless provision is immediately made to replace the railroad with a highway connection, and

"Whereas a road connection about 30 miles in length in addition to a 2-mile rock fill across the head of Turnagain Arm, would join the system of the Kenai Peninsula to that of the Anchorage area and serve to ameliorate the bankrupting effect that will result as a loss of such railroad facilities, and

"Whereas a road about 180 miles in length to connect the Forty Mile Mining District with the Richardson Highway would not only give this old and important section of Alaska access by road to the other parts of

the Territory, but would also traverse throughout its entire length a mineralized area whose development would undoubtedly add to the available mineral wealth of Alaska; and

"Whereas any proposed trunk highway program would contemplate the construction of the connecting links referred to and also take into account the advisability of having an ocean outlet at Haines or a connecting international highway to the States that would bind together the principal industrial area of Alaska with overland transportation: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States authorize and instruct the Public Roads Administration to make preliminary surveys and studies for a trunk highway that will link together the local roads serving the larger communities of Alaska so that they will be provided with one or more adequate highway outlets to ocean shipping ports on the south coast of the Territory and to the States and to make a report to Congress with a recommendation as to the manner of constructing such trunk system of highways by the United States in cooperation with the Territory of Alaska, in a manner similar to that now provided for in the construction of highways in the several States under the Federal Highway Act.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.
"Passed by the House February 10, 1941."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial of the State of New Mexico and the fifteenth legislature thereof, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, relating to the construction of livestock trails in the national forest

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the construction of well-defined livestock trails in and through the national forests of the State of New Mexico, and from and through the lands belonging to the United States leased for grazing purposes, to the public highways of the State is a necessity to the livestock industry, and to the preservation of the national forest and grazing lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the President of the United States of America and the Congress of the United States of America be and the same are very respectfully memorialized and petitioned in the name of the State of New Mexico and the fifteen legislature thereof to make provision for the construction of such trails as soon as possible; and 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 Representatives of New Mexico in Congress.

"Signed by me this 25th day of March 1941.

"JOHN E. MILES,
"Governor of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Whereas there has been introduced before the Congress of the United States, S. Res. 82, by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado, which is a resolution to investigate the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission ordering the abandonment of the narrow-gauge railroad between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex., known as the Chili Line; and

"Whereas said resolution authorizes the creation of an investigation into the acts and

practices of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Co. in its operation of said branch line; and

"Whereas the people of the southern part of the State of Colorado have protested vigorously the abandonment of said branch line; and

"Whereas the actions of any organization and organizations agreeing to, concurring in, or recommending the abandonment of said branch line is not representative of the true public opinion of the citizens of southern Colorado, but represents only the action of a small clique or group interested in said abandonment; and

"Whereas pending the adoption of said resolution, the original date for abandonment of said branch line has been extended for a period of forty (40) days: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-third General Assembly (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and urged to adopt Senate Resolution 82, to the end that a thorough and complete investigation may be had of the facts and circumstances surrounding the said abandonment order and its eventual cancelation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Senators and Representatives of the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A house memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the Honorable President of the Senate and to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in the fifteenth regular session assembled, does most respectfully submit that:

"Whereas the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska now consists of eight members, two from each of the four judicial divisions into which Alaska is now divided by act of Congress, elected biennially for terms of 4 years each at the regular election from each division; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska covers such a vast area, and the population of same is so very scattered, the number of senators now representing their respective judicial divisions is not adequate to deal with the legislation coming before that body; and

"Whereas it is now possible for 4 votes in the senate to defeat a bill, which may have been passed unanimously by the house of representatives, consisting of 16 members: Now therefore

"We, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully petitions that the Congress of the United States enact an amendment to the organic act, whereby the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska shall consist of 12 members, 3 from each of the 4 judicial divisions of Alaska; 1 member to be elected for a period of 2 years only, and 2 members to be elected as at present.

*"And your memorialist will ever pray.
"Passed by the house, March 13, 1941."*

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., favoring the enactment of the so-called

General Welfare Act providing for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TAFT:

Petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of members of the Official Board of Finksburg Methodist Church of Carroll County, and sundry citizens of Cumberland, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House resolution relative to the pollution of the Potomac River

"Whereas in the vicinity of Washington untreated sewage and other waste material are being dumped into the Potomac River, making said river insanitary and injuring its scenic and recreation possibilities; and

"Whereas these conditions should be remedied: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the health departments of the States of Maryland and Virginia and the proper authorities of the city of Washington be and they are hereby requested to take whatever steps may be needed to remedy the above-mentioned conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress be and they are hereby requested to request the proper United States and District of Columbia officials to render any assistance possible for improving the insanitary conditions in the Potomac River; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of these resolutions to the State departments of health of Maryland and Virginia and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress."

(Mr. RADCLIFFE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., and signed by the mayor of that city on March 25, 1941.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Midwest is vitally concerned in a deep-water outlet to the high seas. The State of Wisconsin, having 22 lake harbors entering the inland oceans, known as the Great Lakes, has championed such a project for many years. The city of Milwaukee, having the largest harbor in point of water-borne commerce on Lake Michigan, has never ceased its efforts to secure the improvement of the St. Lawrence River as an efficient connecting link between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean.

The people of the Midwest are conscious of the fact that a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives

them of an economical, expeditious, and free outlet for their factory and farm products to the markets of the world. The deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel, as advocated by successive Presidents of the United States, will prove an economic advantage to the Nation as a whole. It will bring the Midwest a thousand miles nearer the high seas and that much nearer to the markets of the world.

While the project must be regarded as one of the highest importance under normal conditions, it assumes a special significance at a time when the Nation is deeply concerned in the same as a defense measure. While the eastern section of the country is seeking more power service, the Midwest must have greater navigation freedom.

There can be no doubt that the great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region forms a vital part of an entire Nation, and therefore should not be hampered or hindered in rendering a maximum service. The shipbuilding industry in the Great Lakes region deserves encouragement. Such industries not only have their advantage in being centrally located, but at a time when the Nation is dealing with the matter of defense they are more secure if located in the midcountry.

Thus the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project does not only possess power potentialities, navigation advantages, but also forms an important factor as a defense measure: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee herewith formally and respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as outlined by the President of the United States and thus remove the economic barriers which now afflict the Midwest country and the Nation as a whole; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of the foregoing preamble and resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives of the National Congress, and to the mayors of the important sister cities throughout the United States.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROAD FUND—RESOLUTION OF THE IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GILLETTE. The General Assembly of the State of Iowa has memorialized Congress for the liberalization of regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the farm-to-market road fund. I present the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and printed in the RECORD under the rule.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 17

Whereas the forty-eighth general assembly passed an act creating what is known as the farm-to-market road fund and initiated appropriate legislation for the handling thereof, and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Roads controls the expenditure of the money allocated by the Federal Government to match State funds provided for the same purpose, and any roads so built must be constructed in harmony with their specifications. This has resulted in the feeling that our farm-to-market road program is not being advanced as fast as was originally hoped it would be: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring),

That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and the Federal Bureau of Roads to liberalize the regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the various States for the purpose of building farm-to-market roads and to particularly liberalize the rules limiting the highways upon which such funds can be expended for the improvement thereof; and

That the various States, through the appropriate authority created by them for that purpose and in Iowa particularly, the State highway commission, rather than the Federal Bureau of Roads; be given more authority to supervise the expenditure of such funds, as may be allocated to a given State for the construction of farm-to-market roads, than they previously have had; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Iowa Member thereof, and to the Federal Bureau of Roads.

I hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was duly adopted by the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa.

REQUEST THAT A BATTLE CRUISER BE NAMED "GETTYSBURG"

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I present a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the Past Presidents Association of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Adams County, Pa., signed by its district president and approved by the president and secretary of the main organization, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

WASHINGTON CAMP, No. 22,
PATRIOTIC ORDER SONS OF AMERICA,
New Oxford, Pa., March 24, 1941.

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas within Adams County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, lies the hallowed field of Gettysburg, a battlefield upon which was decided on July 1, 2, and 3, 1863, the future destiny of the American Republic; and

Whereas it was here that the almost divine words from the lips of our great President, Abraham Lincoln, dedicated a portion of said field as a resting place for thousands of those who here gave their lives as a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom and liberty; and

Whereas these accomplishments having received world-wide recognition, it is then fitting and proper that the defense agencies of the United States of America should carry upon the high seas along with the Stars and Stripes the name of "Gettysburg": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Past Presidents Association of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Adams County, Pa., do hereby pray that one of the battle cruisers under contemplated construction be named "Gettysburg"; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS, Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, and Hon. HARRY L. HAINES, our Senators and Representative in Congress, urging them to use their influence to carry the provisions of this resolution into effect.

Fraternally submitted,

GEO. D. SHEELY,
District President.

Approved by the above organization.

JESSE C. SNYDER, President.
J. B. BUSSEY, Secretary.

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 27th instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on Friday, March 28, 1941, during adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3735. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 149).

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. R. 4124. An act making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 150).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following reports were submitted from the Committee on Military Affairs:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 166. A bill to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 152);

S. 167. A bill to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 153); and

S. 658. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 154).

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 793. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Ore.; without amendment (Rept. No. 155).

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR (REPT. NO. 151)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. From the Committee on Education and Labor, pursuant to Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, I submit a report on Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, Part IV, the "Little Steel" Strike and Citizens' Committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That 4,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 151, a report of the Committee on Education and Labor submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong.), entitled "Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor," be printed for the use of the Senate Document Room.

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently, from the Committee on Printing, reported the foregoing resolution (S. Res. 92) without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. GILLETTE (for Mr. WALSH), from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy.
By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Several postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1250. A bill to provide for withholding from the normal channels of trade and commerce cotton of the 1940 and previous crops which is owned by the Government or which is pledged as security for Government loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BYRNES:

S. 1251. A bill to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULOW:

S. 1252. A bill to amend Public Resolution No. 127, Seventy-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1253. A bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1254. A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, with respect to counsel in certain matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1255. A bill to provide for cheaper rail and bus transportation for officers, enlisted men, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard when on leave of absence or furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1256. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Snow;

S. 1257. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Snow; and

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of the Cold Spring Brewing Co. of Cold Spring, Minn., and the Schuster Brewing Co. of Rochester, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1259. A bill to amend section 12 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1260. A bill to establish a Division of Aviation Education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1261. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen cattle having a value of \$50 or more in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders, and Henry G. Sanders, her husband; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1263. A bill for the relief of the surviving dependents of Ernest N. Brownfield; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1264. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the rights of the Otoe and Missouri Tribes of Indians to compensation on a basis of guardian and ward; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1265. A bill making it unlawful for any person to change his residence from one State to another for the purpose of avoiding the payment of any judgment for support of

minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1266. A bill for the relief of Etta Houser Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1267. A bill to provide for a study relating to the promotion of the sale and use in South America and Central America of tobacco produced in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1268. A bill to permit members of savings and loan associations and similar institutions to report and pay tax upon their earnings in such institutions in the taxable year in which such earnings accrue and to require such institutions to make an information return as to earnings of their members as is required for interest, rents, and salaries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1269. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Waters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1270. A bill for the relief of Auguste C. Loiseau; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1271. A bill granting a pension to Luther R. Drum;

S. 1272. A bill granting a pension to Rachel Melvina Ann Campbell Frum;

S. 1273. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lelia M. Marple;

S. 1274. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha L. E. Bromberg;

S. 1275. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah Roush; and

S. 1276. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1277. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 1278. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; and

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1280. A bill concerning the qualification of voters or electors within the meaning of section 2, article I, of the Constitution, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or general election for national offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1281. A bill to repeal the provision of law requiring recoupment by the United States of sums advanced by it for school-construction purposes to certain school districts furnishing school facilities to Indian pupils; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1282. A bill to reinstate in the Court of Claims the suits entitled "Eastern or Emigrant Cherokees Against the United States," No. 42077, and "Western or Old Settler Cherokees Against the United States," No. 42078; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. TOBEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 62, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and appears under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3835. An act to exempt from internal-revenue taxes, on the basis of reciprocity, articles imported by consular officers and employees of foreign states for their personal or official use; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4125. An act to amend Public Law No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to relieve 3-year Regular Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard members and certain members of the Reserve components thereof from

selective training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4146. An act to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 4183. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. CONNALLY, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 169) to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SILVER LAKE HARBOR AND CHANNEL FROM MANTEO TO OREGON INLET, N. C.—AMENDMENT

Mr. BAILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

At the proper place, under the heading, "Rivers and harbors," insert the following: "For improvements at Silver Lake Harbor, N. C., and to provide a channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C., as authorized by the act approved October 17, 1940, \$105,000."

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the address delivered by Senator BARKLEY on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner at Boston, Mass., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the address delivered by him on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner at Indianapolis, Ind., on March 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN ON INVESTIGATION OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address on the subject of the investigation of national-defense expenditures, delivered by Senator TRUMAN on March 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON IN HISTORY-MAKING DAYS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him before the Republican Women of Pennsylvania, at the Barclay Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., March 24, 1941, on the subject, Washington in History-Making Days, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR PART IN PEACE—ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by former President Hoover regarding the part of the United States in peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an ad-

dress delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the Massachusetts Committee of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, held at the Boston Chamber of Commerce on March 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GEORGE A. HILL, JR., ON OIL CONSERVATION

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by George A. Hill, Jr., at San Antonio, Tex., on March 21, 1941, on the subject of Oil Conservation Achievements Through the Medium of State Regulation, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIVATE FLYING OPERATIONS AND ACCIDENTS; AIR-CARRIER OPERATIONS AND SAFETY RECORD, 1936-40

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement of private flying operations and accidents, and air-carrier operations and safety record, 1936-40, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER OF THE PRESIDENT TO EMPLOY THE NAVY TO CONVOY VESSELS IN TIME OF PEACE

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a memorandum which he had prepared concerning the power of the President of the United States, when the United States is at peace, to employ the Navy to convoy vessels bound to a belligerent, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNION WITH BRITAIN?—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial published in the New York Daily News entitled "Union With Britain?" which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON ON LIKELIHOOD OF UNITED STATES ENTERING EUROPEAN WAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article by Hugh S. Johnson, published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

FINAL REPORT OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 35)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my privilege this morning to present to the President of the Senate the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee, with illustrations. I shall ask that one of the pages deliver the report to the clerk's desk.

The report presented by the T. N. E. C. represents the conclusion of 3 years of work by the committee, which was set up by Public Resolution 113 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. I have asked Mr. Totty to bring into the room the bound volumes of this report because I venture to say that within the compass of these volumes is to be found the substance of the reorganization for peace and democracy which must come after the war.

When this study began, back in 1933, it was commonly asserted by those who were commenting upon the program that the purpose of the study would be to harass, abuse, and destroy free private enterprise. That statement was made in spite of the fact that in the message in which the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, had recommended this study, he said that—

Generally over the field of industry and finance we must revive and strengthen com-

petition if we wish to preserve and make workable our traditional system of free enterprise.

I called the attention of the public to that declaration by the President when our public hearings began. I announced then, and on frequent occasions afterward, that it would be the purpose of the committee to assemble the facts with respect to the concentration of economic power and wealth which were evident to most observers of the national scene, and that this would be done without any "witch-hunting" or any desire to impede business. Our declarations were accepted as the statements of a person who had his tongue in his cheek.

In the first public announcement I made at the time the hearings were opened I said that whether this study would be fruitful of benefit to society, or altogether futile, depended upon two factors—one, the manner in which it would be conducted; two, the manner in which it would be received by the public. Now, after almost 3 years of study, I can say without fear that any person will contradict the statement, that the hearings were conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Before the distinguished chairman of the committee reports on the details of the great work in which he has been engaged, I desire to observe for the RECORD that I think the great statesmanship of the Senator who happens to be the chairman of the committee is the reason why we did not have a "witch hunt," but had a real constructive examination of conditions in the world and in this country. I have not seen the report, and therefore do not know what has been recommended, and I am not certain that I should be able to assent to what has been recommended; but I know that personally I am gratified over the manner in which this great research was handled by the committee; and to the chairman of the committee I pay my compliments and offer my thanks.

A DECLARATION FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind, and, of course, I deeply appreciate his complimentary reference; but I should be lax if I were not to say that the attitude which he finds in the chairman was to be found also in all the members of the committee. I can say without any reservation whatever that from the beginning to the end the injunction which was made by the President—that we seek the means of reviving competition and free private enterprise—has been followed; and I am happy to say to the Senate that to my mind the outstanding recommendation of the committee's report is its declaration of faith in the system of free private enterprise.

Of course, I should not expect everybody to agree with what appears in the report, nor with what appears in the monographs which have been printed by the committee, nor with the statements made by members of the committee or by witnesses in the hearings; but one thing I do say—that on the part of everybody

who was associated with the committee, so far as I have been able to observe, there was a sincere and deep purpose of preserving what we call the democratic way, the American way of life, to use a phrase which has been popularized during recent years.

I said that much would depend upon the way in which this report would be received by the public. We did not capitalize the headlines as we might have done. We did not seek to pillory witnesses as we might have done. We did not seek to obtain the sensational publicity which was quite possible in this study, but we have obtained a wider public notice than it seemed to me it would ever be possible to obtain when the study began. More than 230,000 copies of these monographs and hearings have already been circulated throughout the United States. Universities and high schools, business leaders, executives in the offices of big business, Government officials, Members of Congress in the House and in the Senate, all are sending letters day by day to the office of the committee asking for copies of the reports. The Superintendent of Documents tells me that more of these documents have been sold over the counter, as it were, by the Superintendent of Documents, than of any other Government publication.

Because of the reception which this work has had at the hands of the public, I am hopeful that deep and lasting results will be obtained from it. I feel that I should make acknowledgement here of the splendid cooperation we have received from all the Government departments, and from business and industry as well. The committee, at one period in its proceedings, issued an invitation to organized business to make its own showing. Some businesses responded to that invitation. The petroleum industry, for example, under the guidance of the American Petroleum Institute, gathered a tremendous amount of material, expended a large sum of money, and came before the committee at its public hearings and made presentation of the picture of the oil industry as those who are in charge of that industry believe that picture to be; and there has been a great demand for that picture. The steel industry likewise responded to our invitation, and not only came before the committee with a well-prepared story, but they also brought to us a motion picture to show the degree of development in the steel industry. I could mention others who have cooperated.

We have attempted to give an opportunity of expression to all who have in any way disagreed with any presentation that was made, and one of the monographs now on the press, which will be ready before long, will contain the statements prepared by various industrial groups in comment on or in answer to the statements which appear in the report. We have tried to go about this study in "the American way."

For example, take the insurance industry. The S. E. C. conducted a study of insurance, and presented for the committee, and the committee published, a report of the facts from the point of view of the S. E. C., developed at the

hearings and from the questionnaires which were circulated among businesses. That has been printed as Monograph No. 28. Certain insurance companies took exception to some of the statements which were made in that monograph, and a group of them prepared their own statement, and that statement was printed in the record of the hearings. Another statement was made later—I received it only 2 weeks ago—commenting upon certain phases of Monograph No. 28, and the committee has ordered that to be printed as Monograph No. 28-A, setting forth the point of view of the insurance companies themselves.

The work of our committee started out under the direction, as executive secretary, of Mr. Leon Henderson, who later became a member of the S. E. C., and who is now occupying an important role in the national-defense program. When he became a member of the S. E. C. he had to retire from his post as executive secretary of our committee, and his place was taken by Mr. James Brackett, who afterward retired because a better opportunity was offered to him in private business. His place was then taken by Dr. Dewey Anderson. Upon Dr. Dewey Anderson has fallen a great deal of the burden of preparing this mass of material so that it is readily accessible to the public. I wish to pay here my tribute of appreciation to these three men for the splendid work they have done. Dr. Theodore J. Kreps, of the faculty of Stanford University, made a most effective contribution as economic adviser, and many others could be mentioned. All were primarily concerned in developing facts.

Members of the Senate will remember that when the committee was created it was composed of six Members of Congress, three from the Senate and three from the House of Representatives, and officials of six of the executive agencies. In other words, there were 12 members. The executive members had alternates. The late Senator Borah was one of the original members, and former Senator King, of Utah, was likewise one of the original Senate group. Both of them contributed materially to the work of the committee.

On the House side we had the honor of being associated with the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, who just now entered the door of the Senate, but when he realized that I was about to mention his great contribution to the work of the committee he retired, modestly, as is his way.

I ask unanimous consent that I may print as part of my remarks the list of the members of the committee and the alternates, as they served throughout the life of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

MEMBERSHIP OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Representing the Congress
Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Senator from Wyoming, chairman.

Hatton W. Sumners, Representative from Texas, vice chairman.

William E. Borah, Senator from Idaho.
Wallace H. White, Jr., Senator from Maine, vice Borah.

William H. King, Senator from Utah.
James M. Mead, Senator from New York, vice King.

Edward C. Eicher, Representative from Iowa.

Clyde Williams, Representative from Missouri, vice Eicher.

B. Carroll Reece, Representative from Tennessee.

Representing executive departments and agencies

Justice Department:

Thurman W. Arnold, Assistant Attorney General.

Wendell Berge, Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

Hugh Cox, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, vice Berge.

Securities and Exchange Commission:
William O. Douglas, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.

Jerome N. Frank, alternate, and also vice Douglas.

Leon Henderson, vice Frank.

Sumner T. Pike, vice Henderson.

Federal Trade Commission:

Garland S. Ferguson, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

Ewin L. Davis, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, alternate.

Department of Labor:

Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

A. Ford Hinrichs, chief economist, Bureau of Labor Statistics, alternate.

Treasury Department:

Herman Oliphant, General Counsel, Treasury Department.

Christian Joy Peoples, Director of Procurement, alternate.

Joseph J. O'Connell, special assistant to the General Counsel, Treasury Department, vice Oliphant.

Charles L. Kades, special assistant to the General Counsel, alternate.

Department of Commerce:

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Sumner T. Pike, vice Patterson.

Hon. Wayne Chatfield-Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce, vice Pike.

M. Joseph Meehan, Chief Statistician, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, alternate.

Leon Henderson, executive secretary.

James R. Brackett, vice Henderson.

Dewey Anderson, vice Brackett.

Dr. Theodore J. Krepes, economic adviser.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine, who succeeded Senator Borah upon the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to make a very brief comment in response to what the Senator from Wyoming has been saying.

I was appointed to the committee following the death of Senator Borah. At that time the committee had been functioning for nearly 2 years, and there had been accumulated a tremendous mass of testimony, running into thousands upon thousands of pages. It became clear to me early that by no possibility could I inform myself as to that vast record. I appreciated that even to keep current with the work that was being carried on after I became a member, in the absence of knowledge of what had gone before, was in itself an almost impossible task. I have done what I could,

which was little, in the effort to familiarize myself with the proceedings.

Mr. President, I have risen at this time primarily to say that I did not join in the report which has been made, but when a few days ago I announced to the committee that I would not join in the report, I stated that that did not in and of itself indicate hostility to any of the recommendations which might be made. I refused to join in the report because I did not feel sufficiently familiar with the record to justify my expressing at the time either approval or disapproval.

I feel that at some appropriate time in the near future I should make a rather brief statement as to my views concerning the whole undertaking. At this moment I merely wish to pay my respect to the services of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He has shown amazing industry during the 3 years of the life of the committee. He has presided and has conducted the work of the committee with the greatest of fairness. He has shown high intelligence, and I believe he has made a most noteworthy contribution, in this work, to the study of the problems which were before the committee. I cannot speak in too high terms of praise of the service which the chairman of the committee has rendered, and I hope I shall find opportunity in the near future to express myself briefly about the work itself.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator is altogether too generous in his remarks.

I have asked the pages of the Senate to distribute to each Senator a copy of the catalog of the publications of the committee. This has been printed at the Government Printing Office, and contains a brief description of the 32 volumes of hearings and the 43 or 44 monographs which have been printed under the authority of the committee.

The final report, which is now being filed, consists, first, of an analysis of our situation, and the recommendations which are made by the committee. Each recommendation shows at its conclusion the names of those members of the committee who expressed dissent. This has been followed by separate statements which have been prepared by some members of the committee setting forth their personal points of view of the analysis of our economic problems. This will be accompanied by a brief history of the committee itself, and a financial statement.

It may be interesting for me to remark that the entire appropriation used during these 3 years amounted to \$1,070,000. That is a large sum of money. The committee goes out of existence on the 3d of April, leaving a balance of something like \$8,000, a portion of which perhaps I shall ask the Senate and House to allot so that inquiries which are now coming in may be properly answered. These letters asking for information with respect to this report and this study, are coming at the rate of at least 150 a day, illustrating, as I said a moment ago, the wide degree of public interest in the report.

In addition to the recommendations and the history of the committee, there will be also the verbatim record of the public sessions, beginning on January 15 of this year, at which the recommendations were publicly presented and publicly discussed. Many of the recommendations which were there presented have not been adopted, but in that verbatim record will be found a discussion from many points of view of the fundamental problems of our economy.

Finally, contained in this report, will be the report to the committee itself of the executive secretary and his staff. That will boil down, as it were, the facts which have been gathered throughout the long period of the study.

A CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY

Mr. President, I should like to add just a few more words with respect to the nature of this report. It is a challenge to democracy. It comes, I believe, at a time when the attention of the democratic governments and the democratic people of America should be concentrated upon this problem of living for people. If the war which is now raging in the world means anything, and if the enthusiasm which wells up in our hearts when we read of the valor of the Greeks and the courage of the Yugoslavs means anything, it means that as a people we recognize the fact that government and business have come into existence to serve men.

If the resistance of the people of America to the thought of aggression means anything, it means that here in America the great mass of our people believe that individual men and women have the right to live their own lives without being regimented by any small group. That, Mr. President, is the essence of the problem which is presented not only to this country but to the world. It is a problem of fitting individuals into an organized economy.

We have pointed out that the organization here in Washington of this tremendous defense effort is the conclusive proof of the concentration of economic power and wealth which this committee was appointed to examine.

Mr. President, I had hoped to have here in the Senate today at the time I was making this brief statement, an enlarged copy of the map which appeared in the issue of Life, which is on the newsstands this week. Let me use these copies of Life. The map shows the "war babies" of the United States, to use the title of the editors of Life. It shows not only that the new plants are built by Government money, but also the location of all the war industries which have come into existence as a result of this all-out effort here in Washington. If Senators will glance at that map they will see that the tremendous sum of money which the Government of the United States is now spending for defense goes to those States and those communities in which industrial concentration first took place. Senators who have taken part in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee during the last few weeks have been impressed by the fact that from every corner of this land have

come pleas from the peoples of various States for the allocation to those States of Government funds to build up industries in those States. A glance at the map will show that the entire Middle West is practically without any allocation of Government funds for purposes of defense.

In the committees' report Senators will find a table prepared by one of the economists serving with the Council of National Defense, showing that three States in the Union have received no allocation whatsoever; that 50 percent of the States have less than half of the total expenditure; and that upon the other side of the scene, six States have received 52 percent of all the Government funds which have been distributed for the defense effort.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to ask the Senator if he can tell us who is responsible for that great concentration in the location of these war industries? Is it a matter of war strategy to put them all in one location, so that if the enemy landed here he could in a short time obtain control of all of them, or if enemy airplanes came over here they could perhaps put them all out of business in a day or in a night?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama is referring to one of the most difficult phases of the defense program. Our plane manufacture, for example, is concentrated in southern California, and that concentration has resulted in the fact that to the State of California has been allocated more than 11 percent of all the funds which have been contracted for under the defense program. That concentration of airplane manufacture in California has been due to a variety of factors, but the most important of them is that the executives in the aircraft industry have reported to the Council of National Defense, and to the War Department and the Navy Department, that they do not have the superintending personnel to distribute to various parts of the country.

I think a glance at the map will show that the Senator from Alabama has pointed to a very serious problem of military strategy. Airplane factories upon the Pacific coast are, of course, readily open to attack. If it be true that there is danger of Nazi penetration in South America, airplane attacks from below our southern border could easily concentrate on that Pacific coast area. Here, directly east of the Rocky Mountains, in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, we have an ideal area, right behind the rampart of the Rocky Mountains, to protect industrial plants of that type from attack.

STATES AND PEOPLE TURN TO WASHINGTON

Mr. President, I had not intended to make any reference to that matter until the Senator from Alabama arose and gave me the opportunity. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] was also kind enough to rise in his place, and in response to the suggestion in his eyes, I referred to my own State of Wyoming,

which is an ideal location for plants of that kind.

Mr. President, that is not the point, however. To me it is one of the saddest things in our economy, and it is pointed out in the committee report that chambers of commerce, Governors of States, and mayors of cities have beaten a path to Washington asking the executive department to allocate to their States defense industries or Government projects of one kind or another in order to solve the local problem of unemployment, in order to solve the local problem of failing business. We turn to Washington for this. We, the people of America, turn to Washington now, because the self-impetus of local business has disappeared. For example, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], a member of the Appropriations Committee, has pointed out that many States are now being drained of their population. Mechanics of all kinds are being taken out of those States and transported to the concentrated plants of concentrated defense industries.

What this picture shows, Mr. President, is that the concentration of economic power and wealth in the hands of big business inevitably leads to concentration in big government. The report now submitted to Congress and to the people is a summons to Americans to restore free private enterprise so that it may spring from the grass roots, as it were. If that is not done, in my opinion there can be no hope of averting the continued erection of a tremendous concentrated structure.

What we must understand is that the modern economy is dominated by group activity, and not by individual activity. The Greeks and Yugoslavs in Europe are opposing their poor bodies to the mechanized instruments of concentrated government. We have seen the impossibility of individuals successfully opposing themselves to concentrated force; and that picture in industry is the picture which will be presented to us in peace.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that there may be in these volumes the last challenge to democracy, the last challenge for the establishment of an economic system which will protect the enterprise of the individual. When the Declaration of Independence was drafted and the Constitution of the United States was adopted, in both instances the founders of this Government declared to all the world and to all posterity that they were seeking to establish a government which would protect men in their inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But individuals cannot compete with highly organized modern industry. The mechanic of our day does not carry in his kit the tools with which he must work.

We wonder why strikes take place. Strikes take place because men on the side of labor and men on the side of business are looking too closely at the immediate problem, and do not see the distant view. They do not realize that in this country we are trying somehow or other to adjust individual lives to the large-scale economy under which we live.

To bring about the reestablishment of competition and the salvation of free private enterprise the T. N. E. C. has recommended, first, that we recognize that the fundamental purpose of government and business is to be of benefit to the people, and that our modern business is for the most part carried on by organization. We should undertake, by enforcing the antitrust laws, to break down the concentration which crushes business as well as individuals. Ever since 1890, when Senator Sherman, of Ohio, stood upon this floor and introduced the Sherman antitrust measure, so far as I know not a single candidate for the Senate or for the House of Representatives has gone before his electorate to urge its repeal, for it was a declaration of policy by the Government based upon the age-long conviction of our people that combinations in restraint of trade are against public policy. But we know that those combinations have gone on and on and on regardless of the law. The Sherman Antitrust Act has been honored more in the breach than in the observance. So the committee urges the strict enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Some will say that that is an old-fashioned idea. It is no more old-fashioned than our fundamental belief in the rights of human beings; and unless we can make it clear by enforcement of the antitrust laws that combinations privately effected shall not be permitted to crush out local business, we have no recourse except to see the Government establishment at Washington continue to expand.

REGULATION OR CONTROL

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think this is a good point to ask this question with respect to the report. On the point on which the Senator is now speaking, I have always felt that there is a vast difference between regulation and control by government. I ask the Senator whether this great committee came to the conclusion that we ought to change our theory in that respect, we having held as a Government up to this time that regulation should be our objective, maintaining the maximum degree of competition under the minimum degree of Government control. Are we advised by the committee to make a change in the degree of control by Government over private enterprise, a change which would amount to management on the part of the Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator has asked that question, because the answer is that in the view of the committee the desirable objective is not control, but regulation. There should be only that degree of regulation which is necessary to preserve the public interest and protect business and the citizens of the Republic from the unhappy and improper activities of those who have heretofore evaded the law. I think the statement just made by the Senator correctly represents the feeling of the committee. Only that degree of Government regulation should be put

into effect which is necessary to keep the door of opportunity open to the largest possible number. I think that is the feeling of the committee.

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

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, the Senator is complaining of present conditions, but he says that present conditions grew up under a system which I presume the committee wants to change. Is there too much control, or too little? Does the committee offer any hope, for instance, that better enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act would bring relief? If the nonobservance of the Sherman Antitrust Act is responsible for the present dilemma, would its observance, rather than its breach, bring relief?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. It is the belief of the chairman of the committee—and I think it is the belief of the committee itself, because of the recommendations which are to be found in the report—that the enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act would materially protect the public interest and materially alter the conditions of which we complain. Let me not be understood as saying that the Sherman Antitrust Act is responsible for this condition. It is not. I believe it is the lack of enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act which is responsible.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator to say that. I think I correctly understood him. Does the committee think the undesirable condition which has grown up has come about because of too much regulation or too little?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Oh, because of too little regulation.

In my response to the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, I was attempting to develop the difference between regulation and control. The ideal of free enterprise, the ideal of democracy, the ideal of individual activity, is an ideal which calls for the least possible exercise of Government authority to direct and control. Speaking for myself, I say that regimentation by big business is responsible for the movement toward regimentation by government; and I will give the Senator an example.

In our hearings upon the patent industry, we had testimony—this story was told under the direction of the Department of Justice; and Mr. Hugh Cox, now the alternate member of the Department of Justice upon the T. N. E. C., was in general charge of the presentation of that story, and it was a perfectly magnificent job—the testimony there demonstrated beyond any possibility of dispute that an organization in Hartford, Conn., the Hartford Empire Co., holding certain patent rights, was effecting throughout the United States its own rules with respect to production and price. Milk bottles could be manufactured only to the degree that this organization at Hartford, Conn., would permit. I have a very clear memory of the day when a witness from Texas appeared before the committee to tell the story of how he had been closed out in his effort to establish a milk-bottle industry in a certain town

in Texas. I have forgotten the name of the town. He was using a certain type of machine, not the machine upon which the Hartford Empire Co. had its patent, but a machine that was patented by an altogether different concern; but when he set up his factory and undertook to manufacture milk bottles, because he found he could manufacture them cheaper than they were being sold by the factories which held licenses from the Hartford Empire Co., he received an inquiry from Hartford, Conn., and presently an agent notified him that there was grave danger that he was infringing the Hartford Empire Co.'s patent, and asked if he would not be good enough to come to Hartford to discuss the matter. He went to Hartford. It is a long story, but the outcome was simply that he could not comply with the requirements which the Hartford Empire Co. laid down, and he had to close the doors of his factory because he could not afford to litigate the case.

I said to him, "Where did you get the capital with which you started this glass-bottle factory in Texas?"

"Why," he said, "that was Texas capital. My friends there in Texas raised the money."

I said, "Where did you get the labor?" "Every man in our factory," he said, "was a native of Texas, save one"—and he had lived in Texas for 15 years, as I recall.

Then I said, "How about the material out of which you manufactured these glass bottles?"

His face lighted up, and he said, "Why, Senator, we have right there upon the borders of that town the greatest deposit of glass sand to be found in America."

So I said to him, "It turns out that Texas capital and Texas labor could not utilize a Texas resource without a certificate of convenience and necessity from a private corporation in Hartford."

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

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to ask a question. In all the enforcement we have had during the past 4 or 5 years under the Sherman Act, has anyone been sent to jail, or have we always had consent decrees?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the Sherman antitrust law provides a penalty of \$5,000. It is so inadequate that that is one of the principal reasons why the Sherman antitrust law has not been effective. The consent-decree device is the only alternative under the present law, because the misdemeanor provision has apparently been in effect unenforceable.

The committee has again recommended the remedy which was recommended in the preliminary report, and to carry out which I introduced a bill which went to the Judiciary Committee—a recommendation that the individuals, the officers and directors of a corporation, who knowingly direct any policy that is a violation of the Sherman antitrust law, shall be held personally liable.

When that bill was introduced, and when I appeared at a hearing held by

the subcommittee of which the former Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Burke, was the chairman, the emissaries of big business appeared there and held up their hands in holy horror at the thought of what a terrible thing it would be to make responsible for violation of that law, in their personal capacity, the men who plot the violation. That is the reason why the Senator from North Dakota can rise here and ask if anyone has been sent to jail. I will welcome the support of the Senator from North Dakota in bringing about the enactment of a bill such as I have heretofore introduced and such as is recommended here.

So, Mr. President, the feeling of the chairman of this committee is that if the Sherman antitrust law is honestly and vigorously enforced, it will go far toward curing this difficulty. But more important than that, Mr. President—and this is one of the objectives the chairman has had in his mind throughout this study—more important than the enforcement of law is that there shall develop in the minds of the leaders of big business a comprehension of their social responsibility, and of the fact that to protect themselves and their businesses they must abandon forever the practices which have restricted production in order to maintain price, and which have resulted in denuding more than half the States of the Union of self-operating business.

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

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In the light of the past, and judging the future by the past, does the Senator think or can he give expression to the faintest hope that in his day and mine we shall ever have an administration that will have the courage to take action under any law we can pass to stop these monopolistic practices by huge trusts and combinations?

RECORD OF PRESENT ANTITRUST DIVISION

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's inquiry, it is only fair to say that under the direction of Mr. Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, the Antitrust Division has been very active and very successful in its enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Judging by the newspapers, I am inclined to believe it has been active chiefly in regard to labor unions.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. The Senator is wrong about that. That was only an incident. The Antitrust Division has brought antitrust suits in various parts of the country; and so effectively have those suits been brought that the persons who were indicted have walked up to the bar and pleaded guilty, or accepted the decree that was laid down. The antitrust prosecutions have been carried on, as the Senator will remember, behind the closed doors of grand juries, so that publicity has not been given to the perfectly splendid record which the Department of Justice has made under the present administration.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, does the Senator know of any officers of any

great combinations that have ever gone to jail, as provided in the law, when found guilty of violating it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator asks a question which was just a moment ago asked by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The law does not effectively impose a jail sentence. Juries hesitate to convict. The report of this committee recommends the modification or amendment of the law so that effective penalties may be invoked; and if such penalties are invoked, I believe the time will not be far distant when there can be effective enforcement. But, more important than that, I wish to say that during these 3 years in my contact with the leaders of big business I have found a widespread disposition to recognize the problem, a widespread disposition on the part of business executives to do something to keep free, private enterprise free from big business as well as from government.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It has often occurred to me and I should like to have the Senator's view about it, that when the courts gave corporations the status of a person, enabling them to come before the law on the basis of equality with their creator, the individual citizen, they made the creature as respectable and powerful as its creator; and, so, from year to year over a long period of time, monopolistic combinations have arrogated to themselves more and more power, and to a greater and greater extent have indulged in practices by which they could rob the people, even to the extent of affecting elections and government, thus becoming often more powerful than the government that created them. Does not the Senator think that the courts have had a great deal to do with increasing the power of such combinations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is absolutely no doubt about that; the Senator is quite correct. When the amendment to the Constitution was so interpreted as to clothe the artificial corporate person with the privileges and immunities of a flesh-and-blood person, that was the greatest economic tragedy that ever took place in this country. Let me give the Senator an example.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, does the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Some time ago, during the course of this colloquy, the Senator from Minnesota asked whether or not the Senator from Wyoming thought we would ever have an administration which would have the courage to enforce the Sherman Antitrust Act against large monopolies. I should like to say, of my own personal knowledge, that at this very time the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has cases which are prepared and ready to be submitted to grand juries, but it is unable to proceed with them and to carry on the trial work necessitated by other cases that are going to trial because of the lack of sufficient appropriations

from Congress. Congress must bear its share of the responsibility, at least so far as Mr. Arnold is concerned, that more comprehensive work has not been done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has called attention to that fact, because I think it is proper to mention here that Congress has given the present Department of Justice much larger appropriations than were ever given before, but the present administration has asked for more than any previous department ever asked. The President of the United States, in his message which initiated the Temporary National Economic Committee, asked for an appropriation, as I recall, of \$250,000 to step up the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Congress has given more than \$2,000,000 for that purpose, and every penny of it, and more, too, has been returned to the Treasury in the form of fines which have been paid by those who had been indicted and convicted under the law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will permit a further interruption, despite the record which he has just cited, if more money were today provided more cases could be brought to the attention of grand juries, and more important cases could be brought to trial than it is now possible to try under even the increased appropriations.

INDIVIDUAL HELPLESS BEFORE BIG BUSINESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is, of course, correct; and it is perfectly obvious that if we permit the continued concentration of big business, with which the individual cannot compete, for the individual is helpless before an organization which spans the country—unless we go a step further, we shall see government growing with the same degree that business grows. Then we will find it impossible to evade the final conflict between big business and big government, which is the very cause of the war in Europe.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make another remark for I have to leave the floor? I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator for the work he has been doing and for his remarks. Having watched the trend of the monopolistic practice of industry, and later copied as a national program for agriculture, toward the theory that to produce less and less would give us more and more, so far as industry is concerned, any system of production based upon that theory will destroy industry itself in the long run; but, before it does that, the large corporations—creatures of the Government—will have so much power that they will destroy the creator that created them—the Government itself. I wish again to express my appreciation to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right, and I was about to call his attention to one of the incidents which first aroused my interest in bringing about a study of this kind, which was before I became a Member of the Senate, as I recall, when Mussolini was preparing for the invasion of Ethiopia in the old days of appeasement. One day I picked up a copy of the New York Times, and there, on the front page, as I recall, I saw two stories, one of which came from Rome

and the other from London. The story from Rome was that a representative of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was in Rome in negotiation with the government of Mussolini to supply oil from the Rumanian fields for the conquest of Abyssinia. The other story, which was from London, was to the effect that a representative of the Standard Co. of New York—the Socony Vacuum Oil Co., I think it was called at that time—was negotiating with the representatives of Haile Selassie in London for permission to exploit the prospective oil lands in Abyssinia, thus indicating that two great corporations, one of them created by the State of New Jersey and the other created by the State of New York, were entering into contracts of such importance that they affected the activities of two governments that were then at war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Two democracies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was reminded of the fact that the Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall, without the consent of the Congress, enter into any agreement with any other State or with any foreign government. Of course, that prohibition written into the Constitution was intended to govern political activities; it was never the intention of the drafters of the Constitution to prevent or to restrain business activity; but the point is that the great modern corporations are so big and so overshadow the States that they endanger the Federal Government itself.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? Then I shall have to leave the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not want the Senator to leave until I answer his question.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator referred to two governments that were influenced. I assume the Senator referred to the two great democracies of France and Great Britain, which sanctioned and had secretly agreed to the taking of Ethiopia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I was referring to the Government of Italy and the Government of Abyssinia.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then four governments were involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; four governments were involved. That is quite correct.

Before the Senator leaves, I desire to call attention to the chart before me, because it deals so clearly with the point he has in mind. These black lines represent the assessed valuation, real and personal, of the taxable property of every State in the Union. The red lines represent the assets of the thirty \$1,000,000,000 corporations which were in existence in 1935. The 2 largest of these are the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. Senators will observe that each of these corporations has assets of about \$5,000,000,000, and that there are only 10 States in the Federal Union whose taxable property is greater than the assets of either of these corporations. On the other end of the scale, down at the bottom, we find 16 or 18 States, each of which has taxable property with an assessed valuation less than the assets of the smallest of

these billion-dollar corporations; and I could have included in the chart the \$500,000,000 corporations and have made this story much more effective.

There, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, is the picture which illustrates why it is necessary for Members of this body, for Governors and mayors, to come to Washington to ask for Government appropriations to try to stimulate local business.

Let me insert the following list in the RECORD to tell the story on the chart:

Total assessed valuation of States (1937) compared with total assets of 30 "billion-dollar" corporations (1935)

	Billion
New York	25.70
Pennsylvania	12.40
Ohio	8.80
California	7.80
Massachusetts	6.30
Michigan	6.20
New Jersey	6.20
Illinois	5.20
Indiana	5.10
Wisconsin	4.80
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.	4.23
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	3.99
Missouri	3.80
Texas	3.20
Iowa	3.20
Prudential Insurance Co.	3.12
Connecticut	2.90
Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	2.86
Kansas	2.70
Maryland	2.60
Kentucky	2.40
New York Central R. R. Co.	2.35
Chase National Bank	2.33
New York Life Insurance Co.	2.22
North Carolina	2.20
Nebraska	2.10
Minnesota	2.00
Standard Oil Co.	1.89
National City Bank of New York	1.88
Guaranty Trust Co.	1.84
Equitable Life Assurance Co.	1.82
United States Steel Corporation	1.82
District of Columbia	1.78
West Virginia	1.74
Allegheny Corporation	1.73
Southern Pacific Railroad Co.	1.67
General Motors Corporation	1.49
Tennessee	1.47
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.	1.38
Rhode Island	1.36
Louisiana	1.34
Bank of America	1.27
Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York	1.24
Oklahoma	1.22
Commonwealth & Southern Corporation	1.17
Great Northern Railway Co.	1.15
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., Chicago	1.14
Northern Pacific Railroad Co.	1.13
Associated Gas & Electric Co.	1.12
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	1.11
City Service Co.	1.11
Colorado	1.10
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Co.	1.09
Washington	1.08
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.	1.07
Union Pacific Railroad Co.	1.07
Georgia	1.06
North American Co.	1.04
South Dakota	1.03
Banker's Trust Co.	1.03
Alabama	.92
Oregon	.89
Maine	.68
Florida	.60

Total assessed valuation of States (1937) compared with total assets of 30 "billion-dollar" corporations (1935)—Continued

	Billion
New Hampshire	.58
Utah	.52
North Dakota	.49
Mississippi	.44
Arkansas	.43
Idaho	.38
Arizona	.36
South Carolina	.36
Montana	.33
Vermont	.32
Delaware	.31
New Mexico	.29
Wyoming	.28
Nevada	.18

Source: State figures from Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Corporation figures from hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, U. S. Senate, 75th Cong., 3d sess., on S. 10, pt. 4, *ibid.*, pp. 768-773.

My point is, Mr. President, that unless we find a way honestly and actively to stimulate free private enterprise in the local divisions, we cannot possibly avoid the continued growth of government.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—
Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The purpose of my interruption is a possible correction. The Senator has stated once or twice that the Sherman antitrust law does not provide for any criminal punishment. That is not my understanding of the law, although the provision for imprisonment is not very severe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The law does make its violation a misdemeanor.

Mr. NORRIS. It makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by a year's imprisonment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.
Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have the law right here in my hands.

Mr. NORRIS. I have it before me.
Mr. LANGER. It provides for 1 year's imprisonment and \$5,000 fine.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right; but it goes against the corporation, and not against the individual.

