

Today, as never before, we miss the wise and courageous counsel of our departed friends and colleagues. Would that they were here now to advise us, to tell us what to do. We miss them sorely.

We must cleave to the will and wish to create, to build better and greater. Subversive influences that would undermine the foundations upon which the Republic rests must be eradicated and destroyed. Here, there can be room only for those who love our country, honor our institutions, and revere our traditions. Those who do not subscribe to these requirements must seek haven in other lands. Here, there can be no divided allegiance, no second choice.

Since our last memorial day four Senators and nine Representatives have been summoned to the supreme congress above. For them the turbulence of the forum has subsided. Today they have their place in a higher body where bitter partisan strife is unknown. While they are no longer with us in the flesh, their spirit is ever with us, and the memory of their labors here is an inspiration to us to carry on. Their names are writ in letters of living light on the scroll of service to their country and fellowman. "They are not dead, they are merely away."

"I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Since the very inception of Christianity the followers of the lowly Nazarene have been subjected to persecution, oppression, and ridicule. Many have suffered exile from their homeland, and even martyrdom for its sake, but faith ever carried them through, and with the passing of time their number has increased until the cross has been carried into every corner of the earth.

To countless millions it has become a symbol of hope, a refuge in time of storm.

The Christian religion has been assailed times without number, but none have been able to offer anything substantial or tangible in its place. It has been, is, and ever will be the greatest known balm and source of comfort to mankind. It greets us at the cradle, sustains us throughout a troublous life, and its gentle and merciful ministrations enable us to face the end with hope, with courage, and with fortitude.

To the sorrowing mother who grieves over the loss of her child, to the abandoned Magdalen who walks the streets, to the man who has lost his faith, to the wayward son who roams the earth, to the cynic who scoffs and doubts—to these and to all mankind the promises of the Saviour come as a solace in their hour of darkest despair. It is then, one and all turn to Him for hope, peace, and comfort. There is, there can be no other outlet for our heart's desire. In Him rests the hope of mankind. Without that hope life would be a black void.

He has promised us eternal life, free from pain and doubt and despair. We know that He has prepared a place for His children where we shall some day gather, where broken family ties will be reunited, where cherished friendships

shall be renewed. What a precious promise; what a glorious fulfillment.

Death is only a quiet door
Set in a garden wall;
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk
When the thrushes call.

Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond the light lies still;
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.

There is nothing to trouble any heart
Nothing to hurt at all
Death is only a quiet door,
In an old garden wall.

The quartet sang the Long Day Closes.
Mr. Winfred Kemp, principal musician,
United States Marine Band Orchestra,
sounded taps.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera
Montgomery, D. D., pronounced the
benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you;
The Lord make His face to shine upon you and
be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up
His countenance upon you and give you
peace; both now and evermore.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess the Speaker called the House to order, and then, pursuant to House Resolution 201, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, declared the House adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents has tentatively scheduled a further hearing on the subject of royalty payments, as covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room 1015, House Office Building. Interested parties are requested to contact the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

668. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution, to authorize temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

669. A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the twentieth annual report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, submitted in pursuance of section 16 of the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468) (H. Doc. No. 281); to the Committee on the Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4137. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of August 29, 1935, relating to Federal assistance in the acquisition and development of State forests, to counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 5088. A bill to provide for standard daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5089. A bill to grant the franking privilege to members of the military or naval forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 5090. A bill authorizing the establishment of a filing and indexing service for useful Government publications; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

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

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

Eternal God, Thou timeless One, Thou source and fountain of all good, who revealest Thyself to the heart and mind of the creatures Thou hast willed to be: Help us to think of Thee until thought fails and faints, like a tired bird beating against the tempest, and our seeming helplessness constrains us to cry out like Thy servant of old, "Canst thou by searching find out God?"

At this the beginning of another day of service, we beseech Thee so to live in us that our lives may be true to the highest laws of being, crowned with the blessedness of faith, and hope, and love unflinching, which means more than happiness.

So may we not miss the spirit of these moments of preparation of our hearts, in which there is not only some tenderness of secret contrition for past failings, but also some fresh stirring of high aims and holy desires that may yield to us a peace which the world can neither give nor take away, after the likeness of the peace that possessed the soul of the Saviour of mankind, in whose gentle name and for whose own dear sake alone, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, June 16, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the

President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 14, 1941:

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Goss; and

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Jess W. Harmon.

On June 17, 1941:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 287. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.;

S. 346. An act to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 879. An act relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming;

S. 992. An act to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes;

S. 1421. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va.;

S. 1469. An act to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes; and

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

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; and

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 239) to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 188. An act for the relief of Maj. R. Lee;

H. R. 859. An act for the relief of Arthur Gose;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman; and

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie; and

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. RAMSPECK, and Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conferences:

H. R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Thomas; and

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4. An act to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 93. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income and to issue bonds and other obligations of the authority for such purpose, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1062. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to accept a gift of lands from the city of Tucson, Ariz.;

H. R. 1073. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

H. R. 1618. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2308. An act to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3182. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority;

H. R. 3864. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1939;

H. R. 4338. An act to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Reserve;

H. R. 4473. An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs;

H. R. 4841. An act to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4903. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.;

H. R. 4988. An act to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended;

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Herring	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Bulow	Houston	Stewart
Bunker	Hughes	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	La Follette	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdoch	White
Davis	Murray	Wiley
Downey	Norris	
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRAVEL BY A CANADIAN SHIP BETWEEN AMERICAN PORTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That notwithstanding the provisions of any of the coastwise laws of the United States, one passenger ship of Canadian registry shall be permitted to travel between Cleveland, Ohio, and Milwaukee, Wis., for the purpose of transporting members of the American Legion and their guests to and from that organization's twenty-third annual national convention to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 15-18, 1941, inclusive; and such passenger ship shall be further permitted to remain at Milwaukee, Wis., during the period of such national convention of the American Legion: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision of section 4488, Revised Statutes, or regulations issued thereunder, any passenger vessels, American or Canadian, which transport members of the American Legion and their guests to and from that organization's twenty-third annual national convention, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 15-18, 1941, inclusive, shall not be required to carry accommodation for more than 50 percent of persons on board in lifeboats and pontoon life rafts: *Provided further*, That not less than two-fifths of such accommodation shall be in lifeboats and three-fifths may be in collapsible boats or rafts, under regulations of the Board of Supervising Inspectors, approved by the Secretary of Commerce, applicable to such vessels during the interval May 15 to September 15, inclusive.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 65 dealt with the authorization of a ship of Canadian registry to travel between Cleveland, Ohio, and Milwaukee, Wis., in connection with the American Legion convention to be held in Milwaukee this year. It was amended in the House of Representatives in a minor manner. With the consent of the Senator from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT—APPOINTMENT OF A CONFERE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has resigned as a member of the committee of conference on House bill 2097, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k). The Chair appoints the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] a conferee on the part of the Senate in place of the Senator from Montana.

DOCUMENTS FILED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, June 19, 1941.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to section 4, Public Law, 108, approved June 10, 1941, has filed with me as Secretary of the Senate two certified copies of each of the following documents:

Charter of Rubber Reserve Company.
Charter of Metals Reserve Company.
Charter of Defense Plant Corporation.
Amendment to the Charter of Defense Plant Corporation.
Charter of Defense Supplies Corporation.
Amendment to the Charter of Defense Supplies Corporation.
Certificate of Incorporation of Defense Homes Corporation.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 67)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, fiscal year 1942, for construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts, in the amount of \$1,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LANDS FOR THE CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF PAYEES RECEIVING \$1,000 OR MORE UNDER 1939 AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the amount of payment to each person receiving \$1,000 or more under the 1939 programs administered under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with the name and address of the payee (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the general court of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Commerce.

"Joint resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering the advisability of the completion of the St. Lawrence River seaway development as an international project; and

"Whereas the claim that the United States needs this seaway for defense is not supported by the facts but has inspired the charge that the military, naval, and air hazards involved in the project are all out of proportion to the industrial or commercial benefits that might accrue; and

"Whereas the waterway would be ice-bound for 5 months of the year and during that navigation season would provide an easy target for bombing and afford an opportunity for sabotage in the locks and dams of the ship channel; and

"Whereas the project would provide no tolls but would permit free use of the waterway for foreign shipping threatening to ruin New England economy, the railroads, the Atlantic coast shipping and deluging the Great Lakes region with cheap foreign products undermining American labor, industry, and agriculture; and

"Whereas the imperative demands of national defense require urgent use of men, materials, and money in the construction of planes, tanks, guns, and other munitions which would be seriously affected by divergence to an uneconomic seaway project; and

"Whereas the waterway could not be placed in full operation before 1948 and would thus not become part of immediate national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That it is the sense of the general court that the use of the St. Lawrence River for the establishment of a deeper seaway is a wasteful and unwarranted project in the present national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of this State and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate.

"CHARLES H. BARNARD,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"WILLIAM M. COLE,

President of the Senate.

"Approved June 13, 1941.

"ROBERT O. BLOOD, Governor."

An act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requiring congressional approval, and approved by the Governor of the Territory; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate bill 62

"An act to amend act 101 of the session laws of Hawaii 1921, relating to the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North and South Hilo and Puna, in the county of Hawaii, so as to extend the franchise to the districts of Kau and South Kohala in said county, and extend the term thereof as to the town of Hilo

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the title of act 101 of the session laws of Hawaii 1921, is hereby amended to read, as follows:

"An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala in the county and Territory of Hawaii."

"SECTION 2. Section 1 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Franchise. Harold V. Patten, of Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, his associates, successors, and assigns, or such corporations as he may or they shall cause to be incorporated under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii (he or they being hereinafter referred to as "the association"), are hereby granted the right, authority, and privilege to manufacture, sell, furnish, and supply electric light, electric current, or elec-

tric power, in the districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, on the Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, for lighting the streets, roads, public and private buildings, or for motive power, or for any other purpose which the association may deem advisable, and from time to time for the term of 50 years, for the purposes herein mentioned, to construct, maintain, and operate suitable poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lampposts, conductors, conduits, and such other appliances and appurtenances as may from time to time be necessary for the transmission, distribution, or supply of electricity to consumers thereof, under, along, upon and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, and to connect the said wires, lines, and conductors, with any manufactory, private or public buildings, lamps, lampposts, or other structure or object, and the place or source of supply.

"Sec. 3. Section 3 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Poles not to interfere with streets. That all poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lampposts, conductors, conduits, and other apparatus constructed, maintained, or operated under, along, upon, or over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, shall be so constructed, and maintained, and operated by the association as not to interfere unnecessarily with the use of such streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes by the public."

"Sec. 4. Section 11 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. Forfeiture of franchise. That if said association, its representatives, successors, and assigns, shall fail or refuse to do or perform or comply with any of the provisions of this act or the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, and continue to refuse or fail to perform or comply therewith after reasonable notice given by the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to comply therewith, said public utilities commission may, with the consent of the governor and of the attorney general, cause proceedings to be instituted before any appropriate tribunal to have the franchise hereby granted and all rights and privileges accruing hereunder forfeited and declared null and void. And in case of a forfeiture of this franchise, the Territory of Hawaii and County of Hawaii, or any political subdivision thereof, shall have the right to purchase all the property of the association within the said districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, at the value thereof, such value to be determined as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That notice of such desire and intention to purchase is given to the association by the Territory of Hawaii or the County of Hawaii, or any political subdivision thereof within sixty days after the forfeiture of this franchise."

"Sec. 5. Said act is hereby further amended by adding thereto a new section to be numbered 15-A, to read as follows:

"Sec. 15-A. Time of commencing work in the districts of Kau and South Kohala. That the rights hereby granted with respect to the districts of Kau and South Kohala shall cease and determine if operations hereunder in said districts are not commenced before 2 years after the approval of this act by the Congress of the United States, by beginning the construction of buildings or other works for manufacturing, transmitting, or supplying electric current for light and power, or by placing poles and wiring the same, or constructing conduits and laying wires therein, in any of the streets, roads, or other places in said districts, for the purpose of conducting electric current for light and power; and also if sufficient works are not completed and in operation to supply electric current for

light and power, or if electric current for light and power be not supplied before 2 years after the approval of this act by the Congress of the United States."

"Sec. 6. This act shall take effect on its approval by the Congress of the United States."

"Approved this 26th day of April A. D. 1941.