Mr. LANGER. No; it goes against the individual also.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood that. I interrupted only because I knew the Senator did not want to have any misstatement of facts in his remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Technically the Senator is quite right. I have been talking about the realistic picture. Of course, it is true that violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act is made a misdemeanor, and there is a punishment. The realistic fact, however, is that when defendants under indictment have appeared before juries and have been accused of some of these violations, which sometimes, it must be confessed, are rather vague, the juries have not found it desirable to invoke the criminal punishment, and the Department of Justice has been thrust back upon the civil penalty. I am very glad the Senator has called attention to that matter.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.
Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the jury would not decide whether the punishment

was to be fine or imprisonment. That would be the function of the court.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.
Mr. NORRIS. The jury would simply find the defendant guilty or not guilty; but is it accurate to say that the committee is of the opinion that if the courts, in administering the Sherman law, would send the guilty parties to jail instead of fining them, it would improve the situation?

NEW COMMON UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I think it would have had that effect; but my own personal opinion is that the time has come now to reorient ourselves and to bring about a comprehension in business and in Government and among the public generally that this sort of restrictive activity must come to an end. I feel that that comprehension can be brought about by a common understanding and agreement, because the manner in which the people of America and the business executives are now cooperating for purposes of defense leads me to believe that when the picture is made clear to them, we may expect them to cooperate to re-establish peace and prosperity likewise, because businessmen are coming more and more to realize that there can be no continued expansion of markets while almost one-third of the population are living on meager W. P. A. and other relief appropriations and are not able to buy the things that industry produces. Particularly now, when the leaders of great industries engaged in the manufacture of the products which we need for war are obtaining their appropriations out of the same deep deficit from which the W. P. A. fund was obtained, they must realize, as this report says, that business is on the same level as the reliefer who gets his check from W. P. A. There was a great deal of complaint about an unbalanced Budget when appropriations were being made for the farmer alone and for W. P. A. alone, but now that millions and billions of dollars are being appropriated for the purpose of expanding business and industry, there is no criticism of that kind.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate brought in upon the floor at the last session an appropriation of several million dollars to build a T. V. A. dam, the Cherokee Dam, in order that public money might be used to supply public power for the Aluminum Co. of America in defense—a very necessary and desirable thing. We have just brought in an appropriation, or are about to bring in an appropriation, to expand the Bonneville project in order to provide public power for the Reynolds Co., which is being set up as a competitor with the Aluminum Co. of America; but the Reynolds Co. could not possibly have entered that field if the R. F. C. had not loaned it some \$20,000,000 with which to do it. In other words, concentration has come to such a point that private capital cannot enter the field.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, of course I entirely agree with the Senator; but, with his permission, I should like to add that it seems to me the failure of the Sherman antitrust law to help out in this situation has come about to a very great

extent from the lack of activity of the courts themselves in not administering jail sentences when the defendants were found guilty.

I am thinking now of a case decided a year or two ago in Madison, Wis., in which the Government, I understand, spent somewhere in the neighborhood of \$250,000 or \$300,000 in getting together the evidence and getting ready for trial.

They had indicted many corporations and many individuals who were officers of corporations. The jury found some 40 of them guilty, and the judge sentenced the corporations which were found guilty each to pay a fine of \$5,000, and each individual to pay a fine of \$1,000. It was just a tap on the wrist. It was merely a license which they would be glad to pay in order to continue in their unholy business. The prosecution did its duty and the jury did its duty; it seems to me the judge fell down in his duty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is quite right.

Mr. President, I have spoken much longer than I had intended, but Senators have been so interested and have asked so many questions, and, of course, I have been glad to respond.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Referring again to the amazingly interesting chart which the Senator exhibited to the Senate, I inquire whether the Senator's committee finds that these enormous corporations, let us say typified by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and the American Telegraph & Telephone Co., are a hazard because of their size per se, and must be dealt with on that basis alone.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President, the committee has made no such statement, and the chairman of the committee has repeatedly said that a big country needs big business. The problem which is posed to the people of the United States, including the business leaders, is how we shall develop a formula by which the necessary public definition shall be made of the duties and responsibilities of these huge organizations. It is with that in mind that the committee has recommended that the country and the Congress give consideration to the principle of national charters for national organizations, because it seems to me, at least, perfectly absurd to believe that the States which have no jurisdiction in the field of interstate commerce can continue to create the agencies which carry it on.

By reference to the list to which I alluded at the beginning, when I showed the map, Senators will find that the State of Delaware, which has created most of these great organizations, is one of the many States receiving a very small portion of the allocations. The people of Delaware do not profit from the big business organizations which Delaware creates to do the business of the entire country.

I remember very well that when the Committee on the Judiciary was considering the bill which Senator Borah and I introduced for the licensing of corporations I pointed out that the Anaconda Copper Co., in Montana, had as one of

its subsidiaries the Butte Water Co., a company which supplied drinking water to the people of Butte, and the Butte Water Co. had a charter from the State of New Jersey to do business in Montana.

A NATIONAL RULE FOR NATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The committee recommend to the consideration of the Senate the desirability of establishing national rules to govern the nature of these corporations, because the unlimited charter which is granted by States like Delaware and New Jersey gives an opportunity to bring about this concentration. The idea is not mine, it is not the idea of the committee. It was suggested years ago. Practically every President since Cleveland who has given any attention to this problem has recommended Federal incorporation. President Taft sent a message to the Congress in 1911 recommending permissive Federal incorporation.

Senator John Sharp Williams stood upon this floor at the beginning of the Wilson administration and recommended the Federal licensing of corporations. The administration turned aside and did not adopt the idea. I have no hesitation in saying that if that idea had been adopted then we never would have had the concentration which is now draining the States of the Federal Union.

Mr. President, I am sorry to have trespassed so long upon the time of the Senate, but the matter is of such importance that I have felt it desirable to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the report of the committee and to its contents. I shall not burden the Senate longer now but I ask unanimous consent that I may append at the conclusion of my remarks the table of contents of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing were not present I might ask that the whole report be printed, but it is beyond the rules, so that I shall not ask that it be printed in the RECORD today. I urge the Members of the Senate to obtain and to read the report.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I was interested in a remark just made by the distinguished Senator, when he said that if some years ago we had had a Federal incorporation law requiring corporations such as the insurance companies to have Federal charters there would not now be the concentration of wealth about us. Will he not amplify that a little? Suppose these companies had Federal charters; would they not still have the wealth?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; the concentration has been the result of the fact that the holding company device has been permitted. The Senator knows that the historic point of view with respect to corporations was that they should be strictly limited in their activities. Under the common law, a corporation could not hold the stock of any other corporation. That was the law in the United States

until the growth of the national petroleum industry.

If I remember the facts correctly, an attorney general of Ohio was undertaking to enforce the common law against combinations and trusts, and a brilliant lawyer in the East conceived a way around, and persuaded the State of New Jersey to pass a new corporation chartering law which permitted the holding company; and it was there, in that alteration of our fundamental historic attitude toward the corporations, that this great concentration of economic power and wealth emerged to life.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate the Senator's explanation; and I am sorry I have not been present during all his presentation, but I had to be in the Supreme Court to move the admission of a gentleman from my State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Which is one of our important duties.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator outline the character of the Federal statute which he would put on the books?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not do that. As long ago as 1935 I introduced a composite bill, drafted upon the basis of the bill which had been introduced by Senator John Sharp Williams, and based upon the bill recommended by President William Howard Taft. It contained other provisions, intended to bring it more in harmony with present-day conditions. The bill was introduced for the purpose of promoting study of this question and of directing attention to it. My own personal feeling is that I do not regard myself as wise enough to know exactly what such a law should provide.

The principle should be adopted, and the least we should do is to pass a law prohibiting to interstate corporations those powers which we all know are against the public interest.

A GENERAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

I have my own personal recommendation in this report, which I hope Congress may see fit to adopt. This is my recommendation only, not the recommendation of the committee. The committee had no opportunity to study the subject, we had no evidence on it, and therefore I did not ask the committee to act on the matter, but I have included in the report my own personal recommendation that the Congress by law call a conference of business, of labor, of agriculture, and of consumers, so that we may all get together and find a program upon which we can agree, instead of concentrating our attention upon the things with respect to which we disagree, and develop the means by which we may increase production, so that the abundance which nature provides may be distributed among the great masses who need them. I shall be greatly indebted, and gratified, and complimented if the Senator from Wisconsin will read the report, and read the record of the Judiciary Committee, which I shall be very happy to place in his hands, because from my observation of the Senator's actions upon the floor of the Senate, I feel that I may confidently rely upon his support.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one other question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. I came into the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] asked the question in relation to the life insurance companies, and I heard the Senator's reply. Of course, it is not contended, as I understand, that the life insurance companies have gone beyond their authority in relation to investments? I take it there is no such contention. Is there?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, if a Federal charter were granted to a life insurance company, we would have the same condition which now exists, unless investment were limited to the field where the premiums were obtained. That has been talked of. The Senator undoubtedly knows that perhaps that is one way of curtailing a great deal of concentration of wealth. For instance, if an insurance company were to take out of the Midwestern States many millions of dollars a year in premiums, it would be compelled under such a Federal statute to reinvest that money in the Commonwealths from which it was taken. I was wondering if the Senator from Wyoming had any other suggestion as to how there could be a decentralization of that power in case Federal incorporation were required of life insurance companies.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. No; the chairman of the committee would not venture to make any suggestions along that line now. Let me say that the committee has not made any recommendations for Federal control or regulation of life insurance companies. Such suggestions were made, but the committee did not adopt them. The committee has made no recommendations, for example, with respect to the investment of insurance company funds in so-called equity securities. The committee has avoided recommendations of that kind largely, I think, because it shared my view that such recommendations would divert attention from the central fact, which is that there must be cooperation among all the people, and among all our statesmen, whether they are in politics or in business, to solve this problem.

The committee did not feel that by bringing in a recommendation with respect to insurance we should terrify, as we would, great numbers of policyholders with the belief that it was the intention by some subtle and back-roads route to take over the assets of the life-insurance companies. That charge was made. It was made when the insurance study first started. The chairman of the committee stood upon the floor of the Senate and denied that there was any such purpose at any time. The report of the committee carries out the statement which was made at the outset. But the report does show the tremendous concentration of assets.

Let me call to the attention of the Senator that on December 31, 1938, the total assets of these life-insurance companies which we studied, amounted to approximately \$27,650,000,000.

The magnitude of these figures—

I said in a statement which I released at that time—

will be better understood when it is realized that these assets amount to more than 85 percent of the total assets of all national banks; that they are far in excess of the total savings in all State and National commercial banks, and that they are greater by almost \$10,000,000,000 than the combined assets of all the savings banks and all the building and loan associations in the country.

Mr. WILEY. Of course that picture shows one side. When we take into consideration that the assets referred to represent the investment of 70,000,000 policyholders, then we have the other side, which shows that they have selected their own managers, and, unless their managers are at fault, it seems to me the real issue is whether anything should or should not be done to interfere with the 70,000,000 policyholders' rights.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Well, of course, nothing should be done to interfere with their rights, but insurance executives have told me that they, like other businessmen, now are finding it difficult to sell their insurance policies, because so large a proportion of the people of the country are not economically free. Freedom, I will say to the Senator, is not only political freedom, it is economic freedom. Economic freedom is the crux of this issue. It lies at the basis of the World War. It lies at the basis of our effort at national defense. Unless we have the good sense and the power to protect the economic freedom of the masses, I have no hesitation in saying that political freedom is in danger.

Mr. WILEY. I can agree with the Senator's conclusion.

EXHIBIT A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of transmittal.

Concentration of economic power—the challenge to democracy.

Message from the President of the United States.

I. The growing concentration of economic power.

II. Financial control over industry.

III. The decline of competition and its effects on employment.

IV. Competition does not mean exploitation.

V. The choice before us.

VI. A program.

General purposes and accomplishments.

The lower third.

Passing on the technological gains.

Personal statement of Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

Decentralization of industry.

The curtailment of production—the stimulating of competition.

Price discrimination and price-fixing laws.

General economic problems.

National standards for national corporations and economic organizations.

Personal statements of Messrs. Reece, Pike, and O'Connell.

Stimulating investment.

A program for business and economic research.

Foreign patent controls over American industry.

Maintaining a free market.

Resale price maintenance laws.

The basing-point system.

Interstate trade barriers.

Government purchasing.

Antitrust.

Enforcement of the antitrust laws. Legislative changes in antitrust.

1. Patent laws:

(a) Licensing of patents.

(b) Unrestricted licenses.

(c) Recording of transfers and agreements.

(d) Limitation on suits for infringement.

(e) Forfeiture of patent for violation.

(f) Single court of patent appeals.

(g) Limitation on period of patent monopoly.

2. Trade associations.

3. Corporate mergers.

4. Penalties.

5. Federal Trade Commission as a master in chancery.

Insurance:

Personal statement of Commissioner Sumner T. Pike, Securities and Exchange Commission.

Personal statement of Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

Personal statement of Senator O'Mahoney, chairman of T. N. E. C. recommending national economic conference.

Appendix A

Major defense contracts awarded by War and Navy Departments, June 1, 1940—February 28, 1941.

Appendix B

Major defense contracts awarded by War and Navy Departments, June 1, 1940—February 28, 1941.

Appendix C

Excerpt from address by Hon. Chester C. Davis, member, National Defense Advisory Commission, before the Southern Governors' Conference, in New Orleans, La., March 15, 1941.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will be received and printed as a document with illustrations.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON LEASE-LEND BILL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I report favorably Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on Senate bill 275, further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (S. 275) entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

PRINTING OF SPECIAL REPORTS ON DISEASES OF THE HORSE AND OF CATTLE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution No. 50, to provide for the

printing, with illustrations, and binding in cloth, of revised editions of the Special Reports on the Diseases of the Horse and the Diseases of Cattle. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) to provide for the printing, with illustrations, and binding in cloth, of revised editions of the Special Reports on the Diseases of the Horse and the Diseases of Cattle, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to have printed, with illustrations, and bound in cloth 20,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which 15,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 5,000 for the use of the Senate, and to carry out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$20,000.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed, with illustrations, and bound in cloth 35,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which 26,200 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 8,800 for the use of the Senate, and to carry out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$30,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if Senators will examine the agricultural appropriation bill at page 9 they will see that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has recommended that there be stricken from the bill an appropriation of \$50,000 for printing the documents referred to in the joint resolution. The joint resolution which has just been agreed to takes care of the matter in the correct way. The provision made in the House bill did not properly divide the publications between the Senate and the House. The customary rule is that one-fourth of the number shall go to the Senate and three-fourths to the House. The provision in the appropriation bill did not divide the money between the two publications correctly, because it costs more to print one than the other. The way it is handled in the joint resolution is the proper way.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF AMERICAN VESSELS FOR CONVOYS

Mr. TOBEY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire has a very important resolution to propose. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Ball	Brooks
Alken	Bankhead	Bulow
Andrews	Barbour	Burton
Austin	Barkley	Butler
Bailey	Bone	Byrd

Byrnes	Hughes	Shipstead
Capper	Kilgore	Smathers
Caraway	La Follette	Smith
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lee	Taft
Danaher	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Davis	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
George	Murdock	Tobey
Gerry	Murray	Truman
Gillette	Norris	Tunnell
Glass	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Green	Overton	Vandenberg
Guffey	Pepper	Van Nuys
Gurney	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Hatch	Reed	Wheeler
Hayden	Reynolds	White
Hill	Russell	Wiley
Holman	Sheppard	Willis

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in this historic Chamber an earnest and historic debate was recently held, culminating in the passage of the so-called lease-lend bill. That debate was conducted by Members of the Senate in a spirit of sincere and earnest presentation of the facts as they understood them. Many of those who spoke for the lease-lend bill in this Chamber during the several weeks of debate took the position that they were voting for the bill because in their conscientious judgment it was the best means to keep us out of participation in the World War.

In contradistinction, those of us who voted against the bill held that we should vote against it because we honestly believed that it was fraught with the grave danger of making us a participant in the World War. So, sincere men on each side voiced their contentions, the majority prevailed, and the bill became law upon being signed by the President. But from this statement of mine it becomes apparent that all of my colleagues on both sides of that question had in their hearts a hatred of war, a bitterness toward war, and a fear that this Nation might be drawn into the war, that they were opposed to our being drawn into war. As the debate progressed toward taking the final vote on the lease-lend bill, there was but one Senator in this Chamber who came out definitely in advocacy of the United States' forthwith going into war.

The gravest issue now before the country is the question of whether or not we will be involved as a participant in this World War. Dr. Gallup, who has been quoted from one end of the country to the other, recently took a poll, as a result of which he certified, I believe, that 83 percent of the American people were opposed to the United States becoming involved as a participant in the foreign war.

With that background I make bold to state that the gravest issue now before the country is the issue of whether we shall go into that war or not.

The factor which in my judgment is most certain to involve us in that war is the issue of whether or not we shall adopt the policy of using our ships and planes as convoys to merchant ships carrying materials to the aid of belligerents.

In section 3, subsection (e) of the lend-lease bill is the following language:

(e) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of the entry of any American vessel into a combat area in violation of section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

Section 3, subsection (d) contains this language:

(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of conveying vessels by naval vessels of the United States.

While the lend-lease bill was being considered before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, there appeared before us many noted witnesses, not the least of whom was the present Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox. He was asked by one of the Senators, "You stand very much opposed to the idea of conveying merchantmen across the Atlantic?" His answer was tersely and definitely, "Yes."

"You do look upon it as an act of war?" "Yes," he said.

He made a similar statement before the House committee, in answer to a question from Mrs. Bolton, a Representative from the State of Ohio. His statement there was that he was very much opposed to the idea of conveying merchantmen across the Atlantic, that he looked upon it as an act of war.

The President himself in a recent statement given to the press made a similar statement. I think his words were:

Convoing means shooting, and shooting means war.

In confirmation of that I read from a feature article by Frank L. Kluckhohn, appearing in the New York Times for January 22, 1941, in which he says:

Sources close to the White House said it is obvious that if the United States Navy convoys ships, either under an American or other flag, into a combat zone, shooting is pretty sure to result, and shooting comes awfully close to war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TOBEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In connection with the authorities which the Senator is quoting on the subject, I think he has overlooked probably the most persuasive authority of all, so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned. If he will permit me to do so, I should like to call attention to the unequivocal statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 6, 1941, as reported at page 1892 in the RECORD. The very distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. GEORGE), the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who piloted the lend-lease bill through the Senate, was speaking:

As plainly as I can, I have always stood against conveying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against conveying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, conveying would lead us into actual war.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. That is a powerful indictment of convoys.

Mr. President, if it is our conviction that convoys mean war—and we have the eminent authority just cited, as well as the President of the United States and Secretary Knox and many other notable men in this country—we of the Congress having assured the American people that we will keep out of the war, as has the President and as has the distinguished candidate who opposed him in the recent election, then it logically follows that we of the Congress should take every step possible to keep us out of the war as a participant, and should use the powers vested in us by the Constitution to prohibit the use of our ships as convoys.

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

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire mean that the simple act of convoying would be war, or does he mean that the adoption of such a policy would result in acts of war by the other side? Which does he mean?

Mr. TOBEY. I will take as my authority the President's own words, when he said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

Mr. CONNALLY. Evidently the Senator does not care to answer my question.

Mr. TOBEY. I have answered it; I have quoted an eminent authority, and no man should be more obedient to that authority than the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator did not answer my question. I wanted him to answer the question.

Mr. TOBEY. What is the question?

Mr. CONNALLY. The question is, Does the Senator contend that it would be an act of war if we should adopt the policy of convoying vessels; or does he mean that the adoption of such a policy would inevitably result in acts of war by an enemy?

Mr. TOBEY. I will answer the Senator by saying that, in my judgment, it is an act of war for a neutral country to convoy ships carrying supplies to a belligerent.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Texas, who propounded the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator asked a question and then turned his back. Does he desire to have an answer to his question, or not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had answered the question.

Mr. TOBEY. The answer to the Senator's question had been only half completed. More than that, with an abhorrence of war in my heart, an abhorrence which I hope is shared by the Senator from Texas, I think war will be a direct result of such convoying. As the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of our great committee, said, "If we convoy these ships, it means shooting, and that is tantamount to a declaration of war."

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

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not attempting to pass upon the wisdom of attempting

to convoy; but it seems to me that the mere act of convoying would not result in shooting unless the other side did some shooting. Regardless of what the President said, the shooting would depend entirely upon whether the other side wanted to shoot at the convoy, would it not?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me answer by propounding a question. Does the Senator agree with the President in his expressed utterance to which I have just referred?

Mr. BARKLEY. I may or may not. I am attempting to ascertain whether the Senator can elucidate what the President meant by mere shooting. The mere convoying of a ship does not mean shooting unless somebody shoots at the convoy. The convoy would not shoot at something just for the pleasure of having target practice.

Does the Senator mean or does he think the President meant that the mere convoying of a ship or of a group of ships across the ocean would automatically result in shooting?

Mr. TOBEY. No. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished majority leader, I will put it this way: It seems to me that what the President had in mind—and it is apparent to all of us—was that if we convoy a group of ships carrying supplies to a belligerent, obviously the enemy of that belligerent is going to take steps to put those convoys out of business; and when, as, and if that occurs, the shooting begins, and our ships are sunk, there will be a wave of wrathful indignation that will go over this country and that will arouse the people passionately and earnestly and perhaps necessarily to cry out and to say, "We will go to war and lick those fellows over there."

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I think that is a deduction that is not far-fetched; but when it comes to technical acts of war, the mere fact that one peaceful nation permits a belligerent nation to repair its vessels in its own shipyards would be regarded under what used to be international law as an act of war, the mere lending or leasing or furnishing of equipment for war use might be so regarded. But we recognize the fact that all international law has been thrown out, and, judging by recent events, we see that it is difficult now to draw a comparison between one act of war that occurred when international law had some force and another act of war. So what is the difference, except that one may be more provocative than the other? In legal effect, what is the difference between convoying a ship on the ocean in order to safeguard transport of facilities and supplies to another nation, and permitting that nation's warships to come into our harbors—as we have done by law—and permitting our Government to buy equipment and to furnish equipment and supplies to a belligerent nation, which we have done by law? What is the difference in international law between those two operations?

Mr. TOBEY. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the Senator answer my question first.

Mr. TOBEY. I will be glad to answer it if I understand the Senator correctly, but I will put it this way: The convoying of ships, in my judgment, is the greatest single factor which would bring us into war by its results. There are others that could do so, as I stated on the floor of the Senate when speaking against the lease-lend bill. I felt then, and still hold—I do not know whether the Senator recalls my statement at that time—that when we open our yards to repair belligerent ships, that might well involve us in war, as other things might, but standing out preeminently as a war danger, the danger of involving us in war, in my judgment, is the matter of convoys.

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

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from New Hampshire or of any other Senator, because we have not as yet completed the morning hour and we are anxious to secure action on a couple of appropriation bills, but I wish to ask the Senator a question. Of course, it all depends on whether the nation against whom the operations are directed regards them as a sufficient breach of its rights to make an attack upon us or to declare war. It would have a technical right to declare war on us for allowing a British war vessel to be repaired in the United States; there is no doubt of that, and, under the old conception of international law, they would have the right to declare war against us because we loaned money to one of the belligerents in opposition to that particular country or do any of the things that we can do under the lease-lend bill we have authorized to be done and which are going to be done now—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, morning business is closed. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I was trying to elucidate for the Senator from New Hampshire when the gavel rapped and disturbed the continuity of my thought was that if a nation sees fit to take advantage of the technical violation of what used to be international law to declare war against us or any other nation similarly situated, it could have done so already on the basis of what we have already done in aid of England or Greece or China. Is not that true?

Mr. TOBEY. I cannot say that is true. Everything is relative in this world, as Mr. Einstein says. Let me ask the Senator is he defending convoys?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; the Senator knows that I am not.

Mr. TOBEY. I am asking the Senator in good faith.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I am answering the Senator in good faith; if we have violated international law in such a way as could result in a declaration of war against us by Germany, we have already done that, and the convoying of ships would be only an incident.

Mr. TOBEY. As I said a moment ago, the matter of convoys is the preeminent danger, in my judgment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be so.

Mr. TOBEY. And the President felt so when he made the statement to which I referred, and Frank Knox also said so.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Germany wants an excuse to declare war against us, she has already had it, and we know from her history with other nations that if it was to her interest she would have done it without any excuse.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were an admiral of the German Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a rank supposition.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were Admiral Raeder.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator, in his effort to make me a German admiral, will not give me a name.

Mr. TOBEY. Suppose the Senator were Admiral X, and suppose he knew that the United States was set upon conveying; that we were going to use the convoys to protect the ships carrying supplies and munitions of war, and so forth, to one of the belligerents, it would be natural for him to order submarines to hunt in packs for the convoy, and when they got sight of the convoy to torpedo some of our ships, perhaps carrying 2,000 American boys, and he would then probably expect that the American people would rise up in their wrath and declare war against Germany, would he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. That might result.

Mr. TOBEY. It is perfectly natural that it should.

Mr. BARKLEY. Probably so.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel that the matter of convoys presents a greater danger of involving us in war than anything else?

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be; I am not disputing that; but what I am trying to ascertain is whether the Senator from New Hampshire thinks that Germany would wait if Germany saw it was to her interest to declare war, or whether Hitler would wait, for I do not really like to associate Hitler with Germany, because I have great respect for the German people; I have none for Hitler, and I hope the time will come when they will themselves recognize the difference between the German people and Hitler.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that in that respect I agree with him 100 percent, but let me say further with reference to our colloquy here that there is always a straw that breaks the camel's back, and that straw, in my judgment, will be when, as, and if we send convoys to transport goods to belligerent nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. That will depend upon events that we cannot now foresee.

Mr. TOBEY. Does not the Senator feel so, too?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will express my views upon that subject when the occasion has arisen.

Mr. TOBEY. In the words of the advertisement, "If eventually, why not now?"

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it is possible for anybody today, even including the wise Senator from New Hampshire, to foresee conditions that may exist.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, the Senator is a past master of sarcasm that has no

place in this Chamber, in my judgment. So I will proceed, if you please.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has my permission to proceed, but did the Senator suggest that I was a psychiatrist?

Mr. TOBEY. No; and neither did I say that the Senator need a psychiatrist.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am willing to acquit the Senator from New Hampshire of any such need.

Mr. TOBEY. I said the Senator indulged in sarcasm and possibly that that might be out of place at this time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. With reference to the point made by the Senator from Kentucky that these acts in contravention of what was once international law have given the opportunity to certain nations to declare war against us, and they have not done so, let me say that when we send our vessels into the belligerent zone it is going to make us declare war against them.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I am trying to avoid. It is not a question of their declaring war against us but it is the doing of those things which will force the American people to declare war against certain nations.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator; and the Congress and the President having assured the American people they were going to do all they could to keep out of war, then it logically follows that the Congress should take every step to keep this Nation out of war and use all the powers vested in it by the Constitution to prohibit the use of our ships of peace for war purposes. To that end I am introducing a joint resolution, which I will take the liberty of reading. It is as follows:

Joint resolution prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or conveying articles or materials to belligerent countries

Resolved, etc., That, except in time of war, hereafter no part of the land or naval forces of the United States, and no vessel documented, or aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States, shall be used, directly or indirectly, beyond the limits of the territorial waters of the United States and its Territories and possessions, to transport or deliver, or in connection with the transportation or delivery of, or for convoy purposes in connection with the transportation or delivery of, any articles or materials to or for the use of any foreign country with respect to which the President has issued a proclamation under section 1 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, or which is engaged in actual hostilities with one or more foreign countries, even though a state of war has not been declared or recognized in any such proclamation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention to the language he has used in the joint resolution, "that except in time of war." Of course, this is a

time of war. I assume that the Senator means a war in which we are associated?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is correct. I may advise him that I raised that question with the drafting agency of the Senate that helped draft the resolution this morning. They said it was the proper language to use, but I questioned it then, and will be very glad to change it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does not seem to me quite definite enough.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator, and I will change it.

Mr. President, since both groups in the Senate protest that they are opposed to our entry into the war, and since it is undisputed that conveying will definitely take us into the war, this joint resolution provides a means of affording Senators a vehicle to translate their public statements into specific legislation to keep the country from taking this fatal step into war. It presents the issue directly and without equivocation. The people have an opportunity to see whether the administration and the Members of the Senate mean business when they say that they are opposed to our country entering the war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or conveying articles or materials to belligerent countries, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 390) relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act 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;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican; and

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4124, making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—War Department—Military Activities—Quartermaster Corps", on page 5, line 14, after the word "Army", to strike out "\$9,000,000" and insert "\$12,400,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think a brief statement is necessary in the presentation of this bill. The amount it carries is extremely large. With a few exceptions it is limited, as its title indicates, to national-defense items. To me the amounts are somewhat staggering, although, as some Members of the Senate know, it is easier to stagger me with amounts than it is to stagger some other Members of the Senate.

The aggregate appropriations included in the bill as reported by the Senate committee for War Department military activities are \$1,994,011,100. For the Navy Department the appropriations are \$295,416,820. For the Federal Works Agency the appropriations are \$4,100,000. For the civil functions of the War Department the appropriations are \$2,303,000. In addition, there are recommended contract authorizations amounting to \$2,093,453,254. The aggregate, as I have it figured, approaches \$4,428,627,000. That figure is subject to some correction.

The items making up the bill are large. They are set forth in detail in the bill. The House committee had extensive hearings, which were printed. The Senate committee had hearings covering the major portions of the bill.

The War Department appropriations, in accordance with the statement of the War Department authorities, follow the necessary course of the authorization for the increased Army and increased defense appropriations. Amendments were submitted by the War Department and recommended by the committee amounting to \$312,000,000 for the purpose of bringing the Air Corps up to the projected 30,000-pilots-per-year program. That, as I say, involved \$312,000,000 in addition to the amount which came from the House.

It is very difficult for some of us—I speak only for myself in saying that—to comprehend these very large, and in fact, enormous figures. When the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Quartermaster General, and others come in and say to us that these amounts are needed for the military program, and they give us details, I have never been able to adjust myself to the figures on the one hand, nor, on the other hand, to set myself up as an authority to refute them. I think, in a measure, that is true of the committee which brings in this bill containing the recommendations of the War Department, supported by the estimates of the Budget Director, approved by the President, and supported by the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House and the action of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Are the figures available as to what the total national-defense appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, will be, including the pending measure?

Mr. ADAMS. I have a clipping as to the estimated and actual appropriations, purporting to be prepared by the Office of Production Management. It has been recently published; and it indicates that the total authorized and pending program, which would include this bill, is \$39,177,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that for this fiscal year and the next one?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir. That is the amount of the additional fiscal-year appropriations and the 1942 bills now before Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Approximately \$40,000,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We might perhaps provide the taxpayer with a convoy, instead of somebody else, pretty soon. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. May I ask the Senator what would be convoyed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will leave that to the Senator's imagination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the item "Clothing and equipage, Army," on page 5, line 19, after the word "equipment", to strike out "\$70,048,000" and insert "\$79,418,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 23, after the numerals "1941", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

"Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, after the word "transportation", to strike out "\$137,630,000" and insert "\$150,852,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 18, after the word "posts", to strike out "\$9,500,000" and insert "including the acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein and temporary use thereof, without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 1136, and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 255; 31 U. S. C. 529), and the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles, \$193,821,000"; in line 25, after the word "until", to strike out "expended" and insert "June 30, 1942"; and on page 7, line 13, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$1,249,506,059" and insert "\$1,433,827,059."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 15, to insert:

Barracks and quarters, Army: For barracks and quarters, \$2,366,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps", on page 7, after the word "Army", to strike out "\$46,714,000" and insert "\$49,807,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Air Corps", on page 8, line 2, after the word "Army", to strike out "\$888,236,000" and insert "\$982,236,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department", on page 8, line 10, after the word "Department", to insert "Army, \$2,876,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942, and, in addition,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers", on page 8, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$18,944,000" and insert "\$19,074,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 16, after the word "with", to insert a comma and "and also including the acquisition of leasehold and other interests in land, and temporary use thereof"; in line 24, after the word "elsewhere"; to strike out "\$98,253,000" and insert "\$94,450,000"; and in line 25, after the word "until", to strike out "expended" and insert "June 30, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department", on page 10, line 24, after the word "Army", to strike out "\$82,039,000" and insert "\$82,132,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Navy Department—Bureau of Yards and Docks", on page 14, line 6, after the word "officer", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500"; in line 7, after the word "officer", to strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$5,000"; and in line 8, after the word "man", to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Alterations to naval vessels", on page 14, line 12, after the word "until",

to strike out "expended" and insert "June 30, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to add a word here. It will be found that the bill as it came from the House in a number of instances provided that the appropriations should be made available until expended, and the Senate committee imposed a narrower limitation, so as to come within what we feel sure is the constitutional limitation on appropriations for the Army.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert:

**TITLE III—CIVIL NATIONAL DEFENSE
ACTIVITIES**

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Federal Works Agency

Public Buildings Administration

Construction of temporary office buildings: For the construction of temporary office buildings for general use on Government-owned land in or near the District of Columbia, including the construction of necessary heating plant, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$4,100,000: *Provided*, That the contract or contracts for such construction may be entered into without advertising.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 2, to insert:

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, WAR DEPARTMENT

Corps of Engineers

Rivers and Harbors

For an additional amount for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of projects authorized by the act entitled "An act authorizing the improvement of certain rivers and harbors in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 17, 1940 (Public Act No. 868, 76th Cong.), including the objects and under the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1941, to be available until June 30, 1942, \$663,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 15, to insert:

Flood Control

Local protection works at East Hartford, Conn.: For the completion of local protection works at East Hartford, Conn., as authorized by Public, No. 859, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 15, 1940, \$1,640,000, to remain available until June 30, 1942.

This title may be cited as the "Civil Activities National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a technical amendment from the committee, on page 7, line 6.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Colorado refer to the amendment on page 16 relating to

the Corps of Engineers, and tell me the purpose of the additional authorization for rivers and harbors?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the clerk state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 6, after the word "fund", it is proposed to insert "and shall remain available until June 30, 1942."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, whenever the Chair can find an opportunity for me to solicit an answer to my question, I should appreciate the courtesy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado had submitted an amendment on an entirely different proposition.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I gather that the inquiry is as to the portion of the text on page 16, beginning at line 6?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. That matter was presented to the committee by both the Senators from Maine, supplemented by one who I would say is a very shrewd, persuasive Yankee shipbuilder from Maine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This has not anything to do with Passamaquoddy, has it?

Mr. ADAMS. If it does, it was very carefully concealed from the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator from Michigan is quite satisfied.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am never entirely satisfied. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, on page 4, line 14, I wish to substitute for the date "September 8, 1939," the date "November 15, 1940."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, referring again to the provision which was stricken out at the bottom of page 5, lines 23 and 24 and 25, and continuing on page 6, the first 7 lines, I should like to bring up again for consideration for just a moment the same subject which was considered rather thoroughly the other day when the Navy bill was before the Senate.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest that the amendment was acted on rather hurriedly, and it might be better if the action were reconsidered. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 5, line 23, running to the end of the paragraph, was agreed to, be reconsidered. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in speaking briefly in defense of American agriculture today, I wish to start by quoting a few words from the 1940 Report of the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the heading, "Agriculture and the national defense," on page 8 of the report, appears the following:

Every loyal American recognizes the need to strengthen our defenses. Present world conditions threaten our safety and warn us to arm ourselves quickly and well not only with physical weapons but with the strength of national unity and morale. Farm people want to help. Preparation for defense is a task not merely for the Nation as a whole, with Congress and the Executive mainly responsible; it is a task for the country's different occupational groups, most of which have special responsibilities in the matter as well as responsibilities common to them all. Agriculture, industry, labor, finance, and trade should severally analyze their relationship to the task. Then as a joint contribution toward national defense, they should compare and coordinate their views. Agriculture, particularly, should clarify and express its viewpoint, since the existing world situation affects it gravely. Agriculture has deeper roots in the world economy than any other large branch of our business life, and consequently a bigger immediate stake in the bearing of our defense program on our foreign relationships.

That, Mr. President, I think is a very fair statement of the situation which faces us today; and, in order that the contribution made by each group of our citizenry shall be fair and proper, I ask the inclusion in the pending bill of the provision that was deleted by the committee. I believe agriculture should make its fair contribution to the defense program, along with industry, labor, finance, and trade. I do not believe that agriculture, or any other division of our people, should be asked to make more than their fair share of the contribution. On page 13 of the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1940, under the general heading, "Agriculture and the national defense," the Secretary says, "We shall not bring South America's surpluses here."

That part of the annual report for 1940 must have been written rather early in the year, for now we are asked to give official sanction to the purchase of foreign surpluses which compete directly with our own burdensome surpluses. I refer not only to the grain and meat produced in my section of the Nation; I include every branch of agriculture, for no part of it can be free from the influence of imports from competitive areas if the protective clause is not replaced in the bill before us. As it now stands, the buying agencies of the Army can buy, where they will, not only meats but wool, cotton, tobacco, fruit, and dairy products. In fact, there is no limit placed on them at all. I insist it is unfair to ask the farmers of America to make this extreme sacrifice to the defense program when other sections of our citizenry are not asked to make equal sacrifice.

Does the Senate want to throw our labor market open to the world? Industry, finance, labor, and trade, representing the nonagricultural groups of our Nation, are not placed in such a compromising position. No, Mr. President; they

are on a cost-plus basis. Ever since the last Great War agriculture has been in a precarious position. It has not been even on a cost-of-production basis, to say nothing of cost-plus. Indications are that the farmers' cost of production will advance sharply. The farmers' sons are being taken to war—or at least are taken from the farm. The farmer will not be able to replace them at the wages his son gets in the Army. He can expect to pay even higher prices for farm machinery as a result of labor disturbances in factories making farm equipment. I do not think it is just that the American farmer be asked to take more than his proportionate share of the sacrifice for defense.

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

If there is any ground whatsoever to support the purchase and importation of competitive foreign farm products, food, or clothing it must be based on the good neighbor policy of the Government rather than on any economic basis. We cannot improve our own economic condition by hiring ourselves not to produce, and at the same time by hiring foreigners to produce for us. The idea of reciprocal trade agreements is just wonderful, and the agreements are a success when they increase our trade without admitting commodities which we already produce in excess of requirements. I commend any administration that fosters such agreements. The trouble is that some agreements have been made, such as the one under consideration now, by which we simply add to an already burdensome surplus of our own. We should increase in every way possible our imports of such items as rubber, tea, cocoa, camphor, tropical hardwoods and many other such items which we do not produce at home; but I see no reason for further pauperizing our farmers by importing grains, meats, dairy products, cotton, and other items which we already produce abundantly at home. We have already appropriated approximately \$2,000,000,000 to assist our sister republics to the south in the development of their industries.

In reading the report of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1940 I note that many of our bureaus have sent delegations to South America to assist the South American countries in their problems. On page 25 of the report, under the heading of Inter-American Surplus Disposal, I read of the dire need that exists in South America for its own products, as follows:

Wheat and corn lie unsalable or rot in Argentina, while citizens in Colombia or Mexico lack proper food. In the Caribbean islands and on adjacent coasts some of the densest populations in the world exist at a near-starvation level. Children suffer from lack of adequate carbohydrates, while Cuba has great surplus supplies of sugar. Brazil stores and destroys coffee, while a cup of coffee would be a rare treat to workers in many other countries.

Continuing the quotation from the top of page 26 of the 1940 report of our Department of Agriculture:

Surplus beef is available from the Argentine at the same time that workers in many other South American countries and throughout Central America lack adequate proteins in their diet.

From the above quotations taken from a recent Government publication, I am sure it would be far more practical to assist our sister republics in the disposal of their surpluses among themselves than to bring the surpluses here into our own country, where they will break down the market of our farmer. Corn is being used as fuel in the Argentine. They have a tremendous surplus. They feed some of it to their cattle and swine, and the Government price on corn sold back to the feeder is 3 cents per bushel. Our commercial price is about 60 cents, and just a few days ago this body passed legislation to make effective a higher price. How can our farmer meet such competition? After furnishing his sons for service in the Army or the Navy, paying taxes to support the war, do you think, Mr. President, it is unreasonable that he should ask to be protected against the destruction of his domestic market?

THE CORN LOAN

I have just quoted the Secretary of Agriculture in his 1940 report, in which he mentioned the big surplus of corn that was rotting in Argentina while people in neighboring countries were without proper food. I agree with him 100 percent in the inference that such surpluses should be put to use as food for needy persons. But why go to South America to get such an example? Go with me to the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and I will show you farmers by the hundred, yes, by the thousands, who themselves are on short rations and have little or no feed for the livestock essential to the continuance of their farming operations. These poor people have for nearly a year been asking for a loan of some of the millions of bushels of corn locked up in the Ever Normal Granary so they may continue on their farms. Mind you, they ask for a loan, not a gift. Their proposal is to return bushel for bushel of corn. They borrow bushels and repay bushels. If loaned to them now, it can be returned later as a part of the Ever Normal Granary, in the meantime saving the Government storage charges that would almost cover the original cost of the grain. It seems somewhat strange that we must go to South America to learn how to dispose of a surplus.

LOSS OF EUROPEAN MARKETS

Some would infer that we are not now trading with South American Republics, but quite the contrary is true. Already there is a large increase in imports from the Southern Republics, both of competitive and noncompetitive articles. The trouble arises mostly because of the loss of the European outlet. That affects our people as directly as it does those of the southern hemisphere. I cannot see why we are under any obligation to take up the slack for our good neighbors when we are already in the same difficulty ourselves. We lost our sales to Europe. Last week, I received a letter from the manager of one of the largest cooperative creameries of the country, reading in part as follows:

It does not seem right that the farmers of the Middle West should be sacrificed on the altar of South American friendship. While in New York, I noticed large quantities of

butter from Argentina, which, naturally, does not help the butter market of our dairy farmers.

Newspapers of recent date indicate that unloading docks in Boston, New York, New Orleans, and elsewhere have been kept busy the past month unloading good neighbor produce, for instance, 70,000 cases of tomatoes from Cuba, and producers are wondering how to dispose of grapefruit and pineapples which formerly went to London. Argentina agrees to hold her shipment of pears to 300,000 boxes; Chilean nectarines, honeydews, plums, and grapes are selling fast and cheap in our eastern seaports; Brazil is asking to swap 800,000 cases of off-season oranges for United States apples.

On page 42 of the report of the administrative official in charge of surplus removal and marketing-agreement programs, I note that we had to buy and distribute as relief during the past season 850,000 boxes of Florida oranges. This report of the official in charge of the programs to the Secretary of Agriculture makes interesting reading. More than 30 different commodities were purchased and distributed as relief to assist in the disposal of burdensome surpluses. Practically every State in the Union produces some of these articles of food or clothing.

If it is necessary as a part of our good-neighbor policy or for defense purposes to take possession of the surpluses of South America, may I suggest that I think we should go the full way of being the good neighbor. Buy them and distribute them in South America. Why bring them to our shores to complicate further the problems of American agriculture? I cannot think it is reasonable to ask farmers of the United States to compete with imports from other nations having low-wage living standards any more than it is to ask American labor to meet competition of low-wage countries like Japan. Agriculture is our basic industry, and ultimately the strength of the Nation will be measured by the strength of agriculture.

OUR FARM MARKET WILL BE BEST IN POST-WAR ERA

Mr. President, the Government is already concerned about the post-war period and the problems that must then be met. Commissions have been appointed to study and prepare recommendations as to the way in which we will return from the defense program to one of normalcy. One thing is certain; the farm market of the United States will be the best market by far that is available to labor, industry, finance, or trade. To quote an outstanding authority speaking in Chicago last week:

A foremost danger is that internationalist thinking will tend to center attention on the fifth-rate markets in other continents, to the neglect of the world's one first-rate market here in North America.

I repeat, the one real hope in the post-armorament period will be the American farm market. Let us be fair with it now. Let us not give the farmer more than his share of the load.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to direct an inquiry to the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] in reference to the bill now under

consideration. I respectfully invite his attention to page 15, under title III. I am not asking for reconsideration of this section. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question. The language reads:

Construction of temporary office buildings: For the construction of temporary office buildings for general use on Government-owned land in or near the District of Columbia, including the construction of necessary heating plant, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$4,100,000: *Provided*, That the contract or contracts for such construction may be entered into without advertising.

I wish to ask the Senator if he can advise us whether the buildings are to be constructed within the District of Columbia or on property owned by the Federal Government outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. ADAMS. I cannot advise the Senator on that question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There is no statement about it in the report. I have looked at the report.

Mr. ADAMS. I believe the language of the bill is "in or near the District of Columbia." So it might be possible to build them either within or without the District of Columbia.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation in that connection. From time to time I have heard that the Government of the United States will have occasion to construct additional edifices outside the District of Columbia, attributable to the fact that property is not available within the District.

I have traveled extensively over the District of Columbia, and I know of many available sites where we could find room for the construction of all the buildings which might be deemed necessary for occupancy by Government employees for the next quarter of a century. Among the areas of considerable acreage there is the area in the immediate neighborhood of the War College, on the river. Another area which has been called to my attention is the Soldiers' Home grounds, within the District of Columbia—as a matter of fact, almost in the center of the metropolis.

If we contemplate the construction of new buildings, I think they ought to be constructed in the District of Columbia. It might be well to give consideration to the removal of the Soldiers' Home to Government-owned land in the immediate proximity of the District of Columbia. I make that observation because I am interested in seeing public buildings erected within the District of Columbia rather than in the State of Virginia or in the adjoining State of Maryland.

I thank the Senator very much.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very glad to yield to a friend of the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. In that connection, I think the Senator might very well point out that in the creation of the Federal city, the District of Columbia, Congress retained exclusive legislative authority over the District. The very purpose of

having the District of Columbia was to have a territory wherein all public buildings would be erected and over which the Congress of the United States would exercise exclusive jurisdiction, rather than to have them in outlying areas where State sovereignties would exercise jurisdiction over them. When they are constructed outside the District of Columbia we defeat the purpose of the provision in the Constitution, which sets aside the Federal city and give the Congress exclusive jurisdiction over it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the able Senator for his contribution in reference to this particular subject. In other words, the construction of Federal buildings outside the District creates what might be called a distribution of authority, and that is one thing we desire to avoid.

I am prompted to make this observation by reason of the fact that I now see in the Chamber the very able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We have but recently constructed in Washington one of the finest airports in the world, if not the finest. It is not an airport merely for Washington. It is not what would be properly called a municipal airport. In every sense of the word it is a national airport. I am informed that a large portion of the property constituting the grounds upon which the structures now nearing completion are located lies in the State of Virginia. I hope that action may be taken through legislation by the National Congress to incorporate into the District of Columbia that portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia which embraces the national airport, because there we find a diversification of authority, and I am rather inclined to believe that as a result of the present situation eventually we shall run into some difficulties, perhaps of a legal nature, which, if they do not prove embarrassing, will certainly prove troublesome. I hope that, if and when such legislation is introduced to incorporate into the District of Columbia a very small part of the historic Commonwealth of Virginia, so ably represented by its fine Senators, they will show their usual generosity and their splendid grace by immediately assenting without opposition.

Having observed the smile presently sweeping over the handsome face of the distinguished junior Senator, I readily recognize that he is thoroughly and properly in accord with the suggestions I have been pleased to make for the benefit of the Government of the United States, without being to the detriment of the second most historic State in the Union.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I have not followed the labors of the District of Columbia Committee, presided over by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator is very unfortunate.

Mr. ADAMS. I should like to acquire a bit of information. Am I correct in my understanding, first, that if a Federal building is erected outside the District of Columbia, the Government pays no taxes on it; but if it is built within the District,

under the formula the practical effect is that the Government has to pay taxes on it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If a Federal structure should be erected within the confines of the District of Columbia, naturally the 800,000 citizens and taxpayers of the District of Columbia would certainly be warranted in insisting that the Federal Government contribute its portion in lieu of taxes.

Mr. ADAMS. How about the citizens of Fairfax County?

Mr. REYNOLDS. They would likewise be entitled to consideration.

Mr. ADAMS. They could not legally tax Government property.

Mr. REYNOLDS. They would be privileged to make a request for taxes upon such structures, although, according to my understanding, Federal property is not taxable in the States.

Mr. ADAMS. I am not making any comment on the situation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Naturally, the people of the District of Columbia would welcome the erection of such structures here, because it would add more revenue to the District of Columbia; and according to the report of the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who has handled that matter with great credit to himself and satisfaction to the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia is really in need of increased revenue, particularly at this time, on account of the great numbers of people flocking here.

Mr. OVERTON. There is no question about that, Mr. President.

Will the Senator further yield, so that I may correct an impression?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to remove the misapprehension under which, strange to say, the Senator from Colorado is laboring. I say "strange to say" because he is usually so very accurate in his observations and conclusions.

The United States Government pays no taxes on its property in the District of Columbia; and if a building were erected by the Federal Government on land owned by the United States the Federal Government would pay no taxes upon such property. Under the terms of the bill which the Senate unanimously passed the other day, proposing a formula in order to fix the amount of the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia, no taxes whatsoever would be imposed on any building presently owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia or which may hereafter be constructed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I was not making any statement. I was merely asking for information. Is not this the situation: If the United States should buy a piece of property now in private ownership in the District of Columbia, and should erect a building on it, under the formula of the Senator from Louisiana the Government would be required to make an additional contribution to the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes?

Mr. OVERTON. On the value of the building?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not know what the basis is, but the Senator has a formula. Whenever the Government increases its

ownership of property it increases its payment to the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. The Federal contribution is based upon the landed area.

Mr. ADAMS. I was making an inquiry, and not making an observation or statement.

Mr. OVERTON. It is based entirely on landed area, and not on either the value of the land or the value of the improvements.

Mr. ADAMS. But every additional acre of ground the Federal Government buys in the District of Columbia involves additional payment on the part of the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That would be in lieu of taxes. In other words, we do not exact any tribute from the District of Columbia to the Federal Government in the form of taxes; but it is, it might be said frankly, in lieu of taxes.

Mr. OVERTON. In one sense that is true; but there are so many reasons why the Federal Government should make payment to the District of Columbia that I do not want to interrupt the debate at this point in order to state them. I have had occasion heretofore to indicate those reasons, and they are numerous. One of them is the amount of land owned in the District of Columbia by the Federal Government.

INVOLVEMENT IN WAR—RESOLUTION OF WOMEN OF GREENSBORO, N. C.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I say to all Members of the Senate that I am gratified indeed to learn that the people of my State of North Carolina—for the first time, I might add—to any great extent have become aware of the fact that the situation in the United States is quite critical. I may add that the people of North Carolina, and particularly the women of North Carolina, have but recently been aroused to the fact that this country may shortly find itself physically at war.

I recall that during the interesting discussion on the lease-lend bill I had many communications in reference to that bill from my constituents. Perhaps the great majority of those who spoke out, and certainly 99 percent of all the newspapers in my State, most emphatically favored the passage of that bill; and as a result thereof those who spoke and those who wrote led the others to believe that there was no danger of our becoming involved; that they need not be worried, and that it was all right for H. R. 1776 to pass. Of course, naturally I am thankful to be able to say—because I opposed with all my vigor that bill—that since the passage of the bill it has become apparent that innumerable people in North Carolina, particularly groups of women, are organized against our active participation, not in war—because we are already in war—but our actual physical participation at war.

I have before me a letter dated Greensboro, N. C., March 27, 1941, reading as follows:

GREENSBORO, N. C., March 27, 1941.

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: Enclosed you will find a photostatic copy of a set of resolutions drawn and signed by 527 women voters,

women taxpayers of Greensboro and Guilford County, N. C.

As we see our country drawn step by step nearer to active participation in the European war, we wish to reaffirm our faith in the solemn promises made by both major parties last November not to send our sons to fight in foreign wars.

We think there can be no national unity unless this policy is adhered to. Eighty percent of our citizens expressed this sentiment in a recent Gallup poll.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. CARL I. CARLSON.

Mrs. N. S. CALHOUN.

Mrs. ROBERT R. KING, Jr.

Mrs. WM. Y. PREYER.

I happen to know personally two of these ladies, particularly Mrs. King, whose husband was mayor of Greensboro for some time, and who is one of the most prominent lawyers there.

Mr. President, I desire to read into the Record the resolution adopted by these ladies of our Commonwealth who are interested in keeping our country out of war. The first clause of the resolution reads:

We are, first of all, Americans and we want to look at this whole situation calmly and without hysteria.

I pause to comment upon that. That one statement should provide inspiration for all Americans. When they say, "We are, first of all, Americans," by that they mean that their profound interest and first interest is the interest of their country, the United States of America.

Then they go on to say, "And we want to look at this whole situation calmly and without hysteria."

Mr. President, we all want to look at it calmly and without hysteria; but with the vast amount of propaganda that today is sweeping the country more fiercely, more viciously than ever before, it is an extremely difficult thing to do—at least it is for me. I cannot go to a single motion-picture theater, where occasionally I like to find myself for information and relaxation, without being disturbed—not somewhat, but greatly—by the projection upon the screen of pictures filled with propaganda. Those of us who attend the motion-picture theaters seek enjoyment and recreation; but we find that we are forced to see such propaganda because so much of it is projected upon the screens of the theaters of the country. If we are pulled into this war, I desire to state without hesitation that a great many of the producers of motion pictures in this country may certainly lay the fault at their own doors.

There is a theater here which I attend occasionally—a theater called the Trans-Lux, which has been turned into a house of propaganda and the pictures which are shown there elicit from the audience reactions which are calculated to be productive of hysteria. As a matter of fact, I almost wish that in this country, since we are declared legally to be a neutral Nation, it could be made unlawful to express one's opinion either favorably or unfavorably regarding a belligerent nation by way of applause when in attendance at a motion picture. I dare say that every one of the 20 republics south of the Rio Grande is

actually and really more neutral than is the United States of America, regardless of the fact that all of us know that in every one of those countries a vast amount of propaganda and of subversive activities is carried on by the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese, who have millions of nationals in the respective 20 republics south of the Rio Grande.

For instance, in every motion-picture theater in Brazil one sees projected on the screen a statement, issued at the orders of the dictator of Brazil himself, to the effect that those in the audience are not to evidence their likes or dislikes for any nation or nations, reminding them of the fact that Brazil is neutral.

In that connection, for those who are interested in this all-important matter, it might be interesting to note that recently an edict has been issued by the dictator of Brazil to the effect that no publication—not a single newspaper, magazine, or periodical—will be permitted to be printed, published, and distributed unless it is printed in the Brazilian language, which of course, as we all know, is the Portuguese language, spoken by the 50,000,000 inhabitants of that country.

So I say that it is very difficult in this country today for the American people to give sound consideration to this all-important subject when they have drilled into their ears and forced upon their eyes from morning until night at every place where they may find themselves propaganda, propaganda, propaganda, which, unfortunately, though permitted in this country, is not countenanced in any other country upon the face of the earth.

I am very happy to observe by the report of the Dies committee, headed by that very able man, the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, that efforts have been successful to bring about the destruction of millions of pounds—actually millions of pounds—of propaganda that has been coming into this country by way of an arrangement that the Postal Service of the Nation has with other countries. I would that it were possible for us to stop propaganda, but the difficulty about it is that it is so astutely prepared that it is difficult, on the face of it, for one to ascertain whether or not it is propaganda. But, anyway, we are being swept forward, I believe into the cesspools of Europe and toward the abyss of death by propaganda. So I say to these ladies—these patriotic American citizens, mothers of North Carolina, 527 of whom have signed this resolution—that, although we appreciate what they have to say about considering the situation calmly, it is going to be a most difficult thing, in view of the propaganda that has been spread, and is spreading and will continue to spread, over this country.

The second clause of the resolution reads:

We want to keep our boys from fighting in foreign wars.

That is not at all surprising. I do not believe that American mothers desire to give their sons to fight and to hazard death for any nation upon the face of the earth except their own Nation—the United States of America.

Clause 3 continues:

We are firm in the belief that an America which keeps at peace can, in the long run, best rid the world of war and promote a just and lasting peace.

Clause 3 reads:

We heartily endorse our Government's preparedness for defense.

We all do.

Clause 4 reads:

We heartily approve of aid to Britain, but we do not want to see our own defenses weakened thereby.

We all, I am sure, share the same thought.

The fifth clause of the resolution reads:

We think the time has come for the United States to take the lead in formulating her ideals of what would constitute a just and lasting peace. We urge our legislators to consider this matter immediately.

I have great respect for these patriotic ladies of Greensboro, and I thank them for that suggestion. I apologize for saying to them now that we cannot give immediate consideration to the matter of peace, for the reason that we have said to the world we shall go "all out," that we will fight to the bitter end, until there has been a restoration of the rights of nations in continental eastern Europe. So we shall say to these ladies of Greensboro, whose petition and resolution we appreciate, that we cannot give consideration to peace, according to what we have said, until France shall have been restored to her feet, until Belgium and Holland and Luxembourg likewise shall have been restored; until Austria and Czechoslovakia, and, as a matter of fact, until Rumania and Bulgaria and perhaps Yugoslavia shall have been returned to the millions of people of those distressed and unfortunate countries. I might add there cannot be consideration of peace, in view of the words which we have held out to the world, until there shall have been restored to one-half the people of Poland their territory taken by the aggressor, Hitler. There cannot be, according to the things that have been said, any consideration of peace until Stalin himself shall have been taken to task and the people of the half of Poland which he controls shall have been returned to freedom; until there shall have been returned to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, their Governments; likewise until there shall have been returned to Finland the portion of her territory of which she was despoiled; and, finally, we shall have to say that Stalin must return Bessarabia to the people of Rumania after Hitler has been eliminated from the body of Rumania itself. So, as to that, we have to say "wait until Great Britain shall have reconquered the world and likewise has kicked Stalin loose from the two-thirds of China which is now under communistic rule.

The sixth clause of the resolution reads:

Resolved, That we pray and meditate each day for higher spiritual guidance to direct us in a just and lasting peace.

We all hope that peace will come and that it may be a just and lasting peace, but we who have given some attention to

the pages of history know that always there will be wars upon wars, and they will come as the centuries follow.

This resolution, Mr. President, is signed by some 527 ladies of Greensboro, N. C. I shall not ask that the names be printed in the RECORD, but I shall hand the resolution to the clerk and retain the names in my files.

Mr. President, the people of North Carolina have become extremely interested in their country. Before I turn to that point, however, they make mention of provisions in the Democratic and Republican platforms. I have marked a portion of page 384 of the booklet entitled "Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1932 to 1940," and I respectfully invite attention to that page. Instead of reading it, I merely ask that the portion of the Democratic platform pertaining to our foreign policy and not sending troops abroad to participate in anybody else's wars may be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this juncture, and that from page 399 an extract from the Republican platform relative to the particular subject may likewise be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Democratic platform, 1941]

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

[From the Republican platform, 1941]

The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the people of North Carolina have become distressed and anxious about this matter within the past few days because they have read, according to communications I have had in the form of letters, that a British ship or British ships were on the way to Norfolk, Va., to be repaired. That matter was discussed when we had under consideration the lend-lease bill. The people are disturbed that there might be some danger in American waters if British ships are to be or are now being repaired in American harbors. They have become more disturbed since having read that we have recently seized a number of ships which belong to foreign nations and which are in our harbors, particularly since protests are to be made by foreign governments whose property was or is about to be confiscated, but, according to the press, it was seized only for the purpose of making preservation of the ships, themselves, and the machinery thereof.

They have become more thoroughly distressed on account of all they have heard recently pertaining to the subject

of convoying ships. The citizens of North Carolina who have written me say that they are afraid if we undertake the convoying of ships some of our ships will be sunk, some of our men will be drowned, some of their blood will be spilled, and, as a result of the propaganda that is sweeping the country and the hysteria we find everywhere, that our country will be immediately swept into war. They naturally have a perfect right and every reason to be exercised about the matter, because I likewise am of the opinion that if, unfortunately, we should undertake the convoying of ships it would lead to physical combat. If we convoy those ships, and if, in protecting the merchant marine by our battleships, our cruisers, our destroyers, and our planes, we should shoot down some German bombers or should sink some German submarines or battleships or cruisers or destroyers, German blood would be spilled, and the probabilities are that Germany would declare war upon the United States. If that should happen it would not be necessary for the United States to declare war upon Germany, because our acts would have been perhaps the necessary procedure for bringing about a state of war under H. R. 1776.

Mr. President, I hope nothing of that sort will take place. I have read many articles recently in regard to convoying ships; and I was told today by some of my colleagues of a very interesting discussion which took place over the air waves of America last night in one of the debates at the Willard Hotel over a forum that is conducted there from week to week.

I see in an article before me something that is quite startling. It is not only in reference to convoying ships, but it is in reference to our actually having sent a propagandist to London aboard a bomber. The article, which I clipped today out of the New York Daily Mirror, is entitled:

United States must get ships to Britain, McCrary says.

There is a picture here of Mr. McCrary; and right under the picture it says:

We must guarantee delivery.

The article reads:

J. Reagan McCrary, chief editorial writer of the Mirror, was heard here yesterday in a broadcast from London.

Mr. McCrary is in London.

He was introduced by Edward B. Murrow, Columbia Broadcasting System's chief correspondent abroad, and his words were rebroadcast here by Columbia.

His talk follows:

"A bomber made in California brought me across the Atlantic to Britain."

When I finish reading the article, you can very easily ascertain the fact that this gentleman is certainly a propagandist; and the thing that surprised me was that he, a propagandist, was taken to England on an American bomber.

He continues:

I was going back to America on a freighter in a convoy, but I lost my nerve.

If he had wanted to get back to America on a freighter or a passenger ship, if he was an American, he could not have gotten back, because all our freighters

and all our passenger ships are filled to the brim with refugees, aliens, noncitizens of the United States, while American citizens, mothers and their children, are left in various foreign ports.

I hope to be provided the opportunity of speaking tomorrow for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Members of this body some of the things which have been occurring about leaving American citizens on shore while refugees, noncitizens, aliens have the ships to themselves, and Americans cannot get aboard.

The battle of the Atlantic is on. Remember that in World War No. 1 Britain had help from Japan in the Pacific, from France and Italy in the Mediterranean, and from America in the Atlantic. And remember, also, that last time Germany had no long-range bombers out over the Atlantic.

Says Mr. McCrary:

But this time there are both bombers and surface raiding cruisers loose in the Atlantic.

The R. A. F.'s, those gritty boys in blue, have beaten Hitler's Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain. I know. I've been safe on this island fortress for 60 days.

Hitler's bombers haven't been able to knock out the docks in the Battle of Britain. But the Battle of the Atlantic is quite a different story. It is true that the R. A. F. has kept Hitler from crossing the channel, but it is also true that Hitler may keep American aid to Britain from crossing the Atlantic.

Americans must know the whole grim truth about the Battle of the Atlantic, they must know—

Says this gentleman with authority, who himself evidently has been the subject of a good deal of propoganda.

They must know how much of their aid to Britain is being bombed and shelled and torpedoed before it gets to Britain to help beat Hitler.

Britain's shipping losses during the next 12 months may average 100,000 tons a week at the present rate. Britain must be prepared to lose 5,000,000 tons of shipping in the ominous year ahead. But Britain cannot build and repair ships at half the rate of loss. The American people—

Says this gentleman—
must decide now.

Decide what? Decide upon the question of convoys.

Says he:

The American people must decide now—and I speak as an ex-isolationist—that it is not enough for us to produce guns and food and bombers for Britain. We must guarantee delivery; we must guarantee victory for this island airdrome in the battle of the Atlantic. There are ways to help—ways safely short of sending our conscript Army of young Americans into this bloody struggle.

But he does not say that there are ways short of sending our seamen into a watery grave.

There are, for instance, half a million tons of foreign shipping idle in American ports. Those ships can be wangled into the battle of the Atlantic on the side of Britain. There are 1,000,000 tons of American shipping on coastal trade that could be safely diverted into Britain's life lines in the Pacific and South Atlantic, feeding arms and supplies to different ports.

I read that article merely because it is in line with some of the paragraphs of the resolution passed by 527 ladies of Greensboro, N. C. I desire to take this

opportunity publicly to congratulate those ladies of my Commonwealth for their interest in keeping America out of war and thereby keeping their sons from dying on foreign battlefields.

Mr. President, I desire to bring just one more thing to the attention of the Senate. I know that all of us want to keep our country out of war. None of us want American sons to die abroad and be returned to their poor, distressed, unhappy mothers in little pine boxes around which are wrapped American flags. None of us ever want to witness again the scene of American mothers standing by the side of graves prepared for the remains of their sons—graves to keep the bodies of boys who died in Europe. I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which I clipped from the Washington Daily News of today in regard to a survey which was recently made by the magazine Fortune as to the number of persons who are against our sending men to Europe to fight again in the war over there, which action is being protested by these ladies of Greensboro, N. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

POLL SHOWS UNITED STATES AGAINST AN A. E. F.

NEW YORK, March 31.—Fortune magazine announced today that its latest survey of public opinion indicated 6 percent of the American people believe "the chances are 50-50 or better" the United States eventually will send a naval and air force to Europe.

Only about one-third of the people favor sending an expeditionary force to Europe, the poll indicated.

"By parts of the country it is the west North Central States that are most opposed to war, with two-thirds opposing the use of ships and planes, and three-quarters against using any army," Fortune said.

The survey showed the Southern and Western States have the highest expectancy of war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "History Shows More War Than Peace," and an article entitled "Hutchins Says War 'Suicide' for America," both of which appeared in the Washington Daily News of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The articles are as follows:

HISTORY SHOWS MORE WAR THAN PEACE

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.—Prof. Walter C. Langsam, of Union College, checked history from 1496 B. C. to A. D. 1861 and found that of 3,857 years the civilized world enjoyed general peace for only 227 of them—but there "There is sufficient evidence of general progress during the past 2,000 years in man's relations with man to encourage me to take an optimistic view of the future," he said.

"As I have pursued my studies, one thing has become ever clearer to me, namely, that the history of the future may well have much less of the grim to record if only more persons within each country would learn to acquire, early in life, certain simple habits—only a half-dozen elementary and fundamental and, therefore, highly important attitudes to govern their relations with their fellow men."

They are:

1. Tolerance for the views and conditions of others.

2. A tendency to hold or advance strong personal opinions only upon subjects on which one is relatively well informed.

3. A critical ability to differentiate, at least in a general way, between propoganda and verifiable fact.

4. A willingness to cooperate and compromise on one's dealings with other people.

5. Recognition of the importance of having a sense of humor.

HUTCHINS SAYS WAR "SUICIDE" FOR AMERICA

CHICAGO, March 31.—The United States still has a chance to remain at peace, President Robert Hutchins, of Chicago University, said yesterday in a chapel address.

He referred to war for this country as "national suicide" and "a counsel of despair."

The United States, he said, has a task to work out, "a new order in America, not, like Hitler's, based on slavery and degradation, but based on the premise that society exists to promote the happiness of its members and that happiness consists in the development of the highest powers of men."

"The war to which humanity calls America is the war against poverty, disease, ignorance, and injustice," Mr. Hutchins said.

He pictured America's fate, after a long war, as "millions unemployed," "an enormous debt," "no middle class," and "maintenance of order by a government scarcely distinguishable from those which we went forth to fight."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me under date of March 28, 1941, by Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, President of "Americans United," and Chairman of the Women's Mediation Committee, together with an open letter to the President, and a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 20 of the present Congress.

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

AMERICANS UNITED, INC.,

Washington, D. C., March 28, 1941.

HON. ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We women are deeply concerned over an article appearing in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., under the date of March 27. The heading of the article is, "Donovan calls for convoys." Col. William J. Donovan, the administration's unofficial observer in Europe, states in this article that the United States has no choice as to whether or not we will be attacked. He states that the United States has done two things in passing the war-aid program which could be considered acts of war. Colonel Donovan states them as follows in his release to the public press:

"One is to authorize the building of fighting ships to be delivered to England. The other is the provision for the refitting and repair of British ships in our yards."

Colonel Donovan goes on to make the following statement in the same article which I enclose herewith:

"Germany has ignored those acts, as she has many others the past year and a half. But we must not delude ourselves into thinking that she hasn't stored it up against us. We'll have to pay for it."

Now, we women ask why have these things been done when we women, mothers of American men, do not want war. And furthermore many of the young men of draft age do not think it is our war and do not want this country to get into the fighting. One of the recent Gallup polls showed that the great big majority of the people of the United States are against our fighting in this war.

I am the president of an organization of women belonging to both political parties. We are incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. This organization called Americans United is nonprofit and nonpartisan.

On Saturday, February 8, 1941, I, as president of Americans United, was invited to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in its hearings on the lend-lease bill. On that day I presented the negotiated-peace plan of Americans United. It is constructive. It is practical. I attach a copy hereto.

The women leaders who came to Washington to fight the lend-lease bill organized the Women's Mediation Committee here in Washington the day after the lend-lease bill passed. They elected me the chairman of this committee. The organizations associated together in this committee have a membership of about 100,000 women from all parts of the country. The activities of these women are known to millions of American women. The women went back to their respective home States to work for the passage of the peace resolution of 1941. It is House Concurrent Resolution 20, introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, on February 27, 1941. The resolution provides that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world. I enclose a copy herewith. The women ask that you use your good influences to get this resolution out of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and that you give this resolution as much publicity as possible, so that patriotic and alert citizens may do all in their power in requesting Representative SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and other Representatives on his committee to get this important resolution out of committee and onto the floor of the House of Representatives.

Before the women left Washington City for their home States some of the national officers with power to act signed and delivered an open letter to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. Mrs. ROSA M. FARBER, acting national chairman of Mothers of the United States of America, and I took a copy to the White House for the President's information. I enclose a copy of this letter to the Congress, together with a copy of our letter of transmittal.

The officers of these national women's organizations who sent the letter to the Congress respectfully request that you have the letter to Congress published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I respectfully ask that you also include our open letter to the President, since it contains the following promise made to the American people by the President during the campaign, which is as follows: "Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." The information that I am receiving from women in the different sections of the country is to the effect that the women intend to hold the President to his promise.

It seems a great pity that during this crisis in the life of our Nation, there is no woman student of international affairs in a policy-making position in the Department of State, or as an advisor to the President. We women feel that if the woman's viewpoint could be heard in the high executive circles of our Government at this time, there would not be such a great danger of our getting into the fighting. The women of the United States do not want war.

We are at present unprepared to wage a victorious war, and would have but few allies

in this second World War if we entered. But we women do not think that it is our war.

A close study of the New Testament shows that Jesus did not advocate fighting. He preached a religion of love. As Christians who feel sorry for the suffering people of all nations and creeds we should send food, clothes, and materials for the rebuilding of homes and cities where it is needed and requested. But it does not seem right to me to send equipment which prolongs this terrible holocaust. I, as one Christian, say it is positively heartless. There should be a negotiated peace now.

I, a southern-born woman, desire at this time to commend you, a southern Senator, for the gallant fight which you made against the lend-lease bill.

I happen to be the daughter of a primitive Baptist preacher. In my girlhood, my father took me with him when he went on preaching tours in your great State. Recently, some of the children of my father's intimate North Carolina friends have been in communication with me. I have told them how grateful the women of the country are to you for your stand on the lend-lease bill. I am looking forward with great pleasure to a visit to North Carolina in the near future.

Assuring you again of the very high regard in which women throughout our country hold you because of your courageous and patriotic stand against the lend-lease bill, H. R. 1776, I am, in deepest patriotic sincerity,

Most cordially yours,
(Mrs.) CECIL NORTON BROY,
President, Americans United, and
Chairman, Women's Mediation Committee.

MARCH 14, 1941.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have repeatedly asked for unity in our country. We therefore send for your information a copy of a letter addressed to Members of Congress, because this letter is a concrete example of unity.

You will see by the signatures on the letter which we transmit herewith that the women of the United States of America have joined forces and are coordinating their activities to keep out of war. We women actually represent over 50 percent of the total national vote—49,000,000 cast for you and Mr. Willkie—less those whom Senator HATTIE CARAWAY claims she speaks for.

We state this with assurance because we know why people voted for both major-party candidates. Mr. President, the vote was not an endorsement of the foreign policy. On the contrary, of all the campaign oratory, one promise, very close to the hearts of our people, stood out clearly and was accepted literally. This promise was as follows:

"Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Mr. President, that was the mandate from the people.

Sincerely and cordially yours,
AMERICANS UNITED, INC.
MOTHERS OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA,
By ROSA M. FARBER,
Acting National Chairman.

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

House Concurrent Resolution 20

Whereas it is the overwhelming desire of the American people that the United States shall remain at peace with the world and free from foreign entanglements, while it faithfully performs its duties as a good neighbor; and

Whereas, if the world ever needed a peacemaker, it needs one now; and

Whereas, with war engulfing a large portion of the globe and threatening to draw other nations into its vortex, there is a real opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its sincerity as a good neighbor by assuming the role of a peacemaker; and

Whereas there is a possibility, faint though it may be, that the New World, under the leadership of the United States might be the means of freeing the Old World from the miseries of war and reestablishing peace and tranquility on earth: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President shall be requested to invite the American republics to send delegates to a conference to be held at the earliest practicable date in the city of Washington to offer to the nations now at war the services of the Western Hemisphere as a mediator, to the end that the blessings of peace may be brought to a distraught world.

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution shall be known as the Peace Resolution of 1941.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4124), making deficiency and supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to take much time at this late hour in a discussion of the problem we have been considering. I should like to inquire what the question now before the Senate is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment at the bottom of page 5 of the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, the committee proposes to strike out beginning with line 23, the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, one of the last acts of a previous administration, on March 3, 1933, was the adoption of an amendment, which I think I will read at this time so that the Senate may get the full purport of it. It provided:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States and only such manufactured articles, material, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles,

materials * * * shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply to articles, etc. * * * for use outside the United States.

In this connection I may say that I think that has been the policy of the Government since the time of the adoption of that language until just recently. In my opinion, it is a reasonable policy, and the House provision, which the amendment now pending would strike out, is a reinforcement of that policy.

I am assured by the proponents of the bill that they have no desire to change the present law, which we call the "buy-American" law. What causes the question to be raised at this time is the fact that recently one of the departments of the Government has seen fit to go to South America to buy some Argentine meat, and only this week a contract has been let for a large quantity of wool for the Government, and nearly 50 percent of it has been awarded to foreign wool. Those are the reasons why we from the farm States are so much interested in clarifying and reinforcing, if possible, the Buy-American policy to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I have discussed the matter of purchases by the Army under the provisions of this act with General Corbin and the officers who are associated with him. I hope nothing I say will be taken as critical of the manner in which they are conducting their job. I know that these men have a very difficult task, and I appreciate that they are merely following a purchasing policy which is laid down for them. I do believe, however, that it is highly important that Congress give this matter its most careful consideration, to the end that a policy consistent with the welfare of our Nation may be adopted.

I wish to call attention, Mr. President, to the language of the provision now included in the bill. It specifies "that no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States, except articles or food not produced in sufficient quantities" to supply the demand. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the broad scope of that language. It means all articles of food and clothing.

The provision is of extreme importance to the farmers of this Nation, who produce the mass of the raw materials which will be needed.

I can see no logical or justified reason why the Government should, in buying materials and supplies for its military forces, go outside the boundaries of the Nation for articles, either food or clothing, so long as there is an abundance produced and available in the United States.

Farmers of our Nation have not been prosperous for many years, Mr. President. Even Government subsidies in the form of parity payments have failed to bring farm incomes to a basis of economic equality. Our raw-materials markets are admittedly cluttered with surpluses.

Under these conditions it is, in my opinion, the obligation of the Government to buy at home as long as there are sufficient stocks of domestically produced goods. I

do not believe we should send our defense dollars, which must be raised by taxes, to foreign markets until American farmers and producers have had a chance to supply our needs.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the many articles produced by our farmers which would be affected by this provision. Not only are beef producers affected; also those who produce mutton, pork, and poultry are concerned. Under the general classification of foods are such items as potatoes, beans, wheat, vegetables, fruits, cereals, sugar, flour, lard, butter, cheese, dairy products, and other commodities which are produced in abundance in our own Nation.

Under the classification of clothing are wool and cotton materials, thus making the pending proposal of great importance to all sections of the United States. With our present supply of wool, the huge surpluses of cotton, and all kinds of foodstuffs in this country, it seems utterly foolish to go elsewhere to purchase these materials.

I am reliably informed, Mr. President, that commencing with June 1941 there will be a sufficient quantity of domestic wool available to supply all our demands. The wool growers of my State have operated for many years on a very slim margin of profit—if they did not suffer actual losses. I believe it is their right to have the first chance to fill the Government's orders for blankets and clothing.

I may say, digressing from my prepared statement, that that has been the policy of the Government from the year 1933 to November 6 last, on which date it appeared to the Quartermaster General that he might be short of some grades of wool. The matter was taken up with the secretary of the National Wool Growers' Association. He was told that the Department desired to include in its bids a bid for some foreign wool; and that was done without objection.

This appropriation contains large sums for the purchase of wool, and there is plenty of wool in this country. Our wool is just now being sheared. But we find that the Government agencies refuse to limit their bids to domestic wool, but include both foreign and domestic wools. This is depressing wool prices right at shearing time, when the producers are selling.

The condition of the American farmer has been so desperate for more than a decade that we have tried to devise ways and means of helping him, even to the extent of granting him Government subsidies. Now, for the first time during that period, we have a situation that will assist the farmer to regain his financial feet. There is a way in which these surpluses of farm products which have been accumulating may be put to beneficial use. Our Government needs these materials for immediate consumption. Could anything be more fitting, or more right, than for the Government to go to its own citizens for these articles rather than securing them from foreign sources?

According to figures from the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the income of the 32,000,000 farmers in this country for 1939, the last year for which

figures are available, was \$5,635,000,000, or 8.1 percent of the total national income for that year. In other words, 25 percent of the population was receiving only about 8 percent of the national income. The same Government source reveals that national income in 1939 had recovered to 83.7 percent of the 1929 total. Farm income was only 77.6 percent of the 1929 total. This was in spite of the fact that in 1929 business and industry were in the midst of boom times, while the farmer, even then, was in a depression.

Translate these figures into terms of the farmers' standard of living, and we find that the situation at present is simply intolerable. If we are to yield now to the advice of those who say we must abandon the farmer, Mr. President, if we give in to those who tell us we must stop the pitiful relief we have been giving him, we shall be betraying our own people.

Figures show that in addition to the abundance of domestic wool that will soon be available, our stocks of livestock on the farms and western ranges are at a high level. I think that at only one time in history have we had more cattle in the country than we have today. The number of beef cattle has increased from 66,789,000, in 1939, to 71,666,000 at present. The number of sheep now totals 55,880,000, as compared with 53,783,000 in 1939. In view of these increases, I cannot see any logic in the Government going abroad for purchases of beef and mutton.

If it were not for the defense program, the present situation would not be so favorable. Without the tremendous amount of purchases being made for defense, the market for both beef and mutton would be in a depressed condition.

With such an ample supply of cattle in this country, it would be a serious mistake to adopt a policy that would encourage the purchase of Argentine canned meats. As I understand, the packers have perfected a process for canning choice cuts of meat for the Army and Navy needs. This process can be utilized in this country. We need not go to South America to make use of it.

Mr. President, the only argument which has been given to me for voting for the committee amendment is that beef can be canned in Argentina much cheaper than in our own country. That argument can be applied to any farm product produced in South America, because, with the cheaper labor and lower standards of living, almost all farm commodities can be produced there at less cost.

Let us consider the Government's policy on wool purchases since 1933. Up to November 6, 1940, the War Department bought wool of domestic origin only, in accordance with the terms of the "Buy American" Act. Since November 6, 1940, however, the Department has been asking for bids on both foreign and domestic wool, or mixtures of the two. On March 5, 1941, representatives of the growers were informed that it was not the intention of the Quartermaster to restore the rule requiring all domestic wool in future contracts.

The wool growers of America feel that when they have an ample supply of wool they should be entitled to the opportunity of supplying the Government's demand. That is the object of the provision now under consideration, as far as wool is concerned. It would require the use of domestic wool in Government contracts only so long as the supply of the necessary grades of domestic wool was readily available.

I believe the "Buy American" policy was a good policy in 1933, and I believe it is an equally good one today. The financial condition of the American farmer is still serious. Our producers are just as essentially in need of assistance now as they were in 1933. They need the added protection given to them by the provision which the committee is seeking to strike out.

The present international emergency has not mitigated the emergency at home. On the contrary, it has intensified it. I do not believe it is wise for our Government to become so absorbed in international affairs as to forget the emergencies which exist at home. So long as American producers can supply our needs they should be given the preference.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the committee amendment to strike out this protection of the American farmer will be defeated. As I have already stated, it has been the policy to give the domestic producers of wool the market so far as it could be supplied, and all we are asking is that that policy be continued. But the Quartermaster General has given the information to the secretary of the National Wool Growers' Association and others who have called upon him that they expect to continue the same policy of dividing the bids. The provision merely directs the Army officials that they must "buy American"; that is all we are asking.

Mr. President, before I conclude I ask that there be printed at this place in the RECORD a statement in support of our proposal which has been prepared by the Secretary of the National Wool Growers' Association.

I also have another memorandum on parity wool prices which I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

I also have a memorandum furnished me of comparison of bids and awards for foreign and domestic wool by the Army, which I wish to have printed in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

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

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE "FOOD AND CLOTHING" IN PROVISION OF H. R. 4124, REQUIRING THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS TO PURCHASE MATERIALS OF DOMESTIC ORIGIN

Respecting the purchases of wool for the Army, the situation is briefly as follows:

During the calendar year 1940 the War Department purchased wool materials representing the equivalent of 248,000,000 pounds of grease wool. Until November 6, it was required in accordance with the terms of the Buy American Act of 1933 that all wool entering into Army purchases should be of domestic origin.

Late in October officials of the Defense Commission called representatives of the

growers into conference to discuss reports that had been received by the Commission to the effect that there was an insufficient supply of some grades of domestic wool available for the contracts which it was intended to make for woolen goods in December. The spokesmen for the growers agreed with the situation, and while they did not approve the suspension of the former rule, they did state they would make no complaint or objection so long as the situation continued in which the available supplies of domestic wool were insufficient for Army requirements.

On November 6 the Defense Commission issued a statement saying that it would not be permissible for woolen manufacturers to bid on fabrics to be composed of all foreign wool, all domestic wool, or mixtures of the two.

Under that arrangement large contracts were let in December. Additional contracts representing the equivalent of 90,000,000 pounds of grease wool have been made or are being made in the present month.

In consultation with officials of the Quartermaster Corps on March 5, representatives of the growers were informed that it was not the intention of the Quartermaster to restore the rule requiring all domestic wool in future contracts when ample supplies of all grades of wool (domestic) would be available.

The provision under consideration by your committee would require the use of domestic wool in Government contracts only so long as the supply of the necessary grades of domestic wool is readily available. The invitations for bids of woolen materials sent to prospective bidders stated that some differential in favor of domestic wool would be allowed. However, the amount of such differential has never been disclosed except to the extent that may be done from examination of previous awards.

A differential for domestic wool was supposed to be allowed in contracts made last week for the purchase of 2,000,000 blankets. Bidders who were proposing to use all domestic wool received contracts for 405,000 blankets. Bidders proposing to use all foreign wool received contracts on 220,000 blankets. The remainder of the awards went to concerns bidding on mixtures of foreign and domestic wool. The average price of blankets to be made from domestic wool was \$6.51, and for blankets to be made of all foreign wool, the price was \$6.29. The proportion of these blankets going to domestic wool users was gratifying. However, it is possible and more than probable that more extensive bids would have been submitted on the basis of domestic wool if it had been possible for the bidders to know the amount of the differential that the Quartermaster would have approved in favor of domestic wool.

The average of awards made on domestic wool blankets was \$6.51 each and on foreign wool \$6.29—a difference of 22 cents per blanket or 4.4 cents per pound of scoured wool.

On March 17, bids were opened on 4,900,000 yards of 18-ounce dark serge, 5,000,000 yards of light serge, and 10,200,000 yards of flannel shirting weighing 10½ ounces per yard.

Again the bidding mills were not informed as to the amount of the price differential that would be recognized on cloth to be made from domestic wool. Here, the extent of bidding on all domestic wool was much less than in the case of blankets. Some firms bid as low on all domestic wool as others did on all foreign wool. The bids on domestic wool were from 16 cents to 20 cents per yard more than on all foreign wool. At the outside, the difference for the small amount of domestic wool bid on was 12 cents per scoured pound. We know nothing as yet about the awards.

Plainly, the inability of the mills to know the amount of differential for domestic wool caused them to bid cheaply upon foreign

wool. The American grower was deprived of the opportunity to furnish, at a fair price, any considerable amount of wool to be used in the manufacture of uniform cloth.

PARITY WOOL PRICES

The parity prices as now published respecting wool by the Department of Agriculture have no value. The reason is that the base period employed for wool is the same as for other agricultural commodities, namely 1909 to 1914. This was one of the lowest periods of wool prices on record, and largely because of the fact that during that period the agitation for free wool was rife, and, subsequently, wool was put on the free list.

The Department of Agriculture recognizes that the customary base period is not fairly applicable to wool. Officials of the Department of Agriculture Adjustment Administration have signified their intention of sponsoring an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, under which the base period for wool would be changed from 1919 to 1929.

On this basis the present parity price of wool would be about 37 cents.

COMPARISON OF BIDS AND AWARDS FOR FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC WOOL BY THE ARMY

On the awards for dark-shade serge, the average price for all domestic wool was \$2.87604. On all foreign wool the average price was \$2.83423. On the combination of foreign and domestic wool the average was \$2.8185, and on a blend of foreign and domestic wool \$2.84255.

In the case of dark-shade serge, the all-domestic wool was 1½ percent higher than the all foreign. The combination was lower than the all foreign, and the blend one-third of 1 percent higher than the foreign.

On the light-shade serge, the award for all domestic wool was \$2.89418 on the average, for all-foreign wool \$2.82241, on the combination of foreign and domestic wool \$2.86340, and on a blend of foreign and domestic wool \$2.8540.

On the light-shade serge made from all domestic wool the price was 2.2-10 percent higher than that made from all foreign. That made from the combination was 1½ percent higher than the all foreign, and that made of a blend of foreign and domestic was 1.1-10 percent higher than the all foreign.

On the light-shade elastique the average bid on all domestic wool was \$3.05562. No awards were made to the all-domestic wool bidders, but awards were made on all-foreign wool at an average of \$3.03866, and on a combination of foreign and domestic wool for \$3.0630.

In this case the bids on the all-domestic wool was ½ of 1 percent higher than the bids on the all-foreign wool, and the combination of foreign and domestic wool was 8-10 of 1 percent higher than the all-foreign wool.

On the shirting flannel, the average bid on all-domestic wool was \$1.80817. No award made on the all-domestic bids. A large award was made on all-foreign wool at \$1.77414, and on a combination of foreign and domestic wool at \$1.83010, and on a blend of foreign and domestic wool at \$1.8340.

In this case, the offer on the all-domestic wool was 2 percent higher than the award on the all-foreign. The award on the combination of domestic and foreign wool was 3½ percent higher than the all-foreign wool, and the award on the blend of foreign and domestic wool was 3½ percent higher than the all-foreign wool.

These awards required 9,717,357 pounds of domestic wool and 12,118,364 pounds of foreign wool. All of these are, of course, in clean weights. Converted to a grease basis, this would mean somewhere between 65 and 75 million pounds of wool.

Figuring another way on the dark-shade serge, the difference between the all-foreign and the all-domestic was 0.04181 cents. That is, the all-domestic wool was that

much higher than the foreign wool per yard. Using the Army's figure of 1.4 pounds of clean wool per yard of 18-ounce serge, this difference amounts to 3 cents per pound of clean wool.

On the light-shade serge, the difference between the domestic and the foreign was 0.06177 cents per yard higher than on the all-foreign wool. Using the 1.4-pound figure of clean wool per yard of 18-ounce serge, we find that the difference in the value of the clean domestic wool would be 0.0441 cents higher than the all-foreign wool.

On light-shade elastic, that manufactured from all-domestic wool was 0.01696 cents per yard higher than goods manufactured from all-foreign wool. Using the 1.4 pound of clean wool to make a yard of 18-ounce elastic, we find that the domestic wool was 0.012 per pound higher.

On the shirting flannel, the price of all-domestic wool per yard was 0.0277 higher than the all-foreign. On the basis of the 1.4-pound figure of clean wool, domestic wool would figure 0.0185 cents per pound higher.

Scoured-wool requirements, fiscal year 1941

Item	Type	Scoured wool		Grade
		Yards	Pounds	
Woven fabrics:				
A. Elastique.....	Worsted.....	835,000	1,169,000	64
Serge:				
Dark.....	do.....	10,058,750	14,082,250	64
Light.....	do.....	12,966,950	18,153,730	64
Shirting:				
Flannel.....	do.....	13,822,500	9,122,500	60
Worsted.....	do.....	1,751,200	1,435,984	60
Total.....		39,434,400	43,963,814	
B. Overcoating.....		7,882,500	18,129,750	44
Blankets				
Total.....	Worsted.....		38,513,663	56
Units				
Total.....		4,346,250	20,383,913	
Knitted fabrics:				
C. Drawers, woolen.....	Merino yarns.....	4,925,193	2,260,220	60
Undershirts, woolen.....	do.....	4,376,018	2,345,570	60
Socks, woolen.....	do.....	17,217,222	1,440,789	64
Total.....		26,518,433	6,046,579	
D. Gloves, wool.....	Carded woolen yarns.....	2,008,933	441,966	56
Aggregate total of 88,966,022 pounds scoured wool which by grade is—				
			34,845,769	64
			15,164,624	60
			20,825,579	56
			18,129,750	44
			88,966,022	

This would require about 233,000 to 240,000 of territory grease wool.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a statement which I made to the Committee on Appropriations as to the parity prices of various farm commodities.

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

I would like to give some figures that will illustrate the economic condition of the farmer. Let us consider some of the crops which are produced and the prices that are being received for them. We will consider these figures on the parity-price basis that has been established by Congress. As you well know, this indicates the prices which the farmer should receive for his products in order that his purchasing power will be on an equality with other industrial groups.

Potatoes, for instance, on February 15, 1940, sold for 87 percent of parity. On February 15 of this year the price was only 62 percent of parity. And potatoes do not share in the parity program. The same is true of a great number of other farm-produced commodities.

Eggs, on February 15, 1940, were selling at 82 percent of parity. Last February 15 they brought only 68 percent of parity. Rye last year sold at 61 percent of parity. On February 15 of this year it sold at 45 percent of parity. The price of wheat on February 15, 1940, was 75 percent of parity. A year later it was 60 percent of parity. Similarly, the price of oats on February 15, 1940, was 74 percent of parity. By February 15, 1941, oats had fallen to 64 percent of parity. The price of sugar beets in December 1939 was 70 percent of parity. In December 1940 this price was 67 percent of parity. The price of dry beans in December 1939 was 70 percent of parity. By December 1940 the

price of dried beans was only 62 percent of parity.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I realize that the same provision was voted out of the naval bill by the Senate a few days ago, and I understand the conference committee has taken it out, with the principal argument of the good-neighbor policy, but the first group of neighbors we should satisfy is the American farmers. I am willing to go along in an effort to help the South American countries as well as we can. We are lending them money now, and doing everything to further the good-neighbor policy, but they ought to be given to understand now that the good-neighbor policy does not include the surrender of the American farmers' market to other countries.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to take the time of the Senate for a few moments in relation to the amendment which has been the subject of discussion here for the last hour or so. As I recollect, the situation as it now stands is that the House wrote into the bill the language:

That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States.

And so forth. The Senate recently approved that amendment. The conferees now have gotten together and have stricken it out.

Mr. President, I realize that we are living in a period when the Executive branch of the Government may consider many external factors which may affect our domestic economy, but I agree with the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who just spoke, that the American market should be for the American producer.

At present, if we want to import 199 pounds of beef there is a protective rate of only \$2.98, but if we want to import 199 pounds of peanuts there is a protective rate of \$9.95. In other words, we now say to the man on the ranch and the man on the farm, the man who has invested his life—and I mean that literally—in clearing the trees from the fields and then breaking up the land, "We are not going to protect you. We are going to buy our products outside this country with taxpayers' money."

The other day when this matter first came up I read the amendment, and I thought to myself, "Well, that is going to hit the dairy industry in my State pretty strong." Then I got to thinking afterward that when we discussed it here in the Senate, and the statement went out through the newspapers that this amendment simply related to corned beef. So I asked Representative MURRAY, who is from my State, and who is a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, to obtain a few figures for me to confirm my conclusion as to what was taking place. In the \$7,000,000,000 appropriation measure, \$1,300,000,000 is provided for agricultural products. If this amendment is stricken out those who are going to do the buying will be given the discretion to spend anywhere in the world this hard-earned money which we are spending allegedly for defense. The American farmer is overlooked in that arrangement.

As I stated, I have had a chance to look into this matter and I find that my State of Wisconsin is one of the greatest beef-producing States in the United States. Of course, it is generally known that we produce a great number of dairy cattle but usually we are not identified as a great beef-producing State.