"J. B. POINDEXTER,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing Congress concerning the tariff on tungsten and tungsten products; to the Committee on Finance. (See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 16th instant, p. 5164, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the relief of citizens physically incapacitated from earning a livelihood by reason of bodily injury or incurable disease; to the Committee on Finance. (See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. ANDREWS on the 16th instant, p. 5164, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 890) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

A resolution of the City Council of Houston, Tex., praying for the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

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

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions of Rev. William E. Callahan, pastor of the First Methodist Church, and sundry citizens of Coldwater, and sundry citizens of Hazelton and Kiowa, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by the Lions Clubs of Munising, Escanaba, and Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

A resolution of the board of governors of the Birmingham Aero Club, of Birmingham, Ala., favoring the establishment of a separate unified air force in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land

and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND PREVENTION OF VICE NEAR MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present a number of petitions from citizens of Delaware, 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.

I also present a number of memorials from citizens of Delaware, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions and memorials presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and lie on the table.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN TAX ON GASOLINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Harold A. Pontius, grand secretary of the United Commercial Travelers of America, and a resolution adopted by that organization's grand council in protest against increasing the tax on gasoline. I ask that both the letter and the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance. I am heartily in accord with the members of this group on this matter. I am opposed to raising the gasoline tax.

I know we will have to find a way to finance our national-defense program, but I am against putting so much of the burden on those who buy gasoline. In my State, as in most other States, a great number of people—most of whom are farmers and others in the lower- and middle-income groups—depend on automobiles to help them in earning a living. To increase the gasoline tax would, in my opinion, work an unfair hardship on these people. I think we can find a way to pay for our defense program without being unduly hard on any class of people.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered referred to the Committee on Finance, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORDER OF UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,
Lawrence, Kans., June 7, 1941.
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We are enclosing a copy of a resolution which was adopted by the United Commercial Travelers of America at the forty-ninth convention of the grand council, held at Wichita, Kans., on June 7, 1941.

Through C. E. Holmes, secretary of the Kansas Petroleum Industries Committee and also a member of the Kansas jurisdiction, we know of the good cooperation which you have consistently given your constituents in Kansas. We assure you that we appreciate all that you are doing and are grateful for your assistance.

Very truly yours,
UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,
EARL T. STEELE, Grand Counselor.
HAROLD A. PONTIUS, Grand Secretary.

Whereas it is reported Congress is now considering proposals to further increase the Federal gasoline tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the forty-ninth annual convention of the grand council of the United Commercial Travelers of America, meeting in Wichita, Kans., on June 7, 1941, go on record as opposing any further increase, and respectfully submit to all Kansas Members of Congress the following reasons:

1. The Federal gasoline tax was increased 50 percent last July—higher than any other similar tax increase.

2. Gasoline is a necessity and under no circumstances should be classed with luxuries for tax or other purposes.

3. The tax in this State is largely paid by farmers, laboring people, and others with very modest incomes, and the present tax is high and burdensome.

4. The gasoline tax is paid only by one class—the motor users—and is based on automobile travel, not ability to pay or for benefits received from the Federal Government.

5. National defense should not be slowed down by excessive rates on vital and necessary highway transportation; be it further

Resolved, That our Members of Congress present our views to the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees.

UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS
OF AMERICA,

EARL T. STEELE, *Grand Counselor*.

HAROLD A. PONTIUS, *Grand Secretary*.

June 6, 1941.

GUARDING OF NATIONAL-DEFENSE FACILITIES

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is pending before Congress legislation authorizing payment of funds to local communities to provide protection to power plants, factories, etc., that are important to national defense; and

Whereas there are in Milwaukee County transmitting stations, factories, and power plants that should at all times be carefully guarded against possible sabotage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County hereby requests the proper Federal authorities for funds to employ additional deputy sheriffs to guard facilities in Milwaukee County essential to national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the county clerk is hereby instructed to send certified copies of this resolution to Members of Congress representing Milwaukee County, and to Senators representing this State.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WILEY also presented a resolution of the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, Wis., relative to the development of the St. Lawrence River, which, with the letter of transmittal, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF SOUTH MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
June 16, 1941.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator, State of Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am inclosing a true and exact copy of a resolution adopted by our council urging the passage of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill now before Congress. South Milwaukee is well aware of the benefits that will be derived from this project, and urge you to do everything in

your power to have the bill passed and the seaway made a reality.

Very truly yours,

H. DAEHLING,
City Clerk.

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, providing a direct outlet from the Great Lakes ports to the Atlantic Ocean, presently contemplated as an integral part of the national-defense program, is now closer to realization than at any time during the continuous struggle for its authorization; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this Common Council that the completion of the aforesaid seaway project, in addition to being of great aid to our national defense, would be of unlimited benefit, not only to the lake-shore region of Wisconsin, but to the entire State of Wisconsin as well: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, That our Representatives in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to extend all efforts to obtain the authorization and construction of the aforesaid St. Lawrence-seaway project, and more particularly to actively support the bill presently before Congress to provide for improvement of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Basin, H. R. 4927; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., and Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senators from Wisconsin, and to the Representative in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, Hon. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI.

Adopted June 13, 1941.

H. W. DAEHLING, *City Clerk*.

Approved June 14, 1941.

CHAS. PLOTZ, *Mayor*.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their title and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 4. An act to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 93. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income and to issue bonds and other obligations of the authority for such purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1062. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to accept a gift of lands from the city of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1073. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

H. R. 1618. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 2308. An act to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California; and

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3182. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 3864. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1939; and

H. R. 4903. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 4338. An act to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Reserve; and

H. R. 4473. An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4988. An act to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; to the calendar.

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 4841. An act to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 16th instant,

The following reports of committees were filed during recess of the Senate:

On June 17, 1941:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 4839. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 445);

S. 1585. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 446);

S. 1589. A bill to prohibit payment of money allowance for subsistence and rental to retired officers of the Navy or Marine Corps for any period when not employed on active duty; with an amendment (Rept. No. 447); and

H. R. 4823. A bill providing for the rank of officers ordered to perform special or unusual duty, and of commanders of special naval units afloat; with an amendment (Rept. No. 448).

On June 18, 1941:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4887. A bill to authorize the construction of Coast Guard cutters necessary in the interest of national defense and for the performance of Coast Guard duties; with amendments (Rept. No. 449);

H. R. 531. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1938 (52 Stat. 201), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 450); and

H. R. 4658. A bill to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 451).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1632. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 452);

H. R. 2074. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as

amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 453);

H. R. 4224. A bill relating to the manning of certain vessels of 500 gross tons and less; without amendment (Rept. No. 454);

H. R. 4225. An act relating to the manning of certain sail vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 455);

H. R. 4258. A bill to supplement the navigation laws and facilitate the maintenance of discipline on board vessels of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 456);

H. R. 4107. An act to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 457); and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to provide suitable vessels for the use of certain State nautical schools, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 458).

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; with amendments (Rept. No. 459).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 271. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 460);

S. 753. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 461);

H. R. 4359. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 462); and

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807); without amendment (Rept. No. 463).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 294. A bill to authorize an appropriation for payment to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of construction costs assessed against certain lands within such district acquired by the United States for the benefit of certain Indians in the State of New Mexico; with amendments (Rept. No. 464).

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

S. 1480. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the leasing of public lands for use as public aviation fields," approved May 24, 1928, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 465).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 485. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 466);

S. 1116. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 467);

S. 1117. A bill authorizing a suit in the Court of Claims of the United States against the United States by certain members of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 468);

S. 1154. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of

Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 469);

S. 1625. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations"; without amendment (Rept. No. 470);

S. 1626. A bill to reserve a certain part of the public land in California for the benefit of the Rincon Band of Mission Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 471);

H. R. 2308. A bill to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California; with an amendment (Rept. No. 472); and

S. Res. 115. Resolution authorizing the payment of \$2,000 to Charles J. Kappler for compiling, annotating, and indexing volume 5, Indian Laws and Treaties (submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on May 13, 1941); without amendment (Rept. No. 473), and, under the rule, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

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. HOLMAN:

S. 1644. A bill to provide for a fishery experiment station to study problems of fish culture and fish management in the western part of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1645. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ADAMS (for Mr. GILLETTE):

S. 1646. A bill to limit the duties which may be performed by certain officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1647. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jeannette W. Moffett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1648. A bill for the relief of the Shaver Forwarding Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1649. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation arising out of loss of tools destroyed by fire at Parker Dam, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1650. A bill for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1651. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, by request of the War Department I ask leave to introduce a joint resolution authorizing the President to make appointments of officers of the Army, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF OLD-AGE PENSION SYSTEM—MINIMUM PENSIONS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to offer a resolution to authorize the appointment by the President of the Senate of a special committee of seven Senators to investigate the old-age pension system and legislation to secure minimum pensions thereunder. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred directly to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for its action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from California.

The resolution (S. Res. 129), was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the old-age assistance and the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, and (2) to make a full and complete study and investigation of ways and means for bringing about the early realization of a minimum pension for all who have reached the age of retirement and are not gainfully employed. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$2,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR CAPPER TO THE LATE SENATOR SHEPPARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him in tribute to the late Senator Sheppard, at the Morris Sheppard memorial service at Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., on May 26, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF IDAHO AT MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, SR.

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator CLARK of Idaho at the sixteenth annual memorial services for the late Robert Marion La Follette, Sr., at Madison, Wis., June 15, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUNKER HILL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHANDLER

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address

delivered by Senator CHANDLER at Boston, Mass., on June 16, 1941, on the occasion of the annual celebration of Bunker Hill Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE PIUS L. SCHWERT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him on the life and services of the late Representative Pius L. Schwert, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him at La Crosse, Wis., under the auspices of the Elks Lodge, on June 14, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATION'S JOB—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him before the Central Retail Feed Association convention at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., on June 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR WINANT AT THE ENGLISH SPEAKING UNION

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Ambassador John G. Winant at the English Speaking Union on May 14, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR WINANT AT LUNCHEON OF THE PILGRIMS

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Ambassador John G. Winant, delivered at the luncheon of the Pilgrims on March 18, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, delivered at New York City on June 17, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, Assistant Secretary Berle, and others before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee on the St. Lawrence River development, which appear in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4926, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives was \$1,191,776,000. That amount has been reduced net by the Senate committee \$2,477,000. The bill is less than the Budget estimates by \$33,596,522.

Affecting the Department of Labor itself there are comparatively few changes. In connection with the Wage and Hour Division the Budget estimate was restored in order to permit the Wage and Hour Division to conduct routine inspections of business throughout the United States. The committee was thoroughly convinced that that amount should be allowed.

As to the Civilian Conservation Corps, there is no enlargement in the amount appropriated by the House, but the House fixed a limitation per enrollee of \$950. It was demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Senate committee that that limit was too low, and the committee recommends that it be increased to \$1,060.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me whether the C. C. C. program is now specifically tied in with the national-defense program in any direct fashion?

Mr. HAYDEN. By law, no; in practice, yes. Many things are done in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps that help to train men for the Army, particularly in a mechanical way, in handling mechanical equipment. It is customary, for example, in practically all the Civilian Conservation Corps camps to have an old automobile or truck which the young men take down and put together, so that they thoroughly understand the mechanism of automotive transportation. They are taught to be good truck drivers and instructed along other lines, so that much of the work they do makes them more valuable when they go into the Army; but no military training is given in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that no military training is given; but the training to which the Senator refers has been proceeding ever since the system was established. There is nothing new about that. What I am inquiring is whether any definitive program is under way to make the C. C. C. camps more definitely a part of national-defense preparation at the present time.

Mr. HAYDEN. While there has been coordination in the sense that contacts have been maintained between those engaged in the national defense and the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, the view of the Chief of Staff was that naturally the men do in the camps a great many things which are of benefit to the national defense. For instance, one of the occupations most needed in the Army is that of a good cook. Men are trained to become camp cooks in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and they become very valuable, having this training, when they go into the Army; but otherwise, there is no close coord-

ination. In other words, the Army does not attempt to direct what shall be done in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator think that in the light of the present situation on the one hand, the increasing lack of labor, and, on the other hand, the general requirement that young men are needed in the Army or in related operations, the C. C. C. from now on should be coordinated, I do not mean as a military unit, but as a developing ground for nonmilitary activities? Why should it not be part of the coordinated problem to which presumably the whole Nation is now dedicated?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the opinion of the Chief of Staff, the C. C. C. fit in just as it is without making such a change. There is a long list of vocations, such as—as I indicated—operators of trucks and tractors, power shovels and drag lines, road-construction workers, building-construction men, telephone-line workers, operators of air hammers and air compressors, blasters and powder men, bridge builders, maintenance mechanics and mechanics' helpers, practical blacksmiths, practical welders, and so forth. Trades of that type are taught in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and the men who have gone out of the camps into the Army have obtained better ratings and have made better soldiers because of the training.