Mr. President, at this point I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks a tabulation showing the total number of cattle and calves on hand on January 1, 1940, in all the States of the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tabulation is as follows:

Cattle and calves on hand Jan. 1, 1940

Maine.....	233,000
New Hampshire.....	126,000
Vermont.....	452,000
Massachusetts.....	193,000
Rhode Island.....	30,000
Connecticut.....	182,000
New York.....	2,116,000
New Jersey.....	203,000
Pennsylvania.....	1,543,000
Ohio.....	2,091,000
Indiana.....	1,748,000
Illinois.....	2,915,000
Michigan.....	1,708,000
Wisconsin.....	3,406,000
Minnesota.....	3,341,000
Iowa.....	4,688,000
Missouri.....	2,802,000
North Dakota.....	1,837,000

Cattle and calves on hand Jan. 1, 1940—Con.

South Dakota	1,630,000
Nebraska	3,084,000
Kansas	3,063,000
Delaware	54,000
Maryland	338,000
Virginia	913,000
West Virginia	600,000
North Carolina	684,000
South Carolina	359,000
Florida	1,009,000
Georgia	821,000
Kentucky	1,243,000
Tennessee	1,228,000
Alabama	1,080,000
Mississippi	1,273,000
Arkansas	1,174,000
Louisiana	1,131,000
Oklahoma	2,247,000
Texas	6,677,000
Montana	1,107,000
Idaho	775,000
Wyoming	787,000
Colorado	1,404,000
New Mexico	1,276,000
Arizona	898,000
Utah	432,000
Nevada	364,000
Washington	826,000
Oregon	1,012,000
California	2,161,000
United States	68,769,000

Mr. WILEY. I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, a table which shows the amount of cattle products, in pounds, produced during 1939, and the cash income of the products for each State in the Union.

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

Cattle products, 1939

State	Production in pounds	Cash income from sales
Maine	33,925,000	\$2,106,000
New Hampshire	18,630,000	1,304,000
Vermont	62,640,000	3,856,000
Massachusetts	24,330,000	2,587,000
Rhode Island	3,050,000	517,000
Connecticut	24,725,000	2,020,000
New York	352,060,000	23,297,000
New Jersey	32,270,000	3,614,000
Pennsylvania	278,470,000	26,056,000
Ohio	458,010,000	41,457,000
Indiana	438,615,000	41,855,000
Illinois	771,460,000	93,404,000
Michigan	359,955,000	26,960,000
Wisconsin	683,420,000	41,215,000
Minnesota	777,845,000	60,323,000
Iowa	1,321,995,000	161,402,000
Missouri	712,585,000	63,956,000
North Dakota	299,980,000	15,546,000
South Dakota	379,600,000	29,074,000
Nebraska	770,460,000	75,698,000
Kansas	807,780,000	80,886,000
Delaware	7,355,000	636,000
Maryland	51,600,000	4,135,000
Virginia	164,160,000	10,866,000
West Virginia	126,965,000	8,585,000
North Carolina	93,215,000	4,981,000
South Carolina	56,145,000	3,089,000
Georgia	110,090,000	5,154,000
Florida	69,845,000	3,415,000
Kentucky	238,275,000	20,292,000
Tennessee	219,080,000	14,447,000
Alabama	145,075,000	6,648,000
Mississippi	191,670,000	9,810,000
Arkansas	168,440,000	10,458,000
Louisiana	162,460,000	8,083,000
Oklahoma	550,020,000	42,163,000
Texas	1,429,730,000	108,319,000
Montana	265,400,000	15,469,000
Idaho	166,285,000	9,460,000
Wyoming	219,325,000	18,128,000
Colorado	377,720,000	40,970,000
New Mexico	276,435,000	22,130,000
Arizona	174,090,000	15,964,000
Utah	97,820,000	6,727,000
Nevada	77,415,000	5,076,000
Washington	160,960,000	10,261,000
Oregon	229,690,000	14,000,000
California	484,415,000	57,711,000
United States	14,955,485,000	1,274,714,000

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention specifically to the fact that the States of New York, Wisconsin, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and California, or 25 percent of the States, produce over one-half the cattle of the country. Note the enormous amounts of beef produced in Iowa, Kansas, Texas, Nebraska, Illinois, and Wisconsin. It is significant to note, as one reads this table, that the annual value of this beef is twice the value of the cotton-fiber crop of 1940, which was only \$595,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD also a table showing the total amount of cattle marketed by each of the States.

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

Table showing the total number of cattle marketed by State, 1939

State	Shipped out	In-shippments	Number shipped out less number shipped in
Maine	69,000	1,000	68,000
New Hampshire	54,000	5,000	49,000
Vermont	186,000	10,000	176,000
Massachusetts	104,000	25,000	79,000
Rhode Island	21,000	7,000	14,000
Connecticut	79,000	11,000	68,000
New York	797,000	10,000	787,000
New Jersey	110,000	27,000	83,000
Pennsylvania	258,000	118,000	140,000
Ohio	730,000	152,000	578,000
Indiana	727,000	227,000	500,000
Illinois	1,447,000	745,000	702,000
Michigan	511,000	75,000	436,000
Wisconsin	1,424,000	40,000	1,384,000
Minnesota	1,465,000	190,000	1,275,000
Iowa	2,240,000	1,097,000	1,143,000
Missouri	1,152,000	414,000	738,000
North Dakota	356,000	30,000	326,000
South Dakota	506,000	67,000	439,000
Nebraska	1,076,000	389,000	687,000
Kansas	1,241,000	744,000	497,000
Delaware	9,000	1,000	8,000
Maryland	98,000	17,000	81,000
Virginia	277,000	14,000	263,000
West Virginia	125,000	2,000	123,000
North Carolina	109,000	2,000	107,000
South Carolina	35,000	1,000	34,000
Georgia	134,000	8,000	126,000
Florida	70,000	1,000	69,000
Kentucky	478,000	118,000	360,000
Tennessee	380,000	55,000	325,000
Alabama	207,000	25,000	182,000
Mississippi	344,000	5,000	339,000

Cattle and beef: United States imports and exports, annual averages by 5-year periods, 1900-1938, and for calendar years 1939 and 1940

[U. S. Tariff Commission, March 1941]

Period	Imports			Exports		
	Live cattle	Beef and veal		Live cattle	Beef and veal	
		Fresh, chilled or frozen	Canned and pickled or cured		Fresh, chilled or frozen	Canned and pickled or cured
5-year average:	Head	Pounds	Pounds	Head	Pounds	Pounds
1900 to 1904	100,000	398,000	(?)	448,000	307,405,000	115,276,000
1905 to 1909	64,000	212,000	(?)	426,000	222,060,000	95,807,000
1910 to 1914	399,000	36,918,000	(?)	88,000	29,453,000	42,265,000
1915 to 1918	414,000	74,083,000	(?)	14,000	242,216,000	118,359,000
1919 to 1923	319,000	35,208,000	8,131,000	61,000	2,628,000	23,422,000
1924 to 1928	301,000	28,692,000	29,842,000	39,000	2,451,000	29,068,000
1929 to 1933	185,000	11,666,000	47,250,000	5,000	2,477,000	13,824,000
1934 to 1938	359,000	3,911,000	77,130,000	5,000	4,785,000	10,373,000
1939	774,000	2,529,000	88,035,000	3,000	6,214,000	8,949,000
1940	631,000	11,216,000	62,743,000	*3,000	*7,265,000	*8,207,000

¹ Fiscal years 1900 to 1918, inclusive; 1915-18 is a 4-year average; calendar years 1939-40.

² Not separately reported.

³ 11 months.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Table showing the total number of cattle marketed by State, 1939—Continued

State	Shipped out	In-shippments	Number shipped out less number shipped in
Arkansas	274,000	13,000	261,000
Louisiana	231,000	19,000	212,000
Oklahoma	936,000	241,000	695,000
Texas	2,560,000	261,000	2,299,000
Montana	248,000	53,000	195,000
Idaho	131,000	6,000	125,000
Wyoming	316,000	32,000	284,000
Colorado	671,000	190,000	481,000
New Mexico	595,000	122,000	473,000
Arizona	319,000	124,000	195,000
Utah	106,000	14,000	92,000
Nevada	72,000	5,000	67,000
Washington	117,000	17,000	100,000
Oregon	184,000	8,000	176,000
California	1,128,000	423,000	705,000
United States	24,723,000	6,161,000	18,562,000

Mr. WILEY. I ask that it be noted that one-third of the cattle marketed are produced in four States—Texas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa.

We were talking about beef as an import. It is a significant thing to note that from 1900 to 1904 we imported 100,000 head of live cattle, but from 1934 to 1938 we imported 359,000 head. In 1940 we imported 631,000 head. It is significant to note that in 1940 we imported 11,216,000 pounds of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, and 62,000,000 pounds of canned, pickled, or cured beef or veal.

It is significant to note that our exports fell correspondingly. In 1940 we imported 631,000 live cattle, and exported 3,000. In the same year we imported 11,000,000 pounds of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef products, and exported 7,000,000 pounds. In the same year we imported 62,000,000 pounds of canned and pickled or cured beef, and exported 8,000,000 pounds.

I ask that the table showing the imports and exports of beef from 1900 to 1938, in 5-year periods, and for the calendar years 1939 and 1940, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the foregoing tables depict the cattle situation in the United States. It will be noted that cattle are found on a large percentage of the farms of this country. Any legislation beneficial to the cattle industry ultimately benefits a large percentage of the farmers of the country. On the other hand, any adverse legislation in connection with beef products causes a very general loss to a large percentage of the farmers of this country.

When I originally spoke on this matter I spoke in relation to the dairy industry. Bear in mind that this money may be spent to buy millions of pounds of butter and beef for the soldiers located in America. I do not have the information, but what has been said here today indicates the possibilities in this connection.

Who constitutes this country? Is it made up only of a few bureaucrats, or a few people on the eastern seaboard? As has been said many times, the farm section is the real backbone of this country. We now have an opportunity, through this very provision, to demonstrate that we have some consideration for the farm section. It has been stated all over the country that the provision relates to corned beef. A team of horses could be driven through this section. The language refers to clothing and products grown or produced in the United States. That language is so all-inclusive that it could even include shoes. If there is a disposition to disregard the implications of this provision for the farmer, possibly those in the East who manufacture shoes and other products will realize what it may mean, even to them.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that since 1913, when the tariff was removed by the Wilson administration, this country has been on a beef-importing basis. A study of the preceding tables will show the large importations of cattle during the past 2 years, amounting to 774,000 head in 1939 and 631,000 head in 1940, or a total of 1,405,000 head for the 2 years.

I ask the following questions:

Why should we continually import such large amounts of beef when the United States is one of the greatest livestock-producing countries in the world?

Why should we appropriate \$500,000,000 annually to control our agricultural production and import from \$500,000,000 to \$860,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products?

If the Walsh-Healey Act is a desirable act for certain labor groups—and I subscribe to its objectives—why are not the farm-labor groups entitled to equal legislative protection?

If the Guffey Coal Act is desirable for coal miners, why is not farm labor entitled to equal legislative protection?

If the Miller-Tydings bill affords business protection to certain business groups, why is not the American farmer entitled to the same legislative protection?

If one group of farmers, representing 29 percent of the milk producers, is entitled to the legislative protection afforded by price fixing in the milk-marketing agreements, why are not the majority of farmers entitled to the same legislative protection?

Let me say at this point, because I want to get it into the Record, that it is a significant thing, which the country ought to know, that in 1939 New York produced 7,465,000,000 pounds of milk, and received \$2 per 100 pounds for it. Pennsylvania produced 4,622,000,000 pounds, and received \$2.40 per 100 pounds. Massachusetts produced 804,000,000 pounds, and received \$3.29 per 100 pounds; but Wisconsin, which produced 11,973,000,000 pounds, received only \$1.23 per 100 pounds.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the milk production in certain States in 1939.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Milk, 1939

States	Total production on farms	Value per 100 pounds	Value of production	Number of milk cows
	<i>Pounds</i>			
New York.....	7,465,000,000	\$2.00	\$149,300,000	1,355,000
Pennsylvania.....	4,622,000,000	2.40	110,928,000	882,000
Massachusetts.....	804,000,000	3.29	26,452,000	137,000
Wisconsin.....	11,973,000,000	1.23	147,268,000	2,108,000
Minnesota.....	8,160,000,000	1.08	88,128,000	1,600,000
Iowa.....	6,519,000,000	1.08	70,405,000	1,393,000
Texas.....	4,227,000,000	1.81	76,509,000	1,342,000
Tennessee.....	1,936,000,000	1.64	31,750,000	553,000
Mississippi.....	1,373,000,000	1.62	22,243,000	522,000

¹ Note the wide price variation in the eastern area.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, who would suggest that we build a battleship in some foreign country because we can secure cheaper labor there? Who, in fairness, can suggest that we import foreign beef, and say that such meat is infinitely better than that produced in this country, when the facts will not justify the assertion?

While the farm people represent only 25 percent of the population, and receive less than 10 percent of the national income, many authorities believe that they have 40 percent of the purchasing power of the country. Many groups are dependent upon the farm groups, not only for food, but also for commercial materials and for their economic contributions. Why continually ask the American farmer to be the good neighbor of the good-neighbor policy? Certainly in our domestic economy we have not been such good neighbors to the farmer.

The foregoing tables show where the meat of this country is produced. Can Louisiana, Colorado, Utah, and Florida

farmers demand the American sugar market for their farmers and at the same time fairly subscribe to a program which gives away the American beef market of the beef-producing States?

How can the peanut producers of Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, and other States expect to maintain a protective tariff of 7 cents a pound on their products and at the same time expect Congress to give away the American beef producers' market? The tariff on peanuts is two and one-third times the cost of producing the peanuts, while the tariff on beef is low in comparison.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a schedule showing the tariff rates on peanuts, together with the tariff rates on beef cattle and beef products under various tariff acts since the act of 1897.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tariff rates on beef cattle and beef products since the Tariff Act of 1897

[U. S. Tariff Commission, Washington, Mar. 10, 1941]

	Cattle	Beef		Tallow	Hides raw or uncured
		Fresh or frozen	Canned		
Tariff Act of 1897.....	\$2 per head, ¹ or \$3.75 per head, ² or 27½ percent ad valorem. ³	2 cents per pound....	25 percent ad valorem	¾ cent per pound....	15 percent ad valorem.
Tariff Act of 1909.....	do.	1½ cents per pound....	do.	½ cent per pound....	Free.
Tariff Act of 1913.....	Free.	Free.	Free.	Free.	Do.
Tariff Act of 1921 (emergency tariff)	30 percent ad valorem.	2 cents per pound....	25 percent ad valorem	do.	Do.
Tariff Act of 1922.....	1½ cents per pound, ⁴ or 2 cents per pound. ⁵	3 cents per pound....	20 percent ad valorem	½ cent per pound....	Do.
Tariff Act of 1930.....	2½ cents per pound, ⁶ or 3 cents per pound. ¹⁰	6 cents per pound....	6 cents per pound, but not less than 20 percent ad valorem.	do. ⁸	10 percent ad valorem

¹ If less than 1 year old.

² If 1 year old or over and valued at not more than \$14 per head.

³ If 1 year old or over and valued at more than \$14 per head.

⁴ Under trade agreement with Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936, cattle weighing less than 175 pounds each were dutiable at 1½ cents per pound on entries not in excess of 51,933 head in any calendar year. Under the new Canadian agreement, effective since Jan. 1, 1939, the reduced rate applies to cattle under 200 pounds each and the tariff quota is increased to 100,000 head per calendar year. Entries in excess of tariff quotas are subject to original tariff act rate of 2½ cents per pound.

⁵ Plus 3 cents per pound import excise tax (sec. 2491 (a), Internal Revenue Code).

⁶ Weighing 700 pounds each or more.

⁷ Beef cattle weighing over 700 pounds each were dutiable under the first Canadian trade agreement at 2 cents per pound on entries not in excess of 155,700 head in any calendar year. Under the new Canadian agreement, the tariff quota was increased to 225,000 head and the rate reduced to 1½ cents per pound. Entries in excess of tariff quotas are subject to original tariff act rate of 3 cents per pound.

⁸ Weighing less than 1,050 pounds each.

⁹ Weighing 1,050 pounds each or more.

¹⁰ Weighing less than 700 pounds each.

Tariff rates, peanuts

	Not shelled	Shelled
Tariff Act of 1909.....	½ cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
Tariff Act of 1913.....	¾ cent per pound.	¾ cent per pound.
Emergency Tariff Act, 1921.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
Tariff Act of 1922.....do.....	4 cents per pound.
Presidential proclamation, sec. 315, Tariff Act, 1922 (effective Feb. 18, 1929).	4¼ cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
Tariff Act of 1930 (effective June 18, 1930).do.....	7 cents per pound.

Mr. WILEY. The much-criticized Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act appears to be very acceptable to the peanut interests of the country. Does anyone want to foster increased peanut importations? Again I say, please remember that the tariff on peanuts is more than twice the cost of producing the peanuts. While 199 pounds of beef cattle may have a duty of \$2.985, 199 pounds of peanuts may have a duty of \$9.95. I am sure that my distinguished friends from South Carolina, Virginia, Louisiana, and Maryland do not desire to harm the beef industry. I noted the desire for an increase in the Smoot-Hawley rates asked by Representatives of those States before the United States Tariff Commission on January 9, 1941, when the question of increasing the tariff on crab meat was under consideration. Our colleagues from those States believed in the American market for the people of their States and districts. Why not the American market for all farmers? It will be remembered that the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, said in his testimony before the Commission:

We are vitally interested in protecting anything pertaining to the canning of any of our fish or shrimp or anything of that nature.

The livestock farmers of this country would be apprehensive of this legislation if they realized the millions of dollars of their money being used to subsidize a sectionally produced crop, and if they realized that some favored crop is the beneficiary of an annual subsidy of one-third of the annual value of the crop.

Mr. President, I hope the committee report now striking out the original provision will not be adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Byrd	Gurney
Aiken	Byrnes	Hatch
Andrews	Capper	Hayden
Austin	Caraway	Hill
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Holman
Ball	Connally	Hughes
Bankhead	Danaher	Kilgore
Barbour	Davis	La Follette
Barkley	Ellender	Langer
Bone	George	Lee
Brooks	Gerry	McCarran
Bulow	Gillette	McNary
Burton	Green	Maloney
Butler	Guffey	Murdock

Murray	Shipstead	Tunnell
Norris	Smith	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Stewart	Vandenber
Pepper	Taft	Van Nuys
Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Russell	Tobey	Willis
Sheppard	Truman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the issue involved in this question seems to me to be the perfectly simple one of whether we will be satisfied with the preference for domestically produced articles carried in the general law, or whether we shall substitute for that a complete, ironclad ban against the purchase of certain articles produced outside the United States.

In ordinary circumstances, if there were no danger of war, and if we were not engaged in raising and supplying a very large Army and Navy, I should be taking today the same position that I took with respect to this matter in a previous session of Congress. But in view of the circumstances my feeling is that it is unnecessary and, indeed, unwise to impose the absolute ban which is provided by the amendment.

The act of March 3, 1933, in section 2 of title III, which, I understand, has already been read to the Senate, provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use.

And so forth.

That places it, of course, within the discretion of the executive bureaus which acquire supplies for the United States to determine whether or not the price is unreasonable.

The amendment which the committee has stricken out provides:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except articles of food or clothing not so grown or produced or which cannot be procured in sufficient quantities as and when needed and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto.

It became obvious more than a year ago, when the defense effort was initiated, that difficult problems would arise with respect to the supplying of our armed forces. It also became obvious that unless the defense efforts were carefully managed there might be discrimination against American producers. After consultation with various representatives of the agricultural producers

of the country, I had several conferences with members of the Advisory Council of National Defense, particularly with Hon. Chester C. Davis, member of the Federal Reserve Board, who is on the Advisory Council and who, as members of the Senate will recall, was at one time administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. No person, I assume, in the whole Government has a clearer idea of the producer's point of view than has Chester C. Davis. He was appointed to the Advisory Council because he did have that point of view. In numerous conferences which were held he demonstrated that to be the case.

Our first conferences had to do with the purchase of wool. I was particularly anxious that wool should not be acquired in great quantities from sources outside the United States in such a way as to endanger the interests of the American producer of wool. The Government of Great Britain wanted to make arrangements for the importation into the United States of Australian wool, but as to that the Council of National Defense was so careful that arrangements were made whereby such importation was to be handled in such a way as not to affect adversely the price of wool. The records for the past year demonstrate that effort to have been successful. Producers of wool are receiving a very satisfactory price.

With respect to beef cattle, I am satisfied that the result will be exactly the same, and, as I had occasion to remark on this floor when this amendment was under consideration only a few weeks ago, the officers and directors of the American National Livestock Association came to Washington to hold conferences with the Council of National Defense in order to make certain again that the interests of the producer would be taken care of. They left here entirely satisfied that that would be done. Their satisfaction was based upon the fact that the Purchasing Division of O. P. M., headed by Mr. Donald Nelson and his assistant, Mr. MacKeachie, agreed to change the specifications for the purchase of fresh meats. The weight of the carcass of beef cattle has been reduced from 500 pounds to 450 pounds, and with respect to lamb, the weight of the carcass has been increased from 45 pounds to 60 pounds. Thus assurance was given that the Council of National Defense had in mind the essential interests of the producer. So the officers and directors of the American National Livestock Association left Washington satisfied that the livestock business would not be injured by the rejection of the House provision.

We should not blind ourselves to the fact, Mr. President, that in this all-out effort, to use the popular phrase, and in the expenditure of the huge sums which have been appropriated for national defense, there is grave danger that prices may get out of line. If prices for agricultural products or for any other products should get out of line the producers of such products would, in my opinion, stand in great danger of suffering from the effects of inflation.

We are now engaged in a momentous defense effort in which complete cooperation of all factors of the population is

necessary. When we consider that there are now considerably more than a million men in the Army, and that these men on active field duty will need meat products which can easily be transported in the field, I think we can understand that there is not much danger from the importation of canned meat. The Purchasing Division of O. P. M. has made the statement that it does not contemplate the purchase of more than 20,000,000 pounds of canned meat; and 20,000,000 pounds is a small amount when one considers the total quantity consumed. Importations of canned meat from South America have been greatly reduced during the past year.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I am very much interested in the Senator's statement, for I know he has given very much attention to this matter and has been very helpful in trying to work out this problem. He mentioned a limitation of 20,000,000 pounds of canned meat. To what period does that limitation apply?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand it applies during the next purchasing year.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Does the Senator mean to the 1st of July 1941, or a year from that date?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it is a year from 1941.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I understand, from reading the newspapers and from conversations, that the Government would be glad to get canned meat for peacetime purposes, and if they can purchase 20,000,000 pounds up to July 1, 1941, was there any agreement about future purchases? That is the point I am making.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it was for the present emergency; that is correct; but, Mr. President, I am satisfied that the Defense Council is making a sincere and honest effort to handle a tremendously difficult problem in a way which will serve the best interests of the producer, the producer of agricultural products particularly, and that we may rely upon them to continue to make that effort. I am sure the agricultural interests of this country will not suffer. They may rely upon the good faith of the O. P. M. in carrying out this understanding.

Mr. BUTLER rose.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Kentucky will pardon me just a minute, I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who was on his feet.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the inference from the Senator's remarks seems to be that the restrictions to be placed on importations affect all the purchases the Nation may make from Argentina or other South American countries. Is it not true that this restriction pertains only to the purchases made by the Army under this bill, and that imports are still admissible and coming in at the rate of hundreds of millions of pounds, in the case of all the articles which are admitted regularly by law from season to season? We are

considering only the spending of tax-collected money by official representatives of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the news which is coming to us every day on the radio and the announcements made in the press with respect to the condition of shipping upon the surface of the ocean certainly make it clear that within the next 6 months or a year we are likely to have a tremendous reduction of the amount of tonnage that will be available for the importation of products of any sort, including agricultural products. It was only on Saturday night that the United States Coast Guard seized Italian and Danish and German vessels in various American ports. What is the significance of that action? I certainly do not anticipate that there is going to be any increase of shipping to bring increased imports into the United States. On the contrary, I feel that our problem will be one of finding ships in which to export our products for defense, and we know now that food and agricultural products will be among our exports. I feel that there is every likelihood that the people of America and the Government of America are about to realize that the biggest market we are likely to have is the market right here at home, which is promoted by increasing the purchasing power of the masses of the people.

It is said that one-third of our people are living below the line of poverty. We have had to circulate food stamps in order to dispose of surplus commodities, and primarily to enable persons with deficient purchasing power to acquire these things. We are moving men into the Army. We are providing men with more food materials than many of them have had in their homes. I feel that the time is coming when we should understand that the way out is to build up the purchasing power of those who are in the lower income brackets. When that is done, there will be a new opportunity for agriculture.

The agricultural appropriation bill, which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will have on the floor of the Senate within a short time, contains large appropriations, the purpose of which is to guarantee parity to the farmer. Those appropriations have been sustained by the Senators upon the Appropriations Committee who represent the area from which the Senator from Nebraska comes. I have supported those appropriations, and I feel confident that he may rely upon the disposition of Congress and of the Defense Council adequately to protect the interests of agriculture. Our danger lies in such a policy of restriction that we may bring about an increase in price which will be perilous to all concerned.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator please yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to say first that I, for one, am certain that American agriculture is as anxious as anybody else

in the Nation to see that the cost of living does not go beyond reason; but as yet the commodities which the farmers sell are away under parity, as indicated by the parity appropriation about which the Senator is speaking. I know that the farmers of America will do their bit and do more than their part; but I do not think we should be quite so much worried about a high price for beef and other farm products until we are more nearly in that situation.

I should like to ask the Senator another question. I believe there is some sort of a legal regulation for the prevention of the employment of foreigners in defense work here in America. If that is the case, is it logical by action of this kind to employ foreigners in the production of our food products? It does not seem to me very logical.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The expert upon that question, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REXNOLDS], tells me that there is no such ban upon the employment of aliens in defense work; certainly not such a ban as he would like.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I may say that my information is that in order to get work in defense activities today a man must show his birth certificate, and it must have originated at the right place, or he does not get work.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina will state the inquiry.

Mr. SMITH. This is a vote on whether or not we will allow Argentine canned beef to come in, is it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from South Carolina that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH. It is a parliamentary inquiry. I do not know, and the Chair ought to know.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator that the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment proposing to strike out, on page 5, beginning at line 23, all language, words, and verbiage down to the end of the first paragraph on page 6.

Mr. SMITH. A parliamentary inquiry: That includes the Argentine-beef section, does it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator that that is the so-called meat section.

Mr. SMITH. A vote to permit the purchase of Argentine beef will be "yea," and a vote to keep it out will be "nay"?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An affirmative vote is to strike out the limitation now contained in the bill. A negative vote is opposed to striking out the limitation.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BONE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. GILLETTE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. I am informed that, if he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and vote "yea." I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. My colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained by illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announced the following pairs upon this question:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pair:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

All Senators referred to are necessarily absent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from

California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I inquire how am I recorded?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—29

Andrews	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Hughes	Stewart
Caraway	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
George	Murdock	Truman
Gerry	Murray	Tunnell
Green	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Guffey	Pepper	Wallgren
Hatch	Radcliffe	

NAYS—34

Adams	Capper	Sheppard
Alken	Clark, Idaho	Shipstead
Austin	Connally	Smith
Bailey	Danaher	Taft
Ball	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Holman	Tobey
Brooks	La Follette	Van Nuys
Bulow	Langer	Wheeler
Burton	Lee	Wiley
Butler	McCarran	Willis
Byrd	Norris	
Byrnes	Reed	

NOT VOTING—32

Bilbo	Gillette	Mead
Bone	Glass	Miller
Brewster	Harrison	Nye
Bridges	Herring	Overtton
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Chandler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lucas	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh
Davis	McKellar	White
Downey	McNary	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot conclude the consideration of the bill this afternoon. I, therefore, move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky, that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. For what purpose?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A motion to recess is not debatable.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Let us have a yea-and-nay vote.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement concerning my pair as before, I will say that if at liberty to vote I should vote "nay." The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and let my vote stand. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. ELLENDER. My colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], is detained because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following pairs upon this question:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pair:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

All the Senators named are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—37

Andrews	Guffey	Reynolds
Balley	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Sheppard
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bone	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lee	Truman
Cannally	Maloney	Tunnell
Ellender	Murdock	Tydings
George	Murray	Van Nuys
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Gillette	Pepper	
Green	Radcliffe	

NAYS—28

Adams	Capper	Shipstead
Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Smith
Austin	Danaher	Taft
Ball	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Holman	Tobey
Brooks	La Follette	Wheeler
Bulow	Langer	Wiley
Burton	McCarran	Willis
Butler	Norris	
Byrd	Reed	

NOT VOTING—30

Bilbo	Glass	Mead
Brewster	Harrison	Miller
Bridges	Herring	Nye
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Chandler	Lodge	Smathers
Chavez	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Wagner
Davis	McKellar	Walsh
Downey	McNary	White

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and only Saviour, Thine arm make bare and Thy righteous will be done; may we join with Thy children in heaven above and in earth beneath in giving praise and glory to Thee forever and ever. As each day we live in the network of divine mercy, Thou who art vast to create and uphold, interpret to us more and more of Thyself, leading us along dim-lit paths, opening into larger

vision, clothing us with the completeness of Christian faith. As the branches of the Tree of Life are stretched above our enchanted gaze, let us see a new day in the night of the world's misery, sweeping up in unleashed love and brotherhood of man. This is the greatest and the chiefest of heavenly favors, gracious Father; when Thou dost grant them our souls will cry "Abba, Father." We pray for our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, that they may be wisely directed in the sacred trusts committed to them. Cause us, O God, each evening to lie down in peace and each morning to awaken in new strength. In the name of our glorified Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act 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;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt; and

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Monroe Short;

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries;

S. 390. An act relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks;

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 941. An act for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, J. T. Polk, and E. F. Goudebeck;

S. 994. An act to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other dispositions of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to pre-

vent depletion of the stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes;

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of William A. Wheeler; and

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also 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. 2082. An act 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 message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1692) entitled "An act for the relief of William F. Kliewe," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. BREWSTER 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. 3836) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes."

SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL-DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 113

Resolved, That the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens, authorized by House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, be continued for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, with all powers granted to it under House Resolution 63, House Resolution 491, and House Resolution 629 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and that the said committee be known as the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

That the said select committee be authorized to further inquire into the interstate migration of citizens, emphasizing the present and potential consequences of the migration caused by the national-defense program, the effects of this migration on the various agricultural programs, and the development of economic conditions creating stranded communities and areas of potential migration.

The said select committee may report to the House with recommendations for legislation at any time, but in no event later than January 3, 1943.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist

the select committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services or facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

MARCH 28, 1941.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to submit to you my resignation from the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,

ANDREW L. SOMERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein information from the Office of Production Management with relation to strikes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Mr. R. R. Gardner, of Glenrock, Wyo., delivered before the national convention of the Izaak Walton League.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on April 18, 1941, after the reading of the Journal, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] may be permitted to address the House on Wednesday next for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may be permitted to address the House on Thursday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day for 45 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE COFFEE BILL

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means be permitted to file separate views on Senate Joint Resolution 43, known as the Coffee bill, which is to be considered Wednesday.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I state that there is a light calendar for tomorrow and if possible, we will bring up the Coffee bill tomorrow. I am glad the gentleman has submitted this request, as I wanted to make that announcement for the record.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Official Court Record of New Orleans on the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a paper in my district.

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

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two short resolutions on the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter to me from Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, and my answer thereto.

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

There was no objection.

STRIKES AGAINST THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just placed in the hopper a bill to make strikes against the United States and against the national-defense program during the present emergency constitute treason.

There is no question but that this country faces a grave emergency. Further, there appears to be no difference of opinion among military and naval men that time is one of the most needed things in this connection today, and therefore it appears to me that the wasting of this precious time, if we have been told the truth by our President and the heads of our governmental departments, does constitute treason and may eventually result in the loss of our Nation.

This bill provides for a 25-year prison penalty, without parole or reduction of sentence for good behavior, and in addition, where a death is involved, either directly or indirectly, as a result of a strike, this bill carries the death penalty.

So far as general labor is concerned, constructive, patriotic labor need not fear this bill, as this group has already said that in their group of unions there will be no strikes where national defense is concerned. This patriotic group has already placed the safety and welfare of this Nation before anything.

In connection with the second group, there is no reason why the provisions of this bill should not apply if they continue in their unpatriotic, un-American, treasonable attitude of destruction of the defense program of the United States. There is no reason, either, why a person guilty of treason should not be immediately taken into custody.

This country is fed up with that un-American, European, communistically inclined group attempting to destroy the national-defense program. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of farm parity prices and to include a letter from farm leaders at home.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of strikes, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a short letter from a constituent with regard to taxation.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has arrived for Congress to take some definite action in regard to strikes in national-defense industries. We are not justified in saying that it should be left to public opinion any more than we should leave kidnaping, bank robbery, and piracy to public opinion.

Not everyone who shouts "Aye! Aye!" to the demands of some of our labor leaders is a friend of the man who works. I want to see the people who toil hold and retain every just right that they have, but I also feel that unreasonable, unfair, and unpatriotic action on the part of a few of the leaders is doing more at the present time to jeopardize the welfare of the working people of America than anything else.

We must also bear in mind that in some instances labor leadership is under the domination of Communists and radicals whose purpose is not to assist labor but to destroy this Government.

The executive branch of our Government, and especially the Labor Department, have aided and abetted the radical left-wingers, many of whom are constantly plotting to destroy this Government and our system of free enterprise. We cannot expect the administrative agencies of government to pursue any labor policy other than one of dilly-dallying and appeasement. If we are going to improve the national defense and preserve this Government and its system of free enterprise, Congress, and Congress alone, must act, and act now. The Judiciary Committee should forthwith report a bill to this House for action before the Easter recess begins. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a concurrent resolution of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa urging that appropriate legislation be enacted to make Federal aid available to farm tenants on the same basis as that afforded to urban residents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a brief statement by

the Milk Industry Foundation of New York.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. GEYER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record in two particulars and to include articles on the poll tax and extracts of addresses at a dinner in honor of Judge J. Warren Madden.)

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an interview between Harold John Adonis, director of the New Jersey State Government Bureau of Research, and George E. Stringfellow, president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood, in one of the forum broadcasts over station WINS, on March 29, 1941.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARRIS J. BIXLER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce this morning the death of a former Member of this House, Harris J. Bixler, of the old Twenty-eighth District of Pennsylvania, which is now the Twentieth District, which I have the honor to represent. Mr. Bixler was accidentally killed last Saturday at Johnsonburg, Pa., and his funeral will be held Tuesday, April 1.

Mr. Bixler served in the House from 1921 to 1927, and was an active member of the Ways and Means Committee. He was a man who was liked by everybody and I know he will be greatly missed. In his passing I have lost a real friend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including an analysis of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty of 1938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one to insert in the Appendix of the Record a resolution of the Board of the County Commissioners of Buell County, Mont., with reference to the Townsend plan; the other, to insert an editorial from the Daily Missoulian, with reference to the Office of Internal Revenue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks concerning war veterans in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Alma (Mich.) Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by the inclusion of a resolution of the California State Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, after the legislative business of today is disposed of, and other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after the consideration of the legislative business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on the subject of the income tax, and also to include a brief resolution which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article by Richard L. Neuberger, recently appearing in the magazine section of the New York Times, in reference to the Grand Coulee Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a brief editorial from the Dallas News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by the inclusion of an editorial on the President's Jackson Day speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two particulars, one in respect to farm exports and the other a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY PERKINS

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

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I received in the morning mail the front page of the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express of March 26, a newspaper with large headlines stating "Secretary Perkins, in Los Angeles, says defense strikes not serious." The article goes on to state:

Madam Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, arrived here on the Southern Pacific today from Arizona and expressed herself as unworried by strikes in defense industries.

She planned, however, to confer with her staff of labor conciliators in this area and to "get the background of the whole situation." "Our record for strikes in 1940, and even in 1941, is going to be good," she said. "There haven't been many strikes, not many man-hours of labor have been involved, and they have been easily settled."

It seems to me if Frances Perkins would stay in Washington and attend to her job, she would find out what is going on in the many large strikes all over the country, and then she would be able to judge what the people of this country think about the great number of strikes that are occurring now against defense industries. Miss Perkins is doing what she can to keep on with the strikes instead of trying to get them settled. Why does she do it? Why does she not advocate a 30-day period before strikes are called so that the radical labor leaders can be controlled before they break down our defense program? I hope we will not have any more strikes in defense industries, and that this country will now prepare for any eventuality. Our weak link in national defense is in our Department of Labor. Does not Miss Perkins realize that?

The President could control them and cause them to be settled if he would just say the word, but he says nothing. Why? If the manufacturers refused to manufacture the defense items, the President would take them over. Why does he permit the radical labor leaders to prevent those who want to work from doing so? Seems strange at such a time as this, when he wants to put forward our program of national preparedness.

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

PURCHASE OF PULPWOOD, ETC.

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 61
(Report No. 351)

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 consideration of House Joint Resolution 15, a joint resolution to investigate the apparent monopolistic purchasing of pulpwood by pulp and paper mills under a contract purchase system from farmers and other owners, price fixing of paper and other pulp products under trade practice rules and regulations, including cost of distribution. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour,

to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution 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 joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

4-H CLUB IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks by including a short article from the Saturday Evening Post.

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

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. PATRICK was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.

FOREIGN ACCOUNTS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND INSURED BANKS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 390), relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill. The House Committee on Banking and Currency has reported a bill unanimously which is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object. I simply wish to reiterate, in substance, my position on this bill as it was stated before the committee. I realize the necessity of the provisions of this act for insuring and protecting the banks. I am still not quite satisfied with the other features of this bill, because I think these may have far-reaching and serious implications. I wish we could have had a little more time to consider the bill, but, under the circumstances, I shall not object.

Mr. STEAGALL. The bill simply provides a method by which Federal Reserve banks and insured banks may discharge their liabilities to foreign governments and central banks. As matters are now, there might be more than one effort to assert the right to collect, and the banks could only risk a guess or refuse to pay and issue suits for collection. The bill provides that such claims may be paid to any authority certified by the State Department as the proper authority entitled to receive payment and that remittance to such authority would constitute defense to such suits.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 14 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "or for foreign banks or bankers, or for foreign states as defined in section 25 (b) of this act".

SEC. 2. Section 25 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"Whenever (1) any Federal Reserve bank has received any property from or for the account of a foreign state which is recognized by the Government of the United States, or from or for the account of a central bank of any such foreign state, and holds such property in the name of such foreign state or such central bank; (2) a representative of such foreign state who is recognized by the Secretary of State as being the accredited representative of such foreign state to the Government of the United States has certified to the Secretary of State the name of a person as having authority to receive, control, or dispose of such property; and (3) the authority of such person to act with respect to such property is accepted and recognized by the Secretary of State, and so certified by the Secretary of State to the Federal Reserve bank, the payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such Federal Reserve bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of the Federal Reserve bank for or with respect to such property.

"Whenever (1) any insured bank has received any property from or for the account of a foreign state which is recognized by the Government of the United States, or from or for the account of a central bank of any such foreign state, and holds such property in the name of such foreign state or such central bank; (2) a representative of such foreign state who is recognized by the Secretary of State as being the accredited representative of such foreign state to the Government of the United States has certified to the Secretary of State the name of a person as having authority to receive, control, or dispose of such property; and (3) the authority of such person to act with respect to such property is accepted and recognized by the Secretary of State, and so certified by the Secretary of State to such insured bank, the payment, transfer, delivery, or other disposal of such property by such bank to or upon the order of such person shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and shall constitute a complete discharge and release of any liability of such bank for or with respect to such property. Any suit or other legal proceeding against any insured bank or any officer, director, or employee thereof, arising out of the receipt, possession, or disposition of any such property shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States and the district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction thereof, regardless of the amount involved; and any such bank or any officer, director, or employee thereof which is a defendant in any such suit may, at any time before trial thereof, remove such suit from a State court into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for the removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

"Nothing in this section shall be deemed to repeal or to modify in any manner any of the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (ch. 6, 48 Stat. 337), as amended, the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (ch. 674, 48 Stat. 1178), as amended, or subdivision (b) of section 5 of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, or any actions, regulations, rules, orders, or proclamations taken, promulgated, made, or issued pursuant to any of such

statutes. In any case in which a license to act with respect to any property referred to in this section is required under any of said statutes, regulations, rules, orders, or proclamations, notification to the Secretary of State by the proper Government officer or agency of the issuance of an appropriate license or that appropriate licenses will be issued on application shall be a prerequisite to any action by the Secretary of State pursuant to this section, and the action of the Secretary of State shall relate only to such property as is included in such notification. Each such notification shall include the terms and conditions of such license or licenses and a description of the property to which they relate.

"For the purposes of this section, (1) the term 'property' includes gold, silver, currency, credits, deposits, securities, choses in action, and any other form of property, the proceeds thereof, and any right, title, or interest therein; (2) the term 'foreign state' includes any foreign government or any department, district, province, county, possession, or other similar governmental organization or subdivision of a foreign government, and any agency or instrumentality of any such foreign government or of any such organization or subdivision; (3) the term 'central bank' includes any foreign bank or banker authorized to perform any one or more of the functions of a central bank; (4) the term 'person' includes any individual, or any corporation, partnership, association, or other similar organization; and (5) the term 'insured bank' shall have the meaning given to it in section 12B of this act."

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

A similar bill (H. R. 4216) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address made by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL-DEFENSE MIGRATION

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 113

Resolved, That the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens, authorized by House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, be continued for the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress, with all powers granted to it under House Resolution 63, House Resolution 491, and House Resolution 629 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and that the said committee be known as the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

That the said select committee be authorized to further inquire into the interstate migration of citizens, emphasizing the present and potential consequences of the migra-

tion caused by the national-defense program, the effects of this migration on the various agricultural programs, and the development of economic conditions creating stranded communities and areas of potential migration.

The said select committee may report to the House with recommendations for legislation at any time, but in no event later than January 3, 1943.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist the select committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services of facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes, being one-half the time, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the continuation throughout the duration of the Seventy-seventh Congress of the so-called Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens, which was set up during the last Congress, and that it shall hereafter be known as the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

The committee, as provided in the resolution, may report to the House with recommendations for legislation at any time, but in no event later than January 3, 1943.

This committee, with the work of which I believe most of us are familiar, is headed, as you all know, by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHN H. TOLAN]. Other members of the select committee are the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS]. Recently there has been added to the committee to fill a vacancy since the beginning of this session, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD].

The committee, I believe, has commanded the respect not only of all Members of the House but also of all citizens throughout the country who are interested in the serious problem of interstate migration of destitute citizens. The committee has not sought any great publicity. They have been conducting, in a very courteous manner, a careful and thorough investigation. They have been doing a good job. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

The gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] has issued a statement concerning the work of the committee of which he is chairman, which statement is as follows:

The select committee was created by the House on April 22, 1940, and began its first hearings July 29, 1940. In the 8 months since our first hearings opened we have completed a comprehensive study of the movements of destitute families across State lines, their causes and effect during the last decade.

In the midst of this study a great new movement, that of defense migrants, began. It is with this whole new pattern of problems that the committee now concerns itself and asks for continuation, under the title of the Committee to Investigate National Defense Migration.

By order of the House the report of our committee on work accomplished to date is due next Thursday, April 3. I am happy to inform you that the report will be released on time.

Outside of interested Members of the House, the following individuals and public groups request continuation: Chester C. Davis, Defense Commissioner on Agriculture; Harriet Elliott, Defense Commissioner on Consumer Protection; Paul V. McNutt, Administrator, Federal Security Agency; Charles P. Taft, Assistant Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Related Defense Activities; William Green, president, American Federation of Labor; Mrs. Saide Orr Dunbar, president, General Federation of Womens Clubs; National Travelers Aid Association; Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America (Home Mission Council of North America); National Catholic Welfare Conference, as well as leading newspapers and periodicals.

It gives me pleasure at this time to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the author of this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can say much to you about the work of this committee or the continuation of the committee in 5 minutes, but I do want to sketch very briefly some of the things we have been doing and some of the things that have prompted us in asking for the continuance of this committee during the Seventy-seventh Congress.

This committee was set up last summer upon a resolution introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN]. When members were appointed apparently it was the purpose of the Speaker at that time to place someone on the committee from each of the major sections of the United States. You will notice that the five members pretty well cover the different sections of the United States.

We started with our first hearings in New York in the latter part of July or the first of August; then we went to Montgomery, Ala.; then to Chicago; next to Lincoln, Nebr.; then to Oklahoma City, San Francisco, Los Angeles; and then back to Washington, D. C.

While we were in California, we made a 2-day trip down through the central part of the State visiting a good many of the largest farming areas, visiting many of the private labor camps, and also some of the Farm Security Administration migrant camps. We came back to Washington the first part of December and started our hearings in Washington. We heard from a great many of the various governmental agencies, as well as private agencies, interested in this problem.

Let me say to you very frankly that had it not been for the changed conditions that came before us in Washington—that became apparent to us at that time—we would not be here today asking a continuation of this committee. So far as our primary interest has been concerned—agricultural migration—I believe we have pretty well completed that work for the present, and our report will be filed within the next 2 or 3 days covering our work up to this time and making recommendations based upon those hearings.

But by the time we got to the Washington hearings in December the na-

tional-defense program was well under way, and it became apparent that this migrant problem was being greatly accentuated as a result of our defense program. People were rushing to the sites of these various defense projects in search of work without apparently any previous consideration of housing, sanitation, schools, and various other things we usually think of as being necessary for proper living conditions. We also started wondering what was going to happen not only to these workers who were engaged in the construction part of the program but to those who were going to operate the plants. A great many of these plants, of course, are bound to be of a temporary nature. Their operation is bound to be temporary, and when this emergency is over a great many of the plants are bound to close down with a suddenness that will give to us, unless we study it ahead of time and plan and prepare for it, a terrific shock.

Mr. Chester Davis, of the Defense Commission, was one of the first to ask us to continue the work of this committee, with particular emphasis upon the defense migration. Mr. Paul McNutt likewise asked that we continue it. Miss Harriet Elliott, another member of the Defense Commission, Monseigneur Ryan, head of the Social Welfare Organization of the Catholic Church, and various other persons and organizations interested in this problem asked us to continue the work of this committee. As a result of these various requests our committee discussed it, considered it carefully, and the consequence was the introduction of this resolution that is before us at this time. I believe there is a great work to be done and that the committee should be continued. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from Vermont complained that I did not yield him time on a certain piece of legislation. I now yield him as much time as he may desire.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein certain excerpts from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes from the Rules Committee with a recommendation for its adoption. I think it should be adopted, although I have some misgivings as to just what it may accomplish because, after all, the thing it seeks to reach, if I understand it correctly, is part and parcel of a major over-all problem that is the primary concern of the Congress as a whole.