The Senator, of course, realizes that modern war is a mechanized effort. Anything that can be done to equip a man in that line ought to be done. The suggestion heretofore made was that a certain amount of infantry drill be given to the men in the Conservation Corps camps; that they be taught how to shoot a rifle, and so forth. In the opinion of the military authorities, the other things the men learn are so much more important that it is better to have it done in that way than to stress merely a certain amount of military instruction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may say so to the Senator, that is precisely the thing I have in mind. I am not talking about military training in the C. C. C. camps. I am inquiring whether they cannot be made more definitely and specifically a reservoir for the mechanized efficiency which the Senator very correctly defines as so essential to the modern defense movement.

Mr. HAYDEN. The answer is that they are already that. The present Chief of Staff, General Marshall, was formerly in command in the Northwest, and had jurisdiction over a large number of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps as a corps-area commander. He knew all about them. His advice to us is that they are very valuable in that respect, and he could see no advantage in changing the system as it now exists.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the average age in case of the camps today?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot state the average. The great bulk of the young men are about 18 to 23.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any difficulty in the present circumstances in keeping up the enrollment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; and that is the reason why the appropriation is reduced.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean that we have to drum up customers for the camps?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but it was disclosed at the hearing before the House committee that the camps had been unable to fill their enrollment, and for that reason the House reduced the appropriation below the amount estimated for in the Budget. The Senate committee did not disturb that sum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How does the sum compare with the previous total appropriations?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total appropriation for 1941 was \$279,944,000. The Budget estimate was \$270,000,000, and the amount allowed in the bill is \$246,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How does that compare with the previous annual appropriations for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry I cannot answer that question. I have not the record before me; but I imagine that prior appropriations are approximately \$275,000,000. This is a reduction of \$23,040,000 over last year's appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I notice that the committee has reported a reduction in the appropriation for part-time youth work and student aid of \$10,984,000. Will not the Senator explain why the appropriation was reduced? The National Youth Administration in my State is doing excellent work, especially among the coal-mine workers and other mine workers, and indeed, all over the State. I regret exceedingly the committee has seen fit to reduce the appropriation. I should like to see the amount restored, and I hope the Senate will restore it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that was a matter I intended to mention next. The amount for the purpose mentioned carried in the bill as it passed the House has been reduced by the committee \$10,984,000. The sum total made available to the National Youth Administration by the bill as it passed the House was \$85,984,000.

It was the considered judgment of the committee that the opportunities for employment being such as they are throughout the United States, due to the defense program, it was not necessary to appropriate so great a sum of money for this purpose as the House had provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I note the Senator says that it was the considered judgment of the committee that the reduction should be made. It is my understanding that no hearings were held upon this matter, and that no opportunity was taken by the committee to determine the need for the fund, or why there should be any reduction. I have been unable to find any record in the Senate committee hearings of any testimony upon this point at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct in that respect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I question the use of the phrase "considered judgment."

Mr. HAYDEN. It was the judgment the committee reached, and I think the committee had a right to take into consideration what is going on throughout the United States which is creating a scarcity of labor and affording the opportunity for employment.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was the division in the committee? Was the report unanimous, or was the committee divided?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a division; but I am sure the Senator would not want me to tell tales out of school.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I would not want the Senator to do that; I merely wanted to bring out the fact that there was a difference of opinion in the committee itself. As I understand, whatever reductions were justified were made by the House, and I think a reduction of \$10,984,000 is very severe and unwarranted. I hope that when we reach the item in the bill the Senate will restore the appropriation, and not agree to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I was struck by what the Senator in charge of the bill said, that because of the needs of the defense program there are opportunities for work of various kinds. I thought we were trying to save some money. Are we to take in everything, the youth movement, and social security, and everything else? All we have to do hereafter will be just fold our hands and say to the administration, "Now, please do this, with no effort on our part."

This kind of thing has gone on until we have become so accustomed to the administration doing everything that we are doing nothing; and that suits us exactly? I think in some places the youth movement does good; of course, it does; but in doing the youth good how much harm is done to the general spirit of the American people, taxing the whole tax-paying population hundreds of millions of dollars, and pouring the money out to benefit those whom heretofore we never heard of. I think it is time for us to lay aside what may do me some good in the mining sections of the mountains. It is a serious matter, when we come to consider the fact that every kind of project is taken over by the Federal Government. We are centralized enough now. For God's sake, let us try to indicate some tendency to be Americans again.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. There seems to be a misapprehension as to what the N. Y. A. does. On the one hand, of course, it does help young men in need, but, on the other hand, it contributes very largely to the defense program. There are at present some 5,500 schools in which boys are trained in trades which are necessary in connection with the national-defense program. For 2 weeks they are given training in regular school work for which they receive no pay whatever. Then they are put to work in the factories or

workshops provided by the Government, where they learn actual production. They learn how to manage machines; they learn all the minutiae of manufacturing. They learn how to get along with their fellow workers. The National Youth Administration is training boys for the very work which they should do in the defense program, and it relieves all private industry, at least to a considerable extent, from doing that very thing.

There are at least 1,500 shops where training is given, and some hundreds of thousands of boys are being trained. They relieve men from doing elementary work, so that the men are available for the defense program, and the work of National Youth Administration relieves private industry from the necessity of training the boys.

We all know there is a lack of skilled workers. It is one of the most serious deficiencies in our national-defense program, and it seems to me that, purely from the point of view of national defense, the National Youth Administration program should be sustained.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word concerning the reduction in the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee. It is somewhat out of order at this time, but since the matter is under discussion, it is appropriate for me to say what I think about the matter.

The chairman of the committee said—and probably that is the explanation of the reduction, or one of the explanations—that, in view of the defense program, it ought to be comparatively easy for the young people of the country to find employment.

Mr. President, without desiring to raise any issues which ought not to be raised, I wish to call attention very earnestly to the fact that expenditure for defense has not been uniformly distributed throughout the country, indeed, I do not think it could be because the primary purpose is to promote the national defense, but of some 15 billion dollars contracted for by the Government up to and through May of this year, less than 7 percent of that amount has been contracted for expenditure in the seven Southeastern States consisting of North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. Less than 7 percent of the entire total contracted to be spent in national defense industries of all kinds has been placed in those Southeastern States. In the Southeastern States we have a youth problem that is more severe than in any other part of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to call the Senate's attention to the fact that by the end of last May, or the first of the present month of June, there were 377,000 youths on the eligible list certified for employment on N. Y. A. out-of-school work projects. Nearly 100,000 of the 377,000 were in the seven Southeastern States, or to be exact, 97,000-plus of the youth of the country who had been found eligible and had been certified were in the seven Southeastern States where less

than 7 percent of all expenditure for national defense is being made.

In the South we have a large farm population. Compared with the average for the country as a whole. The seven South-eastern States have more than twice as many persons on the farms. The youth of the South have been dammed up during the depression years. They have been held back on the farm. They have not been able to find employment. There has been no increase in employment among them. I wish to supplement the figures which I have given by the statement that in the Southeastern States there are now presently employed on N. Y. A. out-of-school work projects 70,536 youths. In the same area 97,237 youths have been certified as eligible.

I am advised, and believe it to be true, because I have tried to go into the situation, that if the proposed reduction in the appropriation is made, some 15,000 young people in this area will be put off of the N. Y. A. out-of-school work projects, which would make a total of 112,000 young people certified in this particular area who could not be employed, who could not be put to work, who could not acquire an experience in line with the mechanical requirements of the national defense and of the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the reduction which is recommended by the committee will compel the dropping of about 30,000 young men in the out-of-school work. These training centers have capacity for 30,000, with 3 turn-over periods a year, which means, if this amendment is not rejected, that during the next fiscal year 90,000 young men who would otherwise be trained in very necessary trades, machine trades and electrical trades, for example, will be denied that opportunity. The proposed action, far from being any assistance in this juncture, will be quite the reverse.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I was confining my statement to the number that must necessarily be eliminated in the section of the country where this work is most needed.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Gladly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may call the Senator's attention to the fact that in his own State about 17,000 young people who are eligible for training would not receive any training if the bill were to be passed as reported. In my State the number is not quite so large but is approximately 10,000. In the State of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] my recollection is that about 11,000 are eligible but would not have a chance for any training under those circumstances.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, no one doubts that if the money is furnished and the opportunity afforded, there will be plenty of eligibles. Such a thing never happened before.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, I think it ought to happen this time.

Mr. SMITH. What I want to know is: Are we going to run everything from Washington, national youth movements, social security, and others, until finally we are out of means to run anything? The tax bill which is soon coming before the Senate for consideration will give some Senators pause. Why should not Georgia and South Carolina and Tennessee and the other States take care of their youth as they have done in the past? If I were to go out on the Capitol lawn and scatter grain on it, the pigeons, of course, would come and eat it. They are now making a living for themselves on the outside, but whenever I go out and begin to throw grain on the ground they will gather and eat it. Do not worry; we could get twice the number of young people out of school if the Government were to furnish them the wherewithal to be trained in the manner proposed. The States used to do it, but we do not have States any more. I do not believe in this centralization, and I am going to fight it so long as I am here.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not quarreling about the question of centralization, but we face facts.

Mr. SMITH. And that is one of the facts.

Mr. GEORGE. Just a moment. I have the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I know the Senator has the floor, and he is welcome to it.

Mr. GEORGE. Of the 377,000 youths who are now certified as eligible, nearly 100,000 live in the Southeastern States. In the Southeastern States the 97,000-plus, together with the number presently employed on N. Y. A. projects, make a total of 167,733.

I wish to call attention to the fact that that figure by no means exhausts the number of young persons affected. That is simply the figure representing those who have thus far qualified and are now eligible. It represents only a small proportion of the youth in the seven Southeastern States who cannot obtain this training, and who particularly will be affected by even this slight reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask him a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I shall be pleased to answer if I can.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator, in addition to the statistics he has presented, tell me what the age bracket is of the youths to whom he refers?

Mr. GEORGE. My information is that it is between 18 and 23 years. I do not know what the average is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it approximately the same age bracket as of those in the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it is approximately the same age bracket. I may be incorrect in that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Sixty-seven percent of them are under 21 years of age.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not have those figures.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any coordination between the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A.?

Mr. GEORGE. I know of no direct coordination. There is a coordination between vocational training and the N. Y. A. Most Senators know that I have sponsored and initiated in this body most if not all the vocational education measures which have been approved in the past 10 years. I strongly favor vocational education, both agricultural and mechanical. Under the bills which I have sponsored we have expanded and extended vocational training; but the vocational schools cannot begin to meet the demands, especially in the Southeastern States, and I dare say in other sections of the country as well. In Georgia, the State which I have the honor in part to represent in this body, there has been the finest cooperation between the vocational education group and the N. Y. A. Of course, they do somewhat the same work, but it is not identically the same work throughout.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to answer if I can.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Apparently the average cost of an enrollee in a C. C. C. camp is approximately \$1,000 a year. Can the Senator tell me what the average cost of an N. Y. A. enrollee is?

Mr. GEORGE. I am unable to give the exact figure, but it is considerably less.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the figure is between \$750 and \$800, or about \$60 a month for each boy.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I have the impression that in the States with which I am familiar the figure is perhaps less than \$200 a year.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator inquiring about the high-school and college projects, or the out-of-school projects?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am interested in knowing the average expenditure per person.

Mr. PEPPER. As I recall, in high schools the cost is about \$3 a month. In colleges it is from \$10 to \$12 a month; and for the out-of-school work I think the figure is between \$16 and \$24.

Mr. GEORGE. So the cost is less than \$200 a year.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator is referring to the educational aid, and not to the training programs. When boys are in residence, of course the residence centers must provide board and lodging for them as well as education. I think the cost is approximately \$60 a month for the boys in residence.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not familiar with the cost throughout the country; but in the southeastern States it is certainly less than the amount indicated by the able Senator.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What challenged my attention was the fact that the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was describing the educational advantages in the C. C. C. camps, which produce mechanics, cooks, and others who in time become eligible for military service. The able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] was pointing to precisely the same net result from the N. Y. A. centers. One apparently costs \$1,000 a year, and the other \$600 or \$700 a year. It strikes me that if we are engaged in an all-out, unified, national-defense program there ought to be some sort of coordination of all the various efforts to provide a fundamental, helpful training for young men and women.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with much that the Senator from Michigan says. It will be recalled that at one time in this body I very strenuously advocated a system of voluntary primary military training in the C. C. C. camps; but in the wisdom of the Senate that effort on my part was defeated. However, we were told at that time that a system of training such as the Senator from Arizona has detailed was being instituted in the camps; and my information is that the system has worked very well, and that it has the approval of the Chief of Staff.

For a long time I have been interested in vocational education and the extension and expansion of vocational training; and I have been pleased to note that at least in my State the vocational education forces have worked in the closest cooperation and harmony with the National Youth Administration. Speaking from my own knowledge, I know that I am substantially correct when I say that the maximum contribution made by the N. Y. A. while the student is in junior college or college is approximately \$15 a month. I am unable to say what the contribution is for the out-of-school work projects, but it is not very high. In Georgia the National Youth Administration made a constructive survey of one of the cities of the State, even before the defense program was well under way, and ascertained what the demands were in that community and within a reasonable radius thereof for skilled or semiskilled men in various mechanical lines. It undertook to establish, and did establish, a training school, and brought in young men who could readily be employed within that radius, not taking them from the C. C. C. camps or out of the vocational schools, but from those who were unemployed, who desired employment, and who could not find it in our area. That particular training has been most valuable, not only for that city, but also for the State; and I am advised and believe that it has served a very useful purpose in the expansion of the National Youth Administration program throughout the country.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to correct the figure which I gave a moment ago. I have just called Mr. Aubrey Williams to ascertain definitely and accurately the amounts paid to N. Y. A. beneficiaries. For high-school students, those receiving student aid in the high schools, the contribution is from \$3 to \$6 a month. Mr. Williams says that the average is \$4 a month. In colleges the contribution may run as high as \$15 a month, but the average is \$11 a month. In the case of students receiving out-of-school aid, but not in residence in camps, it runs from \$4 to \$18 a month. Those who are in residence in camps receive their subsistence and \$10 a month.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator for the figures.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that the age span in the C. C. C. camps is from 18 to 23 or 24, and that the age span in the N. Y. A. is from 18 to 23 or 24. Half of that span is also covered by the Draft Act. I ask the Senator whether or not the application of the draft to at least half of the age span which has heretofore been served by the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. would normally substantially reduce the necessity for appropriations, and equivalently reduce the activities of the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C.?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It has not done so, has it?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has already called attention to the fact that 67 percent of the youths receiving benefits from the National Youth Administration are under the age of 21. So in the case of the youths being served by the N. Y. A., a much larger percentage is under 21 years of age than is the case in the C. C. C. camps.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the basis of the Senator's own figures, that leaves 33 percent of the males who are within the draft age.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Forty percent of them are girls.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well; finally we get to the point where I think we should be able substantially to reduce the appropriation not only for N. Y. A. but for C. C. C. In view of the draft's application to the men within this age span, I do not see why we have to keep on at the maximum in respect to all persons within the span.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In making his statement, of course, the Senator from Michigan assumes that the maximum number of possible enrollees or trainees is being handled; but the Senator from Georgia has already pointed out that on the 1st of May there were at least 382,000 young persons who desired

to enroll, but who could not enroll because the funds had not been provided. Moreover, it is also true that it would easily be possible to enroll twice that number if the facilities were provided.

The situation is that even if this reduction is not made we shall not be able to take on the 382,000 who are not enrolled; we shall merely prevent the cutting off of 30,000. That is to say, we shall thereby reduce the capacity from, as I recall, 325,000 to 295,000; and that will mean, in the entire year, a reduction by 90,000 of the number of persons who may be trained.

What should be said to the Senator from Michigan, it seems to me, is that the C. C. C. work was undertaken at a time when there was no opportunity whatever for employment in private industry. The C. C. C. work was a stop-gap; and under the program which was followed, there were created throughout the country work projects to which the young men who were enrolled in the C. C. C. were assigned. But ever since the beginning of the defense effort, the reduction in enrollment to which the Senator from Michigan refers has been proceeding quite naturally; and the appropriation which is brought in here is a reduction.

The N. Y. A. program is not, like the C. C. C., a work program. It is what the Senator from Georgia has described, essentially a vocational educational training program. The young men and young women who enroll under it are in for only a short time, and are being trained for private industry. The justification of the N. Y. A. program is to be found in the fact that the record shows that enrollees are passing from N. Y. A. into private industry, particularly into the mechanical trades, at the rate of from 12,000 to 16,000 boys and girls a month; so it is building up opportunities for work.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to say that I think the Senator has understated the figure. The figure is about 40,000 per month.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Rhode Island is referring to the entire program. I was talking particularly about the mechanical trades, and I had in mind particularly the figure with reference to national-defense efforts.

Mr. GREEN. That is what I had reference to. The figure is about 40,000 a month. In my own State of Rhode Island, in the month of April—the last for which I have figures—there were 521 who went into private industry.

I rather resent the statement made on the floor that these young men are seeking to avoid their duties and to live on the country. They are seeking to get education whereby they can earn their living, and at the same time they are contributing to the development of the industries of the country for the purpose of national defense.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield? I do not wish to make a speech.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I shall be very glad to yield the floor. I took advantage of the opportunity, by the indulgence of

the Senator in charge of the bill, to say what I desired to say at this time with reference to this particular appropriation.

Mr. HILL. I merely desire to say, in connection with what has been said about the C. C. C., the N. Y. A., and the selective service that the Bureau of Labor Statistics advises me that at the present time there are between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 unemployed young people in this country who are registered with offices of the Employment Service who have had no training of any kind, who have had no technical experience, and who, therefore, are not able to get jobs. The Department of Agriculture advises me that there are about 1,500,000 young people on our farms who are not needed for farm work, who have no training, who have no experience, and who, therefore, are practically without anything to do.

So far as the N. Y. A. and the selective service are concerned, I look upon the N. Y. A. in large measure as complementary to the selective service. When we consider the question of national defense today, we have to realize that we are living in a time of modern technocracy, a time of gigantic machines of all kinds. What we need is men who are trained as artisans, men who are trained as mechanics and technicians, such as are being trained today in the N. Y. A., to go into our industries to produce the gigantic machines which we must have for our national defense, and also to have this training when they go in under the selective service, so that they may be prepared to operate the great machines which we must have for our national defense.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me? Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In response to what the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Michigan said, I desire to say that my approach to this matter is not from the standpoint of aid to youth, although that is the way it originated. From the standpoint of national defense we need 300,000 shipyard workers within the next year; we need 500,000 aeronautical mechanics; and there is substantially no other source. In the past 20 years the apprentice system has broken down, and if it were not for the assistance furnished by the youth-training program this country would be in a very serious condition.

I have watched this training program in operation. I have seen hundreds of boys trained in the N. Y. A. shops going immediately into employment all through the industrial Northeast. I think nothing could be more unfortunate than to cripple or hamper in any degree the program at this time as a primary matter of national defense.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am gratified to hear the statement of the Senator from Maine, because it confirms what I tried to express. We hear much about bottlenecks

today. The truth is that the greatest and most impeding bottleneck we have is the bottleneck due to a lack of trained artisans and mechanics and technicians, and the one place today where we can train and turn out the artisans and mechanics we need is the N. Y. A. So the N. Y. A. is merely complementary and necessary to the national defense, as is the selective service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the discussion, of course, is general. The only way to get to this amendment is to consider in their order the amendments to the bill. I ask that the clerk proceed to read the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 9, after the word "services", to strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$494,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Chair's pardon; I desire to wait until the amendment last under discussion is before the Senate. Is that the next amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; Mr. President, the amendment which we have been talking about is on page 59 of the bill, and we shall have to proceed through the bill and have the committee amendments stated.

Mr. PEPPER. The reduction in the N. Y. A. appropriation is not now up for consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It will be reached in due order. We have just had a general discussion; but in order to reach the amendment pertaining to the N. Y. A. I have asked that the committee amendments be read. They are now being read.

Mr. PEPPER. I will postpone my remarks until the amendment pertaining to the N. Y. A. is reached.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 23, after the word "services" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspaper clippings not to exceed \$1,400"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if he will accept a slight amendment which the Secretary of Labor has just asked that I present. It refers to the word "newspapers" on line 2, page 3; to "newspapers" again on page 5, line 11; and to "newspapers" again on page 8, line 25.

Mr. HAYDEN. Similar amendments are made throughout the bill. What is the proposal the Senator has?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The proposal is merely to restore the word "newspapers." The Department does not in any sense object to the amendment on page 2, line 23, striking out the words "newspaper clippings not to exceed \$1,400,"

and that amendment has been agreed to. The point is that the Bureau of Labor Statistics for several years has subscribed to certain newspapers, and in order to maintain the continuity of their studies they will have to have the newspapers.

Mr. HAYDEN. Are the newspapers in question published by labor organizations? For instance, in Arizona we have the Arizona Labor Journal. In some places similar publications are published weekly; sometimes they are published monthly; and I imagine that, like the newspaper entitled "Labor" which is published in this city and with which we are all so familiar—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The newspapers they are interested in are merely three, namely, the New York Times, the New York Times Index, and the Journal of Commerce, three newspapers that deal with statistics of various kinds which the Department has been following in making up statistical reports.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator could accomplish the purpose in this particular instance by having the amendment rejected.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I, therefore, suggest that the Senate reject the amendment on line 2, page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 3, at the beginning of line 2, striking out the word "newspapers."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will call attention to the other amendments when they are reached in the reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, to increase the total for contingent expenses from \$215,500 to \$219,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, after the word "field", to strike out "\$1,538,000", and insert "\$1,749,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "industry", to strike out "\$595,000" and insert "\$608,220."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the word "offices", to strike out "newspapers,".

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that the Senate reject the amendment on page 5, line 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 8, line 25, before the word "books", to strike out "newspapers."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that that amendment be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 1, after the word "reference" and the comma, to strike out "periodicals,

and press clippings" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maternal and Child Welfare", on page 9, line 12, after the word "equipment" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that that amendment be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 12, after the word "reference", to strike out "periodicals, and press clippings" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division", on page 12, line 2, after the word "For", to strike out "all" and insert "the Administrator, Deputy Administrator, and other"; in line 7, after the word "rendered", to strike out "\$4,697,700" and insert "\$5,406,800", and in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,000,000", and insert "\$1,035,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 19, after the word "reports", to strike out "newspapers and press clippings."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move to amend the amendment so as to leave in the bill the word "newspapers" and to strike out the words "and press clippings."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 14, line 9, after the word "reference" and the comma, to strike out "periodicals, and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, subhead "Civilian Conservation Corps", on page 17, line 9, after the word "reference", to strike out "periodicals, and newspapers", and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$950" and insert "\$1,060", and on page 20, line 1, after the word "enrollees", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That such limit of \$950 may be exceeded if the actual enrollee strength falls below 232,500 enrollees, but in no event shall the total expenditures from the appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps be in excess of the amount that could be expended under the operation of the limitation of \$950 cost per enrollee on the basis herein established.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Vocational Education", on page 24, after line 20, to insert:

Payments to States, and so forth (National Youth Administration): For payment to States, subdivisions thereof, or other pub-

lic agencies operating public educational facilities, for the cost of vocational courses and related or other necessary instruction provided by such agencies for young people employed on work projects of the National Youth Administration, such courses and instruction to be provided pursuant to plans submitted by such agencies and approved by the Commissioner, \$10,000,000, payment thereof to be made through certification from time to time, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the United States Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator and approved by the President, by the Commissioner to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of such agency to whom payment is to be made, and the amount to be paid, such payment to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office: *Provided*, That the amount allotted to any agency shall be available for expenditure for purchase or rental of additional equipment and rental of additional space found by the Commissioner to be necessary for carrying out the approved plan: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$125,000 of the above sum shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a perfecting amendment, on page 25, line 18, after the word "available", to insert "to the Office of Education"; otherwise the language would not be clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 25, line 18, after the word "available", it is proposed to insert "to the Office of Education", so as to read:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$125,000 of the above sum shall be available to the Office of Education for administrative expenses.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education and Training, Defense Workers (National Defense)", on page 28, line 9, after the word "Code", to strike out "colleges," and insert "colleges and"; in line 10, after the word "universities", to strike out "and hospitals,"; in line 18, after the word "college", to insert "or"; and in line 19, after the word "university", to strike out the comma and "or hospital."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 25, after the word "schools", to insert "including vocational schools exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 8, to strike out:

(5) For the cost of vocational courses and related or other necessary instruction provided by such agencies for young people employed on work projects of the National Youth Administration, such courses and instruction to be provided pursuant to plan submitted by such agencies and approved by the Commissioner, \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount allotted to any agency shall be available for expenditure for purchase or rental of additional equipment and rental of additional space found by the Commissioner to be necessary for carrying out the approved plan:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$125,000 of the above sum shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Federal Security Administrator" and insert "Commissioner", and in line 13, after the figures "\$100", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Commissioner shall transmit to Congress quarterly during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, a report of the defense training programs and training programs for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects covering such educational programs which operate under his administration, as provided for in this act, such reports to show the distribution of Federal funds and activities by States, types of programs and numbers of persons trained.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 24, after the word "established", to strike out "and where the cost of training any worker not classed as a youth is not disproportionate to the productive benefits to be obtained from such training, preference in selection for training shall be given to nonyouth applicants therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 22, to insert:

The Commissioner may delegate to any officer in the Office of Education any of his powers or duties hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Food and Drug Administration", on page 34, line 9, before the word "exchange", to strike out "periodicals and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Freedmen's Hospital", on page 38, line 10, after the word "books", to strike out "periodicals, and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals", and on page 39, line 1, after the words "Provided further", to strike out:

That the cost of maintaining and treating patients who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be chargeable to the District of Columbia and paid in like manner as other appropriations of the District of Columbia are paid.