You will recall that the so-called Tolan committee was set up some time ago to study the problem of interstate migration. It had come to the attention of Congress in many ways that destitute

people living in areas where they could no longer make a decent living for one reason or another were migrating from those areas into other areas where they hoped to find employment. Many of the areas to which they went unfortunately were areas where there was not sufficient employment to take care of them, and as a result the relief loads on those areas became terrific. Suffering and destitution was on every hand. It was said to be a problem for the Congress to consider because the migration was across State lines and because it was a national problem. In an effort to determine what the causes of that migration were and what might be done to alleviate some of the distress and suffering that flows from such migration the Tolan committee was set up.

In considering this proposal for the extension of the committee I believe we should bear in mind that the problem which I understand this resolution seeks to deal with is a different problem from the one originally sought to be dealt with by the Tolan committee.

In other words, the migration that was in mind when the committee was first set up was migration from an area where there was no work to another area where there likewise was no work. The migration that is presently taking place all over the country is a migration to areas where there is employment. If I understand this proposal correctly, it contemplates a coming of the time when the war will end, when the tremendous war or defense effort that is presently going on the country will come to an end and when the workers who have migrated to these areas of defense effort will find themselves out of employment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said with reference to the purpose of the committee, and I am in agreement with him. A different type of problem has arisen in the Middle West recently as a result of the defense program. That is a problem that results from an exodus of persons engaged in labor in the Middle West to places where defense plants are established. It is a well-known fact that there are not a great many defense plants in the Middle West. The section of the country which lost the greatest amount of population during the last decade is now being more greatly denuded of its labor by an exodus of labor to points along the seaboard or to the industrial sections where people are seeking work.

May not that problem be considered by this committee as well as the problem to which the gentleman has addressed himself up to this point?

Mr. HALLECK. The resolution does provide that the committee shall study the facts of this migration; that is, with reference to defense-work migration and the various agricultural problems, and, knowing the gentleman's intense interest in agriculture, I take it he has that in mind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would it not be possible for this committee to give consideration to the question of the balancing of our national economy by recommending that a reasonable number of these defense plants be located in the Middle West, which has suffered so drastically from the ravages of nature, from drought and from crop failures? Would it not be within the province of this committee to give consideration to the question of recommending that this unbalancing be offset to the advantage of the Middle West, which has suffered so badly, by the location of some of these defense plants in the Middle West? That would have an additional effect of decentralizing industry, which is one of the objectives of the defense program, and it would also greatly benefit the Middle West, which needs this sort of a program.

Mr. HALLECK. Under the resolution I think clearly the committee could make such a recommendation. As to whether or not it would be followed by those in authority in respect to the location of further defense industries, I do not know.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I realize the gentleman cannot commit himself as to what the committee may do, but I believe it would be well, when we vote to continue the committee, that the Congress indicate, and those who are interested in the problem of the Middle West should indicate to the committee, that it give consideration to that question.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Right along that line, I may say that the committee has given that consideration, particularly since the Washington hearings held last December. We have quite a little testimony from Chester Davis and others in reference to the placing of defense industries and its effect upon the movement of people and the dislocation of people; however, we are without authority other than to get these facts and deliver them to the House.

Mr. HALLECK. The committee would be permitted under this resolution to make a recommendation?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and that is one of the things we expect to do.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, if I might proceed for a moment, in order to conclude my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give this note of warning to the committee as it enters upon its work. I said a moment ago that the resolution clearly contemplates the potential problem of migration that will follow the end of the war effort, because many of the industries are highly temporary in their nature and will be closed down after the war is over. I am one of those who believes that a man going from his home in Nebraska, Indiana, or any place else to take one of these high-paid defense jobs should understand, know, and realize that it is incumbent upon him to think a little bit ahead and to begin to make some preparation for his resettlement after this

emergency is over. I for one would not want to go on record here today by supporting this resolution as putting the Government in the position of saying to these workers: "You can spend every dime you make, you can live high, wide, and handsome, while this job holds, and after it ends the Government will step in, assume the problem of your resettlement and undertake to see to it that you are put back to some place where you will again have a job."

I just do not want these people who are going to these jobs to have any idea that the Congress of the United States, rather than expecting them as individuals to make some provision for their own future security, is going to immediately, even before the time comes, when there is a problem, undertake to carry the responsibility for them. I think that is one danger that is implicit in the extension of this committee's life.

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

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad the gentleman emphasizes that point and the committee, if its life is extended, should take note of that so that one of the fruits of its work might be to give this kind of warning to these workers who are migrating.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I suggest again that the problem of migration, as it is referred to in the pending resolution and in the work of this committee, is part and parcel of the whole problem? There is no question but what we are now living under another illusion of prosperity created by the tremendous deficit financing of defense work. One of these days we will be back with our old problems of continuing economic depression and the necessity of working out ways and means to bring about economic recovery.

I wish I could feel in my heart that we had solved the problems of economic depression before this latest phase came upon us, but I am one of those who are very much afraid that we have not solved them, and that one of these fine days those problems will be back upon us with ever-increasing fury.

Therefore, as this committee works along and as all of us work along in a spirit of unity for the preservation of our country and for its defense against the threat of dictators from without, let us constantly have in mind the coming of a day when we will again be suffering the ravages of unemployment, depression, distress, and suffering, and let us, as far as we can, build our program to the end that when this is over we can so revitalize our economy as to provide real work opportunities for our men and women who want to work. Let us not be willing to say, "Oh, well, just have another public works program and continue with more of our deficit financing," because one of these days, whether we like it or not, we are going to get to the bottom of the sock.

There is only one solution for the general problem and that is to provide real work opportunities for the people who want to work. If this committee can perform any real service in that direction, I

think it should do it. It should develop in these defense workers a recognition of their individual responsibility to take care of themselves and their families. It should be constantly shaping policies and views and preparing programs that may be adopted by Congress to the end that we bring about real economic recovery. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when I accepted a place upon this Select Committee for the Investigation of Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens I had two very definite notions in mind with respect to that committee. One was that we should finish our work on time and the other was that we should keep our expenditures within the allotted money that was given us by the Committee on Accounts. Our report that is due on April 3 will be filed by that time, and I understand there will be a few dollars left in the fund after we have finished our work.

This committee has called the attention of Congress and the Nation to a rather serious condition that exists in this country. It seems to me that it has uncovered a situation that is far more serious than mere relief, that is, that we are witnessing the development in this country of a gypsy population of about 4,000,000 people. It is my understanding of our Constitution that every citizen of the United States is also a citizen of the State wherein he resides. We have about 4,000,000 people who at this time are not residents or citizens of any State.

I agree with everything the gentleman from Indiana has said in regard to the work of this committee. I hope that it does not, and I am sure that it will not, become a mere instrument whereby more and greater relief is provided when all this national-defense industry is over.

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman feel that rather than have this problem develop by concentrating the defense industries in the thickly populated sections of the country, it would be better to prevent the rise of the problem by distributing defense industries through the Middle West and pushing them back from the seaboard so that this concentration of defense population will not take place?

Mr. CURTIS. I very much agree with the gentleman, and the committee has done considerable along that line. Of course, we are without authority to tell the Defense Commission, or anyone else, where they shall locate industries, but we have placed in our records and brought to the attention of several members of the Defense Commission the situation that is arising by reason of the congestion of these defense industries.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentleman's committee is doing a good piece of work in that connection, and I hope you will continue to call that to the attention of the country, because up to date at least there has been altogether too much of a tendency to concentrate these in-

dustries in the large cities and thereby aggravate the problem the committee is attempting to alleviate. I believe the attention of the country should repeatedly be called to the fact that throughout the Middle West, where there are so many unemployed people, there are splendid places to locate defense industries without aggravating the migrant problem.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. If the gentleman will read our Washington hearings, particularly the testimony of Chester Davis, he will find that we have gone into that matter and have shown what a potential labor supply there is in the agricultural area. I may say that the decentralizing of defense industries and placing them in the agricultural areas has been opposed by certain organized labor groups, which wanted those industries established in the industrial "ghost towns" in industrial States.

Mr. MUNDT. I may add that Chester Davis has been very friendly to that kind of movement. I only wish more of our dollar-a-year men came from the Middle West.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Dakotas, Montana, Wyoming, and western Nebraska, as the gentleman knows, are being drained white of our skilled labor, for these men are going elsewhere. The result is that our unemployment situation is just as bad as it has ever been. The defense program has not helped it at all. In addition none of the States I have mentioned has any of the industries we are speaking about developing to carry out the defense program.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I assure him that I am very much in sympathy with the decentralizing of defense industries.

Coming back to the situation with regard to these migrants, as I said earlier, perhaps somewhere between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 people who are citizens of the United States are not citizens of any State. What happens to them? They travel from one State to another trying to find work or relief or what not.

They are given a little temporary relief and told to move on, and the result has been a contest between States over settlement laws. In the last few years the legislatures of a number of States have increased the settlement requirements for persons seeking relief. This has meant that the burden has fallen upon the private charities in our large cities and created a tremendous problem. Regardless of what is ultimately done from the standpoint of relief in connection with these people, I believe and I hope this committee will be able to bring forth recommendations that will again place these people in the communities where they belong, where they can have their homes and their friends and their neighbors.

I stated in the beginning of my remarks that we wanted to finish this investigation on time. There were several things that happened in 1940. One of

them was the starting of the European war and of our defense program. For the first time in the history of our Republic Congress remained in session until the new Congress came into being, and whether some of you recall it or not, it was also an election year. In spite of all these obstacles the committee traveled several thousand miles, heard hundreds of witnesses. Our hearings will include about 14 volumes. With the stress of all these things, I feel that we have not been able to go into the problem as well as we should.

In addition to this, the whole picture of the movement of people and their dislocation has become more accentuated by reason of the defense program itself, but, after all, I am not so very much worried about the problems facing these people who are going to these defense industries. They are all going to get a job and those who get on the pay roll will somehow get along. The various agencies will muddle through in some way and everybody will be taken care of, but I am thinking of that day when all this defense industry stops very abruptly. I, for one, hope that our economy will be such and that these individuals will have planned for themselves to such an extent that mere relief is not the only answer when that time comes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How are they going to plan for themselves when there are not any defense industries to go to and they are growing poorer every day? How are they going to know where to find jobs?

Mr. CURTIS. I wish you would not discourage this committee by emphasizing how tremendously difficult the job will be.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I only hope you tell us what answers you have thought of along these lines.

Mr. CURTIS. It has been definitely talked of in our committee, although there have been some witnesses who have disagreed with the proposition that there might be some enforced saving on the part of people engaged in national-defense industries, so that when the emergency is over they are not dependent upon public relief. The details of that have not been worked out and there is opposition to it, but that is one of the lines we have been trying to pursue. We want to do exactly the thing that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] called to our attention and that is not make everyone dependent upon relief when this defense program is over.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am interested in the statement of the able Representative from Nebraska that some means should be devised to force saving for the evil day so that these people may not be left stranded when a condition of unemployment comes about, and I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Nebraska what he thinks about the farmer in the South whose income is less than

\$200 a year. What does the gentleman think about forcing that man to save out of his meager earnings when he cannot make enough or does not make enough for the bare necessities of life, to say nothing about any of the comforts of life?

Mr. CURTIS. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman. In the first place, the gentleman has misunderstood my statement. I simply cited that as an illustration of the type of thing we were trying to follow through on, and, in the second place, I do not feel that the farmer the gentleman refers to, if he is making only \$200 a year, would be an employee in a national-defense industry. We are referring to those people who are receiving wages that would justify following such a plan. And, again, I am not advocating that as a recommendation of the committee. I simply cite that as one of the things called to the attention of the committee in regard to national-defense migration.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If the gentleman will yield for a further question, I will call his attention to the fact that these people represent about ten or fifteen millions of the inhabitants of this country and are a very substantial part of our population. I wonder if the gentleman has thought about trying to suggest some means of raising the income of these people so that the conditions would be different in these communities?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I am glad to inform the gentleman that, so far as my interests on this committee are concerned, or until this whole war emergency came along, were primarily with the agricultural people of the United States, because I felt that was the source of most of our outward migration, both in the areas of the South that are problem areas, and the area I know the best—the Great Plains States—where the drought and the dust storms have made conditions almost unbearable for the people there. This committee has gone into the problems of farm prices, soil problems, water needs, mechanization, and other farm problems. I may say that my own State of Nebraska has had a percentage loss in population second in the entire Union. Half of those people have gone from my own congressional district. I believe the plight of agriculture is the source of a great deal of this migration. While many of those people did not take to the road and become "oakies," or the individuals referred to in John Steinbeck's book, they did leave the farm unwillingly and went to the city and perhaps got a job, and may have displaced someone who did become a migrant.

I wish this Committee of Five could provide the solution of all our agricultural ills, I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]. That is one of the problems that we are working on, but, after all, we cannot do what this entire Congress up to date has failed to do. I do believe our report will contain some worth while suggestions toward that end.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman is familiar with our section of the State. Will the committee make some recommendations to take care of our territory?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; there will be recommendations dealing with the drought area, involving water conservation, farm ownership, and related items. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL].

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of transient unemployed is a very serious one not only from the standpoint of cost to the community, but from the standpoint of permanent rehabilitation to any metropolitan district such as mine. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that it will be extremely important after the present emergency.

The city of Minneapolis, part of which I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives, is vitally interested in the problem of the transient unemployed workers or the transient unemployed and his family. In cities of the population group of 250,000 to 500,000, Minneapolis ranks second in the number of transient cases handled. A study of this problem in Minneapolis shows that the average unemployed transient family consists of a man and his wife and four children. Their care under the department of public relief costs the city of Minneapolis approximately \$115,000 annually. In addition to this fund private agencies expended a considerable amount of money in meeting the direct needs of families following the expiration of the regular 15-day public-relief period.

For instance, during the month of June 1940, 176 transient cases were dealt with in varying degrees by private agencies in Minneapolis for which there are no funds for this purpose. Although the cost to Minneapolis is approximately \$115,000 per year, the expenditure of this amount of money is meeting only the bare necessities of livelihood for these transient unemployed, and is in no way helping to permanently solve this problem or to offer any means of stabilization.

In Minneapolis a transient service was set up by all agencies for homeless persons and families. At the present time relief is given to employable transient couples for only 15 days and only emergency medical care is furnished. Most other cities have somewhat similar rules and regulations regarding the care of these transients. The very fact that they are transients and that no city is willing or financially able to let down the bars and class them as residents compels them to remain transients and condemns them to a floating existence finding temporary employment where they can and moving from place to place in order to come under short periods of direct relief.

Without Federal leadership and Federal financial aid the problem of the transient unemployed seemingly must always remain such a problem with the consequent heavy drain on relief funds of various cities. It is a problem that I believe not only my district, but every other district will be interested in seeing it solved.

I believe the work of this committee in making an investigation of facts and attempting to work out a permanent solution is one to be commended and its continuation should be supported.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that this resolution will be adopted. I think the gentlemen on this committee have done a mighty good job.

I think there is the greatest importance in what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said about the tremendous importance of solving fundamentally the economic problem that will confront us in the future, but I cannot expand on that in 2 minutes. I should like to say to this committee that I hope very much, since its scope has been somewhat broadened to consider defense migration, that that does not mean that the committee will in any way neglect the splendid job done up to now in studying the more basic problems of migration of homeless people about our country and the destitution of a large number of our farm people. I doubt very seriously that those problems will be very much mitigated by the business of the defense program, and as I have said many times on the floor, I feel that those people who have in the past throughout the history of America been the tillers and owners of the soil are the backbone of our Nation. I hope the committee will continue its work in that field just as vigorously as it has done it up to now, and I hope this resolution will be agreed to. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], the chairman of the committee.

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

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

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is really in the spirit of gratitude that I address the House today rather than in a spirit of appeal for a continuation of my own committee. I have lived with this problem for about a year, and it is the most interesting investigation and the most interesting matter I was ever connected with. During our entire national existence we have spent millions of dollars for the regulation and protection of interstate commerce, the passing of iron and steel through the States. Congress has appropriated during the last five sessions for the regulation and control of the migration of birds \$7,500 each year; but we never, up until this investigation, have spent any money for the study of human migration.

As a committee we have paid no attention to partisanship. The finest gentlemen I have ever been associated with in my life are the members of this committee, Congressmen OSMERS, PARSONS, CURTIS, and SPARKMAN, and we have an able new member, Congressman ARNOLD, of Illinois, succeeding Congressman PARSONS. We traveled throughout the United States and never issued a single

subpena. Neither did we ever attempt to cross-examine any witness.

What constitutes migration? We have always had it in the United States. In the early days of this country we welcomed migration. Lincoln was a migrant from Kentucky and he always referred to how well the Ohio people took care of him.

But when the depression came along all sorts of barriers are raised against human migration from State to State. I would like to say to you that everyone has a constitutional right in this country to move from one State to the other. The migration of people between States is caused by many things—wornout soil, unemployment, mechanization, and other factors. Therefore there is no single solution to the migration problem in this country.

We started out in New York. Mayor LaGuardia was our first witness. He said this is a national problem. We heard the Governors of the States. We heard the leaders of most every State in the Union. They all agree that it is a national problem.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURRIS] referred to his State. Please ponder these figures: One-half of his congressional district had to migrate to other States. Eight years of steady drought in his district caused them to move.

In all of our travels—and we examined nearly 400 witnesses—we never met one of them who did not want to stay home if he could stay home. But there comes a time when you have got to move. In other words, our own American people will not starve standing still.

Now what are you going to do about it? We certainly can do better than we have been doing. They leave their farms. They go on the road. The first thing they run into is the private employment agency that offers them jobs when there are no jobs across the State border. We have contractors, who transport migrants from Southern States all the way up into Michigan. No rest; no nothing.

Under the laws of this country, you know, there is the Interstate Commerce Commission watching carefully every railroad, requiring the unloading, feeding, and watering of cattle every 24 hours. We have been paying more attention to cattle than we have to human beings.

I have introduced a bill that will put these private employment agencies out of the business of sending these people across State lines, promising them jobs when there are no jobs. What is the solution to it? What are we going to do about it? Are we going to remain idle like we have in all the years of our history?

Nearly every State in the Union has laws making it a misdemeanor to transport a destitute citizen across State lines. One State law makes it a felony, a penitentiary offense to transport a destitute person across the State line. They have raised barriers in every State in the Union, making a residence qualification from 1 year up to 5 years. In other

words, when you leave your home in one State now you lose your residence there and you do not acquire a new one. You become a homeless, Stateless wanderer in this country of ours. If we can fix a status for iron and coal and steel in this country we ought to be able to fix a status for a good American citizen who has to move on account of circumstances over which he had no control. [Applause.]

Now, about the farmers. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] mentioned the farmers. There is not an acre of farming ground in my district. There are no migrant camps or anything like that in my district. One of the solutions of this problem is to keep them at home. The Farm Security Administration appropriation was cut this year. We are making a fight to restore it. Those people do not want to leave their homes. I want to make this one point to you. We have to make this country worth fighting for and dying for and we cannot do this by kicking around millions of our migrant people. We must watch the morale of our people. You had 4,000,000 of these migrants on the road last year that were just kicked around. What are we going to do for them? It seems to me when we have standing committees and the Interstate Commerce Commission watching over the entire interstate transportation system, protecting the free flow of commodities in this country, and appropriate thousands for the regulation and protection of wildlife, it is about time we address a little attention to the human equation in this country. [Applause.]

I would like to point this out to you—that each of you are citizens of your respective States, and under the Constitution you are citizens of the 48 States. You go broke or lose your farm and try to negotiate the 48 States, or some of them, and see what you are up against.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I do not raise any opposition to the spirit or principle of this resolution. I agree that the committee is wrestling with a very important problem, and the work thus far accomplished is largely attributable to the able and sincere leadership of the gentleman from California. I do wish to call attention, however, to the language of the resolution in line 9, page 2, that "the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage"—and I labor those three words "and/or engage"—personnel temporarily to assist the select committee upon the request of the chairman. I am mindful that it is too late to approach this angle by an attempted amendment, but I would like to have the RECORD reflect the intention of the committee with regard to the administration of that particular language in the resolution, to the end that we are not throwing the door wide open to a vast increase in Government personnel for the functions intended.

Mr. TOLAN. Has the gentleman ever had any experience with the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have not. I have not been here long enough.

Mr. TOLAN. You will find out there is not much trouble about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEAVY. There is some considerable contention made that since the national-defense program is absorbing so many unemployed there no longer exists the necessity for the continuance of a committee such as the gentleman has so eminently headed and been so well supported by the membership of the committee; but is it not a fact that just the contrary is true—that the national-defense program is causing a migration of unemployed people far beyond the needs and its ability to absorb them?

Mr. TOLAN. Yes. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That was brought out by several witnesses last week at our hearings. The defense program has augmented the migration; not only augmented it, but there are four or five people waiting for each and every job.

Mr. LEAVY. This committee therefore ought to be continued, for its need is even greater than it was a year ago.

Mr. TOLAN. I thank my good friend the gentleman from Washington Congressman LEAVY.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On that particular point I have in my hand an article from the most recent number of the Daily Argus Leader, which deals with the question of men migrating from small communities to the shipyards and other places seeking employment. Later in the day I shall ask permission to extend the article in the Record.

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

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I should like to get the gentleman's reaction for the benefit of those on this side who are going to support the resolution as to what the future of this legislation will be; how much it will cost.

Mr. TOLAN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that it is nearly a year now since our committee was set up. We spent \$23,000 and will have some small amount to return. As to the cost, we have been working on our final report and have not had time to complete our break-down on the appropriation to be asked for. Let me say, however, that we never spent a dime on publicity and that we borrowed every bit of help we could. I can allay any fears that any unreasonable sum of money will be asked.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman expect to ask for more money than he had originally?

Mr. TOLAN. I do not know about that; I have no idea. The resolution was offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and will be presented to the Committee on Accounts for action.

Mr. FISH. I shall support the continuation of the committee. It is one thing if the gentleman expects to ask for the same amount or not more than the same amount his committee had last year but quite another if he expects to ask for \$50,000 or \$100,000.

Mr. TOLAN. As I say, I have no idea at this time just what amount of money will be requested from the Committee on Accounts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that if there are idle factories in the cities with thoroughly competent workers in the immediate neighborhood who could work in defense production the gentleman's committee will consider having a defense industry put in such factories. For instance, in my own city of Lowell there are vacant factories and there are highly skilled labor in that city also.

Mr. TOLAN. Absolutely. That is within our jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, let me in conclusion say again that I am deeply grateful for the assistance we have had from the leadership of this House—and that means on both sides of the House—the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the assistance we have had from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, and every member of the Rules Committee which reported the resolution out favorably—and to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS]. I again say to you I close in a spirit of gratitude. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the membership were informed as to the splendid services and valuable work this committee has rendered to the House and to the country there would not be a single vote cast against this resolution, which proposes to extend the time of this committee.

I may say to the gentleman from New York in answer to his objection or question, that it merely means the committee may have the right to request aid from the departments so they would not be obliged to spend any more money than absolutely necessary. To my colleague, a member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], let me say that during my many years of service I have never seen a committee more economical than this so-called Tolan committee.

The gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], chairman of this committee—yes, and each and every member of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], have shown themselves to be sincere, honest, and hard-working men, and although the committee is composed of these very conscientious and active members, I know it will be materially strengthened in its work by the appointment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] as a member to fill the existing vacancy who, as the House knows, is an exceptionally able and diligent member.

I do not know of a committee of the House that has devoted its time and energy to a greater degree with a desire to

be of aid in bringing about or eliminating unfortunate migration conditions that might develop after the preparedness or defense program is out of the way than has this committee. The work they have done up to now entitles them, as I say, to the thanks of the House; but I must not omit to say that some preliminary investigations of the problems of migrant workers were originally made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], in cooperation with about 40 other Members. They began working on the problem of unemployment, and I am sure that this group, which is composed of members of both parties will cooperate with this committee in continuing its splendid work in the future.

This committee, unlike certain Members of the House, does not brand anyone who tries to improve the conditions of labor as being a Socialist, a Communist, or a person dangerous to the community. They view these men as men who are entitled in this great Nation of ours to provide themselves and their families with the necessities of life. Due to conditions that existed a few years ago, millions of people, unfortunately, were unable to find employment, and they were obliged to migrate to other parts of the country. Because of this condition many agencies in this country took advantage of these unemployed by charging them exorbitant fees for temporary positions, and in many instances misrepresented the work that was to be given them in the place to which they were lured in search of employment. I hope we have put an end to that, and with the bill now pending, which I hope will be enacted shortly, we will put all of these cutthroats and dishonest men out of business.

We all must recognize that the defense program will bring about a dislocation of labor, not only in the farming sections, but also in those centers of the Middle West which have been shorn of thousands of skilled mechanics and skilled laborers. Consequently, in view of conditions, I feel it is timely that a thorough study be made so that when these activities cease and legislation is most needed, we will have before us the results of the committee's investigations and its recommendations upon which we can act intelligently.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt the fears entertained by the gentleman from Indiana as to the after-effects of this defense migration, as I feel that there will not be a recurrence of the conditions which confronted the country in 1930, 12 years after the World War. Thanks to its creation, the Securities and Exchange Commission will serve to prevent in the future any orgy of inflation similar to that which took place in 1928 and 1929, which resulted in the financial crash and subsequent depression.

In conclusion, I want to say once more that this committee is entitled to the appreciation of the House and the country for the splendid work which it has done. I know they will continue with the same determination and sincere effort to help the cause of the migrant workers. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY], who is ill and unavoidably absent on account of illness, may have permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

NET WEIGHTS IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TRANSACTIONS IN COTTON

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 136.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 136

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 consideration of H. R. 968, a bill to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, 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 Agriculture, 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. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and pending that I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY].

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, this net-weight cotton bill has been before the Congress many, many years. We usually pass it in the House but it always fails to pass the Senate. I am going to state briefly what the bill does, its purposes, then try to give you a picture of conditions, and finally draw the conclusions that I deem are reasonable and logical why this bill, if enacted into law, will help the cotton farmer. He is the man I am endeavoring to help, and I think we all agree that the majority of those opposing this legislation are the people who are interested in the jute industry. We all know the farmer always pays the bill, and losses are usually passed on to him by those higher up.

This cotton net-weight bill simply authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the handling and the transportation of cotton, and, further, to investigate the wrappings that cotton is wrapped in when it is ginned. After investigating the materials that wrap the cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish a standard known

as United States official cotton tare standard, which means prescribing the type of bagging or material with which the baled cotton will be wrapped when ginned.

The bill goes further and provides that the Secretary of Agriculture in establishing this standard has to prescribe that the material used for wrapping the cotton shall not exceed the maximum weight of 14 ounces per square yard; that the patches put on the baled cotton will not weight over 20 ounces each. After he promulgates these standard tares or establishes standard tares, which this bill provides shall be done by January 15, 1942, then every bale of cotton ginned after July 15, 1942, shall be sold on a net-weight basis. This simply means the cotton shall be sold on the basis of the weight of the cotton in the bale. In other words, less the weight of the wrappings and the ties.

What condition does that bring about that is different from the present condition? Briefly, the present condition is, as evidenced by the two bales of cotton out in the lobby and as evidenced by various pictures that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], will show you, for he has given years and years of thought and study to this bill and this type of legislation, as well as the result that will naturally follow to the farmer. I do not think there is a Member of this House but who will say that the American ginned bale of cotton today is the most unsightly, the most disgraceful, and the most uneconomic package that is put on the market today by any business at all. Cotton is the only agricultural commodity that is today sold on a gross-weight basis. Of course, if you consider cattle an agricultural commodity, some of them are sold on the hoof.

A number of you Members perhaps have never seen a bale of cotton or possibly do not know how it is ginned. Here is what is happening today and here is what this bill is endeavoring to remedy: The farmer knows that the cotton he produces will about one-third itself. In other words, he puts up 1,500 pounds of seed cotton in his wagon or vehicle and carries it to the gin and knows it will gin around about 500 pounds, or one-third. There the ginner usually charges him about \$5. This \$5 is not altogether for ginning. The ginner usually sells him the jute. That is this open-weaved stuff that you see out here on the bale of cotton on exhibit. On the average, that costs the farmer about 50 cents, and it takes about 6 lineal yards of jute to cover a bale of cotton. The farmer pays for it about 50 cents, and the jute that he puts on that cotton will weigh around 14 pounds, or at least that. The ties will weigh about 1½ pounds apiece, and there are 6 ties to a bale, which is a total of about 9 pounds. You get, then, about 23 or 25 pounds of bagging and ties to a bale of cotton that weighs 500 pounds, including wrapping, ties, and so forth.

Of course, the farmer pays for that at the gin. Then the farmer takes his cotton and sells it to the ginner or the cotton buyer or whoever it is that buys his

cotton—possibly a merchant. If that bale of cotton weighs 500 pounds, he is paid for a weight of 500 pounds. The farmer knows, you know, I know, and everybody else knows that the farmer is getting paid for that jute bagging and those ties, and that fact has always appealed to the farmer. That fact enables the jute interests to keep the cotton farmer from knowing what really does happen in the buying of the farmer's cotton.

You will find that those who oppose this bill now will say that if you pass this bill the farmer will lose that money. That is the crux of the situation. That is the argument of the jute people. To my way of thinking, the farmer will benefit. He will not get paid for the bagging and ties, it is true, if it is sold on the net-weight basis, but he will have a different type bale of cotton; he will have a bale of cotton that is wrapped economically, neatly, and nicely. Whereas the jute will cost 50 cents, the cotton bagging may cost \$1.50. The ties will be the same. But the farmer knows when he sells to the cotton buyer that the buyer cannot use the cotton himself, as all cotton is raised to be ultimately milled and manufactured, and he knows that the miller or manufacturer never uses the bagging or ties for any purpose. They are a total waste.

The farmers know that there are anywhere from 23 to 26 pounds of tare on the bale of cotton. Even if the farmer gets 10 cents a pound for his cotton, bagging and ties, he loses in the long run. By the time the buyer and the warehouseman have to handle that large, raggedy, disgraceful bale of cotton and pay the extra warehouse charges, because the bale takes up more room than it should, and also pays the large increase in the insurance cost, because it is absolutely inflammable, as well as extra transportation charges, there will be considerable additional cost in the use of the present type of cotton bales, and the farmer pays it. Go out in the lobby and see how quickly the jute on that cotton there will burn. Not only the insurance rate but the transportation rates are reflected in the price paid to the farmer who produced that bale of cotton, together with all the other expenses. Everybody knows the mills cannot handle the bagging and ties and have no use for them. Furthermore, they take off more for tare because the old jute absorbs moisture and cotton clings to it, so that the mills lose a good many pounds of cotton when they unwrap the bale.

The Liverpool market always takes off 6 percent of the gross weight of the cotton for tare, and that is usually 30 pounds. All cotton is sold at Liverpool on the net-weight basis when we export it.

When that is done, and we know that to be the fact, even though the farmer gets paid for his bagging and ties that is reflected back in the price the mill, or the buyers, or the export marketers are willing to pay for the cotton. Therefore, just as a practical proposition, if the farmer gets 10 cents for his cotton including the bagging and ties in that old package that belongs way back in the horse and buggy days, he is no better off. There has not been any progress in the

ginning or the looks of a bale of cotton generally in the last 75 years. It is today just as it was when it was ginned by the press, packed by hand, and drawn by the mule tied to a pole. If we can get a neater package, it will be reflected back to the farmer and he will be entitled to the benefits and will get them. That is what those of us who advocate the passage of this bill want, and I hope the bill will be passed, for I sincerely believe that our cotton farmer now pays these extra charges and not the trader.

(Here the gavel fell.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This bill requires net weight?

Mr. DOXEY. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is there any requirement compelling the ginners to put on cotton bagging or any other type of bagging unless the cotton is sold by net weight?

Mr. DOXEY. No type of bagging is absolutely prescribed. You can put on any type of bagging that will come within the weight limit and standards set by the Secretary of Agriculture if the cotton is sold by net weight, but you cannot put on this jute that we import from India duty-free because it weighs more than 14 ounces to a square yard. Either cotton, or burlap, or something of that kind will have to be used as bagging. This bill does not provide that cotton bagging must absolutely be used, but we hope it will be used because it will use up around 250,000 bales of cotton a year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this bill prohibit the use of jute?

Mr. DOXEY. It does—that is, the jute that is now being used—because the prescribed bagging cannot weigh more than 14 ounces to the square yard, and the present jute bagging used weighs much more than that.

(Here the gavel fell.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute so that he may be interrogated by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DOXEY. I thank the gentleman for the additional minute. I shall be delighted to answer any questions I can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman answer this question? First, let me say that I am in favor of this bill.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate that. The gentleman's help is valuable. The gentleman has studied this question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we can enact this bill into law and get it into operation, will that not be a step toward bringing about the high-density compression of cotton at the gin?

Mr. DOXEY. I certainly hope so, because it should come, and come quickly. A high-density bale would be a wonderful benefit not only to the cotton trade but to the cotton farmer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that should happen, then, in the gentleman's opinion, will it make this program more acceptable to the whole cotton industry than it is at the present time?

Mr. DOXEY. It certainly will.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who hopes and trusts and believes that although our export trade in cotton has gone now, we will get it back some day. The passage of this bill, in my opinion, will be a great step in that direction, and thereby benefit our cotton farmers. [Applause.]

(Here the gavel fell.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader on the subject of migration of workers along the lines on which I interrogated the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] earlier in the day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I think the answers to the last questions indicated practically what this bill amounts to. It is an attempt on behalf of those who manufacture a certain grade of cotton goods to secure control of a market at the expense of northern industries and southern industries that have been established for over 100 years. In other words, instead of putting the weight on the kind of baling which can be used in connection with cotton, which would permit the use of the present-day bagging, they see to it, as the last speaker pointed out, that the weight shall be of such an amount that no jute bagging can be used. This is the whole thing involved. They make it 14 ounces to the square yard, knowing that the present bagging weighs not less than 18 ounces to the square yard.

The cotton industry certainly deserves to be protected and the cotton growers deserve to be protected, but I do not feel they are entitled to have a protection placed around them that prevents other persons in the United States in established business from continuing in business. Jute manufacturers would certainly have to go out of business under that plan.

I think another evidence of privilege is a bill which has been introduced by the same gentleman who introduced this bill. It provides that if you are making wood pulp, for instance, for paper, if you put cotton into the wood-pulp machine and come out with a cotton grade of wood pulp, then you will not have to pay any processing tax, but if you are making paper and you are making it out of wood pulp and the wood pulp does not have any cotton content, then you will have to pay a processing tax. The tax, presumably, is going to be used to buy cotton from people down south to put into the cotton pulp. In other words, it seems to me we are going very far with this legislation, and I think we ought to look into it very carefully.

This bill, for one thing, should be considered as one which will result in revolutionary changes in the commercial handling of cotton and the methods and

materials for covering it, which will be required.

The bill proposes criminal penalties applicable to every cotton farmer, to every cotton merchant, to every cotton exporter, and, indeed, to anyone who handles a bale of such cotton hereafter in commerce.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. The statement was made by the gentleman from Mississippi at the conclusion of his remarks that a great part of the jute now used in bale coverings was imported from India. It is not a fact that very little new jute is imported each year, the fact being that the jute which is used as covering is used over and over again, is rewoven by these jute mills, and that the principal source of their supply year in and year out is not new exports but the reweaving and reassembling of the former bale coverings?

Mr. CLASON. It is my understanding that the gentleman's statement is correct. If this bill should be adopted, those persons who have supplies of bagging on hand, either new or second-hand, are not given any time hardly, or perhaps only a few months, in which to dispose of this bagging, and therefore will suffer the loss of its total value.

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

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can the gentleman tell us something about the difference in cost of these two coverings?

Mr. CLASON. I can tell the gentleman that at the present time mills which manufacture the kind of cotton bagging which it is apparently determined they would like to have used on these bales of cotton have only covered in any one year not more than one-twelfth of a crop, and that the cotton bagging so used in the baling of those crops has been subsidized to the extent of 60 cents on the dollar of their selling cost by the United States Treasury. I think this shows that the cost of the cotton bagging today is at least twice as great as the jute bagging which is being used and which has been used for more than 100 years. I doubt if many of us realize that the cotton bagging which has been used up to the present time has been subsidized in part by the Federal Government.

(Here the gavel fell.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Following up the effect of this bill on the jute mills, is it not true, according to the gentleman's information, that the jute mills now are not being called on to manufacture any material part of the present requirements for national defense in the textile field?

Mr. CLASON. That is true, and if they are not allowed to go ahead with their present commitments and with their present lines of production, their people are going to be thrown out of work.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. And by the same token, is it not true that the cotton mills to which all this new business would go are now busily engaged, some of them on a 24-hour-day basis, handling national-defense contracts and that, as a matter of fact, they are not in need of this new business which would naturally inure to them by the passage of this bill?

Mr. CLASON. That is true and I think it should be pointed out further that in all probability in order for the cotton mills to turn out cotton bagging to cover a large crop—the largest proportion of a crop up to the present time having been one-twelfth of a crop—it would be necessary for them to get a great amount of new machinery. There is not a person on the floor of this House who does not know that one of the great bottlenecks in our present national defense is the inability of our machine-manufacturing corporations to turn out the necessary machines for our national defense.

This bill is going to make it a criminal offense, as I pointed out, for practically every person who handles cotton hereafter to do so unless he does it in the manner prescribed by law. The extent of the authority granted to the Secretary is unlimited. He can determine on the size, the weight, the construction, and other factors for any such bale covering, and the use of any other kind is made a misdemeanor. He can change these requirements at any time. In other words, if it was possible for any competitor to get into the picture, along would come the Secretary of Agriculture and change the picture again so as to force out that competition. I think that type of work and that type of legislation is un-American.

The cotton farmer has been selling cotton on gross weight and he knows that he has been paid on the gross weight basis. He knows what his crop calls for, and what he can get for it. If they pass this bill, they will add this cotton baling to it, and they are going to sell at net weight. The farmer of the South, before he gets through, will find himself in a position where he is going to get paid for cotton, and he himself will pay for the cotton baling, and he will pay twice as much as the cost of the jute baling or bagging at the present time. There is no question about that, and the person who will lose will be the cotton farmer, who has to pay twice as much in the future for the covering for his bales of cotton.

Let us look at some other things. We are in a war-torn world.

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

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not probable that the cost of this cotton will be charged to the farmer on practically the same basis as the storage of his cotton?

Mr. CLASON. He is certainly going to pay for it. I do not know on what basis, but you can bet the grower will pay for that cotton baling before it goes onto the market and is sold to the consumer. The consumer is going to see to it that he does not pay for it. If we add this additional price on the

bale of cotton the result is that he has to meet competition a little bit keener in every world market, and American cotton today is having plenty of difficulty in getting used in any foreign market.

Mr. DOXEY. Is there any American cotton sold in any world market that is not sold on weight? All the American export is sold on net weight.

Mr. CLASON. It may be, between the warehouseman and the person abroad, but, as I understand it, the cotton grower knows when he sells his bale of cotton that he is going to be paid for every pound there is in this bale. That cotton has been wrapped in jute bagging for 100 years and has gone into every world market and has been successful in every world market until you start in adding to its cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the House in the closing days of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress with hardly any consideration whatsoever. It is interesting to note that in this bill brought in today they apparently have brought it in with so little consideration that they have left practically the same dates in the bill for carrying it into effect, as in the 1939 bill, with the result that it is impossible to conceive that the mills which make cotton baling would be in a position to furnish bagging in order to bale the cotton within the time this bill, in its present form, sets forth. There have not been any hearings on the bill before the committee at this session of Congress, and if gentlemen will read the report which accompanies the bill, they will see it refers to four other bills, heard at other sessions of Congress, and every one of them defeated. It is also interesting to note that in this report they have a lot of letters and arguments in favor of the bill, and they very wisely left out the dates that went with the letters and the communications, and the answer to it is this. The only date they left in here was for Secretary Wallace in 1939-40, and I understand from members of this committee that every other one of these letters or communications is at least 5 years old and was written at a time when there was not a world upset in trade and when the whole country was not involved in this great war issue with our great national-defense program. In other words, the arguments which they are using are based upon what was happening more than 5 years ago.

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

Mr. CLASON. I would not trust myself against a technical man like the gentleman, but I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the former legislation was defeated?

Mr. CLASON. It certainly never became law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that this particular bill passed the House and the gentleman himself made a motion to recommit, and his motion was defeated by a vote of 137 to 22?

Mr. CLASON. I spoke of that a moment ago.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. On June 8, 1939.

Mr. CLASON. Yes; and it died in the Senate; and I think this ought to die in the House today.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the gentleman stated it never passed the House. I wanted to correct the gentleman.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Is it not true that this bill is cotton against jute, and is it not true that if this bill is enacted into law the jute mills throughout the Nation will close their doors?

Mr. CLASON. They will have to.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Is it not also true that the farmer will lose by the enactment of this bill, due to the fact that the covering of these bales will be subjected to further use as draperies, curtains, and even wearing apparel?

Mr. CLASON. There is no question about that.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Do they not realize that?

Mr. CLASON. It ought to be brought home to them if they do not.

As a matter of fact, when you get down to this cotton baling, they talk about how pretty it is when it comes out, all white and all of one color and everything is fine; but the moment anyone puts a hook into it to sample it, they have to put a patch or a tear on it or whatever mending they do on this bagging, and you will likely find some of your old last year's shirts—pink, orange, or any color. By the time it gets into the buyer's hands or the consumer's hands it will look like a galaxy of all the dress suitings or coatings they could find in the United States.

Now, the present bagging costs far less than that which would be required by the terms of this bill which, stripped of generalities, tells the American public that, if this bill is once adopted, thereafter cotton can only be sold when wrapped in cotton cloth. I have already told you that those who are interested in cotton are trying to place cotton in wood pulp, so that every paper mill in the United States that makes its paper out of pulp has to put cotton in with it. But if this law is good for baling cotton, why is it not just as good as a container for potatoes, or for candy, or for anything else? In other words, cotton has got to serve its purpose and be served, and paper and jute and everything else has to go out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman withhold his point for a moment?

Mr. COOLEY. I will withhold it for the moment.

Mr. FULMER. I would like to state to my colleague that the only thing we can do is to delay this until tomorrow. It will come up immediately tomorrow.

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman mean, "It will come up immediately"?

Mr. FULMER. Tomorrow this will be the first thing. You will simply lose this afternoon, lose that much time.

Mr. COOLEY. Do you contemplate permitting this discussion to go over until tomorrow?

Mr. FULMER. If there is no quorum, this bill will come up the first thing automatically tomorrow, and you will simply lose this time.

Mr. COOLEY. But I am making the point of no quorum at the present time.

Mr. FULMER. I say if there is not a quorum, this will come up tomorrow. I understand a great many Members are away, and the leaders no doubt have some arrangement about that. The only thing you do is lose this afternoon, and immediately we come back to the same thing tomorrow.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not understand what the gentleman means when he says we will lose this afternoon. It is now 2 o'clock. There is no quorum present, and I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of order for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the same argument just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] more than a hundred times, always made by some person engaged in the processing of jute or by somebody who had a jute manufacturer in his district.

This is one bill that does not cost the Government a dime. It is a bill that is offered in the interest of regulating the sale of cotton. It is a bill in which the cotton growers are particularly interested. The controversy has been referred to as a contest between the manufacturers of jute, on the one hand, and the manufacturers of cotton on the other. I happen to be interested in neither the manufacture of jute nor the manufacture of cotton. I am tremendously interested in the people who stir the soil and make it produce the commodity which we know as cotton.

The Ludlow people, who have a monopoly on jute, have been able to dominate this whole question for 50 years. They have thus far succeeded in misleading many Congressmen and many farmers. Their interest is in profits and not the farmer.

The jute manufacturers do not want this legislation. Why? Because it takes away from them their market in supplying the cotton grower with the coverage for his cotton. The adoption of the bill would not mean that they would go out of business. If their looms are such that they cannot be readjusted to the spinning of cotton, they can buy other machinery or supply themselves with other machinery, which is not costly and which will do so.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be so kind as to yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DOXEY. Is it not a fact that cotton bagging takes only about one-tenth of the jute imported into this country?

Mr. COX. That is correct. I wish I had time to discuss this question somewhat fully. The whole vegetable fiber schedule of the Tariff Act as passed 25 or 30 years ago was written by the jute people and it is the only illogical schedule in the Act. For instance, the raw commodity carries a higher duty than the jute which has been processed two or three stages along the line to the finished fabric.

The custom has grown up in the cotton trade of deducting 30 pounds from every bale of cotton that is sold. The growers of cotton, of course, have been interested in using a coarse and heavy fabric which costs less money, because it more nearly enables them to make up for that 30 pounds of tare. At present they are able to put on as high in some instances as 21 pounds of tare. When his cotton is sold 30 pounds is deducted for tare and there the trader grabs 9 pounds of cotton out of the grower's bale. To overcome this situation many of the farmers have agitated for a system of net weight sales, and they have come here with this legislation which means that when the cotton is sold the 7-pound tare that it carries is deducted. This is objectionable to the trade because they have accustomed themselves to deducting 30 pounds. In other words they will have to reform their rules of practice, they will of course have to meet the law. Where could objection come from except somebody interested in maintaining the status quo, somebody interested in the manufacture of jute or jute products, or somebody who has such manufacturing interest in his district? The bill should be passed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Andersen,	Domengeaux	Jenks, N. H.
H. Carl	Douglas	Jennings
Andrews	Duncan	Johns
Bender	Eberharter	Keefe
Bishop	Fellows	Kelley, Pa.
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Kelly, Ill.
Boehne	Flannagan	Kilburn
Bolton	Flannery	Kirwan
Bryson	Fogarty	Kocialekowsk
Buck	Ford, Thos. F.	Kramer
Buckler, Minn.	Gamble	Kunkel
Camp	Geyer, Calif.	Lambertson
Cannon, Fla.	Gifford	Lanham
Casey, Mass.	Green	Lea
Celler	Hall,	LeCompte
Chiperfield	Leonard W.	Ludlow
Clark	Harrington	McArdle
Cluett	Hart, N. J.	McGehee
Cochran	Hébert	McGranery
Courtney	Heldinger	McGregor
Delaney	Hinshaw	Maclora
Dickstein	Hoffman	Magnuson
Dingell	Holmes	Martin, Iowa
Dirksen	Howell	Mitchell
Disney	Izac	Moser
Ditter	Jarman	Murdock

Myers	Scanlon	Thomason
Nichols	Schaefer, Ill.	Tibbott
Norton	Schuetz	Treadway
O'Brien, Mich.	Scott	Wadsworth
O'Brien, N. Y.	Shannon	Wasielewski
O'Day	Sheridan	Weiss
O'Leary	Smith, Conn.	Wheat
Osmer	Smith, Pa.	Whelchel
Pearson	Smith, Va.	White
Ploeser	Stearns, N. H.	Wilson
Poage	Sullivan	Wright
Reece, Tenn.	Sutphin	
Robison, Ky.	Sweeney	
Rodgers, Pa.	Taber	
Rutherford	Taylor	
Sacks	Thomas, N. J.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eleven Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. COLMER, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

NET WEIGHTS IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TRANSACTIONS IN COTTON

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] 5 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order on a very important matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, there should be no partisan politics in national defense. Yet, as Americans, it is high time for 22,000,000 people, called Republicans, to wake up and, as both Republicans and Americans, insist that action shall be had by the party in power at once with respect to our national defense and your safety and mine.

If those to whom we have delegated authority are incompetent or unwilling to attempt to cope with the situation or do not have the intestinal fortitude to defy the saboteurs, the racketeers, the "fifth columnists," laborers and employers, and all those who are determined insidiously to wreck the United States, then let Congress, without respect to partisan politics, in 36 hours take the matter into its own hands and outlaw these strikes.

Calvin Coolidge said:

There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time.

It was never more true than it is today. Why not make it so?

Let us repeal, if necessary, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and any other act, by which we pay strikers while they strike and induce them to stay out against us. Let us invoke the provisions of a hundred different statutes to penalize and punish employers who seek to interfere with the progress of our defense production. This is not an antilabor but a "for us" suggestion.

We have laws enough. For God's sake, and for yours and mine, let us get busy; let us get some action, and before it is too late.

Are we too dumb to learn anything from the experience of others?

The vital life spark of this country is involved and is being smothered and choked to death at the Allis-Chalmers plant by those who are inspired by foreign influence and paid to do it and know

what they are doing and where and why. Let us wake up, America.

If—and I feel it is so—incompetency to deal with our national peril has been sufficiently evidenced by those to whom we have delegated authority, let us stop talking. Let us do something now.

This morning's papers carry the story that the soft-coal miners and employers and others engaged in other essential defense industries are either in or involved in a strike or are contemplating a strike. Who knows what will happen next?

Are we here in Congress as helpless as we look? Let us show the world that democracy and a republican form of government can function.

The Republican Party should be known as something other than the party of oppositionists. It should have a constructive suggestion that it is ready to offer. It has one and is ready to help make it a reality. It is 100 percent, or approximately so—or should be so—for the outlawing of these strikes against its own safety, individual and national. Let us get going before it is everlastingly too late. [Applause.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, because of my admiration and affection for the distinguished chairman of my committee, the author of this bill, I am, frankly, somewhat reluctant to speak in opposition to it. I have actually tried to bring myself to his way of thinking about this measure; and if I could be convinced, as I am sure he is sincerely convinced, that this measure is in the interest of the cotton farmers of the Nation, I most certainly would be here advocating its approval, rather than speaking in opposition. But I am not convinced that it is in the interest of the farmer. The fact is, I am convinced that this legislation will have the effect of adding tremendously to the burden now being carried by the cotton farmers of the Nation.

The purpose of this bill is to force cotton farmers to abandon the use of a cheap bagging, which they now use, and force them to use a more expensive bagging. I challenge anyone to deny that that is the effect this bill will have.

Jute is far cheaper than cotton. It is cheaper than burlap, which is made of jute. The jute bagging now being used has probably been in use for more than a hundred years. The cotton farmers have been accustomed to selling on a gross-weight basis. They believe, whether true or not, that they are actually paid by the cotton buyer for the bagging and ties used on the cotton. We pass this bill, and immediately the weight of bagging and ties must be deducted at the place where the cotton is offered for sale. Immediately the farmer wonders why this deduction is being made. Why are the cotton buyers no longer paying me for my bagging and ties? The answer comes back, "Because of an act of Congress, a Federal law, which makes it a crime, a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of \$500 for its violation." If it is well for cotton farmers to use cotton bagging, that material is already available.

The Federal Government, in an effort to encourage the use of cotton bagging, in 1939 subsidized cotton to the extent of \$280,000, in 1940 the subsidy amounted to \$250,000, and for the current year \$300,000 will be used by the Federal Government to subsidize the manufacture of cotton bagging. Even with all of that effort on the part of the Government to encourage the use of cotton bagging, the farmers do not actually want to use it.

Strangely enough, the first witness who appeared before our committee in opposition to this bill, was a gentleman from Georgia, Mr. C. D. Redwine. Who was he? "I am a businessman from a small Georgia town. I grow cotton, I gin cotton, I warehouse cotton, and I merchandise cotton."

The next witness called was Dr. F. V. Taylor, president of the North Carolina-Virginia Ginners' Association of Stanley, N. C. Dr. Taylor referred to the use of cotton bagging. He said that they had tried to encourage the use of cotton bagging and here is what happened: "We liked to have lost all of our ginning because the farmers would not handle it any more, even if we allowed them 7 pounds extra tare." Further in his testimony he said, "We could not get any farmer to allow us to use it any more."

Here we come, by Federal law, and force the cotton farmer to use it whether he wants to or not. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is not any precedent for this type of legislation. Of course, we have regulations in interstate commerce with reference to sanitation and other things, but no one would be foolish enough to suggest that there is anything inherently vicious, vile, unhealthy, or unsanitary about the use of jute bagging. Now we undertake under the commerce clause to pass a law, the effect of which is to say to the potato growers, "You may use jute," to the vegetable and fruit growers, "You may use jute bagging," to those who ship furniture and crate their furniture with burlap, "You may use jute." Everybody else in America is perfectly free to use jute in any form they want to use it, but the poor old cotton farmer by Federal law is required to use a more expensive wrapping on his commodity.

I submit it is a ridiculous proposition. If \$2.25 a bale is deducted from every bale of cotton at the cotton yard at the time of sale, representing the cost of the bagging and ties, with a crop of 12,000,000 bales of cotton, there will be approximately \$27,000,000 deducted from the small income of the cotton farmer only in the hope that by some manipulation of the market he will be able to recover that \$27,000,000.

I submit it is an unsound proposition. I know my good friend will bring before this House perhaps a bale of cotton wrapped in cotton and one wrapped in jute. I ask you to notice the bale wrapped in jute. It is obviously a stronger bagging and better in many respects than the cotton bagging. The gentleman mentions the fire hazard. The Bureau of Standards reports that jute from the standpoint of being a fire hazard is far

less so than cotton. It does not burn as easily as does cotton.

Then the gentleman will bring here a picture of a ragged bale of American cotton which he says is a disgrace in all the markets of the world, but that bale of cotton of which he will have the picture is one which the buyers with long, sharp knives have slashed from one end to the other in withdrawing samples. If they were to give the same treatment to the other bale of cotton which he has sitting in the hall, that is wrapped in the very delicately woven cotton bagging, it probably would not have any bagging on it at all.

I have here a cotton bagging which has been on a bale of cotton and has been ripped off, and I will just show it to you. This is the bagging that was on a bale of cotton and it was given to me by a distinguished Member of this House this morning. There is the cotton bagging, and that is a perfect indication of what American cotton will look like in the markets of the world, wrapped up in this sort of a rag.

There is no reason to believe that the farmer is going to use cotton when it is more expensive than jute. Here is another sample of jute. This is made in India. This is jute bagging, a very neat, closely woven jute bagging, that is far cheaper than cotton and far stronger, and not as likely to burn.

Mr. SOUTH, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. NORRELL rose.

Mr. COOLEY. I prefer not to yield now.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman has a sample of used jute bagging.

Mr. COOLEY. It is out in the hall. If the gentleman would be kind enough to bring it in here, I should be glad to exhibit it to the House. It is much stronger than this cotton bagging.

Mr. COX. I am talking about used bagging that came from the same source.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know where that out there came from, but I know it is cheaper than cotton bagging.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this particular jute bagging come within the specified weight in the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand it does come within the weight.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. This is the disastrous effect this bill will have on an industry in this Nation. It actually outlaws jute. They talk about the Ludlow jute trust. I do not know anything about that, but I have a jute mill in my district that employs about 600 people. I have here a letter, which I shall place in the RECORD, indicating that if this bill passes the mill involved must close its doors, because the machinery now used cannot be used in weaving this type of bagging.

The question is whether we are going to pass a bill forcing the cotton farmer to do something he does not want to do and, by the same bill, lock up the jute industry

in this Nation and drive it back to India, and let this stuff be manufactured there and imported into this country to be used in wrapping American cotton.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why would it not be a good idea to put a tariff on these articles so that we can manufacture everything in this country?

Mr. COOLEY. I suppose all the people who are interested in this would vote for the highest sort of a tariff on jute or would vote for quotas on jute imported into this country, and keep it all out.

Mr. COX. What is the gentleman's attitude?

Mr. COOLEY. I would be perfectly willing to vote for a tariff or a quota on jute—anything I could do to give this market to cotton—but I am not willing to force the use of cotton on the cotton farmer and not force it on anybody else.

The argument being made is that it will substantially increase the price of cotton, but who is foolish enough to believe that you are going to increase the use of cotton because of the nature of its wrapping, or that you will advance the cost of cotton because of the nature of its wrapping, when we all know that the wrapping does not go into the processing of cotton? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram from Phil Murray to me, and my reply, together with a statement in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH].

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. R. 968, for I believe the passage of the measure would bring no good results, but would instead cause untold harm due to the revolutionary changes in the methods of sale of the entire American cotton crop which passage of the bill would signify. It would be particularly harmful to the jute bagging industry, an industry which has been developed by American capital, manned by American labor, and which has even through the lean years of depression afforded work with good wages to many thousands of Americans.

The proponents of the measure state that the bill does not prohibit the using of any kind of material for bale covering, if the material comes up to the standards which the bill specifies for all covering. The question, however, is not that it specifically prohibits any type of material, but that through the standards set up it would outlaw all existing kinds and types of bagging that the cotton trade itself has chosen and used for covering cotton bales, for the better part of the century. The bill provides that no such bagging could be used after July 15,

1942; thus the entire jute industry would have to get rid of this bagging in the present cotton season, for after the effective date of the act it would become absolutely worthless. It also means that in the 6 months between January 15 and July 15, 1942, an entirely new kind of bagging of less than one-half the weight of that used at present would have to be made to the tune of approximately 72,000,000 yards. This is virtually impossible.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be a fine thing if 12,000,000 bales of cotton were raised and could not lawfully be wrapped and protected for handling in commerce because there was no lawful bagging available? The export situation being what it is, this is hardly a time when a tried and universally accepted type of bagging should be outlawed by the Congress in favor of theoretical and, up to now, experimental cloth of so much less weight, no greater strength, and much higher cost.

Let me remind you as to what jute means to the United States and to the cotton growers of the South. The United States purchases directly and indirectly from one-quarter to one-third of all the jute and jute products exported from India. This amounts to \$78,000,000 per year. India purchases directly and indirectly from the United States a yearly average of \$87,000,000 worth of American products. India consumes one-third of the cotton goods produced by England, our second-best customer for raw cotton. Bengal, India, the province which produces jute, takes 40 percent of all the cotton goods imported into India.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues, why should not the cotton producers in the South use jute to wrap and tie their bales of raw cotton?

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am against the passage of H. R. 968. I can see no benefit to the cotton farmer in the measure; in fact, I sincerely believe he would suffer rather than benefit. I can see in this proposal, which has been debated for many, many years, only one thing—discrimination against an industry which employs American labor in America, an industry which would be forced to curtail production if this bill were passed, and in doing so would be forced to remove thousands of American men and women from jobs and relegate them to the ranks of the unemployed.

If this bill is passed and the baling of cotton is completed with cotton bagging, the cotton farmer has been loaded with the burden of the additional cost. If the bagging is done with burlap of light weight, the employment has been given to workers in foreign lands, for the burlap is not an American product. But if the bill is not passed, we will keep the American jute industry working full time for the benefit of all America. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to vote down the measure.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had the privilege of hearing the debate on

this measure, although I understand it has been before the Congress in several previous sessions. It is my observation that if there were compelling reasons for the rejection of legislation of this kind in previous Congresses, those same reasons are more compelling and more cogent in connection with the pending bill; and why do I say this? Because, entirely aside from the doubtful benefits which might accrue to the cotton farmer by reason of the use of a small additional amount of his product for the making of cotton covering for his bale of cotton, we should face the fact that in this day, when the purpose and spirit of the country is to conserve our economic resources and hold economic dislocations to a minimum, this bill would undoubtedly not only cause many well-established and long-functioning businesses to go out of business, but its adverse economic effects on the employees, not only of the mills but of the factors and merchants dealing in jute, would be enormous. I do not have in my district any manufacturers of byproducts of jute or any other textile, but I do have in my New York constituency numerous dealers in textile byproducts, and these men have been in business for decades, for generations, if you please, and they have been building up their stocks of jute, and they reweave it every year for use in the baling of cotton. It is a process that has stood the test of time; and let us see what would happen to the cotton farmer in the event jute were eliminated as a bale covering. I am authoritatively informed that the maximum requirement under this bill annually would be in the neighborhood of 500,000 pounds of cotton out of an approximate yearly crop of 11,000,000 bales. This would simply mean that a mere scintilla of the cotton crop would be devoted to this purpose, and against that you would have the putting out of business of these long-established and flourishing enterprises of which I spoke a moment ago.

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

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. If the amount of cotton that would be used is insignificant, the amount of jute that would be used would be insignificant too, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question for the reason that the amount of jute that is used represents the very essence and substance of the business of these small concerns that are dealing in jute, whereas cotton has any number of other uses.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman does not mean to convey the idea that cotton bagging is the principal use of jute in this country?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. No; but I do wish to stress the fact that that is one of the principal uses of jute in this country.

Mr. PACE. It is only a very small percentage.

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

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. But the fact is that some mills in this country are geared up in such a way they cannot produce anything else except that cotton bagging which is now made out of jute.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. That is true, and has been true for many, many years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the question is whether or not the House will adopt this resolution to provide for the consideration of this bill which passed the House on June 8, 1939, on a motion to recommit by a vote of 137 to 22. The concrete question is whether or not, in an effort to provide for jute mills, we are going to legislate against the interests of cotton producers.

It is universally acknowledged that cotton tare is an economic evil. The cotton trade has not been able to eliminate the tare, and William L. Clayton, a large cotton buyer, as disclosed by the report, states that only legislation will do the job. There is a tare on foreign exports of 30 pounds, and a domestic tare of 21 pounds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be that under the system that would obtain initially the farmer would have to pay a little more for his bagging, for his coverage, but the fact remains that he knows and the trade knows that the trade is not going to pay him for 30 pounds of something that they do not get. When this bill is passed, when Congress does for the cotton grower what we have done for the wheat grower, and what we have also done for the cotton grower in providing for the regulation of cotton exchanges, he will get paid for the 30 pounds of cotton and will get better prices; and that is not all.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for new uses of cotton. The Congress appropriates every year hundreds of thousands of dollars for this purpose and what will Congress do if we provide here for the use of 200,000 bales of cotton? Do not take my statement for it. Mr. Cheatham, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, says that the level of prices will rise and I quote:

Economists tell us this would amount to one-half percent a pound, or \$2.50 a bale; or, on an average crop of 12,500,000 bales, \$31,250,000.

The cotton farmer, whether he knows it or not, will get on the average, in the long run, \$2.50 a bale more than he is getting for his cotton now, and he will get paid for 30 pounds when he sells in a foreign market and for 21 pounds when he sells in a domestic market. He is not getting that pay now.

What about elimination and change of machinery? They tell me that automobile plants are being converted into airplane plants and that National Cash Register plants are now being converted into gun plants, and it is idle and absurd to say that any textile plant cannot be converted, within a reasonable time, from jute to cotton.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have only 4 minutes, and the gentleman had a much longer time. The testimony in the hearings shows that there may be a reasonable conversion from one kind of a textile plant to another kind, and I say, in the long run, that will benefit American industry in the factory and on the farm, as shown by the hearings and arguments on June 8, 1939, the only time this bill was ever considered by the House. The jute influences were able through their power to prevent it from being brought on the floor of the House before 1939, and the jute influences have been very powerful for 100 years in preventing a tariff on jute. The only time that the Congress ever considered this matter it passed by a vote of 6 to 1.

Are we for the few thousand employees in the jute mills of the country that now, when other mills are being converted, can be more easily converted than ever before in our history, or are we for the hundreds of thousands of cotton laborers in the South who will be benefited as shown by the hearings on this bill if we provide for 200,000 bales in new usages of cotton, and thus remove the disgrace of jute bagging that you can see by observing the photographs of cotton wrapped in jute in the Speaker's lobby? They show that the American bale of cotton is the most disgracefully wrapped bale of cotton in foreign markets. Every country save the United States provides for the sale of cotton by net weight as we provide for the sale of it in this bill.

The bill in the long run will be of benefit to the cotton producer and the cotton manufacturer. It is favored by the Department of Agriculture, and it is supported by the Texas Cooperative Council, the American Cooperative Cotton Association, the North Carolina Cotton Growers, the American Farm Bureau Federation, by cotton mills, by cotton shippers, by spokesmen for insurance and transportation and by cotton growers.

It is opposed by jute mills, and by those whom jute mills can influence or convince.

It provides for net weight in the sale of American cotton just as foreign cottons are sold by net weight. At present American cotton is sold by gross weight. Net weight will eliminate marketing costs, insurance hazards, transportation costs, and it will simplify trade practices. The cotton trade should itself provide for net weights but the jute influences have prevented.

The bill only applies to cotton that will be ginned in the future. It does not apply to Government-owned cotton, or to other cotton that has already been ginned. In the long run the bill will provide a better price to the grower. It should be considered and passed by the House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in discussing the rule by inserting a brief statement by members of the committee.

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

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 968, to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, 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. 968, with Mr. ROBINSON of Utah 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 South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] is entitled to one-half hour, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to one-half hour.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. It is very interesting to me to listen to some of these gentlemen who have preceded me on this bill speak of their interest in the farmer, when as a matter of fact in a great many instances there are no cotton farmers in their districts. The attitude of my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is very interesting. He has a jute mill in his district, and like all the other jute interests, it is very powerful. In North Carolina they have thousands of cotton farmers, many of them going into tenant farming and many are migrating from his State and my State.

What about the agricultural commissioner of the gentleman's State? He certainly is interested in the cotton farmers in North Carolina. I am quoting from a telegram received from him today:

This is to further assure you that I endorse cotton net-weight bill and sincerely hope you succeed with its adoption.

Everybody knows about the Progressive Farmer, a real farm paper, edited in North Carolina. This paper has been fighting all these years in the interest of the cotton farmer. Listen to the editor of this paper, Dr. Roe, in a letter just received from him:

I am delighted to know that you hope to get the cotton net-weight bill up for consideration in the House of Representatives next week, and I hope you will leave no stone unturned in your fine fight to secure its adoption. The whole South ought to back you up in this contest. I shall be disappointed if any Congressman from the Carolinas fail to do so. On behalf of all southern growers I want to thank you again for your continuing interest in this matter and hope next week will bring to a successful conclusion the long fight you have made.

Now, my friends, this bill has for its purpose two things: First, to bring about net weight. During all these hundred years, referred to awhile ago, cotton has been sold on gross weight, and for no other purpose than to be able to use this

old, heavy, wasteful, and disgraceful jute bagging.

The other is to standardize cotton tare—cotton bagging. Every other container has been standardized and every other farm product in this country and every other country, except cotton in this country, is sold on a net-weight basis.

This bill will become effective in 1942 and will not affect any of the cotton that will be baled this year or that is carried in warehouses. As stated a moment ago, this is the only cotton country in the world that sells cotton on a gross-weight basis. This is the only cotton country in the world that uses this old heavy, wasteful, disgraceful jute bagging; not even India, where jute is grown, uses this heavy bagging. They use only 15 pounds of bagging and ties, and they use a neat burlap.

My friends, one of the charges against the farmers' price is when the cotton mill takes off this jute bagging they have to pay for the picking of the jute fiber out of the cotton. When you pull off burlap, the type used in India and every other cotton country in the world except the United States, it is like peeling a banana.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not your bill permit the use of that lightweight burlap if they want to do so?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely. My bill does not outlaw any material, provided they comply with the uniform standard coming within the weight allowed under net-weight selling.

Now [showing a picture], there is cotton covered with cotton in Brazil. In fact, every bale in Brazil is covered with cotton and every bale is compressed at the gin. Why do you not do it in this country? It is because the jute interests will not permit it. They put on this heavy bagging, and when the cotton leaves the farmer with 18 pounds, 21 pounds, or 24 pounds, and goes to the compress, they patch on the difference between that and 30 pounds, and when that bale of cotton goes to any market in Europe they knock off 30 pounds and settle for it on a net-weight basis. You can put 100 bales of compressed cotton in 1 freight-car box, but it takes 3 box cars to hold our type bale. Look at the freight our farmers are losing.

You have heard about the United States losing foreign markets. The reason for it is because of the type of bale we are putting up—the most wasteful, the most disgraceful, bale of any country in the world. If you only knew about the complaints coming from Europe and the claims against our exporters all coming out of cotton farmers. It comes right out of the price of cotton.

I have some photographs here. Look at the jute bale out in the corridor and then take a look at this picture where they are unloading our jute bales in Europe. Now you can understand what I mean about waste and a disgraceful bale. If you will notice the difference between that and the cotton bagging, all of that comes out of the price of the cotton farmer. Brazil is selling her cot-

ton today to Canada. Why? Because of the type of baling. There is no knife put in the Brazilian bale. Every bale is properly graded and proper bagging is put on at the gin and every bale is compressed at the gin.

Someone made a remark about whether the farmer would get any difference in price. Here is where the farmers are losing: This excess weight (bagging) is being shipped all over this country, and to Europe. The farmer pays the freight. It comes out of his price. It is the greatest waste of any bale in the world. The American bale carries the highest insurance of any bale in the world, and it all comes out of the farmer's price. When they settle in Europe they knock off 30 pounds for the bagging and ties, and settle on a net-weight basis. Why put on this excess weight? They have asked this country to do something about improving the baling and covering of American cotton but it cannot be done unless we can pass this bill. Someone said awhile ago that the farmers did not want to make this change. That is pitiful. I can remember when I was a boy my father belonged to the Farmers' Alliance. They put on cotton bagging 15 pounds, including ties, but they had to settle on the basis of 30 pounds. They lost the difference between the 15 pounds and the 30 pounds, so they had to go back to heavy jute. Every State in this Union has got a different tare rule. Some of the States 19 pounds, some 21 pounds, 23 pounds, and 26 pounds. Then the buyers patch on to make up 30 pounds. I could take the time to read you letters from cotton mills all over the country. They make this statement: "When the cotton comes in we strip a certain percentage of bales to get the total average amount of tare so as to know how to fix our price, and the price is made gross weight less all of the waste, bagging and ties, insurance, and everything else."

Now when the cotton is sold it is cut. That bale of cotton shown on the picture is still in a warehouse at this time, and you will note it has been cut seven times, and every time a buyer cut that bale he took a nice sample out of it. You would be surprised to know the number of thousands of bales of cotton that this practice takes out of the cotton farmer.

Listen to this: Oscar Johnson is one of the largest cotton growers in the United States, producing 15,000 bales. He was in my office the other day. He said, "Congressman, I use 2½-pound bagging. It gives me 24 pounds. I know that they take off 30 pounds, but the farmer who uses only 18 pounds, which is one type generally used, or 21 pounds, another type generally used, loses that difference."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

What about Anderson Clayton, the largest cotton buyer in the world and a large producer? Every gin that Anderson Clayton owns has a high-density compress. He uses this light burlap bagging, and his cotton is sold on a net-weight basis all over this country. If old, heavy jute is good for farmers, why

does not Mr. Clayton use it at his gins in this country and in Brazil?

Now, it is a joke to think that farmers get a price for old, disgraceful jute and ties equal to the price of lint, for that which cotton mills cannot spin in their mills. Last year the Commodity Credit Corporation took the farmers' cotton in on loans on a net-weight basis, and they put the price up 40 points—\$2 a bale—but what happened when the farmer took his cotton out of the warehouse? It was sold gross weight and it went back to the average old price, losing his \$2.

We had before our committee a man who represented the cotton shippers and the cotton buyers of the country. Let us see what he had to say about it. He was Mr. Lockie. He said:

Mr. FULMER, my point was specifically directed to the point that the cotton merchant does make a profit on his tare, but it is a profit that is absolutely essential since it is necessary to put a patch on a bale.

Answering the point that you bring up I quite agree that in the final analysis when the mill buys a bale of cotton they know that they are not going to consume the tare and they figure accordingly.

Mr. FULMER. And when the farmer gets a gross price naturally he is getting a price less the amount figured on by the mill for the tare?

Mr. LOCKIE. Yes, sir.

I have a letter here from Mr. Comer, one of the largest textile-mill operators in the country and a man who has been fighting for all these economical changes that would mean millions annually to the farmers; he said—

Congressman, naturally, as buyers and spinners of cotton, our concern when we buy a bale of cotton is how much cotton we get out of the bale. If the bale weighs 500 pounds and has 12 pounds of jute bagging on it and 8 pounds of steel ties, we know that we are only getting 480 pounds of cotton and we make our calculations and prices accordingly. If that same bale of cotton had 24 pounds tare on it instead of 20, we would pay less per pound than if it had just 20 pounds. If it had cotton bagging on it weighing only 5 pounds instead of jute bagging weighing 12 pounds, we would make our calculations in price accordingly. Every other buyer of cotton would do exactly the same thing. So far as I know now, cotton is one of the few commodities that is not sold net weight. In most cases the law requires that the information as to the net and gross weights appear on every package or parcel.

Until we have a net-weight bill, our mills are among those who have signed up to allow 7 extra pounds for every bale that we buy that comes to us covered in 5 pounds of cotton bagging. The very day that your bill becomes a law and trading on the exchanges shifts from a gross-weight to a net-weight basis, you will see immediately a change in the quoted price that will fully reflect this difference in the weight of the tare.

The Department sent up a strong report for this bill, setting out the reason why we should not use this type of bagging.

Let me quote from the Secretary's letter:

The three chief defects of the American cotton bale are: (1) Its ragged and unattractive appearance; (2) the waste and damage to which the contents are subjected because

of the inadequate protection afforded by bagging materials which are chosen on the basis of cheapness and weight, but which in many instances fail to withstand the wear and tear of shipment; and (3) the lack of even approximate uniformity in weight of bales and weight of tare.

Fire-insurance rates in European cotton markets are materially higher for cotton in American bales than for bales of other cotton-producing countries.

In brief, the gross-weight system of trading has the following disadvantages: (1) It encourages the use of unsuitable bale-covering materials; (2) it involves unnecessary costs for bale-covering materials in excess of those needed for the protection of the bale contents. This is particularly true in the case of patches added to bring the weight of tare up to the maximum allowed under trade rules. This is encouraged under the gross-weight system because of the fact that the per-pound cost of bale-covering materials is less than an equivalent weight of cotton; (3) this extra weight involves increased transportation costs; and (4) the accompanying system used for tare determination and for the assessment and collection of claims for excess tare adds materially to marketing costs.

Under a system of net-weight trading and standardized tare marketing agencies would no longer be able to exact a profit by adding patches to cotton bales, but would realize definite advantages in the way of freight savings, simplification of trading practices and price calculations, elimination of risks associated with uncertainties as to weight of tare, possible savings in insurance, savings in customs duties in certain instances, and in the sales advantage of a neater package.

The annual economic loss entailed in the present system has been variously estimated at figures ranging up to \$20,000,000.

This morning you passed a resolution extending a congressional investigation of migration from the farms. You have poured millions of dollars out of the Treasury trying to make landlords out of tenants; but the thing that is making tenants out of landlords, the thing that is causing migration from the farms is the price that farmers receive for their products, and the thing that we propose to remedy under this bill, that is costing cotton farmers millions annually.

You talk about farmers doing it. Unorganized farmers have not got a chance in dealing with the jute interests. They have been flooding Members with telegrams and letters in the name of the farmer, just like many of the arguments we have heard here this afternoon in the name of the farmer.

Now let me show you a picture showing how American cotton looks in a warehouse. There you have the American cotton stored in a warehouse in Europe, and I can show you the record that practically every fire that starts in Europe in warehouses begins in American cotton. That is why they charge higher insurance rates. Do you know that a great many of the foreign countries charge a duty of 40 cents a bale because of excess bagging? [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if a farmer is shrewd he will put this type of jute bagging on his cotton. It weighs 3 pounds to the yard, or 27 pounds bagging, and this because he knows he is going to lose 30 pounds. The ginner is the fellow who puts it on and the ginner, in a great

many instances, gyms the farmer when he puts on a 1½-pound bagging or 2-pound bagging.

You are stacking up millions of bales of cotton in warehouses. In the meantime we are permitting India to ship into this country enough jute, pound for pound, used in this country, to take the place of a million and a half bales of our cotton.

I want to say that unless we commence consuming more cotton in this country we are going to have to further cut the production of cotton in the South to the extent of at least 3,000,000 bales below the amount we now produce. When we do that we will be forced into dairying, wheat raising, hogs, and cattle, and I shall regret to see all of these sections of the country competing with each other. I am fearful that the time is coming that the same gentlemen who occupy this Chamber now will see something in this country that we should not have, and the only way to remedy this situation, the only way to stop the landowners from losing their farms and to stop migration from the farms is to do something for that class of people that every other class of people seems to be able to do or have done for them by Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there anything in this bill that would prevent cotton buyers from slashing up the bales of cotton like it is now?

Mr. FULMER. You heard one or two of the speakers a while ago state that they believed this would lead up to cotton being combined with wood pulp. It is a shame so far as the Congress of the United States is concerned that we have gone along all of these years and have not had high density gin compression down at the gins like they have in Europe. Then you would have every bale properly graded, and the farmer would get the benefit of proper grading, like in Brazil and other countries where they have high-density compression and proper grading. One gentleman stated that he was fearful we would get to that point where we would use cotton mixed with pulp. All right. We import into this country duty-free, newsprint, wood pulp and pulpwood, with all the forest resources we have in this country, with millions of unemployed people, and with millions of bales of cotton in the warehouses. Cotton can be used with wood pulp, rayon, and other fibers. They are doing it in some of these other countries. No doubt you are fearful about it, but if we want to solve the problem that is holding down agriculture, employment, and business, we have to do some of these things for the farmers which they are not able to do for themselves and that every other group has been able to do or get done for them in the passage of legislation by the Congress.

If you will take a look at the report and the numerous letters and telegrams that I have here in my hand you will find that this bill is endorsed by all of the agricultural commissioners of the South; textile mills; many of the legislatures of

the South by resolutions; Mr. Oscar Johnson, who produces 15,000 bales of cotton annually; Mr. T. O. Walker, president of the Agricultural College of Texas; Cotton Growers' Cooperative Association for the Southern States; Anderson Clayton, the largest buyers of cotton in the world who operate many cotton gins in the United States and in Brazil; Texas Cooperative Council; the Voice of Texas Agriculture; Cotton Textile Institute of New York; the President's committee appointed to investigate the complaints of New England and southern textile mills; the World's Cotton Congress; Various State farm bureaus; and the State and National granges.

Listen to a telegram just received from Mr. Harry B. Caldwell, master of the North Carolina Grange:

State and national granges passed resolutions last November endorsing the principles of your net-weight bill. Glad to reaffirm our position.

I am quoting from a telegram signed by Harry D. Wilson, president, Association of Southern Commissioners:

The Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture are 100 percent for net-weight cotton bill. Said association has passed resolutions on several occasions urging Congress to enact legislation requiring that cotton be sold at net weight. This is the only cotton-producing country where cotton is not sold at net weight. We appreciate your efforts on this most important progressive legislation, and hope committee will give favorable consideration to your bill.

A telegram from W. B. Parker, California Director of Agriculture, states:

Have been advised your bill, H. R. 968, re net-weight cotton trading and standardization bale covering scheduled for hearing March 31. Desire advise you said bill will mean huge saving American cotton producer and entire cotton industry. Will put United States cotton on equal trading basis abroad, and will expand domestic use of cotton, thereby decreasing dangerously large surplus. Strongly urge endorsement this bill by committee, and passage by Congress for benefit of entire American cotton industry. Bill favored by farm bureau, Southern Commissioners of Agriculture Association, and many leaders in cotton industry, including California interests.

L. M. Walker, Jr., commissioner of agriculture, Richmond, Va., states in a telegram:

Appreciate your energetic support of net-weight cotton bill for benefit of cotton growers in Virginia and other States.

I could go on and on quoting letters and telegrams, all of which should clearly indicate to every Member of this House that, apparently, all farmers, farm organizations, in fact, everyone interested in cotton farmers, are for this legislation. I hope that the bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, we must remember during the course of this debate that if you shift from jute bagging to cotton bagging, somebody is going to pay additional sums of money. Today those additional sums of money come out of the United States Treasury to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and

still that money is not sufficient to permit this cotton bagging to be made in this country and sold in competition with jute bagging. That is the fact as it stands today.

By passing this bill you are going to make it just that much worse for the taxpayers and the consumers of the United States. Somebody is going to pay the bill. The jute industry has been in existence in the United States for more than a century. To say at this late date that there is any fault or any reason or cause for throwing out jute bagging at this time for any other reason than to help the sale of a few bales of cotton is quite beside the point, unless the purpose is to help a certain group of mill owners manufacturing this cotton bagging, because they are the only persons who are really going to profit. They are going to profit at the expense of other mill owners who have already put millions into their plants right here in the United States. That can be the only change.

Let us look at this cotton proposition from the standpoint of the use of cotton. You were led to believe that there is going to be a tremendous use of cotton by virtue of this bill, when, as a matter of fact, we are told that the first year, assuming that there is no cotton bagging in the country today, they would use 120,000 bales, and in every successive year they would expect to use not more than 20,000 bales. On a 12,000,000-bale crop that would be a small fraction of 1 percent of the cotton crop of the United States.

The bill states that anybody can use any kind of bagging he wants to use to bale a bale of cotton after the passing of this bill. Of course, that is a specious statement. The reason it is so is that they do not leave the number of ounces to be determined by the Department of Agriculture for each square yard of the bagging. There is not a person in favor of this bill who does not know that jute bagging weighs more than 14 ounces per yard.

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

Mr. CLASON. Not now; I do not have the time. The last time I yielded about 10 minutes out of my 15, and this time I should like to go ahead.

By putting it down to 14 ounces as your standard you wipe jute bagging out, and that means not only the northern mills but the mills in Savannah, Ga., and all over the South which make this bagging that covers the bales of cotton.

The men who are in these mills have been brought up in that industry and are entitled to have their jobs looked out for just as much as the mill owners and the employees of the cotton mills making cotton bagging. I want to say a word for them, because they have been in these mills for generations and they are entitled to have their interests protected also.

It was stated in the debate on the rule that the United States Treasury is not called upon to pay a cent in connection with this cotton bagging. That statement is not correct, and it has been confirmed since we started this debate. Of course the United States Treasury is

paying a subsidy, and it plans to this year, of 15 cents a pattern, on every pattern made up of this cotton bagging. Yet giving the cotton producers and the cotton-mill owners this advantage of a subsidy, they still cannot sell in competition with jute.

The cotton people tell me that in normal times cotton bagging costs almost twice jute bagging for each bale of cotton. I want everybody who is here just to figure that one out. They would have us believe that this extra cost is not going to be paid for by anybody, it goes up in the air and nobody pays for it, but of course the answer is that it is going to be paid by the farmer. The person who is going to kick the most if this bill should become law is the cotton farmer of the South, because he will have been sold down the river by the persons who vote for this bill.

Then let us look at the bill itself. Apparently not much consideration was given to it in committee this time. Let us also look at the bill that we had before us last time. This bill provides that within 9 months the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate the official cotton tare standard. He must complete the tests by January 15, 1942. Within 7 months thereafter these standards become effective, and it is a criminal offense to use bale covering which does not comply with them.

If you will look at the law we had before us previously, and which was presented in 1939, you will notice that the dates were practically the same; in other words, 2 years have gone by, but the change-over in the industry is going to take place within even a shorter time than was the case in the bill of 1939. At that time the bill stated that the standards should finally become effective on January 1, 1943, and under this law it will be in the middle of 1942. That is ridiculous on the face of it. Changing over this great industry in the course of such a short time cannot be done.

Further, unless the President, or some high authority, shall decide that cotton bagging has become part of our national-defense program, it will not be possible for the cotton mill owners to get machinery with which to turn out this additional bagging. Anybody who has been in the manufacturing business and has tried to get machinery out of some of these machinery companies, or to get tools from the tool-machinery industries knows just what a job that is. For any cotton mill man to come in now and say that he can go to any big manufacturer of machinery or machines or tools and get what would be required to build up a cotton-bagging industry 10 times as large as that of today is pretty farfetched.

I feel that if this bill is ever put into effect, instead of having the dates brought forward, as under this bill, they ought to be put back at least 3 more years. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is a little difficult for me to understand this plea

that is being made for the cotton farmer. This is a rather simple thing. A cotton pattern costs \$1, aside from the subsidy of 15 cents. In the first instance the cotton farmer is charged for wrapping that cotton. When he takes his cotton to the gin he is charged for the cost of that wrapper, which is \$1. In the case of the jute he is charged 72 cents. That is just a plain fact. So how could the cotton farmer possibly save by paying a dollar when he can get the jute for 72 cents?

The jute pattern weighs about 6½ pounds more than the cotton pattern. When the cotton is sold to the spinner, it is true that the spinner pays 71 cents more at the present market price of cotton than he would if the bale were wrapped in cotton, but the farmer does not pay that. That is paid by the trade. So where is your argument for the cotton farmer in the South in this bill?

Even assuming that it costs more to the trade, not the cotton farmer, for the jute, what is the purpose of this program? The Department of Agriculture has informed me that the object is to find new uses for cotton. They said nothing about the cost of the cotton, the price of the cotton, either to the farmer or the public. If the purpose is to find new uses for the cotton, then of course the question of cost drops out altogether. This cannot be a new use for cotton because it is merely a replacement.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SOUTH. As a matter of fact, the cost of shipping this excess weight of the jute throughout the country and then shipping it abroad is a substantial item itself and the producer must ultimately pay that. And in the second place, it is idle, it seems to me, if not foolish, for the cotton farmer to import an article for the purpose of wrapping cotton, the very character of which lends itself so admirably to the same purpose. And now, if the gentleman will permit me just briefly—

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Let me answer your first question before you ask another.

I believe I have already answered the gentleman's question. Is the purpose of this bill to meet prices?

Mr. SOUTH. It is both to meet prices—

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If it is for the purpose of meeting prices, then the purpose of your bill again is to fix prices.

Mr. SOUTH. No.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What other conclusion can you come to? If the purpose is to meet prices you certainly have to fix a price lower if you cut under, or higher if you intend to go above, or equal to the prices of jute if you intend to equal it, and in any of the three cases you are fixing prices.

Mr. SOUTH. The Department of Agriculture favors this bill and states it would be in the interest of the farmer and of the merchant and of the manufacturer, and the State departments of

agriculture throughout the South are for it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Let me answer your other question. You say the Department of Agriculture is advocating this?

Mr. SOUTH. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What difference does it make who is advocating it, in face of the fact that under this bill the cotton farmer is charged \$1 and an additional charge of 15 cents is made to the taxpayers of the United States for every bale of cotton, and in the other instance, when jute is used the cotton farmer is charged 72 cents.

Mr. SOUTH. If the gentleman will permit, the 15 cents the gentleman is talking about is being paid now and the bill is not passed; therefore that cannot be charged to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not know what you mean.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman spoke of 15 cents now being paid in the form of a subsidy.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will be paid.

Mr. SOUTH. No; it is being paid now.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. All right.

Mr. SOUTH. The bill is not a law and therefore that expense cannot be charged to the bill which is now under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman means by that we already have this machinery, this subsidy machinery, going, but leaving out the 15 cents you still have \$1 as against 72 cents the cotton farmer must pay for wrapping his cotton.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee referred, in his opening remarks, to a telegram in support of this bill from the very distinguished Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of North Carolina. The first telegram I see in the RECORD is one from Dillon, S. C., from the Carolina Milling Co., and it reads as follows:

Passage of Fulmer net-weight cotton bill will cost farmers of South Carolina thousands of dollars. As practical cotton farmer and ginner we vigorously oppose any change cotton covering at this time.

I also notice telegrams and messages placed in the RECORD by the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Jones, of Texas, from Columbia, S. C.; Orangeburg, S. C.; Sycamore, S. C.; Seward, S. C.; Cameron, S. C.; Bamberg, Chester, and from all over South Carolina, North Carolina, and other States, from people opposing this measure because it is not in the interests of the farmer.

Now, because by chance I happen to have a little jute mill in my district, employing about 600 people, all of whom will be affected adversely by this measure, the suggestion is made here that perhaps I am unduly and very greatly influenced by that fact. I am, of course, interested in the welfare of those people employed in that industry. I am the

only Representative they have here, but I would frankly say I would be willing to sacrifice that little industry if that were all that was at stake and if by doing that we could greatly benefit the cotton farmers who are in much distress; but when it comes to the question of what can be done, here is a letter from a very reliable constituent of mine, and in speaking in behalf of this little industry in one of my counties he says:

This bill will destroy the business of every American manufacturer of jute bagging, as they now operate.

Since talking with you I have verified my understanding of the matter of converting machinery with the president of the Carolina Bagging Co. and he tells me that the machinery now in use for manufacturing jute bagging cannot be so converted as to make a bagging within the limits of the Fulmer bill and that most of the machinery now in use will be worthless under the terms of the Fulmer bill.

In the open market the farmers would naturally use a light-weight burlap in preference to a cotton bagging on account of the price. As between the two the price of cotton bagging would be prohibitive.

All burlap is made abroad and the business of covering bale cotton would go to the foreign manufacturers.

The machinery necessary for making light weight jute covering is obtainable only in England, and it is not probable that such machinery could be obtained at all under present conditions.

On account of prohibitive price, farmers would buy cotton bagging under only two conditions:

1. Under compulsion.
2. Under a Government subsidy that would enable them to buy it at a price comparable or cheaper than imported burlap.

If cotton bagging were subsidized and used it would require only 120,000 bales to cover a 12,000,000-bale crop the first year; and very much less in subsequent years, because the cotton in cotton bagging can be reclaimed, re woven, and so used over and over. Some tests show as high as 90-percent reclaimed.

On account of the inability of American manufacturers to obtain necessary machinery to make a lightweight jute under war conditions the farmer would either buy cheap foreign-made burlap, or be forced to buy high-priced cotton bagging.

Under the present system the farmer buys cheap jute bagging and sells his bale of cotton at gross weight.

Under the net-weight bill the farmer would have to sell at net weight, deducting from the sale the weight of the bagging and ties.

If net weight results in the compulsory use of cotton bagging, it would force the cotton farmer to buy the cotton bagging and give it away. If the farmer uses the cheaper foreign-made burlap, he would be giving the business to foreign manufacturers and giving the bagging to the purchasers for the purpose of putting the American manufacturer out of business.

In any aspect of the case it is hard to see where the American cotton farmer comes in, and it is very easy to see where the American manufacturer of jute bagging goes out.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman stated that burlap comes from England. It really comes from India.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think there is any argument about that. At present I understand that the reason we cannot change the machinery is because there

is not any machinery in this country, since all of the mills are located in Calcutta, India. As I stated, to sum this thing up, much can be said in opposition to it. I cannot for the life of me understand how we can by Federal law provide that a cotton farmer has no right to ship his cotton in any kind of bagging that weighs more than 14 ounces per square yard. Does anyone know of any precedent for any such thing? Yet that is what this bill does, and if a farmer ships his cotton in any heavier bagging than that, he is guilty of a misdemeanor.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. One gentleman stated that the cotton bagging used to wrap this cotton is sometimes in a deplorable condition. Does the gentleman mean to say that this bill would make it a criminal offense for any cotton grower to tie up his bale of cotton with a stronger and better cotton wrapper than the 14 ounces to the square yard?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what the bill will do. The cotton farmers have used this jute bagging for 100 years. This bill requires them to use a light-weight bagging, cotton which is not as strong, or burlap, which is imported.

Mr. MICHENER. Would it prevent him from using a heavier cotton wrapper, and using more cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. It limits the weight of the bagging. It limits to that extent the use of the cotton that the farmer can use. He could not even wrap it up in his own cotton if the bagging weighed over 14 ounces.

Mr. MICHENER. And, of course, he would not want to do that.

Mr. COOLEY. I think not. Some of these pictures which have been exhibited show fire hazards in the cotton after the bale has been cut to pieces by the buyer. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent that practice. That has been going on for years. The only way to solve that is to do what was suggested awhile ago, and that is to draft a law to provide for an American standard bale of cotton and have the cotton graded so that the public will buy and sell on that grade. Then you would prevent the cutting of the bale. Other suggestions are made here about selling on net weight. If I understand the contentions of the proponents of this bill, they contend that cotton is now sold in the world market on net weight, so what is to be accomplished? The only thing to be accomplished is just to force the cotton farmer to use cotton when it costs him more than the bagging he is now using, and I, for one, from a cotton country, am unwilling to do that.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SOUTH. But the farmers want to use it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely in error.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not a fact that three out of every four or more of the Representatives here who represent the cotton districts are in favor of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I have not undertaken any poll of the House, but the record shows that the farmers do not want to use it, and they would not use it when the Government subsidized it to the extent of 28 cents a bale.

Mr. SOUTH. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The record shows it, whether the gentleman agrees with me or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill interests me very much because of several fundamental things that have taken place during the last 10 years, among which we find an enormous number of bills which have been enacted by Congress having to do with the commodity cotton.

It may be true that for a hundred years or more cotton has been bagged with burlap, but it is not true that for a hundred years or more the Federal Treasury went to the assistance of cotton growers as it has during the last decade. Therefore, in my opinion, in discussing bills that have to do with cotton, it is quite proper for us to think in terms of the last decade.

The Federal Government today holds almost six and one-quarter million bales of cotton which it owns outright. We have stocks of cotton on hand altogether of close to fourteen and one-quarter million bales. Unless through new legislation, which is now being considered in the other body and which will be considered here shortly, we reduce the production of cotton, there is a fair chance that the Government will soon move into the position of holding in excess of 10,000,000 bales of cotton.