And insert:

That 65 per centum of each of the foregoing appropriations for the Freedmen's Hospital shall be chargeable to the District of Columbia and paid in like manner as other appropriations of the District of Columbia are paid, subject, however, to adjustments from time to time to be made during and at the end of the fiscal year so that the portion of each of these appropriations charged to the District of Columbia shall bear the same ratio to the total of each appropriation as the number of hospital days of service to persons who have resided in the District of Columbia for over 1 year on the day of admission bears to the total number of hospital days of service performed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 40, line 19, after the name "Surgeon

General", to strike out "newspaper clippings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 22, after "\$380,000", to strike out the comma and the words "including the purchase of newspapers and clippings from newspapers containing information relating to the prevalence of disease and the public health."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 6, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers, and periodicals", and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 21, after the word "work", to strike out "\$1,615,000" and insert "\$1,665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 10, after the word "by", to strike out "such agencies" and insert "public agencies operating public educational facilities"; and in line 19, after "\$1,200,000", to insert a comma and the words "payment thereof to be made through certification from time to time in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator and approved by the President, by said Surgeon General to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of such agency or hospital to whom payment is to be made, and the amount to be paid, such payment to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board", on page 53, line 9, after the word "equipment" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers, press clippings (not to exceed \$1,500), and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 17, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$70,000,000" and insert "\$78,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Youth Administration", on page 59, line 4, after the word "persons", to strike out "\$85,984,000" and insert "\$75,000,000"

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the amendment we have been discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that that amendment be rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this, as has already been indicated by the Senator in charge of the bill, is the amendment concerning which we spent so much time earlier in the day, assessing the various factors. It is probably not necessary to go into it at length now; I think the Members of the Senate understand the problem very clearly. I do wish to say, however, that the factor which should be of the utmost importance, it seems to me, in the consideration of this amendment is that it relates to the national defense.

The Chairman of the Maritime Commission called me only this morning to invite attention to the fact, which has

already been alluded to by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], that there is a great need of workers in the shipbuilding industry. The Maritime Commission is anxious to take advantage of the training facilities of the National Youth Administration; the War Department is anxious to take advantage of them; the Office of Production Management is anxious to take advantage of them; and if the Committee on Appropriations had held any hearings upon this matter, if it had undertaken to find out what the facts are with respect to the manner in which this fund is being expended, a substantial showing would have been made to support the retention of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

I wish to call attention to the fact that, according to the figures available to me, at least 1,409,000 persons are needed at this moment in various mechanical activities necessary in the national defense; 324,000 in shipbuilding, 408,000 in the construction and building of planes, 292,000 in machine shops, and 385,000 in related industries.

The National Youth Administration is providing the training facilities for this demand; and if we cut it off we shall be acting only to deprive essential industries of securing the necessary labor, which they cannot now secure because, as has already been pointed out, the apprentice system in this country has been practically abandoned.

During the month of April, according to the report of the N. Y. A., which I have in my hands, 155,697 youths were employed in workshop production projects of various types. These projects provide training in sheet-metal work, in welding, in foundry work, in automobile maintenance and repair, in aviation service, in farm-implement service, in machine-shop service, in electrical work, in radio work, in woodworking, drafting, map making, and blueprinting, and, for the girls, sewing and other production. Every one of these items is obviously an essential activity in the preparation for the national defense; and it is necessary only to state the facts, it seems to me, to indicate the necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, would it interfere with the Senator if I should interrupt him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. While the Senator was speaking about national defense a few minutes ago I took occasion to say that I felt that the N. Y. A. work was complementary to the selective-service training, and that it was just as necessary to the national defense as is the selective-service training.

In that connection I desire to call the attention of the Senate to some excerpts from a letter written by the Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, to the able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] on the 12th day of this month.

At the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the bill providing for the deferment of persons

between the ages of 28 and 36 it developed that the Army is rejecting registrants under the Selective Service Act on account of illiteracy. The committee was most interested to know why these men were being rejected because of illiteracy, and General Marshall wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee in which he said:

During World War 1 it was not necessary to place a literacy qualification on selective-service men. Today, tactical units, with their much greater degree of motorization, require a higher average of intelligence to absorb the necessary training. The current troop basis contains a minimum of labor units to which illiterates and morons can be assigned.

Early in the spring of 1941 replacement training centers and tactical organizations were commencing the training of selectees in large numbers. At that time the War Department began to receive numerous complaints from the commanders of these organizations concerning illiteracy. The number received among selectees was far in excess of the number that could be successfully utilized without seriously impeding the progress of other fully qualified selectees, and, in fact, of the organizations themselves. Immediate and positive action was necessary to prevent the diversion of our relatively few expert training personnel as well as our limited housing facilities for the extensive training necessary to make this type of selectee even an acceptable soldier. The only solution appeared to be the establishment of a literacy-test regulation.

And the War Department adopted a literacy test.

Mr. President, this letter shows how necessary it is that the work of the N. Y. A. be carried on, that we may continue to train and to educate as many as possible of these young men, that we may do all possible to remove illiteracy in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for that contribution to the consideration of the subject.

I was pointing out that the chairman of the Maritime Commission this morning telephoned my office to say that this type of training is very greatly needed in the shipbuilding industry. I have before me a letter which Admiral Land wrote to Mr. Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General of the O. P. M., on May 13, in which he said:

I think it is unlikely that enough mechanics can be supplied on time unless the training job is attacked directly and expeditiously by everyone concerned.

I have a copy of a letter which was written by Secretary of War Stimson to the F. S. A. Administrator in which he pointed out the great need at this time of training in radio. He said:

In time of an emergency the Army will need a large number of radio operators. It is requested that the N. Y. A. program for the training of radio operators be expanded to 5,000 youths, if practicable within the limitation of available funds.

In April 1941, according to the figures I have just read to the Senate, only 3,238 young persons were enrolled for radio training. The Army would like to see 5,000 enrolled.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be perfectly clear that this is a reduction which certainly should not be made at this time.

I have some other interesting figures.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I desire, first, to commend the Senator from Wyoming for the attitude he has taken on this subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the commendation of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I trust his very creditable performance on the Senate floor will bear fruit when the final vote is cast.

I desire to say to my distinguished colleagues that I have made quite a study of N. Y. A. projects in my State. We realize, as the Senator has well said, that trainees are available in greater number than this humble effort attempts to care for. Not only are trainees available, but the Army and the Navy, as the Senator has stated, are clamoring for trained men; and we read in the newspapers last evening that England is looking for thousands and thousands of men trained in the radio and in other crafts here in this country. We recognize also that private enterprise in America is stalemated in its effort because of inadequacy of the supply of trained mechanics.

Mr. President, this program reaches a class that is not included in the selective-service draft. It goes down to those 17 and 18 years of age. It prepares them for a particular work which will be helpful to national defense; and, in addition to that, I point out that it aids a class unable to carry on an educational program of their own in private or public vocational or technical schools.

It gives to them part-time training and part-time work, so that they may in this manner achieve an education which would otherwise be denied them, under their economic circumstances. So, since it reaches down below the years of those included in the Selective Service, and prepares them for national defense, and, in view of the added fact that it rescues those who have given up perhaps all thought of a superior education and gives to them an opportunity to rise above the grade of, we will say, the ordinary laborer. I think it is a very fine program, and should be encouraged.

The youth problem is the greatest problem confronting any country in the world. We have only scratched the surface here. Think of it. Over a million boys and over a million girls become of working age each year in this country, and there are certainly many opportunities for them which will be fulfilled only if we reject the amendment proposed by the committee.

As I stated in the beginning, we have scratched the surface only. The youth problem is the biggest problem in this Nation. Training our boys along technical lines supplies the most valuable asset for our national defense, and a nation which has the personnel well trained, technically trained, will be the predominant nation at the close of the present crisis. I understand that a technically trained army of less than a quarter of a million men was all that was employed by Germany in its invasion of France. Even though that army faced

an army of nearly 5,000,000 men, but men who lacked the machinery and the technical training, the smaller army—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Six divisions overcame France.

Mr. MEAD. The smaller army, by reason of the superior technical training of its members, caused France to surrender.

I wish to leave the impression that this committee amendment strikes at the very heart and center of the problem, and it should be unanimously rejected. Again I commend the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator has made these remarks. They suggest to my mind that the enrollees under the N. Y. A. program all come from families in the lowest income strata. They come from families having incomes of less than \$1,200, and, of course, we know that there are very large numbers of families in this country now receiving less than \$500 annually. This program offers opportunity for training, and, as I shall show in a moment, the experience indicates that, having received this training, they have been going in increasing numbers into private industry.

I am happy the Senator from New York has made reference to the importance of the youth problem in this country. I know that it was for that purpose that the Senator from West Virginia rose to interrupt me, and I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, I wish to add merely a word of testimony in connection with this problem, one which is intensely interesting to me, because I have helped to administer the N. Y. A. funds in my State, and I know something about the help those funds have given to students in our colleges and high schools.

The expense compared with the result is very modest. The amount allowed for a student does not pay all his expenses; it is a sort of spark plug which induces him and his parents to get him into high school and into college.

Just one thought about its lowering self-respect. There is absolutely nothing in that argument. The aid given to high school and college students does not lower the self-respect of any young person. The college campus for a hundred years has been familiar with the campus job and the campus scholarship; those things are a part of our college and university life. The young people who receive this aid are encouraged and inspired to go ahead and make the best possible out of themselves, and they experience no loss of self-respect whatever.

I think that the Government receives a finer return from this investment than from any other investment I know of which it makes, and I speak from personal observation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from West Virginia for the statement he has made.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. There is one point the Senator from Wyoming made in his ad-

mirable presentation of this matter which it appears to me should be amplified; that is, the need of the families who are helped by this form of aid. I know that some Senators are under the erroneous impression that the standard of need has been abandoned by the N. Y. A., but such is not the fact. I should like to read that part of the regulations which relates to this very matter. In the regulations which were formulated about a year ago appears section 13, which was not a new section then, but which was reissued at that time. I read:

Certification of need: Youth employees should be certified as in need. The State youth administrator may request public-relief agencies to certify eligible youth known to such agencies, and direct applications to the National Youth Administration by eligible youth shall also be accepted for certification. For the purpose of certification a youth shall be considered as needy if he is—

A. A member of a family whose income is insufficient to provide the basic requirements of all members of the family, including the youth member, regardless of whether the family is receiving or eligible for any form of public assistance; or

B. Without family connections and his income is insufficient to provide his basic requirements.

As a result of the administration of the regulation I have just read, it appears that in this out-of-school work program some of the youth—a larger portion of them—are certified by the local relief agencies, but all the others are, without exception, investigated by the N. Y. A. officials, who make certain of the needs of the youth and his family before he is assigned to work.

In the N. Y. A. student work program the average annual income of the families of the students is \$645. One-fifth of the families earn less than \$300 a year, and over two-thirds of the families have incomes under \$900 a year.

I think that disposes effectively of the argument that this has ceased to be a means of reducing the needs of the poor families. However, I still believe that the main argument for increasing the appropriation which is now proposed is that it would assist in the development of our industries, and especially those producing articles used in the national defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not take any more time to discuss this matter, because it seems to me it is very clearly understood; but I wish to put into the RECORD the figures to which I was referring when the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] interrupted me a moment ago.