We are spending enormous sums out of the Federal Treasury in buying cotton in the market, and through the stamp plan, the mattress production and distribution plan. I am in favor of this bill because it is another way of getting some of the cotton now on hand unsold actually used. If we are going to subsidize cotton and other crops, I think it is well for us to insist, where the situation operates as in this case, that the raw material which we are subsidizing be used as a container in which to carry the balance of the product to market. That is exactly what this bill proposes. To me it is sheer common sense to support legislation of this kind. That is one reason.

I am in favor of this bill for another reason: I am absolutely satisfied that it will not hurt the American cotton farmer and that it will protect him to a considerable extent, as far as bagging and ties are concerned, against a little racket which has been operated against him down through generations on the part of the gin operator and the purchaser of the cotton from the cotton grower.

If you will set a standard and sell cotton on a net-weight basis I think that will be very beneficial to the cotton grower. This bill moves in that direction. So those are the two main reasons why I would sup-

port this legislation. It does not prevent the use of jute if the jute manufacturer wants to bring it down to a certain weight basis. Even if it did prevent the use of jute and caused cotton to be used instead, I still contend that would be a highly constructive program so long as the Federal Treasury is forced, for many reasons, to subsidize cotton production and operation as at the present time.

If a Federal law is enacted which in some way interferes with the old-established operations of many of our lines of industry—and that is taking place every day—those old-established industries have to adjust themselves to the new conditions set up by the new Federal legislation. Here is a case where that rule would continue to apply. It is not anything new at all. Any man who has had business experience knows that statement to be true.

So I hope the House will pass this bill. I hope when it goes to the other body it will be approved and I shall be very delighted if it becomes law, because I want to see us move farther in the direction of using cotton as bagging for the bundling of the raw product. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute, the remainder of my time, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield he remaining time on this side, 9 minutes, to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot hope to add very much to the very instructive and constructive argument that has just been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. He spoke to the bill, and he spoke by the record. His arguments are really unanswerable.

As he suggests, the primary purpose of this bill is to provide for new uses of cotton and thus to provide for a more adequate price for cotton, thereby relieving the public Treasury from some, or much, as the case may be, of the appropriations that have been made from time to time, the purpose of which is to give to the farmer a better price for his crop.

In response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, I would say that the only way for the farmer to get a better price for his cotton or a more adequate or a fairer price is for the trade to pay it. By this bill we are proposing probably the most effectual method concretely suggested that would enable the farmer to benefit from the prices actually paid by the trade.

Mr. Chairman, I think I noticed a few of the objections that have been made to the bill in my argument in favor of the rule. I have high regard for the views of my agricultural friend, the gentleman from Springfield, Mass. [Mr. CLASON]. He is really an authority on cotton growing. I esteem him. I admire him. But I am inclined to think that looking through the glasses of the jute manufacturers of Springfield, Mass., he rather sees the side of the jute manufacturer than the side of the cotton grower.

It is said there will have to be a readjustment, that the substitution of cotton for jute will necessitate the substitution of machinery in jute mills. That is a fair statement, but let me call your attention to the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina, with all deference to his very able argument, rather overspoke himself. He said we were dependent upon a foreign country for the machinery, that it would be necessary to provide for the substitution, but in the next breath he said that the passage of this bill would provide for the use of burlap manufactured in a foreign country and would not result in the use of cotton. I respectfully submit that if we can import burlap during these war days we can import some machinery that may be necessary for textiles; and I interject at this point the suggestion that our factories that cannot replace their machinery, either by repair or replacement by machinery that is manufactured in the United States, had better make arrangements to use domestic machinery, because we are in an emergency that is likely to continue for several years. I cannot believe that the United States is dependent upon England for machinery with which to manufacture cotton, or for cotton machinery to replace jute machinery.

It has been said in opposition to this bill that it will be expensive to the farmer. This argument is advanced by my good friends who have jute mills in their districts. I find no fault with them, but I am inclined to think now that the gentlemen who speak in opposition come here with facts and statistics furnished them not by cotton growers but by jute operators and jute manufacturers as they tell us how the replacement of machinery will affect the situation.

I make the suggestion that according to the hearings in this case—and I believe it is fair to say regardless of what any manufacturers may think—it will be practical to provide machinery that can go from the manufacture of one textile to another. There are those who believe that the manufacturers of machinery in the United States, whether it be for textiles, for munitions, airplanes, or motors, exceed the manufacturers of similar equipment or machinery in any other part of the world, and it is rather passing strange to me that if England is dependent upon us for improved machinery for munitions and airplanes that the only type of machinery now that would provide for the manufacture of jute can be bought in England or India. It must, if that be true, be rather antiquated machinery, as the United States is the greatest industrial country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated on the rule, this bill has been reported out numbers of times. It never came to the floor but once, but that once, in June 1939, it was passed by an overwhelming vote substantially in the form it is now. It is well to keep in mind that it has no reference to cotton that has been previously ginned or processed, and all of the Government stocks and all of the cotton now owned by textile operators or cotton dealers is exempt, because the bill applies only to

cotton hereafter processed or ginned, and the bill will not go into operation until 1942. No one will be done an injustice. Everyone will have an opportunity to dispose of existing stocks, and there will be ample opportunity to provide machinery that will give employment to American workmen in the manufacture of an American product, and in that way we are able to provide for the manufacture of an American product, rather than a product that would be imported. Surely of all times this is the most propitious. It is time to recognize that the tare evil is a disgrace in the sale of cotton.

My good friend from North Carolina brought in a piece of cotton bagging used many times. The testimony shows, the hearings disclose, that cotton bagging is more lasting. If the gentleman had brought in a piece of jute that had been used as many times as that piece of cotton bagging, in all probability it would look like the bagging on the cotton in the pictures exhibited by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], in his able presentation.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOXEY. Knowing the gentleman's great experience in the cotton-raising business I ask the gentleman if he ever saw a better ginned bale using jute wrapping than the jute-covered bale on exhibition in the lobby? Are not 98 percent of the jute bales more disgraceful and uneconomical and disreputable looking than that jute bale out there in the Speaker's lobby?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think so unquestionably.

Now let me say with respect to the telegrams from South Carolina—and you can get them from my district, too, Mr. Chairman—no matter what appeals are made to Members of Congress, a bill should appeal to our judgment and to our common sense if it is in the interest of the farmer. We have a few or some selfish or thoughtless people in all of the districts. There may be the ginner or the merchant interested in his profits on the jute that he has on hand or that he has handled through the years, but those people should remember that the bill does not go into operation for a year and a half.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. According to the gentleman's understanding of the operation of the bill will it apply to this year's crop of cotton?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not. It does not go into effect for 1 year, and may not go into effect for either the 1941 or 1942 crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It goes into effect in 1942.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unquestionably. Mr. Chairman, the growers, the buyers, the traders, the cotton factors, the transportation agencies, the insurers all recognize the evils of the cotton tare. No better way has been proposed than that

which we have under consideration to prevent the use of a foreign product in competition with American cotton, and that is all this bill does. For that reason the weights are prescribed, and the farmer, in the ultimate analysis, will get the benefit of it. Let me say that is the view of cotton buyers, too. I read from page 6 of the report, the testimony of W. L. Clayton, who probably handles more cotton than any other buyer in the United States:

As stated to you in Washington, I am strongly in favor of legislation to correct the tare evil. I have read your bill twice, and, so far as I can tell, it should accomplish this purpose.

The cotton trade has been seeking for many years to bring about the necessary reform in the tare evil, but has made practically no progress in doing so, and due to the fact that the interests involved are so widely scattered and divergent it probably never will succeed in doing so except through legislation.

If that be the opinion of the cotton buyer, and that is the opinion also of the insurance agencies, the cotton growers' associations and so forth, I submit that the real interest of the cotton grower in common sense will be promoted in the long run by the passage of the pending bill. The tare is most expensive to cotton growers. It is a great disadvantage to them.

It has been stated that the evil should be remedied by the cotton trade. I agree that the cotton trade should remedy the evil. They should have remedied gambling in cotton futures, but the trade did not eliminate this evil, nor will it eliminate the evil of cotton tare. Congress provided legislation to regulate cotton exchanges, and Congress must provide legislation to provide for the net-weight bale.

Congress has made many efforts to increase new uses of cotton. The pending bill is probably the best avenue for this purpose.

I know the influences behind the cotton merchants and the cotton buyers who have asked us to oppose this bill. These influences have been able to influence the cotton trade, and the exchanges in cotton trade. The average farmer does not write to the Member of Congress who represents him. He depends upon that Member to analyze legislation and to vote for the bills that will promote his welfare.

Jute is cheaper than cotton, but when cotton is cheapest, jute is often highest. If cotton is sold on a net-weight basis, in the long run it will provide a better price to the grower. Those who favor the promotion of cotton and the increase of cotton and other agricultural products should support this bill. I trust it will be agreed to by the Committee. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known by the short title of "Cotton Net Weight Act."

The word "person," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to import the plural or singular, as the case demands, and shall

include individuals, associations, partnerships, and corporations.

The words "in interstate or foreign commerce," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean from any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District or to or through any foreign country, or within any Territory or District.

The words "bale covering" shall be construed to mean bagging, ties, and patches.

The word "cotton" shall be construed to mean cotton of any variety produced within the continental United States, including linters.

When considering and enforcing the provisions of this act, the omission or failure of any official, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any association, partnership, or corporation within the scope of his employment or office shall in every case also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such association, partnership, or corporation, as well as that of the person.

Sec. 2. That in order to provide for the more adequate covering and protection of the American cotton bale and to facilitate net-weight trading in cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to investigate the handling, inspection, and transportation of cotton in interstate and foreign commerce; to study the materials used for bale covering; and from time to time to establish standards for materials to be used for bale covering, which such standards shall include specifications and tolerance as to sizes, weights, constructions, strength, and any other factors of quality that he may find to be necessary; said standards, when established, to be known as the "United States Official Cotton Tare Standards": *Provided*, That the official cotton tare standards first established hereunder shall be promulgated on or before January 15, 1942, and shall become effective on July 15, 1942: *Provided further*, That any change or replacement of such standards shall become effective only on and after a date specified in the order of the Secretary of Agriculture establishing the same, which date shall be not more than 1 year from the date of such order, but pending such effective date of new or revised standards any bale covering material conforming with such new or revised standards may be used in lieu of any bale covering material embraced in the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards theretofore promulgated. The maximum weight of any fabric or material standardized under this section as bagging for the covering of cotton bales shall not exceed 14 ounces per square yard, and the maximum weight of any fabric or material standardized for patches shall not exceed 20 ounces per patch; and no such fabrics or materials standardized for bagging or patches shall be composed of any material previously used for covering cotton bales unless the same shall have been reprocessed and rewoven.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: Page 3, line 5, strike out "January 15, 1942" and insert "January 15, 1943," and in line 6, strike out "July 15, 1942" and insert "July 15, 1944."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is in order to bring the bill in line with a bill that was offered in 1939 and passed the House. You will recall that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] stated a few minutes ago in answer to a question by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that this bill could not probably apply to any crop within the next 2

years. Yet here it is the 1st of April 1941, and this bill, by the wording of it, is to become effective on July 15, 1942, just a little over 1 year from now.

On the face of the argument made by the proponents of this bill, it is absolutely impossible for it to become effective on the date indicated in the bill. In 1939 the bill was so framed that the standards were to be promulgated on January 1, 1942. You will note here that they have extended the time for setting up the standards to January 15, 1942, or exactly 2 weeks. Under the previous bill the law was to become effective on January 1, 1943, 1 year later, but here they have cut down the time. It was January 1, 1943, back in 1939, but today in this bill it is advanced to July 15, 1942. In other words, we are 2 years later in the consideration of the pending bill, yet they have moved up the date when it shall become effective by 6 months.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a list of about 50 mill owners, manufacturers, and processors of this bagging, who are vitally interested in this bill. They employ thousands of men. Thousands upon thousands of persons have been engaged in this business for many years. They are located in North Carolina in one instance. You people should not get the idea that this is a northern proposition. These mills extend all over the Gulf country, the east coast, Texas, Louisiana, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Virginia, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Tennessee, and New Jersey. This is not one little, isolated plant in Ludlow, Mass., or some other particular city or town. This is a business which is country-wide. It covers one of the largest crops produced in the United States of America, and it seems to me that my amendment should be adopted in order that these mills employing thousands of Americans may be given a decent length of time in which to work out their problem.

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

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that it would be quite difficult to obtain the necessary machinery to convert these mills?

Mr. CLASON. I am told it will be absolutely impossible, unless it is decided that this is a national-defense measure. We are greatly in need of airplanes, shells, rifles, and everything else, and this is inconceivable.

Mr. COOLEY. Likewise, if this bill passes may we not anticipate that the cotton mills will find it difficult to install the necessary machinery to weave the cotton bagging, which would be the only bagging available?

Mr. CLASON. I agree with the gentleman. I do not see how this can become effective in 1 year after this date or 15 months after this date, when a man who has had such experience as the gentleman from Mississippi says it could not possibly become effective for 2 years, in his opinion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I said only 2 years, and, frankly, my reason for saying it is this: The pending bill may be passed by the House. If it is passed, it goes to the Senate. It may be considered there in this session or later. I had in mind that contingency. Frankly, I think the figures inserted in the bill are reasonable.

Mr. CLASON. What about the bill of 1939, which had an effective date of January 1, 1943?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I had that in mind in making the response. When that bill left the House it provided that it should become effective in 1 year. It went over to the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture reported the bill with the date July 15.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not let the House fix it, then? There is no reason why we should not agree to the amendment.

Mr. CLASON. This is 2 years after we talked about the 1939 bill. It seems to me only fair that these mill owners and these employees should be given the time that they were given back in 1939.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in fixing these dates we took into consideration just what the gentleman has been talking about. I had a number of these jute people a year ago come to me and ask, "Do you expect to pass this bill in time to interfere with us in this year's crop, 1941?" I said, "No."

This bill becomes effective in January in promulgating and working out the standards, but it does not go into effect so far as covering the cotton is concerned until the crop of 1942. I call to the attention of the gentleman that because of the lack of shipping space it is impossible to get jute, burlap, or even this type of jute over here to be manufactured into cotton covering. The cotton textile mills of this country, however, are ready to manufacture all the cotton covering we want on any notice, because it does not take any special change of the machinery.

Unless we are able to put this bill into effect in 1942, you will have subsidized cotton bagging, because I doubt seriously that you have enough jute in this country to do the job. There is not shipping space to bring it in. They have been cutting down on the purchase of waste jute during the last year or two because they expected this bill to pass sooner or later. While we will be in position to put this bill into full operation in using cotton bagging in 1942, it would not interfere with those mills, and no doubt would be very helpful in carrying on the proper baling and selling of cotton.

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

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If that is the case, then why have this bill at all? Why do you not let the cotton farmer then raise the cotton to make these bags? If they cannot get jute in here, we will use cotton.

Mr. FULMER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. This is the

reason. This bill makes the sale of cotton on a net weight basis and standardizes the bagging. If you do not pass the bill and if you do not have the jute available, they can put anything on from fertilizer sacks to cotton sheets or any kind of waste. There is nothing today to prevent them from putting anything on, but they are putting the heavy bagging on because they know that 30 pounds will be knocked off and if they do not have 30 pounds on they will lose that difference. If you do not have this bill, there is no limit, and you can put on anything, from fertilizer sacks to cotton sheets or anything else.

Mr. RICH. Let the cotton farmer sell his cotton with the idea that they are going to take only the net weight, whatever it is. If the tare is only 10 pounds, there is no reason the farmer should pay for 20 or 30 pounds, when he gets only 10.

Mr. FULMER. I agree with the gentleman, but all the farmers cannot do that. You heard the gentleman awhile ago quoting Anderson and Clayton, the biggest cotton buyer and the biggest cotton farmer, that they never would do that until we pass the bill.

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

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not the very purpose of this bill to make the net weight compulsory so that would be done? And if the gentleman will yield further, may I say that when this bill passed the House on June 8, 1939, there was a provision that it would be effective 1 year from date? It was the following April before the Senate committee reported the bill, and they substituted language so as to make it the year following the date that they reported it. Therefore, if the argument be true that you cannot get the machinery at all except from abroad, there would be no occasion to postpone the date to 1943 or any other date.

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

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Has not the situation changed since 1939?

Mr. FULMER. Changed how?

Mr. COOLEY. Have not the international and the shipping situations changed? This machinery must come from Great Britain, Calcutta, or some other place. I believe it would be only reasonable to ask that a reasonable length of time be given to these mills to make the necessary changes.

Mr. FULMER. Our mills do not need any time to make changes to manufacture cotton bagging. Because of not being able to ship any jute or jute bagging of any type, certainly we ought to have the bill, so we can go ahead and sell on net weight and set up proper standards.

Mr. COOLEY. People who are in a position to know—and I know they are reputable citizens—advise me that they would experience difficulty in getting the necessary machinery.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman from California, who represents a great cotton section in California, was telling me about the trouble in shipping jute; that he had a letter from his people stating that it would be impossible to get the jute in this country, because they have absolutely cut out importing it, because of the lack of shipping space, and they are not going to permit any jute to go out of this country because they want to use it for other purposes—bags and things like that. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my observation, in trying to help the cotton farmer, and goodness knows we have been trying to help him in the last few years, that if you fellows had not passed the Bankhead cotton bill about 6 or 8 years ago you would not have put the cotton farmer out of business. When you passed that bill you tried to raise the price of cotton so high in this country that you could not sell it abroad. When you passed that legislation you thought everybody would have to come to America to get the cotton, but you just ruined the cotton farmer in this country. It seems to me that the only way you are now trying to help the cotton farmer is by bringing in all kinds of legislation that will make us use cotton for everything under the guise of national defense. It seems to me we will have to start eating cotton pretty soon if we are going to really help the cotton farmer.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Not being able to get the world to use our cotton we are now attempting by this bill to force the American cotton farmer himself to use it.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me if we would try to do something to really help the farmer instead of always taking the bull by the tail and then allowing the bull to carry us all around in a circle all the time, we should really think about what we are doing here.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. Does not the gentleman think that the tariff which has protected his section of the country and its manufacturing industries, might have had something to do with impoverishing the cotton farmer?

Mr. RICH. Yes; if we would put a tariff on the jute right now would we not help the cotton farmer? That is the way we ought to do it so as to enable the people of the country to use cotton instead of using jute that comes in here free. I am for a tariff for the American farmer, for the American manufacturer, and for American labor, and I always have been and always will be because I think that is the salvation of our country.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not true that about the only help the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given the cotton farmer has been in the sense of criticism? The

gentleman has not sponsored any legislation to help the cotton farmer.

Mr. RICH. I do not have any cotton farmers in my district, but I know that if we do not help the cotton farmers they are going to raise everything that our farmers raise up in Pennsylvania, and then we are going to have that competition. I want to help you, but I want to see some good legislation brought in here.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman ought to be for this bill.

Mr. RICH. I want to see some good business legislation and not a lot of legislation that proposes that we go around Robin Hood's barn all the time.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman has stated he is very strong for the principle of protection. If we pass this bill today, it will accomplish for cotton by keeping out jute just what a tariff on jute would accomplish, and does not the gentleman think that in this way we can help preserve the American market for American cotton and at least the gentleman will be preserving the principle of protection? It seems to me the gentleman ought to support this bill.

Mr. RICH. I want to help the cotton farmer because I believe that is something we have got to do.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman can do that by voting for this bill.

Mr. RICH. The way you fellows want to help the farmer is by paying him for not raising cotton, and then you get him to raise a lot of stuff that the northern farmer raises. That is not going to help this country and it is not going to solve your problem, because that is not going to get them to use more cotton. Put a tariff on the jute—

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This bill has nothing to do with the control of the production of cotton; this is an attempt to preserve the American market for the American cotton farmer, and the gentleman is for that principle.

Mr. RICH. Yes, surely; but the gentleman says this bill is not for the cotton farmer. What is it for if it is not to make them use cotton?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is right.

Mr. RICH. And you are going to bring in another bill here within a week compelling them to use cotton to make pulp and paper, so the farmers cannot sell their pulpwood.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman think that this bill will do what he has been contending for in preserving the American market for the American farmer?

Mr. RICH. Go back and put a tariff on them. This good-neighbor policy you fellows have established here of permitting farmers in foreign lands with peonage labor to come in here and compete with our farmers is going to have the effect of destroying the cotton farmer and you are going to destroy the wheat farmer and the buckwheat farmer if you do not put on a tariff. Put the tariff on, I tell you. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULMER) there were—ayes 32, noes 36.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. FULMER and Mr. CLASON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were ayes 59, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: Page 3, line 15, strike out the words "the maximum weight" down to and including the words "20 ounces per patch" in line 20.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to have final determination if there are to be any proper standards established, after hearings, by the Secretary of Agriculture. By the wording of this bill, once standards are set the Secretary of Agriculture can change them as he sees fit, without any further consideration from Congress. That being so, and it being evident that the purpose of the wording in this statute is to rule out jute and to put in cotton, regardless of the cost that has been given in debate, my amendment is offered that everybody would have a chance to come in with any kind of bagging. The purpose of my amendment is to lay that wide open. If we are to have regulations set up by the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department, let us permit him to do it. Why put in 14 ounces to the square yard? Why not leave that to the Secretary and let him determine what it should be. Perhaps we will find a year from now that it is not possible to have cotton bagging, so why put this law on the statute book which rules out jute, when the Secretary may say at that time it is impossible to have enough cotton bagging on hand to cover the 1942 crop or any other crop? Why not let the Secretary of Agriculture decide that and not have it decided by this nonhearing legislation, because there was not a single hearing on this bill before the Committee on Agriculture.

That is the situation. We are near war. The whole country is disturbed over the defense program. Why put in jeopardy every business, whether it is cotton or the jute bagging business, or any other bagging. Why not give everybody a fair chance, with the Secretary of Agriculture determining what we ought to have in the way of standards and not have one isolated clause put in here, the purpose of which is to bite out jute and shove in cotton, in exclusion to every other known fabric? If you do that, the cotton farmer will be the one who will suffer. He will pay twice as much for the bagging on his cotton as he would otherwise have to pay, and the United States Treasury is paying 15 cents in subsidies for every cotton patch that is used on cotton today. Let us

cut out that type of work, if we are going to play fair. Let us be fair, and not have legislation like this bill so that everybody in the United States can have fair standards set up by the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the language in lines 20 to 23, as follows:

And no such fabrics or materials standardized for bagging or patches shall be composed of any material previously used for covering cotton bales unless the same shall have been reprocessed and rewoven.

With that language there it does not make any difference whether the material formerly used is in good shape or not. It may be in perfect shape, but this bill prevents the farmer from using it again until he takes it back to a mill and has it rewoven.

Mr. CLASON. I agree with the gentleman. I feel as though my amendment should be amended to carry out those words also, because it is obvious, if cotton has been around a bale and has not been damaged, it is right to use it on another bale, and it is silly to make anybody put that through another process in another mill at great expense. That is wasting the farmer's money, just as this bill is going to do from the first page to the last.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to announce that I have just received a telegram from Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Louisiana, announcing that the southern commissioners of agriculture are all supporting this bill, and by permission of the House I place the telegram in the RECORD at this point:

BATON ROUGE, LA., March 28, 1941.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Congressman FULMER has introduced a measure whereby cotton must be sold at net weight. This bill has endorsement of southern commissioners of agriculture and shall appreciate your support of said bill and also contact other members of our Louisiana delegation.

HARRY D. WILSON,
Commissioner.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts and what he had to say with reference to his amendment, I submit the following: Everybody knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] has given much thought to this bill and is just as much opposed to it as I am in favor of it. If his amendment carries, that will take out the heart of the bill. I say that because of this pertinent fact: Many crimes have been committed in the name of trying to benefit the farmer. The argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the observation of the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. COOLEY], is that we are preventing the

farmer doing what he wants to do. If you do not prescribe the type of wrapping that is to be used, you might just as well not have any bill. If that is cut out, the purpose of this bill is lost. The purpose of the bill is to have an economical package, to have a package that will not have this 30 pounds tare taken off. It will be a package that will have a tare of about 14 pounds. It will be a package that is nice in appearance. That is the purpose of submitting what we know from the hearings before the Department of Agriculture to be a type of wrapping that is desired; not any particular wrapping, but with reference to the weight. If this language goes out of the bill you can put old sheets or tow sacks or anything else that might be forced upon the farmer under the guise of telling him he has to pay less for it than something that is marketable and material that we know will enable him to get a better price for his cotton.

When you say you are interested in the farmer that is the interest we should manifest; that is, to get a better price for the cotton. That is what those of us who are advocating this net weight bill feel it will do, on account of the economical packaging and the attractive packaging. When you say we are heaping any imposition upon anybody by providing that the weight of the material shall not be greater than 14 ounces per square yard, and that the many patches which will be put on it will not exceed in weight 20 ounces each, I say if you cut that out you will have an unsightly bale of cotton, even more so than the disgraceful bale that is marketed now. That is one of the reasons why we cannot get a fair price for the material that is produced by the farmer. It is on account of the appearance. I say the gentleman's amendment should be defeated. If it is carried it will take the heart out of this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The language that is proposed to be stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] is the very heart of the bill that provides for a net-weight bale. If this amendment carries, it goes to the very heart of this bill and destroys the very purpose for which the legislation is offered.

Mr. DOXEY. Yes; the gentleman is exactly correct. Let me say that other gentlemen, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, think this is entirely a fight over wrapping. This is a twofold bill. It not only endeavors to make a nicer package and a more economical package, but it is to get baled cotton sold on a net-weight basis, so that the farmer will not be charged with all this unnecessary tare that is put on a bale of cotton and charged to the farmer. The net-weight feature is something that my friend from Pennsylvania and others may have lost sight of in the beneficial results that will accrue to the farmer as a result of enacting this bill.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why do we have to legislate in order to determine what the net weight of a package is that is on a bale of cotton?

Mr. DOXEY. We have to legislate because the trade has adopted as a practice the gross-weight system that certainly works against the farmer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were ayes 37 and noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 3, line 20, strike out all words commencing "and no such" to the end of section 2.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It strikes out the following words:

And no such fabrics or materials standardized for bagging or patches shall be composed of any material previously used for covering cotton bales unless the same shall have been reprocessed and rewoven.

It seems to me we go pretty far in this legislation; we go back to the pig-killing days, the burning of wheat, the plowing under of cotton, and the destruction of our crops. If this is not what this bill means, I do not understand it. If second-hand jute is available and is still fit to be used, why should it not be used a second or a third time, or as many times as it is capable of being used, without having to be reprocessed each time? I would like to ask this simple question: Will anyone in this House stand up and tell us why jute covering for cotton should not be reused?

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I cannot tell you why that should not be reused, but I will say that in the woolen industry they use bags over time after time after time. They are made of substances other than cotton. They could use those. If they use woolen bagging, they would want to use it more than once, would they not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question: The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] told me why we had to legislate in order that the farmers should not be charged the net weight that was on a bag of cotton. Now, do we not have cooperatives in the South among the cotton farmers?

They make their rules and regulations. Should not they say that the farmer should be charged for only the net weight of the bagging? Then again why cannot those cooperatives insist that this be done instead of our coming in here and trying to legislate that bags must weigh 12 pounds? A farmer naturally does not want to be charged 18 pounds for a bag that weighs only 8, but why cannot the cooperatives insist that cotton be sold on the net weight basis, that only the actual weight of the bagging be deducted?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman from Ohio will yield I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if a farmer puts any kind of covering on cotton that weights more than 14 ounces he is liable to arrest for violating the law, be charged with a misdemeanor, and have a fine of \$500 imposed on him.

Mr. RICH. Where is that provision?

Mr. COOLEY. It is in this bill.

Mr. RICH. That is crazy legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I want to make just one point further: There would be just as much reason in bringing a bill into this House to prevent people from rehabilitating their shoes, clothes, or anything else they possess as there is for this clause in this bill. If the Members of this House believe such restriction is proper legislation then vote for it, but vote against it if you believe it is not.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; not now. If you do not believe that is a proper restriction then of course you will vote against such legislation. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he voted for a bill at the last session which eliminated the use of soiled wool scraps in the manufacture of blankets, and so forth? And whether or not the gentleman saw the sample the gentleman from North Carolina had, a ragged, torn-up piece of bagging which he exhibited to the House a short time ago? Would the gentleman want to see that used on a bale of cotton?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe that is up to us. The gentleman is not handling cotton; he is a Congressman. Let those people who handle cotton take care of that end of it. Why do we have to meddle in all these things all the time?

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The piece of bagging the gentleman referred to that was exhibited a while ago one could not pick up, for it was nothing but holes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentlemen from Ohio is conscientious about the statement made awhile ago. May I state to the gentleman that even jute bagging is never used a second time until it is rewoven because as a rule when you put old bagging on you start a bale out looking like the picture I showed you awhile ago. Think what bale covering would look like after it has been cut seven or eight times. Certainly you could not use any of it unless it is reprocessed. If you adopt that amendment then they would come in with any old type of bagging or sacking that would be even worse than this old jute. You would leave the type of bagging wide open. The poor appearance of our baled cotton is one reason we are losing our foreign markets. This provision in the bill simply states that the bagging must be reprocessed before being reused so as to insure a proper ap-

pearance for the American bale, so it will stand up in comparison with any other country's cotton. Brazil uses cotton bagging and Brazil has taken our Canadian and other markets away from us. Japan is buying from India. We used to sell to all these countries. All the complaints coming from Europe deal with the type of bale we ship there.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I wonder if the Committee on Agriculture has ever given consideration to the proposition that it might be well to ship some of our surplus cotton to India? There are plenty of people there who are not clothed at all but who would wear cotton clothing and be sold on the idea of importing some of our cotton if they could get it cheap enough.

Mr. FULMER. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman's question. We are getting all kinds of jute from India. In making trade-treaty arrangements to give away our own markets in lots of things besides jute, we should put in these agreements with India and other countries that if we take their jute they should take our cotton. But they do not do that. We buy the jute from India, but the American farmer's cotton goes into the warehouses in this country. Brazil is shipping her cotton to Canada and Canada is shipping into this country, duty-free, millions of dollars' worth of apples, newsprint pulp, wood, and wood pulp. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that I am introducing a bill to put a tariff on jute, on oil, and on starches; and I hope when we get it before the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman will assist me in securing favorable consideration thereon so that we can give the cotton farmers our market which India is now getting.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Brazilian cotton industry, which is increasing by leaps and bounds, is sending its surplus cotton to Canada?

Mr. FULMER. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. And it is coming into our country free of charge?

Mr. FULMER. No; not into our country but into Canada.

Mr. STEFAN. It is going to Canada. Canada is not buying our cotton?

Mr. FULMER. That is right.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. In addition to the reasons given by the gentleman, is it not true that the wrapping which often stays on a bale of cotton 2 or 3 years gets damp, that the fabric rots, and it will be unfit for wrapping further even though it has not been slashed up with a knife?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true one of the reasons assigned by the opponents of this legislation is the fact that jute bagging generally is rewoven and that you are only requiring that the rewoven bag be used for patches just as it is used in covering the original bale?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that Mr. Lockie, of the American Cotton Shippers' Association, replied that the use of this bagging that is not rewoven is for the benefit of the merchants and buyers and comes out of the pockets of the farmers?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely. When it leaves the farmer it may have 18 pounds on it. Then they patch up to 26 pounds and to 30 pounds for export. They usually make from 50 cents to \$1 profit on each bale. Those are the fellows who are against this bill because it interferes with their profit.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman see any difference in passing a law preventing the use of second-hand jute and in passing a law preventing the use of second-hand automobiles, hats, or anything else?

Mr. FULMER. That has not anything to do with this problem. All other commodities have rules and regulations, you have standards, and the net weight is marked on practically everything that the gentleman buys except cotton. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio), there were—ayes 39, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That except as provided in section 2 of this act, it shall be unlawful for any person to ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce any bale of cotton ginned after the effective date of the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards on which the bagging, ties, or patches do not conform with such United States Official Cotton Tare Standards.

No person shall be prosecuted under the provisions of this section when he can establish a guaranty signed by the manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, or other party residing within the United States by whom such bagging, ties, or patches were sold, to the effect that the same conform with said United States Official Cotton Tare Standards. Said guaranty, to afford protection, shall contain the name and address of the party or parties making the sale of such bale covering materials, and in such case such party or parties making such sale shall be amenable to the prosecutions, fines, and other penalties which would attach in due course to the shipper under the provisions of this act.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to examine and test bale covering materials and samples thereof for the purpose of determining whether such materials conform with the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards, and to promulgate regulations for

submitting samples of bale covering materials for examination and testing.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of this bill, and I will vote against it. I oppose it reluctantly, because, generally speaking, I favor and have voted for all legislation for the benefit of the farmer. However, I am more cognizant of the effects of this bill because in my own city we have jute mills, and I know there will be men and women thrown out of employment if this cotton net weight bill passes.

The gentleman from Mississippi stated that it would be possible for the manufacturers of jute bagging to install new machinery and to go into the manufacture of cotton bagging. That is quite true, and at other times that argument might have more weight with me than it has at the present time. I realize—and I think everyone here who has any intimate knowledge of our defense program realizes—that it is impossible at the present time to secure machine tools or new machinery. That means that those of us who have these jute mills in our districts or in our home cities will have to contemplate a situation wherein they will be unable to secure new machinery for installation in order to go into the manufacture of cotton bagging.

It is for the reasons stated above that I will have to oppose the bill. I cannot understand why at this time we have to ruin an industry that has only grown up and developed in the last 100 years because the farmer himself has demanded jute bagging. Jute bagging has not been forced upon the farmer. He has purchased jute bagging because it has been more economical to do so.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. I appreciate the fact the gentleman has usually gone along with the farmers and I have not any quarrel with him in this instance, but may I suggest to the gentleman that the farmer has never demanded jute bagging. It may be that the ginners has put it off on him. I grew up in a cotton country and I never heard of a cotton farmer demanding jute to wrap his cotton in.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the farmers themselves will decide? Does not the gentleman think if the cooperatives, for instance, through their members wanted to use cotton bagging that they would use it?

Mr. SOUTH. That is possible, but this is a situation that has worked down from the top. The top has been the Jute Trust and it has worked on down through the ginners and the processors. The farmer has had nothing to say about what his cotton is to be wrapped in.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman, however, that I have some knowledge of the marketing of cotton? I have always been sympathetic to the problems of the cotton farmer because I know he has always

been made to pay for anything that took place in the nature of a loss in the cotton industry. I would be glad to go along on this bill, but we have to protect our own industries.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say that cotton bagging is now available to the cotton farmer if the cotton farmers want to buy it. Cotton bagging is subsidized this year to the extent of \$300,000 of Federal funds for the purpose of encouraging its use.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is quite true.

Mr. COOLEY. This subsidy as granted by the Federal Government is, of course, already at the expense of the industries in the gentleman's district, in my district, and in other districts that are manufacturing jute.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What the gentleman says is quite true.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that in the passage of this bill they will work irreparable harm to an American industry and to thousands of manufacturing plants which are located in various parts of this country, and that we have to protect the interests of the workers in those communities to the same degree that we have to protect the interests of the cotton farmers in the South.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. In answer to the gentleman from North Carolina, may I state that the trouble now is that this is still on the gross-weight basis, and the buyer will not give the farmer an advantage. The year before last I put all my cotton in cotton bagging to help out, but when I went to sell it I did not even get the 7 pounds back that some of the mills stated they would give back, since it is still on a gross-weight basis. We never will get that until we get the net-weight basis.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand that what the gentleman says is correct, but we are still faced with the necessity of protecting American industries and American communities. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That from and after the effective date of the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards it shall be unlawful for any person to buy or sell or to offer to buy or sell any American cotton ginned after such effective date for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce except according to the net weight of the cotton involved, excluding in each instance the weight of bagging, ties, and patches.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cause such investigations and tests to be made as he may find to be necessary in order to determine practical means for the permanent identification of different types of bales of cotton by the use of markers, tags, and other devices which will facilitate the effective administration of

this act, and by public notice to prescribe standard specifications for such markers, tags, and other devices. Such standard specifications or any change or replacement thereof shall become effective on and after a date specified in the order of the Secretary establishing the same, which shall be not less than 1 year after the date of such order, and thereafter it shall be unlawful for any person to ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce any bale of American cotton ginned after such effective date which does not bear a tag, marker, or other device conforming with such standard specifications.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 5, in line 9, the words "of different types" be stricken. They are perfectly useless, in that a different type is not mentioned in the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. That for the purposes of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be promulgated such regulations, may cause such investigations, tests, demonstrations, and publications to be made as he shall find to be necessary; and he is hereby authorized to cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivisions thereof, or any person, in carrying out the provisions of this act, and he shall have the power to appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees not in conflict with existing law, and to make such expenditures for printing, books of reference, technical, newspapers and periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, travel, and other supplies and expenses as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Sec. 7. The duties developing upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this act may with equal force and effect be executed by such officers and agents of the Department of Agriculture as he may designate for the purpose.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee if the word "developing", in line 14 of page 6, should not be stricken out and the word "devolving" inserted in its place.

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 6 in line 14 the word "developing" be stricken and the word "devolving" inserted in lieu thereof.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. Any person who shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this act or of any regulation made in pursuance hereof; or any person who shall knowingly represent by misbranding or otherwise that any bale-covering material sold or offered for sale or shipped or delivered for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce conforms with the United States Official Cotton Tare Standards when in fact such bale-covering material does not conform with such standards; or any person who shall forcibly assault, impede, resist, interfere with, or influence improperly, or attempt to influence improperly, any person

employed under this act in the pursuance of his duties, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$500.

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This act shall become effective January 1, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 968, to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 136, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were 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 question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 75, noes 58.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold that so I may submit a unanimous-consent request that the vote go over until tomorrow?

Mr. CLASON. To be frank, we have had this discussion this afternoon, and I do not know what will be gained by going over until tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was understood last week that if the question of a roll call were to come up today, we would, if possible, postpone it until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit, I would say that the agreement was made concerning the Hobbs bill, which we thought would be up for consideration today.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but I construed the agreement as being a little bit broader than that. I believe that specifically what the gentleman from Massachusetts says is correct; but on the other hand, the general impression was that there would probably be no roll call on any bill that might come up today, and that every effort would be made to put any roll call over until Tuesday. Of

course, I want to keep my part of the agreement.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask if the request is that the vote go over until tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Chair finds that a quorum is not present, I should assume that to be the situation, to protect the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. Is that as the Speaker understands it? We are suggesting that if the vote goes over until tomorrow it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Massachusetts includes that in his request, when the vote is taken tomorrow it will be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the Speaker will permit, for the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts may I say that if by any chance a Member should make a point of no quorum tomorrow, that would come ahead of the fulfillment of the gentleman's request, and then his request would not be carried out unless sufficient Members would support the demand for the yeas and nays that such a vote would be ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn, in order to bring this matter to a head.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to make a statement. The Chair has told 20 or 30 Members, both on the Republican side and on the Democratic side, that if he could prevent it there would not be a roll call today on any bill, so may the Chair suggest that the request be made that when the House meets tomorrow and this vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It would relieve us of any difficulty here if the gentleman from Massachusetts would include in his request that the vote go over until tomorrow and that it then be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. I want the gentleman from Massachusetts to have his rights fully protected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I believe that would protect him.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, and I had a gentleman's agreement with reference to the alien-deportation bill, but I may say to the gentleman that I construed the agreement to be broader than that and to apply to any bill that might come up today because so many Members had acted upon the assumption that there would be no roll-call vote today. The gentleman from Massachusetts was perfectly within his rights, but in view of that understanding of mine I think it applies to this bill so far as I am concerned. Naturally, I do not want to take the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] off his feet or deprive him of any of his rights, because, according to the vote just announced by the Speaker, evidently a quorum is not present and on tomorrow the gentleman might be taken off his feet, and that should be kept in mind with respect to the unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but I think if we yield too much we are liable to get into further trouble.

Mr. FULMER. I would simply like to state that it is my understanding that the Speaker and the majority leader had spoken to a number of Members and it was for that reason we did not want to have a record vote this afternoon, but so far as I am personally concerned I would be perfectly willing to have the vote this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this one statement, if I may. The gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, always acts in good faith toward Members on both sides of the aisle and while we could get a roll-call vote if he wanted to, yet inasmuch as the gentleman has requested that the vote go over until tomorrow, in order that it may be fair to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], I would suggest that the gentleman include in the request that the roll-call vote be taken tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the motion to adjourn prevailed I would undertake to protect the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sure the gentleman would.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the taking of the vote on this bill be postponed until tomorrow and that when the vote comes on the final passage of the bill the vote shall be taken by the yeas and nays.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, when we were in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union I asked unanimous consent to file in the RECORD at a certain point designated by me a telegram from Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture of Louisiana, in reference to the bill we had under consideration today. I would like to ask unanimous consent to include the telegram at the point mentioned.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 170

Resolved, That Joseph C. Baldwin, of New York, be and he is hereby, elected to the following committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Labor, Committee on the District of Columbia, and Committee on Pensions.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD by including an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a concurrent resolution in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill under consideration in Committee of the Whole House today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by the former Postmaster General on Jackson Day, in New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Senate report concerning primary voting irregularities in New Mexico.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution passed by the Forty-ninth Assembly of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem entitled "The Forgotten Man," by A. P. Taplett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of New York with regard to the highways of the State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would not claim the time if I did not think the matter I want to speak about is one of paramount importance. I shall speak about the labor situation.

I think that everyone will agree, and I know the rank and file of the labor movement will agree, that by every possible means strikes should be avoided and prevented at this time. Thoughtful

labor leaders will agree, I know, because they know that in the present state of the public mind the one thing that would be best for the labor movement would be a complete avoidance of all strikes. I hope also that employers will agree that strikes should be avoided and prevented at this time. And I say that because there are causes for strikes and the burden of these causes of strikes is not always, or even most of the time, on the workers regardless of what antilabor publicity may attempt to indicate. The question is how to accomplish that purpose. For it must be accomplished in such a way that fairness and justice is done all around—in such a way that the spirit of cooperation and loyalty is increased, not diminished.

These are times that try men's souls. They are times when unjust judgment and the bitterness it may cause is far more serious than in ordinary times.

It is of basic importance to be fair; it is of basic importance to know the facts; and we must always remember that what we are seeking to accomplish is the promotion of a spirit within the Nation which will make possible a successful carrying forward of the national-defense program in the best possible way. This can only be done if we win the hearty response of all groups, and labor is just about the most important one of all. It will do no good just to pass some piece of antilabor legislation than to have a large group of our essential workers feel that we have not understood or dealt fairly with them. That would be destructive of morale, and morale is all-important. We do not just want people to keep on working. We want them to keep on working with a will to produce. We can have both these things if we are fair and if we are wise. We will get neither of them if we start treating labor as if we thought they were disloyal. They are not.

Someone in this House, from time to time, has to speak on behalf of and in interpretation of the point of view of labor. It is not going to be popular to do it, but someone has to do it, for once the indispensable skilled workers of America get the idea that they cannot expect understanding of their point of view—that no voice is raised to give their side of the question—then we shall have lost the thing on which we must ultimately completely depend, and that is the spirit of the men who must produce the planes and ships—yes—and the food and clothing. As has been done so well in England, we must make our workers feel that they are partners, and partners not without honor in this great effort.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE

A few weeks ago Mr. Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor in the Churchill cabinet of Great Britain was addressing a group of important and prominent bankers and businessmen. In the course of his remarks he said, "England could spare every man in this room better than she could spare one man who knows how to make an airplane propeller." He was right. And this is something for us to think about. I doubt if we think about it enough.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about France and very little about Eng-

land in connection with this strike problem. We have been told that it was strikes that ruined France. But we have not been told why and how British labor has been cooperating completely with the government, how and why there has not been a single strike, although no law has been passed forbidding them. To say that strikes were an important cause of the downfall of France is only a half truth. It is only part, not all of the story. Another part of the story is that having neglected constructive measures, having neglected to arouse their people to the necessity of united action to save the nation, the French finally clamped on a dictatorship, swept away practically all the rights of labor and the people generally, and imposed sharp and drastic regulations upon some of the people. But from what I can discover, at no time were sacrifices demanded of the 200 families or the directors of the Bank of France who were the people who controlled most of the French economy, and the greater part of the munitions industry. France tried to have business as usual, almost up to the very end.

And while they were attempting to securely control labor, at the same time labor knew that in France there were groups of French industrialists and other people of that character who were going on with business as usual and profits as usual. I am not unmindful of the work of Communists and "fifth column" agents. I just do not believe they were any more dangerous on the whole to France than were the men who thought maybe Hitler was not so bad, and that they could continue to carry on their businesses without being bothered by labor if Hitler conquered France. Indeed, it is true that when Leon Blum in 1936 asked twenty billion francs for national-defense expenditures, French capital repaid by shipping to America half enough French gold to have paid for the proposed defenses on the Belgian frontier. The Blum government fell, and Chautemps followed. He asked fifteen billion francs for defense. Promptly there was another flight of capital, and the franc fell to its lowest point since 1926. Daladier came in—and held on. And one reason he did so, apparently, was that he did not ask an increase in the expenditures of the Government. Indeed, the national-defense budget of France in 1938 was only 1 percent above that of 1934. No wonder the French people did not respond. The point I want to make is that one main reason they did not respond was because the people at the top politically and economically never acted as if they felt it necessary to make any sacrifices themselves for the sake of the nation. Meanwhile the French chamber of commerce was warning against the danger of overexpansion. Yes; there is more than one lesson to be learned from France.

But in Great Britain, on the other hand, what happened? What was the difference between Chamberlain and Churchill. The fundamental difference was that Chamberlain, on the one hand, stood for the preservation of privilege that then existed. But Churchill said, "No; it has got to be a great national effort to which every group shall make

their full contribution." He called in the leaders of labor themselves, told them he had to have their cooperation, showed them that there were actually to be no great profits allowed to be made, said he was ready to ask his own group to make sacrifice. Would they help? They would. They did. They are now. England is standing as one man. That was the difference, and I think I could state, without fear of being wrong, that if he should feel the occasion warranted it and the President of the United States called upon any group of American workers and said to them, "Your work cannot be spared. I am asking you men to stay on the job, and I am telling you that if you do stay on the job your right to recognition, to a fair agreement, to fair settlement of grievances will be fairly handled by an impartial board," he would get quick response without any shadow of doubt.