I was discussing the number of young trainees who go from the N. Y. A. centers into private industry. In July 1940, 14,500 young persons went from these centers into private industry; in August the number was 13,490; in September, 17,093; in October, 18,234; in November, 16,844; in December, 16,026. In January 1941, when the defense movement was gaining impetus, the number was 22,442; in February it was 31,582; in March, 38,853; and in April, 40,902.

Thus month by month the graduates of this youth training are going into the factories and the shops which are engaged in

national defense. I can think of very few greater contributions to the strengthening of the morale of our young people than is to be found in this study.

Mention was made earlier in the day by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] of the fact that the States are not taking care of this problem. The States cannot take care of it. That is the unfortunate fact of our present situation. States and local communities have actually lost their economic independence, as it were. They are not able to provide the work which the rising generation requires. That is the heart of our whole problem. No one pretends to believe that this is a final solution. It is not a final solution. But under the N. Y. A. there is being provided an opportunity for training and for employment in industry of hundreds of thousands of young men and young women who otherwise would have no opportunity at all.

Mr. President, I think this is certainly not the place to reduce an appropriation. Particularly is that true when it must be acknowledged that no hearings were held upon this matter by the Senate committee and that no evidence was taken. This Bureau of the Budget made a recommendation to Congress at the beginning of the session that \$100,000,000 be appropriated for this purpose. Ten million dollars was taken away and given to the Bureau of Education for vocational training. Five million dollars is required for the administrative expenses, leaving approximately \$85,000,000 for the work. The Senate committee has reduced that to \$75,000,000. If the reduction stands, I think it will be a serious undermining of a very necessary program, and I hope the Senate will not support the committee amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point a letter from Admiral Land to Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General, Office of Production Management; a letter from Secretary of War Stimson to the F. S. A. Administrator; and a list showing the number of those who are registered for enrollment and who have not been enrolled, divided according to the States, so that Members of the Senate who are interested in knowing how many young persons there are in their particular States who are awaiting enrollment in this program may have that information by consulting this list.

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

The letters and list are as follows:

UNITED STATES
MARITIME COMMISSION,
May 13, 1941.

SIDNEY HILLMAN,
Associate Director General,
Office of Production Management,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HILLMAN: The Maritime Commission is vitally concerned, as you know, with the Labor Division's work of recruiting and training manpower for defense industries. In order to accelerate the construction of ships, which defense requires and the President has requested, a very large number of shipyard mechanics must be trained in a very short time. Most of the yards have already instituted training programs of their own, but I am somewhat fearful that the demand for more and faster production will

call for trained labor faster than it can be supplied by individual shipyard action. Estimates prepared for us, which we believe are conservative, indicate that all shipbuilding, including both Navy and Maritime, will require 374,000 additional shipbuilding workers by September, 1942, than are now engaged in the industry. Of this number 287,000 will be skilled, semiskilled, and supervisory workers. I think it unlikely that enough mechanics can be supplied on time unless the training job is attacked directly and expeditiously by everyone concerned.

Representatives of this Commission have held several discussions with representatives of the Office of Production Management and the Federal training and employment agencies associated in defense training. These discussions have been helpful in clearing the ground, and I am now anxious to see the blueprint of a specific program.

We shall probably need the assistance of all of the various Federal agencies now coordinated by the Division of Labor Supply and Training, including the Employment Service, the Training-Within-Industry Division, the vocational and apprentice training groups, the National Youth Administration, and such other State and Federal agencies as are engaged in this work. While it will, of course, be necessary to coordinate the work which these agencies may do for us through the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management, I assume that you have no objection to representatives of this Commission going direct to any of the individual agencies to secure advice and assistance in the preparation of training projects.

Prompt action is required and I shall appreciate it, therefore, if you will arrange to have representatives of the various agencies now coordinated by the Division of Labor Supply and Training establish direct contact with this Commission through Commissioner H. L. Vickery to work out a program which I can submit to the full Commission for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, Chairman.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1940.
The Honorable ADMINISTRATOR, F. S. A.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I have been informed that the N. Y. A. is engaged in training radio operators at certain work projects. Further, I have been informed that the Administrator of the N. Y. A. is agreeable to expanding this type of training, if it is of benefit to the military service. Such training as will qualify enrollees in the N. Y. A. as amateur radio operators will be of direct benefit to our national defense.

In time of an emergency, the Army will need a large number of radio operators. It is requested that the N. Y. A. program for the training of radio operators be expanded to 5,000 youth, if practicable, within the limitation of available funds.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Federal Security Agency, National Youth
Administration

YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT, MAY 1941
Grand total ----- 377,002

State or Territory:	
Alabama.....	16,161
Arizona.....	275
Arkansas.....	19,774
California.....	5,143
Colorado.....	6,580
Connecticut.....	32
Delaware.....	124
District of Columbia.....	254
Florida.....	9,547

Federal Security Agency, National Youth
Administration—Continued

State or Territory:	
Georgia.....	17,438
Idaho.....	805
Illinois.....	6,571
Indiana.....	5,744
Iowa.....	5,551
Kansas.....	4,345
Kentucky.....	16,903
Louisiana.....	4,690
Maine.....	1,537
Maryland.....	611
Massachusetts.....	4,827
Michigan.....	3,458
Minnesota.....	5,012
Mississippi.....	14,150
Missouri.....	9,233
Montana.....	1,324
Nebraska.....	1,918
Nevada.....	54
New Hampshire.....	147
New Jersey.....	809
New Mexico.....	1,868
New York City and Long Island.....	10,823
New York (excluding New York City and Long Island).....	2,039
North Carolina.....	13,705
North Dakota.....	2,806
Ohio.....	10,895
Oklahoma.....	11,771
Oregon.....	907
Pennsylvania.....	23,016
Rhode Island.....	-----
South Carolina.....	11,164
South Dakota.....	1,774
Tennessee.....	15,052
Texas.....	38,864
Utah.....	2,514
Vermont.....	378
Virginia.....	11,438
Washington.....	654
West Virginia.....	11,350
Wisconsin.....	4,394
Wyoming.....	274
Alaska.....	50
Puerto Rico.....	38,097
Virgin Islands.....	142

Source: Reports of State youth administrators on N. Y. A. Form 510.

DIVISION OF FINANCE AND STATISTICS,
June 17, 1941.

MR. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the last few months we have heard much, not only in the Senate but elsewhere throughout the country, about the national defense. There have been contradictions in sentiment as to the methods by which the country could best be served. There have been some who thought the best way to defend democracy was to aid in stopping Hitler, who threatens freedom everywhere. But here and elsewhere Senators and spokesmen have eloquently said that the best way to protect and preserve democracy was to do it here at home in the United States. Today, Mr. President, we have before us a bill the purpose of which is to provide part-time employment for needy young persons in schools, colleges, and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, and to provide employment for unemployed young persons on subsequently enumerated public projects.

Mr. President, how can anyone not support proposals of that character? How can anyone deny to a boy or a girl trying to go to high school a chance to work to earn an average of \$4 a month? How can anyone deny an American boy or girl a chance to make an average of \$11 a month by working in a college or a university in America? How can anyone deny to a boy or girl an average of

between \$14 and \$18 a month compensation for his or her labor when he or she is trying to learn a vocation that will serve the national defense? How can anyone deny to a boy or girl an opportunity to earn by his or her labor subsistence and \$10 in a resident N. Y. A. camp in the United States of America? How can anyone deny those privileges to work, Mr. President, and yet say they believe in strengthening democracy here at home?

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator not also think it is important that the selectees who are now in training, who have had this work before they went to the Army, shall when they return have the same opportunity to work and make their way through school?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator think the Government owes them the duty to afford them the same opportunity which they had before they entered the military service?

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly do. I am glad the Senator made the contribution by that suggestion.

Mr. President, I happen to recall that in 1937 I obtained figures, and presented them to the Senate, which showed that at that time we had in the United States 3,670,000 illiterates. Do they aid the national defense? Then we had but 2,000,000 college graduates. A great democracy, the greatest democracy in the world, the hope of democracy everywhere, had more illiterates than college graduates. How can those illiterates deal with the complexities of a technological civilization? How can they even operate the complicated instruments of war which perhaps alone can defend democracy in the world?

At that time we had only 32,000,000 in the whole citizenry of America who had the advantage of even an elementary-school education, a grammar-school education. Only 32,000,000 of America's 130,000,000 had had any elementary-school education. Only 14,000,000 had graduated from elementary school. Only 5,000,000 had had a high-school education, and, as I have already said, only 2,000,000 had had a college education.

Mr. President, surely nobody would think that democracy could be strengthened by denying to a boy or girl a chance to work to obtain an education. I am proud to say that I am one Member of the Senate—and perhaps there are many others—who had to work his way through college. If I had not had a job I could not have obtained a college education, and I should have been one of the millions who are handicapped in the struggle for existence in a great democracy, because fortune had not smiled upon me or my family?

Mr. President, in Florida in the month of April 5,562 youths were employed on the out-of-school program; but 15,257 are still awaiting assignment—assignment to what? To a chance to work in a great democracy.

We talk about strengthening the sinews and fibers of democratic institutions, and then thrust the deserving boy

or girl back into the oblivion of sorrow and unemployment. The hand of a mighty nation that stands for human liberty against its worst assault should not be turned against the boy or girl who offers his services for its defense. I cannot believe that those who have said that what we need to do is to strengthen our democracy from within will not on this occasion rush to the defense of a proposal which offers to open the windows of the human mind and soul to those who would otherwise have to experience for the remainder of their lives the sadness of intellectual and spiritual darkness.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am interested in the work of the National Youth Administration, not only because of its importance at this particular time in connection with the national-defense program but also because I believe that the activities which it has been carrying on are essential to the strengthening and functioning of democracy in time of peace as well as in time of national emergency. I think the Senate should bear in mind that at no time has the appropriation been adequate to meet the needs of eligible youths for this program. Last year about \$101,000,000 was provided for this purpose; and yet on the 1st of April 1941 less than one-half of the eligible youths had an opportunity to participate in the N. Y. A. program.

The House of Representatives has already cut the appropriation for this program \$10,000,000 below what was provided for last year, by giving \$10,000,000 to the Office of Education. In the past fiscal year the Office of Education received \$7,500,000 of direct appropriations to carry on its activities in relation to training for national defense; and instead of providing such an appropriation this year the House of Representatives has taken \$10,000,000 out of the Budget recommendation for the National Youth Administration and has given it to the Office of Education. So, instead of having a program equivalent to the one which we had last year, even if this amendment should be defeated and the Senate should rest content with the House figure, we should be cutting the program of the National Youth Administration by as much as \$10,000,000 for this year. Of course, if by any chance the Senate committee amendment should prevail we should be cutting it more than \$20,000,000 as compared with the amount provided last year.

Mr. President, last week the Senate was in a hysterical state of mind over strikes and interruptions to defense preparation. I agree with every word that has been said here by other Senators to the effect that the real bottleneck which will ultimately develop and which will be more detrimental to the national-defense program than the bottlenecks in aluminum, steel, the transportation system, or anything else, will be a lack of skilled workers who are trained to manipulate the instruments of production in our modern industrial society.

In view of these facts, I hope that the Senate will reject the committee amendment. I myself would prefer to be fighting for an amendment which would give

us at least the equivalent of last year's program, because I think that, even if we should reject the amendment and rest upon what the House has provided, a few months from now, we should find, much to our sorrow, that we had not taken the necessary steps to provide an adequate appropriation for this program.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am very hopeful—although not optimistic—that the committee amendment will prevail. It is true that we have not provided as much money this year as we had in the appropriation of last year; but I hope the Senators will not overlook the fact that in the interim we have appropriated many billion dollars which will go far toward providing work for the young men and women for whom the N. Y. A. program was originally created.

Recently we were invited—or perhaps challenged—by the chief financial officer of our Government to cut non-defense expenditures one billion dollars. I had hoped that the Congress would meet the challenge, but as a result of what has transpired since that time I must confess that my hopes have waned to a very great extent.

In the eloquent statements by the opponents of the amendment much is made of the fact that cutting the appropriation by \$10,000,000 would jeopardize the defense program under the National Youth Administration. Such is not the case. In another part of the bill a separate fund, amounting to \$56,972,000, is specifically set apart to enable the National Youth Administration to carry out its national-defense work.