BUT THERE MUST ALSO BE JUSTICE

But the thing you cannot do is to fail to say the second thing. The thing you cannot do is just to say to labor, "Labor has got to keep working, no matter what anyone else does. If it does not, it is unpatriotic." You cannot do that, because there are certain things that labor has a right to expect, and one is that it will be treated as a partner in industry, and that it will be bargained with; that it will have a chance to make agreements; that it have a chance to find its place in this national-defense picture, just the same as any other group. Just as soon as you are ready to do that, then I am positive you will get response. Indeed, if we went over all the strikes that have taken place, we would not find very many that have been against employers who have done these things. There are exceptions, of course, and they have to be dealt with in other ways. Jurisdictional strikes, for instance, seem to me almost inexcusable at a time like this. But up to date, although we have preached to labor long and hard, we have not really acted as though we felt that the situation was one that demanded sacrifice from top to bottom. We have placed no limitation on profits. We have not even effectively curtailed a lucrative commerce in gasoline with Japan, or in machine tools with Russia. We have not passed a tax bill that was in accord with general sacrifice in proportion to ability. We have not even taken steps to end the waste of unemployment once for all. We have not said to other groups in the population that we expect sacrifice. Indeed, the same men that want to put labor in jail if it offends have been telling us we must restore confidence if we are to expect the cooperation of business. The Congress itself enacted legislation last fall which was for the explicit purpose of meeting the demands of the manufacturers and of business management in order that they might have security against any losses in the future. I voted for that legislation. But I ask you now what would we do today if we took a similar point of view toward labor?

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

SUCCESS OF MEDIATION BOARD

Mr. HEALEY. Apropos of something the gentleman just said about the settlement of these strikes through proper mediation, I call to the gentleman's attention the fact that newspaper statements of today reveal that the four strikes that were certified to the Mediation Board only last week have now all been settled. That is the Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation at Bridgeville, Pa.; the Condenser Corporation, South Plainfield, N. J.; the Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.; the International Harvester Corporation, four plants, Richmond, Ind., Chicago, Ill., two plants, and Rock Falls, Ill., one plant, all in the course of a few days, indicating that the gentleman's views are correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman; and his list includes every single dispute that has been submitted to the National Defense Labor Mediation Board up to date.

Mr. HEALEY. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I want him to know I had planned to use the information he has given to demonstrate that the American method of working things out by agreement between employers and workers has not failed. We are only beginning to try it, only I hope we are getting a new spirit—a spirit of saying it has got to work—both sides have got to be both fair and reasonable.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I only have a few minutes. I would rather proceed if I may. I wonder if the gentleman would let me do that?

TWO METHODS

There are two ways in which we can get the kind of spirit and cooperation which we want in America today. One way is by inspiring mutual willingness to give and take and cooperate in the national interest; to inspire that by means of such national leadership, both in Congress and out of it, as will impart the great need in which we stand today, as will put shame upon any group which will attempt to profit out of this situation for their own benefit; as will lead to the bringing together of all efforts, capital, labor, and everybody else, so that you get the kind of an inspired democracy that is the strongest society in the world. This is the best way. It is the way in which most of our basic values can be saved.

But if it does not work—

Well, there is another way you can use if you cannot get it that way. This first way is typified by agreements voluntarily made between employers and workers, by National Defense Mediation Board, by bringing people together and settling difficulties as they arise. The other way is by requiring in the name of all the people equal sacrifice in proportion to ability to make sacrifice, from every group, beginning at the top; beginning first with possessors of idle wealth; second, prosperous and favored industries that are getting almost all the big orders; third, the well to do, including Members of Congress; fourth, labor; fifth, the farmers; sixth and last, W. P. A. workers, and the unem-

ployed. The second method is for all these groups to know that the Nation is in so difficult a position that everyone is being asked to do all he can. We have not done this. But if you say that from every group we are going to ask everything they can give and then show labor this is the kind of program we have got, we will get a response that will put some gentlemen to shame. You have to get response, under those circumstances.

YOU CAN DRAFT MEN FOR SERVICE TO THEIR COUNTRY, BUT YOU CAN'T DRAFT THEM TO HELP MAKE PRIVATE PROFIT

A gentleman came in today and said he had introduced a bill so that if any strike took place "against the United States" severe penalties would be imposed. He spoke about strikes "against the United States." I wonder if the gentleman really meant strikes "against the United States," because if he did I can understand him. If he meant a strike on the part of people who are working for the United States Government, if he meant a strike on the part of Government civil servants or people working in a plant that belongs to or has been taken over by the Government of the United States, I think he is right. I do not think there can be such a thing allowed as a strike against the Government. But if he means he is going to punish a group of employees of a private company because they make a protest, and if he proposes that Congress should say to labor, for example, "We are going to drive you under any circumstances to work for 'Little Steel,' no matter what 'Little Steel' does," then I say he is wrong. In other words, the Members of Congress have got to understand that once they abandon the method of improving our machinery for avoiding strikes by means of fair settlement and adopt, instead, the method of using the power of Government to compel labor to work, then, at the same time, we must compel industry to expand and we must see to it—really and actually—that not one penny of profit results to any private person or agency or corporation. When we have to take over industries or plants for the sake of national defense, then we can be responsible for right conditions of labor and we can, and, of course, would be in duty bound to, prohibit strikes completely in such plants. Until that time comes, we must use the methods of preventing strikes by improving the machinery of adjustment, conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration. I hope most earnestly these methods will be adequate.

This thing has to work both ways. I have heard it argued in the House that there cannot be a limitation on profits now because we have to give "incentive" to the owners of industry. We have been told that the manufacturers have to have an incentive or they will not produce necessary defense materials. Incidentally I don't believe that about most American manufacturers. But if we are going to start on that premise then it is equally true that we have got to have an incentive for other groups, and labor, for example, has got to believe that they can expect to improve their condition. The same thing applies all the way down

the line to every group, or it does not apply at all.

I have said that I believe labor should do everything in its power to avoid strikes in defense industries. Indeed, I fear for the future of our organized-labor movement unless this is done. For there will not be many speeches like this one in the House. But neither do I believe that conditions ought to be imposed that would cause labor to strike. And I beg the House to remember that there are employers in America—not many, I hope, but some—who would not hesitate to do things that are in the nature of an attempt to get labor to strike and thus incur the wrath of public opinion. I believe there is a lot of the story that has not been told. For instance, in the case of Bethlehem Steel you have a corporation that is in violation of the laws of the United States and has been so held by duly constituted authority. Bethlehem Steel has never, so far as I know, recognized or bargained with a labor organization. Moreover, this corporation, during the first World War, not only paid a bonus of close to a million dollars in 1 year to one of its officials but it was called upon by the War Labor Board appointed at that time to grant a wage increase and refused to obey that order and never did obey that order. The men had continued at work on the agreement that meanwhile negotiations would continue and a decision would be made which both sides would accept. Finally, Congress passed a bill on March 4, 1925, and appropriated \$1,600,000 of the public money to make good the award of that War Labor Board. William Howard Taft, Chairman of the War Labor Board, at that time was outspoken in his condemnation of the action of Bethlehem Steel.

Now, I know that simply to explain the causes of strikes does not in itself help to remove their danger to national defense. But to know their causes does enable you to act intelligently in preventing them. All I am asking is that we be fair. All I am asking is that we see that because it is labor that commits the overt act does not mean that labor may not be attempting to protect its basic and fundamental rights against subtle attack. There are always two parties to every controversy.

DESTRUCTIVE FORCES NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF AMERICAN LABOR OR EMPLOYERS MUST BE ROOTED OUT

I would not be telling the whole story here if I did not say that there are in the ranks of labor and in the ranks of industry some men whose attitude is actually destructive. Their interest is not in the success of our democracy. Indeed, Communists in the labor movement and Fascist-minded people on the other side have a common interest. Both of them would no doubt be pleased if a situation could be brought about where we would have American workmen and American Government forced into antagonism to one another. To prevent that, primarily, I am speaking this afternoon.

Let me say here with emphasis that the one thing that would do more than anything else for labor's cause today would be a genuine housecleaning of such Communists as remain in its ranks. Nor

do I think a man who says this or who tells who they are—if he is sure of his facts—is speaking against labor; on the contrary, he is doing the labor movement a genuine service. And my appeal to labor would be that they clear their ranks of that small fraction of Communists. I know it is not easy, but it has been done already by the A. F. of L. and by most of the substantial C. I. O. unions. The task can be completed. There are good, patriotic men at the head of labor in this country, and this is their job. For the kind of strikes that may result from the work of Communists are going to be awfully, awfully bad for labor in the long run, as well as in the short run, and to temporize with this matter any longer is to court disaster.

But there is another job that needs doing by another group. I have heard sound labor men criticize pointedly and publicly the destructionists in their ranks. But I have seldom, if ever, heard one industrialist offer open criticism of a fellow industrialist who may hate democracy as much as any Communist hates it, and who may admire Hitler because, as he will put it, "After all, Hitler put the labor unions out of business and enforced the rights of property." There are men in positions of economic power who have that attitude and who do not wish us well in our defense program for their reason. They, too, need to be exposed.

INITIATION FEES

I am speaking in defense of labor, and especially of those tested organizations of American workers which through the years have been as loyal and true as any groups in America. But I am going to try to tell the whole story. I do not think that when a man goes in on a job, one which is known to be temporary, especially a temporary national-defense job, he should be charged a big initiation fee. At the very least, special arrangements ought to be made for a very moderate fee on those temporary jobs; the fee ought to be nominal, and then if the man holds the job and wants to become a full-fledged union member, it ought to be made possible so that he could pay it over a period of time. But I honestly believe the situation with regard to this matter is not so bad as it has been painted. For example, the president of the California State Federation of Labor wrote me as follows:

I note your suggestion relative to permitting applicants to pay the initiation fees over a period of time while working on the job. For your information, that is exactly the system which is being used by practically all the unions in this part of the State.

And the recent action of the executive council of the building-trades department of the American Federation of Labor regarding this whole problem of initiation fees, dues, and employment of nonunion men should have been blazoned across every newspaper in the country. No one unfamiliar with the problems of labor can fully appreciate how far these men went toward solution of these problems. Of course, the various international unions and the locals will have to cooperate. But I believe they will, and I think these problems, too, are going to be fairly worked out. I believe they must be. And while we are speaking about

initiation fees we must remember that their purpose is to make possible the payment of sick and death benefits and other means of protection for union members. I would only add that, in my belief, this should be the whole purpose of such fees, and that any practice of permitting organizers to retain a portion of such fees as part of their compensation should be ended.

WHAT THE LABOR MOVEMENT MEANS

Members of the House, we must remember that the labor movement through the years has been the one basic means of enabling the toilers of the world to put themselves in a position of somewhere near economic equality with their employers. To cripple that movement in the name of democracy should be unthinkable. Are we actually to consider in a moment of passion the sweeping away of any basic features of that movement? But for these organizations for mutual aid among wage earners we should indeed have conditions in our Nation that would mean that millions of our people living in misery and degradation would have little indeed to defend. This is something to think about.

Labor must have the right to share in the gains of industry. I have inserted figures in the Record comparing the increase in profits on the one hand with the increase in wages on the other in the last year. In steel, which is one that I carry in my mind, it was 93.9 percent increase in profits and 2.8 percent in wages. In machinery profits increased 90 percent in 1940 over 1939 and wages only 3.8 percent. Adjustment of things of this kind has got to be made, but it is something that not all people understand. We must recognize the right of the men who labor to a position of partnership. We must recognize the right of the American laborer to work under agreements with his employer and we must recognize his right to be treated as though he had a rightful place in our economy. These things are labor's basic rights. Labor must defend them.

And may I remind the House at this point that every dictator on earth as one of his very first acts has destroyed the organizations of labor. One of the greatest differences between dictatorship and democracy lies here. And we seek to defend democracy. Furthermore, even in Fascist countries, after labor was destroyed the owners of industry came next. Which is also something for American industrialists to remember. And Members of Congress.

ON STAYING ON THE JOB DURING NEGOTIATION AND SETTLEMENT

Then we have other problems connected with this great question which do not involve basic rights of labor. For example, the public is not going to have much patience with jurisdictional strikes. It ought, it seems to me, to be possible to get rid of those disputes without carrying them out into the open where they tie up defense industries. In this case I should think it ought to be possible to submit all such disputes to the National Labor Relations Board or some similar body for final and definite determination.

And now I want to make a proposition, based on the assumption that we

have established a body which will be fair and which will prevent any advantage being taken by one side over another. It occurs to me that it should be possible for the work of defense to continue while grievances and wage and other adjustments are being negotiated and ironed out. Suppose that labor would say, "We will stay on our jobs; but here is our case, here are the things we believe should be adjusted. We ask that the employers meet and fairly negotiate with us. We only expect to see justice done to us." That is a constructive policy labor can pursue, in my opinion, just so long as a fair mediation board is used and just so long as employers are willing to meet and treat with the men. This problem can be solved, gentlemen, if we keep our heads.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Does not the gentleman believe that if contracts were entered into between labor and industry to the extent that there must be conciliation or mediation and arbitration before there would be any stoppage of work, there would not be a stoppage of work and that during this mediation there be a retroactive clause that any agreement made would be retroactive to the date of the expiration of that agreement, the same kind of an agreement that has been entered into by organized labor with the United States Steel Co. under which there has been no stoppage of work at all?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. I agree with the gentleman. I think that is the way to do it. We should perhaps say that until the good offices of this Mediation Board have been exhausted there shall not be a stoppage, and neither shall there be a change on the part of the employer in the conditions of work. But I must hasten to add that just as most all labor trouble arises because of lack of an agreement between employers and workers, so the necessary condition of doing what the gentleman suggests is the willingness of employers to treat with labor and make fair working agreements with it.

I would like to say that in at least one or two cases I know of labor organizations have asked that work continue while the negotiations lasted, and in at least the case of one industry, one of our greatest industries—namely, coal—the employers refused.

NO SPECIAL GROUP CAN BE BIGGER THAN THE UNITED STATES

I do not think that labor should have the right to dictate to the country, but neither do I think any other group should have that right. I am asking for a square deal this afternoon. I am asking that Members of Congress take pains to know the facts before they speak. I am asking that as we go forward we take the attitude that nobody—not the owners of the monopolistic industries, not the C. I. O., not international finance, not the A. F. of L., not anyone shall be bigger than the United States of America. I am asking that all the people in the United States of America shall know that at the hands of Congress, the Executive, and every-

body connected with government there will be a square deal on the basis of the facts for all concerned, and that no great humane movement like the labor movement is going to be deprived of its fundamental basis by an act of Congress taken in an ill-considered fashion.

I want to say one word about union membership. For that is pretty close to the heart of the matter, after all. You cannot blame a labor organization for emphasizing the importance of membership, because, after all, only the members have borne the burden and heat of the day; only they have helped establish the improved conditions in the industry; and it is hardly fair, is it, to expect them to permit anyone who wants to to come in and enjoy the improved conditions without making any contribution? I have almost exhausted my time, Mr. Speaker. But I have barely scratched the surface of this great human and national question. If I have shown the Members of the House one thing, however, I am content. That one thing is this—the action of the Congress in this hour must be such that it will bind the American people together rather than raise barriers of misunderstanding between any group of them and their Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. My question does not really fit at this time, but I am going to ask it just the same. The gentleman stated awhile ago that he was opposed to the union charging enormous fees at these defense projects.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I am.

Mr. RUSSELL. I take it the gentleman means he thinks it is all right for them to charge a small tribute in order for the American boys to go to work on defense projects. Is that correct?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Where we have an opportunity on the part of people to get a better rate of pay because the union has established a rate of pay, the man who gets the advantage of that can, it seems to me, hardly expect not to make some contribution toward this work.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I simply say I have not lost faith that our American way of solving all these problems will succeed. I believe even now a new spirit is growing among all groups in our country. Labor has been severely attacked. Some of the criticism is justified. We have got to avoid these strikes, and we can do it by the application of common sense, appeals to patriotic action by all parties, and above all, by being fair.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SPECIAL ORDER

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

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the House should create a special committee, similar to the special committee created by the Senate, for the purpose of investigating the need of further legislation to promote our national-defense program.

Some time ago we established a sane policy of full and complete preparedness. In the interest of our own peace and security we also decided to become "the arsenal of democracy." We are seeking to substitute economic force for military action. We are seeking to rely upon preparedness and production for peace and security. The die is cast. There is no turning back. To fail to make maximum use of our enormous economic and productive capacity with all possible speed is to commit a crime not only against ourselves but against posterity. Under authorizations and appropriations already made, we will have expended some forty billions of dollars by the end of 1942 in the cause of national defense. Time may greatly increase this amount. To do a half job or a poor job in this matter will be to waste this money and to place in jeopardy what is of far greater value—American manhood.

The American people are willing, even anxious, to buy total defense and an "arsenal for democracy," but they insist on getting what they pay for and they do not want anyone getting rich out of their sacrifices. They rightly and strenuously object to profiteering by industry, labor, or others. They object to any slowing or stoppage of production for any reason. They insist that all interference with the defense program be immediately reduced to an irreducible minimum. They want and should receive maximum production at maximum speed with reasonable economy.

Some weeks ago the House Judiciary Committee inquired of the executive branch of this Government, through responsible executive departments, if there was any need of further legislation to deal with the strike situation. The committee was told that no further legislation was necessary, that the executive branch of the Government had full and sufficient authority to deal with the situation. Yet we find strikes in vital defense plants slowing down our production at a time when we seek to step it up. Testimony has been given to the Congress that as many as 200 factories in this country make different and essential parts of certain airplanes. In one instance, at least, a strike in one of these plants materially reduced our plane production. The Congress and the people have a right to know of all such instances and the causes therefor. Because a man works in some strategic plant whose continued operation is essential to the continued operation of other plants and to the final completion of planes, shall he be permitted to strike, and demand, and receive almost as much money per day as the best young men in America receive per month when drafted into the Army? There can be but one answer to that question.

Again the owners and operators of this plant have no right to take the same advantage of the same situation by demanding exorbitant profits or by imposing unreasonable conditions on labor. Labor has struck, in some instances, for its share of a supposedly big profit melon. Because some industry has a monopoly on some commodity essential to defense production, as for example aluminum, shall such industry be permitted to profiteer out of our country's peril and to

exact unreasonable prices for their product? Further, because some plant is equipped with tools or machinery necessary to use in vital defense production, shall such plant be permitted to place its own price on work done? Again, there can be but one answer to these questions. The boys training at \$21 per month, Mr. Taxpayer, Mr. Average Citizen, Mr. John Q. Public, have a right to a square deal out of every person under the protection of the American flag. If and when they are not getting it they are entitled to know the reasons why.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of these individuals and in the interest of national defense I have today introduced a resolution to create a special committee of the House to consist of nine members. The purpose of the committee being more fully disclosed by the following part of the resolution:

The committee is authorized and directed (1) to investigate all cases and forms of profiteering in the defense program; (2) to investigate causes and cures of shut-downs and slow-downs in defense production; (3) to investigate reports of industrial, labor, or other alleged racketeering in the defense program; (4) insofar as possible, to investigate all cases wherein the committee has reason to suspect corruption, inefficiency, or neglect of duty in the prosecution of the defense program; (5) to make periodic reports of its findings; (6) to recommend any needed legislation in connection with its findings and investigations.

We have great hopes that the President's newly created Mediation Board will successfully mediate. But simply to take over an industry and to settle a dispute at the expense of the public or at the cost of efficient operation will not be successful mediation.

It has been but a short time, as goes the lives of nations, since the cry of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" inspired a young French Republic to toil and sacrifice in the building of a great nation. But sordidness and selfishness too soon submerged that spirit of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Today France is reaping the natural and inevitable fruits of social and moral decay. Nations, as surely as men, reap whatsoever they sow. Let America beware. It can happen here. Almost too late England listened to the voice of a dynamic and aggressive statesman as he shouted to his countrymen: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." Mr. Roosevelt now asks Americans for sacrifice, relatively small sacrifice, in order that "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" may not become necessary to save or to rebuild our country. Surely we are not going to permit the selfishness of the few to defeat the sacrifices of the many.

Someone has said a grafter is one whose income exceeds his service to humanity. We have too many grafters in this country, and the way of such transgressors must be made exceedingly hard. We must control and use the tremendous power that is ours or be destroyed by it.

The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee last week expressed the sentiment of every patriotic American when he declared that those who cannot be persuaded to do their duty in this time of our Nation's peril should

be treated as the enemies of a great republic. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time simply to have the RECORD show that industry in one very important case has refused to continue, pending negotiations, the conditions existing under the contract which has expired, namely, in the coal-mining industry the operators have refused to continue the conditions under the agreement which had expired pending negotiations. This is very, very important for the Congress to know, particularly because we may be faced with a very serious situation in the coal industry and we ought to know where the responsibility for being obdurate and unreasonable lies, that is, on the operators. If a coal strike should take place, I hope that Congress will realize that the coal operators and not the United Mine Workers of America are to blame.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN COORDINATION IN NATIONAL-DEFENSE EXPORT EMBARGO—RUSSIAN SHIPPING IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on March 27 I spoke briefly but earnestly to thank the Philippine government for its expression of readiness and eagerness to cooperate with our Government in making more effective our national-defense scheme insofar as it relates to the Philippine sector.

The Philippine expression was made public on March 25 by Mr. ELIZALDE, the Philippine Resident Commissioner, following press dispatches from Manila that copra and coconut oil, vital materials usable for war purposes, have been moving in increasing quantities from the Philippines to Vladivostok, Russia, thence presumably by the Trans-Siberian Railway to Central Europe.

While the matter of how effectively to implement the Philippine-American cooperation and coordination is under consideration, I wish to inform the House today that abaca or manila hemp is being shipped to Vladivostok where it was hardly seen before and Japan is taking much more than its normal imports of the fiber. Manila hemp, according to our Government, is one of the twenty-odd strategic raw materials. It is the basic component of rope which is used in our Navy. The Philippines has a natural monopoly on it, and since we do not produce it the President has not listed it in the export-control proclamations.

As I consider this matter urgent at this time, I asked for a memorandum on it from a leading authority on Philippine-American economic matters, Mr. Vicente Villamin, who is also well informed on

many other economic questions. Working on my request yesterday, Sunday, he was able to assemble the following interesting data which, although he himself says is incomplete, is enough to give a good clue to the situation. He writes:

Two days ago, March 28, the Russian steamer *Smolni* sailed from Manila for Shanghai and Vladivostok with a cargo of more than 5,000 bales of hemp.

In the first half of February, last month, the Japanese steamer *Asama Maru* took directly to Vladivostok 500 bales from Manila.

During the last half of January the Japanese steamer *Kamo Maru* had a cargo of 964 bales for Vladivostok.

In the calendar year 1940 Japan imported from the Philippines 106,138 bales more than she did in 1939.

There are regular steamship services between Japanese ports and Vladivostok, Dairen, Manchukuo, and other ports on the northern littoral of east Asia.

For the purpose of comparison, the Philippines in 1940 exported a total of 1,344,004 bales, of which 471,790 went to the United States, 387,747 to Japan, and 307,639 to the United Kingdom.

It is logical to expect that during the current year exports to the United States will decrease substantially, while exports to Japan will increase enormously.

The United States Navy is buying some of its rope requirements in Manila, and it is generally understood that the plan is to have a stock pile of that strategic commodity.

There is a Philippine government-owned corporation dealing in hemp and, in harmony with the government-directed cooperative system, is trying to improve the quality of the product and to support and extend the participation of Filipinos in the industry, particularly since the Japanese are becoming stronger and stronger in that field.

The natural monopoly of the Philippines on manila hemp has not been broken despite the intensive scientific efforts in various countries.

Cooperation in a practical manner between the Philippines and the American rope manufacturers seems highly advisable, even urgent, in view of the Japanese inroads and advantage due to their position of vertical integration in production from raw material to finished product and in transportation and marketing.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize some of the points in the memorandum, to wit, that manila hemp for the first time in the past few months, is going in sizable quantities to Russia, and that Japan in 1940 imported over 100,000 bales more than she did in 1939 and that the prospects are that the shipments to Japan and Russia are bound to increase very appreciably.

In the fall of 1935, I visited the hemp-producing Province of Davao in the southern part of the Philippine archipelago. I was deeply impressed by the natural beauty and fertility of that vast region and the predominance of the Japanese in agriculture and commerce. I must confess I came away from Davao filled with anxious thoughts as to the future of the Philippines under its own flag.

Mr. Speaker, if the Philippine government should place an embargo on certain commodities in its desire to cooperate with our Government in national defense, such action would naturally involve a sacrifice on the part of the Philippine producers and exporters of those commodities. Of course, such

sacrifice would precisely be the same as the sacrifice that producers and exporters in the United States make, of the hundreds of commodities placed under export control. We are all facing an international emergency that requires us to make sacrifices in order that our greater interests might the better be protected and conserved. Nevertheless, in token of our appreciation of the good will and cooperation of the Filipinos in these stirring times and to bolster their morale and strengthen their economic sinews, I very earnestly hope that our Government will explore sympathetically all possibilities of making the sacrifice as light as possible, if it cannot be entirely avoided, to all our people and the Filipino people. Upon this vital point I shall quote in the latter part of my speech from a statement by Mr. Villamin which, I think, is worthy of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, not only manila hemp, copra, and coconut oil are being shipped to Japan and Russia, but manganese and iron ore and other vital materials are moving in that direction. In 1940 more than 1,000,000 tons of good quality iron ore were shipped from the Philippines to Japan. The bulk of chrome, however, comes to the United States.

As the situation stands today, with the Philippines not having a coordinate export-control law, with our own law not in operation there, and with the President's proclamation issued thereunder excluding the Philippines from the list of banned countries, there is no way, so far as I am informed, of stopping the importation into the Philippines of the embargoed commodities from the United States and other countries and their reexportation to Japan and Russia and points beyond. This phase of the situation has not been touched upon before and I suggest to the Governments of the United States and the Philippines that it be looked into without delay. No part of our export-control program should be permitted to be defeated, weakened, or circumvented by any lack of comprehensive examination of all its ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, a convinced and confirmed Republican, I am an American first and foremost, and when it concerns national defense, particularly during an international emergency, my partisanship gives way to my nationalism as it is wisely interpreted and faithfully implemented by the adverse party in power. The subject I am discussing today commends my fundamental Americanism and my willing nonpartisanship and I give the Roosevelt administration my cordial cooperation in the formulation of a program of export control that would bring the Philippines within the circle of effective cooperation with the United States as the Filipinos so laudably desire.

Mr. Speaker, reverting to the question of copra and coconut oil which accelerated the movement toward the coordination of Philippine and American actions under the export-control program, I wish to give the basic facts as gleaned from a study made by Mr. Villamin to form as a guide for our future action. Among other things he says:

On November 5 last the steamer *Margaret Johnson* with 5,018 tons of copra, and on November 17 the steamer *Colombia* with 5,355 tons of copra and 338 tons of coconut oil sailed from Cebu, P. I., to Vladivostok, Russia. I have not looked up the registry of these vessels.

On February 3 the Russian steamer *Velen* carried 5,800 tons of copra from Cebu to Vladivostok. (Note: The average extraction of coconut oil from copra is 63 percent.)

The Japanese soap industry normally uses only about 13,500 tons of coconut oil a year to produce about 200,000 tons of soap, but she is importing much more than that quantity from the Philippines, the Japanese Mandated Islands, and various other sources.

It is believed, although even approximate figures are not available, that Japan ships coconut oil to Vladivostok in sizable amounts.

Just before the war Germany imported a total of 172,000 tons of copra from all sources, of which 104,000 tons came from the Netherlands East Indies. In 1940 Germany was able to import only about 15,000 tons from the Netherlands East Indies. Hence the efforts with the aid of Japan and Russia to bring in copra and coconut oil from the Philippines and other sources.

The Netherlands East Indies as a wartime measure are keeping copra from going to Russia or Germany. It is reported that copra accumulating in the Netherlands East Indies can and will be stored in those Holland possessions for as long as 5 years. When peace comes and this copra is released on the world's markets it will affect the international structure of fats and oils. This situation bears watching closely.

Russian ships in unknown numbers are scouring the South Seas and the ports of countries on the rim of the Pacific Ocean for copra, sugar, and other foodstuffs as well as minerals and take them to their home port of Vladivostok, paying for their purchases in cash.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to state that on March 10 the President of the United States, by proclamation, acting under section 6 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," placed 12 commodities under export control, among them being copra, coconut oil, fatty acids, glycerin, palm-kernel oil, and palm kernels.

The effect of this proclamation is to stop the shipments of these commodities from the United States to Japan and Russia. But—and let me make this clear—shipments from the Philippines are not barred because there is no Philippine embargo law and our Export Control Act is not effective in that country.

What precipitated this proclamation was, I understand, the shipment of 25,199,332 pounds of coconut oil from a port in California to Vladivostok last February. Let Mr. Villamin tell that story that carries the tang of mysterious ships from far-away places laden with strategic cargoes and manned by strange persons. He writes:

Early this February, out of the thick fog that enveloped the Golden Gate, the Russian steamer *Aserbaidjan* dropped anchor in San Francisco Bay and unloaded at the port of Oakland a cargo of copra; and after it was converted into coconut oil at a nearby oil mill, the same steamer pumped the oil, about 8,000 tons, into her tanks and then she set sail for Vladivostok.

Soon after another Russian steamer, the *Minsk*, arrived, and, after following the experience of the first vessel, sailed for Vladivostok with 14,000 drums of coconut oil. It

was reported that she also took on 500 tons of coffee, 2,000 barrels of palm oil, and from the port of Portland, Oreg., a shipment of platinum worth \$500,000.

These are tramp ships manned by Soviet men and women, the women not being restricted to the jobs in the steward department, but function as mechanics, radio operators, deck hands, and navigators. The ships look weather-bitten, dirty, disheveled, and disreputable, but they must have sturdy engines and resourceful crews to cross and recross the broad expanse of the restless and turbulent Pacific.

I raise the query: What about the lifting of the "moral embargo" on Russia in an effort to detach that country, if possible, from the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis? If this "moral embargo" is still lifted, strictly speaking, Russia could still get coconut oil and copra and other things from the United States. It is my belief that priorities, local needs, and such like will prevent Russia from continuing her purchases of commodities under embargo in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, very pertinent to the present subject and discussion is the signing by President Roosevelt a few days ago on the yacht *Potomac* in the Florida waters, to go into effect on April 15, of another proclamation placing under export control the entire catalog of commodities in the field of fats and oils, numbering more than a hundred.

While this action has been expected by the trade all along, it was accelerated, according to Mr. Villamin, by the heavy and significant shipments of lard and glycerin to Japan from the United States which a year ago, or even 6 months ago, were negligible. During the last 3 months the United States shipped to Japan over 7,018,000 pounds of lard and more than 3,686,000 pounds of glycerin. Over 1,000,000 pounds of lard were sent to Russia. I am informed by him that our Government experts are alive to these things and are grappling with the problems that arise with skill and patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, as I intimated in the first part of my speech, I shall, after quoting him factually, quote Mr. Villamin, giving his personal opinions and suggestions, and before doing so I wish publicly to thank him for making available to us a connected, clear, and careful exposition of the subject of export control and its relations to the Philippines. Mr. Villamin says:

In applied economics I like to consider myself a fundamentalist. I am interested in the maintenance and expansion of Philippine-American trade. But over and above that, I am interested in the coordination and strengthening of Philippine-American efforts to render more effective the cause of national defense. The Philippines, out of gratitude and loyalty to America and as a measure of national self-preservation, should respond cheerfully to any sacrifice that America may ask or hint. The President of the Philippines has advised the National Assembly that he has "assured the Government of the United States in behalf of the Commonwealth that the entire Philippines—its manpower and material resources—are at the disposal of the United States in the present emergency."

I understand that there is under consideration by the American Government, at the suggestion of President Quezon, that some \$50,000,000 may be appropriated by Congress to promote Philippine national defense. This sum is made up of two items, the dollar-devaluation profit and the sugar-processing tax, whose payment to the Philippine Gov-

ernment was authorized several years ago when and if appropriated by Congress. As the maintenance of the economic welfare of the people is a factor in national defense, it is respectfully suggested that if the Philippines is to stop shipping a part of its exports to certain countries under a local export-control law some sort of compensatory plan be devised to minimize the sacrifice. That's all I desire to say, and I wish to stress that I consider that plan as a secondary, even tertiary, consideration in the present emergency. The first consideration is an all-out cooperation with the United States by the Philippines with all the sacrifices that it requires.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the spirit that permeates Mr. Villamin's statement, above quoted, and I think his suggestion deserves our most earnest attention.

Before concluding, I wish to repeat the point I made on March 27, that if the Philippine government desires on its own initiative and volition to pass an export-control law it could and should act under the Tydings-McDuffie Act by passing the enabling act, and then sending it to the President of the United States for his approval. Such an act would, I think, be approved by the President. Yes; he would welcome it, and thank the Filipino people for it.

By that method the Philippines, on the one hand, would be acting voluntarily, and, on the other, the American Government would not be infringing upon the local autonomy of the Filipino people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes more to bring up the matter of Russian shipping in the Pacific, which I dare say may have more significance in the present international situation than we may attribute to it. The Russian ships, numerous and mysterious, are active around the Pacific Ocean gathering foodstuffs and industrial materials. No one knows how many ships enter Vladivostok, whether it has not actually become one of the busiest ports in the world today, and how heavy is the traffic on the Trans-Siberian Railway, which connects directly with Polish and German railroads.

The subject matter is worthy of immediate study by our Government. Japanese shipping, of course, is in some manner connected with it, and both of them are material in the survey of comparative naval and maritime positions in the Pacific.

I wish, therefore, to quote from the notes of Mr. Villamin who said that he found some intriguing information about Russian ships and shipping in the Pacific in the course of his examination of Philippine and American trade matters. He states:

Last year there was an average of one Russian ship a month that called at the ports of Washington, Oregon, and California and before that Russian ships were rarities.

But during the last 3 months more than a dozen Russian ships called at Pacific coast ports. Some of them were reported to be the following with their Lloyd's tonnage ratings: *Smolni*, 3,767; *Minsk*, 5,949; *Kim*, 5,114; *Batum*, 6,236; *Transbalt*, 11,439; *Michurin*, 3,908; *Tbilisi*, 7,169; *Dekabrist*, 7,363; *Angarstroi*, 4,761; *Aserbaidjan*, 6,100; *Vorostki*, 4,000 (?); *Askhasbad*, 5,000 (?); *Donbass*, 5,000 (?).

According to conservative estimates, based on statements of the proper Soviet Commissar in 1938, the Russian merchant marine today has a total tonnage of about 1,500,000. It is believed that some 400,000 tons of that are on the Pacific side with Vladivostok as the principal rendezvous.

Mr. Speaker, I wish again to suggest that our Government look into the matter of Russian shipping in the Pacific for it may turn out to be essential to our commercial and strategic interests. Pacific Ocean affairs and things are very entrancing and the poems and stories of Robert Louis Stevenson have endowed them with the inexpressible mysticisms of life; and who knows if these ghostly Russian tramp ships gallivanting from isles to isles and from atolls to atolls with crews of men and women have not gilded the saga of the Pacific with new mysteries and new challenges? [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke on the floor of the House on the question of coordination of effort of the United States Government in handling the defense program. Since then I have had occasion to talk at length with Commissioner ELIZALDE, member of the Insular Affairs Department of the Government, and the Department of Commerce, and I have been thoroughly convinced that Commissioner ELIZALDE and Mr. Rojas, one of the Philippine officials who is carrying great responsibility during the illness of President Quezon, are doing everything in the world they can to coordinate their efforts and cooperate with the President of the United States in handling the very serious problem of Philippine exports, especially as they relate to fats and oils in the form of copra and refined coconut oil, and manila hemp, or what is known in the trade as abaca.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOEHNE, for 1 day, on account of important business.

To Mr. RANDOLPH, for 1 day, on account of important business in West Virginia.

To Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. GILCHRIST), indefinitely, on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. LECOMPTÉ (at the request of Mr. GWYNNE), for 3 days, on account of the death of a relative.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 317. An act for the relief of Monroe Short; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 324. An act to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind., and to purchase, maintain, and operate certain ferries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lieut. J. B. Edgar, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 941. An act for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, William W. Addis, C. H. Seaman, J. T. Polk, and E. F. Goudelock; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 994. An act to appropriate the proceeds of sales or other dispositions of strategic and critical materials acquired under the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), in order to prevent depletion of the stocks of such materials available for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes, to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; to the Committee on Claims.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act 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;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican; and

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 537. An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.;

H. R. 568. An act 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;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Mary Madeline Zwalinski and Ilene Mary Zwalinski, a minor;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Helen Louise Giles;

H. R. 2998. An act for the relief of M. F. O'Donnell;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Henry L. Munt;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James P. Melican; and

H. R. 3836. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 1, 1941. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 2500 and S. 324, relating to a bridge over the Wabash River at New Harmony, Ind.

There will be a meeting of the petroleum investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 1, 1941, to resume hearings on national defense in connection with oil.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, April 3, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1037, to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families. Open hearing.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold public hearings in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, as follows:

Wednesday, April 9, and Thursday, April 10, 1941, at 10 a. m. each day—resume hearings on H. R. 3359 and H. R. 3360, relating to preventing publication of inventions and prohibiting issuance of injunctions on patents, respectively.

Tuesday, April 15, 1941, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123 (identical resolutions), relating to payment of royalties for use abroad of American patents, trade-marks, copyrights, secret formulas, and processes.

Thursday, April 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 3331, a bill to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Public hearings will be begun on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3378, known as the income certificate bill, and other major proposals to increase farm prices to actual parity.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, April 24, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1585, relating to a construction reserve fund, and H. R. 1004, relating to the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Dunkirk, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

384. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment" (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 30), as amended June 2, 1939 (Public. No. 109, 76th Cong.), so as to provide compensation for donors of blood for persons entitled to treatment at Government expense whether or not the donors are in the Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

385. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing annual appropriations for the maintenance of that portion of Gallup-Durango Highway across the Navajo Indian Reservation, and providing reimbursement therefor," approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 606); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

386. A letter from the chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a copy of the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America (H. Doc. No. 17); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

387. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of awards for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

388. A letter from the vice chairman, Temporary National Economic Committee, transmitting the final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TREADWAY: Committee on Ways and Means. Part II, minority views to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 43. Joint resolution to carry out the obligations of the United States under the Inter-American coffee agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 330). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4216. A bill relating to foreign accounts in Federal Reserve banks and insured banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. (Reported March 28, 1941, pursuant to the order of the House of March 27, 1941.)

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 113. Resolution for the continuation of the select committee conducting the investigation and study of the interstate migration of destitute citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 15, a joint resolution to investigate the apparent monopolistic purchasing of pulpwood by pulp and paper mills under a contract purchase system from farmers and other owners, price fixing of paper and other pulp products under trade practice rules and regulations, including cost of distribution; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the construction and maintenance of overhanging walks on the highway bridge, route No. 36, at Highlands, N. J., for public use; without amendment (Rept. No. 352).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4105. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character; with amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4107. A bill to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4167. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). 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. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3809. A bill for the relief of Stephen Kelen; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). 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. 3730) granting a pension to Homer H. Haws, 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. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4223. A bill to make strikes against the United States and against the national-defense program during the present emergency constitute treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4224. A bill relating to the manning of certain vessels of 500 gross tons and less; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4225. A bill relating to the manning of certain sail vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:
H. R. 4226. A bill to provide for the construction of a Coast Guard cutter designed for ice breaking and assistance work on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4227. A bill providing for an appropriation and payment to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, for money for highways and bridges in aid of national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 4228. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section authorizing, for the purpose of detecting or preventing certain crimes, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, when specifically authorized by the Attorney General of the United States, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications; and making such authorizations and communications, and testimony concerning same, admis-

sible evidence; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARRABEE:

H. R. 4229. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4230. A bill to give persons honorably separated from the military and naval forces and the Coast Guard preference in appointments to civil-service positions concerned with the national defense; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4231. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4232. A bill to amend paragraph 757 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase duty on filberts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 4233. A bill to authorize flood-control works on Tombigbee River and tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 4234. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to January 1, 1930; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4235. A bill to change the name of Santa Fe Dam, Los Angeles County, Calif., to the Duarte-Azusa Dam; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 4236. A bill to provide for and promote the general welfare of the United States by supplying to the people a more liberal distribution and increase of purchasing power, retiring certain citizens from gainful employment, improving and stabilizing gainful employment for other citizens, stimulating agricultural and industrial production and general business, and alleviating the hazards and insecurity of old age and unemployment; to provide a method whereby citizens shall contribute to the purchase of and receive a retirement annuity; to provide for the raising of the necessary revenue to operate a continuing plan therefor; to provide for the appropriation and expenditure of such revenue; to provide for the proper administration of this act; to provide penalties for violation of the act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 4237. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River near Nolan, Mingo County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4238. A bill to prescribe fair standards of duty and procedure of administrative officers and agencies, to establish an administrative code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 4239 (by request). A bill to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. R. 4240. A bill to repeal the provisions relating to compulsory removal from the rolls of Work Projects Administration workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4255. A bill to amend Public Act No. 505 (H. R. 24145, approved March 4, 1911); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution for the relief of the Indians in California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 162. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 163. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the export of certain materials; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. Res. 164. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the national-defense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 165. Resolution authorizing the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 258 of the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 166. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. Res. 167. Resolution authorizing the expenses to conduct the investigation authorized by House Resolution 113; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to make H. R. 970, a bill to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activities a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 169. Resolution to make H. R. 971, a bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 1, relating to the construction of livestock trails in the national forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 12, with reference to Executive Order No. 905; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 14, with reference to silver and the Silver Purchase Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8, with reference to a special stamp in commemoration of the memory of the late Senator Key Pittman; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated March 13,

1941, with reference to a program of military highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated March 24, 1941, with reference to legislation concerning Aerovias Nacionales Puerto Rico, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 2, house file No. 1319, with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, with reference to establishing a seaplane training base at American Falls Lake; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution 17, with reference to building farm-to-market roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, concerning the Niukluk River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 9, that the name of the old illustrious battleship *Oregon* be changed to the name "*Illustrious Oregon*"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4241. A bill granting jurisdiction to the United States Board of Tax Appeals to reopen and readjudicate the case of William B. and Madeleine B. Haffner; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of the Corbitt Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4243. A bill for the relief of Berl F. York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4244. A bill to place David J. Gilmer on the retired list of the Army with rank of captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of the Lawson Coffee Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late Hugh McGilnecy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Helen Mary Nichols; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of William Frank Coman Nichols; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 4250. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to Roland Boucher, in recognition of his bravery and heroism in rescuing

five children from drowning in Lake Champlain; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4251. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. R. 4252. A bill for the relief of Raymond Trammell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. O. Danneberger; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

611. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Memorial No. 1, relating to the construction of livestock trails in the national forest; to the Committee on Roads.

612. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N. Y., urging immediate consideration by the Congress of the Townsend national recovery plan as set forth in House bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

613. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Federal Bureau of Roads to liberalize the regulations governing the allocation of Federal funds to the various States for the purpose of building farm-to-market roads and to particularly liberalize the rules limiting the highways upon which such funds can be expended for the improvement thereof; and that the various States through the appropriate authority created by them for that purpose and in Iowa particularly, the State highway commission, rather than the Federal Bureau of Roads, be given more authority to supervise the expenditure of such funds as may be allocated to a given State for the construction of farm-to-market roads than they previously have had; to the Committee on Roads.

614. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Bronx Woman's Club, Bronx, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to free postage franking privilege to the armed forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

615. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., urging the Federal Government to appropriate funds, for defense purposes, for military highway construction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

616. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Assembly and Senate of California, memorializing the Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

617. Also, resolution of the City Council of Los Angeles, memorializing the Congress to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, October 11 to be General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

618. By Mr. GAVAGAN: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, concerning the building of military highways; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

619. By Mr. HOUSTON: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, condemning discrimination practiced by certain employers in Kansas, who are now or hereafter engaged in in-

dustries essential to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Labor.

620. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Memorial of the Ninety-fourth General Assembly of the State of Ohio, directed to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives, asking that the social security law be amended so as to secure for the blind more adequate relief than is granted to the blind in the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

621. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Detroit Board of Commerce, Detroit, Mich., concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

622. Also, petition of the Citizens Committee for Government Arts Projects, New York City, concerning continuance of the arts projects of the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

623. Also, petition of the Maritime Commission of the Port of New York, concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

624. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the California Stripper Well Association, requesting Congress to amend the Venezuelan Trade Agreement Act so that petroleum excise taxes should be excepted from its operation and the authority of Congress over these excise taxes and imports be resumed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

625. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, stressing the need for additional highways and traffic arteries in and around Los Angeles city because of the defense activities and asking the President and Congress to make available money for immediate construction of such roads, highways, and arteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

626. By Mr. LEWIS: Senate Joint Resolution 10 of the senate and house of representatives of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, urging that the Congress of the United States adopt Senate Resolution 82, to the end that a thorough and complete investigation may be had of the facts and circumstances surrounding the order for the abandonment of the narrow-gauge railroad between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex., and the eventual cancellation of this order; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

627. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of the General Assembly of Iowa, urging early consideration and passage of Senate bill 860, providing 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.

628. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., urging the Federal Government to appropriate funds, for defense purposes, for military-highway construction; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

629. Also, petition of the Virginia Dare Extract Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support and passage of House bill 3383, to amend section 2800, chapter 26, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

630. By Mr. TALLE: Memorial of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa, urging that the Congress of the United States amend the Federal Housing Act or enact new and appropriate legislation to make available to farmers, and especially to farm tenants who are without farms, governmental aid equal to that afforded to urban residents, in order that they may be able to obtain sufficient land and decent homes in which to live and maintain their families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

631. By Mr. WELCH: California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, memorializing Con-

gress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

632. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Monongahela Valley Industrial Union, Charleroi, Pa., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

633. Also, petition of the State board of agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to a study of the migratory labor problem from a national viewpoint; to the Committee on Rules.

634. Also, petition of the Board of county commissioners of Crawford County, Kans., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. Also, petition of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. Also, petition of the University of Richmond, Va., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 929 and House bill 1640, concerning a youth reference service in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

637. Also, petition of the Baptist Bible Institute, New Orleans, La., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for the control of conditions in the vicinity of training camps for soldiers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

638. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, Pennsylvania, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to our military and naval trainees from exploitation in the vicinity of the Army and Navy Establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, March 31, 1941)

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

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

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who art ever patient with us, even though we do but bring to Thee the story of our years stained with sin and failure, and as we contemplate the disorder of our lives, we can but dread the piercing look of Thy holiness: Draw us unto Thee by a longing which no fear can chill, no sin can wither, and do Thou abide with us as Master of our conscience, Strengtheners of our will, Fulfiller of our hope, that henceforth we may be wholly Thine.

Suffer us not to sink in blank dismay before the greatness of our debt to Thee and to our fellow men, but summon, Thou, our powers, enabling us to serve and count no sacrifice too great, no burden too heavy, if thereby we can be a benediction to all with whom we come in contact, even the humblest of Thy children.

We ask it in His name who said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me," even in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.