Mr. President, I was in the Congress when the National Youth Administration was created, and when the Civilian Conservation Corps and other relief agencies came into existence; and I clearly remember that the only reason then advanced for the creation of such agencies was that of a need to provide work for men and women, and boys and girls, who otherwise could not obtain employment, and who otherwise could not find the means to support themselves or provide for their education. During those days of economic darkness I was among the Members of Congress greatly concerned with the appropriation of a sufficient amount of money for that needed work. I have never voted to reduce a W. P. A. appropriation as it came from the Bureau of the Budget. On occasion I have voted to increase the appropriation. Nor have I ever voted to decrease an appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps. I have also and always been among those who were anxious to provide sufficient money for the National Youth Administration. But the day of reckoning is certain to come; and while it has been pointed out that this program, without enough money, could be a bottleneck and that the neglect of our young people might be harmful to our preservation of democratic principles, I fear that our financial condition may one day be democracy's bottleneck. I feel that one of our great dangers may

be our inability to appreciate the financial dangers which lie ahead.

If we are ever to cut out or curtail the relief agencies of another day, the time to do so is now. There is not now the need that there has been for jobs and positions for those who would be taken care of under this bill. Every Senator knows that the National Youth Administration has been conducting a canvass for young men and young women to work under this program. There is not now the need for those young men, because as our defense program has expanded during these past many months, many manufacturing plants have been constructed and expanded, and millions of people have gone back to work, and many more are constantly being employed.

In my own State there is at the moment a crying need for thousands of persons to work in our agricultural industry. There is a hope that they can be obtained in other States. At the same time, in the name of national defense, an effort is now being made to build up agencies which were created solely for purposes of relief. Agencies which in the last 8 years caused the expenditure of billions of dollars to give work to men, now are sought to be continued, under the plea that their existence is necessary in order to find people for employers. Agencies created to make jobs now are sought to be continued, under the argument that they are needed as agencies to go out and find people to take jobs.

As I said, Mr. President, I am not optimistic, but I promised myself, as one of those who was for liberal expenditures during the days of distress, that I would endeavor to meet the invitation or challenge of the chief financial officers and the crying need of our country, that we endeavor to cut down nondefense expenditures. I do not pick out the N. Y. A. I should be willing to make a further reduction in the W. P. A. and in the C. C. C., just as I was among those active in the effort to cut down an appropriation of a considerable amount recently sought for a branch of the Department of Justice.

I shall try to act in the immediate future with the realization that there may be great danger to democracy in the day of financial reckoning, which may not be far off. Congress will in a little while awaken to this situation. The awakening will come when a broadened tax base, with a tremendously heavy tax burden, reaches out and touches many more of our people and very forcibly some of those who have been crying loudly for increased appropriations under such measures as this.

Of course, as has been noted, the appropriation is not so large as last year's, but there is now no such need, Mr. President. Billions upon billions of dollars, let me reiterate, have been and are being spent under the national-defense program, thus creating jobs for the people of our country. Our employment situation has never, in our generation, been more promising than it is now, and I think that if we are going to turn in the other direction, if we are going to do our part—and we have the responsibility

here—of protecting the great numbers of our people from excessive, probably unbearable, tax burdens, the Congress had better start right now.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, just a word in reply to the Senator from Connecticut. It is all very well for the Senator from Connecticut to talk about the billions of dollars which have been poured out for defense contracts, and about the employment created thereby; and I have no doubt, in following the report of the allocation of contracts, and in noticing the large number of contracts which have been allocated to States along the Atlantic seaboard, especially in New England, that there has been a terrific pick-up in job opportunities.

But unfortunately, Mr. President, because of the geographical location of our peacetime industries, and because of apparent lack of understanding of the economic headache which they will ultimately create, contracts have been allocated in the normal manufacturing States, with some few exceptions—my own State included. But it must be remembered that these defense contracts are not distributed on a population basis, that many of the States in the South and in the West have not received any direct benefits from the allocation of defense contracts. That is the first point I wish to make in reply to the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? Would a brief remark by me interrupt the development of the Senator's points?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President; I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. In connection with what the Senator has said, let me say that I secured some figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, because I felt that the argument would be made that there is no longer any unemployment.

The answer is that there are a few places in this country where there is no unemployment, or certainly very little unemployment, so far as young people are concerned; and one place mentioned as having no unemployment happened to be Hartford, Conn. Of course, we know that Hartford, Conn., is right in the center of a great industrial-producing area. On the other hand, as the able Senator from Wisconsin has so well said, there are millions of young men out of employment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics advises me that today there are between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 young people in this country who are registered with employment offices, but who cannot get any employment. They have had no training; they have had no preparation; they have nothing today to offer. They are out of jobs.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Alabama has touched upon the second point I wish to make, namely, that many of the youths of this country have received no training. I am sorry to say that during all these years when we have been providing hundreds of millions and billions of dollars for W. P. A. and for other activities, we have not had any comprehensive program. Outside the regular George-Dean program, for vocational training, we have not had any

broad, large-scale, national program to train people in order that they may acquire skill. Therefore, many youths, although jobs actually may be available in their communities, are not sufficiently trained so that they can obtain those jobs and hold them.

We have already had testimony, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, on a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada, providing that some of the C. C. C. camps should be turned into vocational schools. At the committee hearings manufacturers have appeared and urged the adoption of that measure, because, they say, they are not equipped, they do not have the facilities, to train the men under the so-called apprentice system, because all their facilities are now under pressure from the O. P. M., the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and all other agencies interested in production of instrumentalities of national defense, urging them to push their plants to their utmost capacity, and therefore it is necessary for them to abandon, or certainly not to enlarge, the apprentice training programs which they have had in the past.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Wisconsin well says, today our industries have not provided the facilities to carry on an apprentice program, and in the days before the present national emergency, in the days of the 1937 recession, and in the days immediately prior thereto, during the depression, industry then did not carry on the apprentice program, because there was a terrible lag, as we know, in industrial production, in the marketing and sale of industrial goods; industry tried to economize, and it did cut down its expenses, by cutting out the apprentice program. So, for a period of years before the emergency we had no apprentice program; and now we do not have any apprentice program, because of the lack of facilities for such a program.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to make one further point, Mr. President, and then I shall conclude. The Senator from Connecticut referred to the fact that the defense program of the National Youth Administration will not be affected by this amendment; and technically that is a correct statement. But only 1,000 of the 5,500 workshops of the National Youth Administration are designated as defense-training centers. The reason why they are designated as defense-training centers is that those are all the centers which they could so designate which would be training men for the so-called key-defense industries.

However, in the other 4,500 workshops, under what might be termed the regular activities of the National Youth Administration, young men are being given basic training in the use of machinery and tools. Although this training is not shaped directly toward the aviation industry or some other particular industry which might be designated as a key defense industry, nevertheless, it will give them a basic training which will provide

them with skill so that they may obtain work in other industries, and thus in general assist the national-defense program.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to make the point that the National Youth Administration at no time has been able, nor would it be able even under a larger appropriation than would be provided if the committee amendment were rejected, to accept all the youths who have been certified as qualified in every respect to participate in the program.

Mr. ANDREWS obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say at this point in the RECORD that I want to repudiate the inference that my statement or action on this bill is motivated by sectional partisanship. Although I had never expected to hear that particular charge made against me, the Senator from Alabama has pointed to a situation prevailing in Hartford, Conn., which, it seems to me, makes the reference pretty personal.

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

Mr. MALONEY. Not at the moment. During the several years I have been a Member of Congress I have voted for every farm bill, with the exception of one which was set aside by the Supreme Court. Parity payments have no special appeal to my constituency, nor have parity loans or conservation measures, excepting as a matter of fairness, but I never have been, and I pray I never shall be, guided in my actions here by sectional feeling.

I wish to point out, partially in answer to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, that it is true that the eastern section of the country has profited, if it is profit, to a greater extent than some other sections of the country as a result of the industrial advancement under the national-defense program; but I want the RECORD to show that the Work Projects Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the other Federal relief agencies, or what were heretofore relief agencies, operate on the basis of need, and I know that if there is a cut in this appropriation, or in other relief appropriations, the cuts made within the States and the sections will be on the basis of existing conditions in those areas. I do not expect, if a cut is made, that my State will maintain its proportion of employees as that proportion has heretofore existed. I know that there will be greater cuts in the areas where the employment situation is better. I know that the cut will be deepest in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England, and I believe that it should be that way. I think it is entirely unfair for Senators to point out in debate, as has been pointed out in this debate, that a Senator might have a personal interest because he feels in conscience that the time has come to cut nondefense Federal expenditures.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that there was nothing further from my mind than to make any personal reference so far as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned. I state frankly and sincerely that I think no Member of the Senate tries more honestly or more diligently to look at all the matters that come before this body from a national standpoint; I think there is no Member of the Senate who is affected less by a sectional viewpoint. The Senator from Connecticut has demonstrated the truth of this statement time and time again on this floor. But, naturally, all of us have our viewpoints somewhat shaped and somewhat determined by the situation as we see it best, and, naturally, the situation which we see best and which perhaps gives us our best guide or our best insight into conditions is the situation back home, for it is the situation back home which we see most of and with which we are most familiar.

The Senator from Connecticut always tries to consider matters from a national point of view, but, like myself, I cannot imagine that at times he may not necessarily be influenced somewhat in the light of facts as those facts come to him from home. It is home where we get most of our information; it is home where we have most of our contacts; it is home where we are present most of the time when we are not here in the Senate.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it has always been my purpose to vote with the committees of the Senate unless by so doing I violate a conscientious conviction. The committee proposes to reduce the amount appropriated for the National Youth Administration from \$85,984,000 to \$75,000,000.

In my judgment, no agencies ever created by Congress are entitled to greater commendation, praise, and approval than is the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. The boys and girls whom this particular appropriation will most benefit are those who otherwise might not have a chance. If it is not the purpose of the Congress to try to improve and make the future brighter and better for the less fortunate and underprivileged boys and girls who must ultimately take our places, then we have not very much excuse for having lived at all.

I have gone to the trouble to visit C. C. C. camps and see what they are doing. I recently visited one near Tampa, Fla. I found there approximately 200 boys. That camp, constructed a long time ago, is not one of the best equipped, but I found there food prepared and cooked by enrollees there being trained nearly as good as can be obtained in the Senate Restaurant. I also found there boys who were being trained in various vocations, and doing their work in an excellent manner. Some of the boys there have been trained in a few weeks actually to make bearings and steel bolts and pins which were needed for the machinery

with which to build MacDill air field at Tampa, and which had not been furnished by reason of the strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee. Such materials were being produced by C. C. C. boys in their shop at their steel-turning lathes.

I was very much impressed with one incident, and there were many just like it. Some of the boys who were there were underprivileged. They came from homes of the poor. Some of them thumbed their way several hundred miles. They came not only from Florida but from other States in the South. Some of them gained as much as 15 pounds in weight within 2 months, and were able to be received into the Army and the Navy by reason thereof.

One boy to whom my attention was particularly called had St. Vitus' dance. I do not know how he ever got to the camp, but he finally arrived there, and on four occasions he was turned down. His head could not be steadied on his shoulders, his hand was not steady, and the authorities wondered what they could do with him; but he begged to be allowed to stay, and he stayed. I went to his steel-turning lathe, and I saw that boy turn out some bearings and threaded steel pins that it would require a very highly trained man to do properly. He did it, and I went out of that camp believing that we could not do better than to provide ample appropriations to continue that kind of training and work. You heard in the debate today that over 40,000 boys and girls a month are going out from this training to a useful and happier life which they hardly could have experienced under other circumstances if it had not been for that fact.

I am therefore opposed to a reduction of this appropriation. Let us try to do something for these future citizens of this country who would not otherwise have had a chance. Let us try to make of them men and women who can face the future with some hope.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] a moment ago made a statement to which I wish to advert. He indicated his belief—and I regret to say it is pretty generally shared—that the expenditure of money upon educational purposes is an extravagance—a waste of money.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me remove that thought from the Senator's mind. I said nothing like that; I implied nothing like that; and most certainly I do not think anything like that.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me say to the Senator that I am sorry I so poorly interpreted what he said. At least I understood the Senator to say that he did not think the purpose for which this appropriation is designated was justified, and I judged him to mean by that that we did not get more than a dollar of value for a dollar spent.

Mr. MALONEY. No; I did not say anything like that. If the Senator will further yield, the purposes of the bill are

completely justifiable. I have always supported the appropriations for this agency. I said the need now was not so great as it had been.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I know, but obviously the Senator will have to conclude that he is thinking the expenditure is not justified, or he would favor it. In other words, if he thought the national income would be increased by the money spent, that the country would get back more than it put out, I am sure he would not make the argument of economy against this appropriation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me, then he may interrupt me further, or perhaps I shall be able to make the point.

I therefore sent for Who's Who, and I have, on page 2871, figures showing an analysis of the personalities carried in Who's Who for 1934 and 1935—in number, 29,389—submitting statements of their educational qualifications. There were educated in the common or public schools 7.17 percent, or 2,110. There were educated in academies, seminaries, high schools, and business colleges 6.27 percent of the total number, or 1,842. There were attending college—that is, those who attended colleges but did not graduate—11.83 percent, or 3,476. Those who attended and graduated from college were 74.73 percent, or 21,961.

What I meant to say, Mr. President, was that there is the living proof that money spent on educating boys and girls is a good investment and yields a profitable return; and if we should appropriate in this Congress enough money to give the education appropriate to their mentality and personality to every boy and girl in America it would be an economy and a profitable investment, and not an extravagance.

Mr. President, I regret to say that I very frequently hear in the Senate, when an appropriation is proposed for public health, the statement that "We have not the money." We necessarily mean, when we make a statement of that kind, that human health is not worth buying, that human life is sometimes not worth saving at the price of a few million dollars. Right here in the Senate I have seen amendments turned down upon which the Senate had the advantage of the testimony of the best physicians in the country, including the Chief of the Public Health Service, Dr. Parran—than whom there is no more eminent man in America in the field of public health—that an appropriation of \$3,000,000 would save 20,000 lives a year in the United States. Senators perhaps were not aware of it, but when they turned down amendments of that kind they were making a decision that 20,000 lives were not worth \$3,000,000, else they could not have brought their consciences or their judgments to oppose the appropriations.

A little later we shall have the W. P. A. bill before the Senate, and there will be a cut in that bill on the ground of economy. I believe anybody can show that the national income has had a direct relationship to the amount of money spent upon public employment. Such an expenditure is not an extravagance. It is an investment. It is like seed thrown

into the ground; it comes back at the harvest manyfold. It is a short-sighted view of economy, therefore, when one says that it is extravagant to spend money intelligently for public education in common schools, high schools, colleges, and technical schools, for vocational education to train the minds and hands of boys and girls to create, to construct, to build, to carry on this great economic machine, to save the health and the lives of children, of babies, of mothers, of adults.

The other day a Senator occupying the seat in front of me, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], read to the Senate a statement that disease had interrupted the defense productivity of the country more than had strikes. I am not in favor of strikes, and I voted against strikes; but when a bill comes before us which says, "Let us make America healthy," too often we hear the cry, "We cannot afford that. We have not the money. It will add to the national debt." What is valuable in America but the people of America?

I hope the Senator from Connecticut will excuse me for taking advantage of some remarks I understood him to make to express my sentiments on that subject. I am sure the Senate is interested in the larger economy of America.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I merely wish to correct the Senator's very erroneous impression. He would have the Senate believe that I was opposed to the features of the bill which provide for the continuation of the education of these young men and women. I want completely to clear his mind by saying that I had no such thought, and the committee amendment would not bring about any such result.

I sometimes almost wonder, under the spell of the eloquence from Florida, how the country became powerful and great without the National Youth Administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, in my opinion the Federal program, generally speaking, is loaded up with too many alphabetical activities. However, the N. Y. A. is not one of which I would complain. I have watched the work of that administration closely ever since it was organized, and I think it has been of great help to the youth of our country. It is sound and practical, and should be continued. The work of the N. Y. A. in Kansas is commended by all classes of people. I hope the amendment reducing the appropriation will not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on line 4, page 59.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, after the word "employment", to strike out "and training", so as to make the paragraph read:

(b) To provide employment for unemployed young persons on public projects of the following types.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a feeling that this amendment is allied with the amendment which has just been rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me assure the Senator that such is not the case. There is no connection whatever between the proposal to strike out the words "and training" and the amount of money carried in the bill. This amendment is suggested on the recommendation of the National Education Association and the American Farm Bureau Federation, who sent letters to the subcommittee pointing out that what we did last year is not entirely accomplished unless these words are removed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator, before he explains the position of the committee, because I want him to understand how the matter appears to me, that the Senate has now expressed its opinion that the full amount passed by the House of Representatives for the training of young men in these various projects should be appropriated. It seems logical that if we now strike out the words "and training" we are saying in the second breath that, though we want to appropriate the money, we do not want to train the young men. Is there any basis for that?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. The training provisions are in another part of the bill, and other amounts of money are appropriated. This provision reads:

To provide employment and training for unemployed young persons on public projects.

This means employment. If incident to that employment some training comes about, that is all right, but the training program is provided for elsewhere.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will glance at the bill, I will explain what is in my mind. On page 58, beginning with line 25, we find language reading as follows:

PAR. 1. Part-time youth work and student aid: To enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1942, under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Agency, to engage in the following types of programs for assistance to needy young persons, \$85,984,000, namely.

Now we come to list the types of program for which we have just appropriated \$85,984,000. One of those, under paragraph (b), is:

To provide employment and training for unemployed young persons on public projects of the following type.

Will the elimination of the words "and training" prevent the N. Y. A. from training young enrollees upon this type of project?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The matter was submitted to Mr. Williams himself, and I shall read what he says about it, indicating that it is not a matter of any great importance. He says:

When this matter was being considered by the House Appropriations Subcommittee handling the Labor Security Act the opinion was expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee that our work experience constituted "training" on the job and, therefore, the use of the word was not incon-

sistent with the purposes of the administration. I agreed with the position taken by the chairman, feeling that this was a more realistic attitude toward the objectives of our program.

Mr. Williams would like to stress the training feature rather than the employment on public works. The paragraph just before the one in question provides:

To provide part-time employment for needy young persons in schools, colleges, and universities to enable such persons to continue their education.

That is another function. In the opinion of the American Education Association and the Farm Bureau Federation, when we simply provide for employment we draw the line, so that where there is an educational matter to be undertaken it shall be under the control of the educational authorities.

As I started to say awhile ago, the Senator will remember that last year we had to draw the line very carefully, and required Mr. Williams, when the Youth Administration was undertaking any educational program whatsoever, to have it done subject to the education authorities, so that he would not set up an independent department of his own.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is that all taken care of in other parts of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the judgment of those who represent great educational organizations in the United States, it is desirable to keep the camel's nose out from under the tent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator when the phrase "and training" appeared. Was it in the law last year?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, under those circumstances, I really feel that that phrase should not come out of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is for the judgment of the Senate. We are acting under the advice I have given, and the committee thought it had substantial reason for the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the circumstances, and in view of the action which has already been taken by the Senate, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no connection between the two things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 59, line 8.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for a division.

Mr. RUSSELL. May we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 59, line 8, after the word "employment", it is proposed to strike out the words "and training."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 13, after the word "periodicals",

to strike out "newspapers, and press clippings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 16, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "18" and insert "19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 8, after the word "paragraph", to strike "18 of the National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1941" and insert "19 hereof", and in line 18, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "18" and insert "19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 11, after the word "to", to strike out "22" and insert "23."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital", on page 73, line 20, after the word "books", to strike out the comma and "periodicals, and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board", on page 79, line 6, to strike out "\$2,173,600" and insert "\$2,045,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment just stated. This is an amendment to reduce the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board by \$128,600 below the figure set by the House of Representatives. The House had already reduced the appropriation from the estimates of the Budget Bureau by \$126,560.

As we know, at one time there was considerable criticism of the administration of the National Labor Relations Board—so much so, in fact, that the House of Representatives set up a special committee, known as the Smith committee, to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. That committee conducted a very extensive hearing into the operations of the Board.

The House Committee on Appropriations went into the matter of the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board much more thoroughly than did the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In fact, the hearings before the Senate committee were very meager, indeed.

After going into this matter of the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board thoroughly, the House Committee on Appropriations, with all the background of the House Smith committee before it, made its report, in which it said:

Since the committee had occasion during the past fiscal year to deal with the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board, the Board has undergone a reorganization, and it appears from the evidence given the committee that there is a genuine cooperative spirit now existing in the Board, and that the future holds promise for an effective, fair, and impartial administration of the National Labor Relations Act.

In other words, the House Committee on Appropriations now finds that all goes well with the National Labor Relations Board, and believes it is going to do a good, efficient, and effective job of administering the National Labor Relations Act. The Committee goes further and

states that, although the number of cases before the National Labor Relations Board was falling off in the previous fiscal year, during the past fiscal year there has been an increase of some 40 percent in the number of cases before the Board. The House committee points out that, instead of a majority of the cases being cases dealing with unfair labor practices, they are cases dealing with the question of representation, evidencing, as the House committee says, that both labor and industry, under the guidance and administration of the Board, are now abiding by the mandate of the law respecting unfair labor practices.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I can state the situation very briefly. The action taken by the Committee on Appropriations was based upon the amount of money made available for that purpose this year, with the thought that the item would be taken to conference.

Mr. HILL. Yes, of course; the item would be taken to conference. That means that the House might have to compromise with the Senate. The amount of money wanted might not be obtained. I do not wish it to go to conference. I wish to have the Senate approve the same amount as that fixed by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point is we did allow the exact amount appropriated for this agency for the current fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but, whereas the committee may have allowed the same amount as appropriated for this current year, there has been an increase in the number of cases before the Board by some 40 percent since the current amount was fixed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's line of argument, but I should like to point out, if it is agreeable to him, that the cases involving the determination of collective-bargaining units and the designation of representation of employees are, many of them, occurring in defense industries. It is a well-known fact that the defense industries are not highly organized. As a matter of fact, only about 40 percent of them, at a conservative estimate, have any collective bargaining at all.

It has been contended here that we want to do all we can to avoid strikes, and it is a fact that the National Labor Relations Board, in conducting elections, and in conducting them speedily, is helping to prevent strikes, or is helping to bring them to a conclusion. In connection with the Ford strike, for example, which finally resulted in an election, 200 employees of the Board were required to conduct that election. Instead of hamstringing the Board by reducing its appropriation we ought to give it the money it needs for its administration, so we can speed up the settlement of the problems that occur under it, and thereby help to increase the production of national-defense materials.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution, and state that he has

said what I had in mind to say, but I am sure he said it better and more forcefully than I could have said it. As the Senator so well said, many of the cases the Board is now handling are in national-defense industries. In fact, more than 50 percent of them are in national-defense industries. So many of them are in defense industries that the Civil Service Commission now lists the National Labor Relations Board as a defense agency.

Mr. HAYDEN. Vote!

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the bill and the amendment, calls for a vote. If that means that he is willing to have the amendment rejected, I am willing to stop talking.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee is the servant of the Senate and will bow to the will of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in view of the very fine and splendid attitude of the Senator from Arizona, I hope the Senate will proceed to vote down this committee amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before the Senator yields the floor may I express my approbation of the position taken by him, and likewise the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. President, in view of the greatly increased work necessary to be done by the National Labor Relations Board, by reason of the increasing industrial productivity, I believe that the committee has made a mistake of judgment in reducing the amount allowed by the House, and I therefore join with the Senator who now has the floor in asking that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California. I simply wish to say that if we want to do our part, if we want to make our contribution to industrial peace, and toward preventing the stoppage of work which impedes the national-defense program, the thing for us to do is to join with the House of Representatives, which has gone into this matter thoroughly, which has analyzed it thoroughly and investigated it thoroughly, and give to this Board the amount which the House of Representatives proposes. Let us vote down the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am very reluctant to take up the time of the Senate on this amendment, but, due to the fact that I served on the Smith committee of the House which investigated the National Labor Relations Board for over a year, I should feel very derelict if I did not supplement to some extent the statement of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I did not join with the majority of the Smith committee in the recommendations it made to the House of Representatives. I am still of the opinion that the minority report of the Smith committee is the correct report, and I am satisfied that a few years hence the majority of the people of the United States will agree with me.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the National Labor Relations Board, not-

withstanding all the criticisms which have been directed against it, has made the greatest record in the Supreme Court of the United States of any administrative agency of the Government.

Now, when we come to the item which is in question here, Mr. President, what do we find? We find, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama has pointed out, that it was not even considered during the hearings before the Senate committee. The only thing that was considered before the Senate subcommittee on this particular item of appropriation was whether or not the sum of \$128,420 should be added to the amount appropriated by the House. But instead of acting at all on that item, we find the Senate committee recommending a reduction of \$126,000, as I recall the amount, under the amount appropriated by the House. Not only did the Bureau of the Budget recommend the amount which the House passed, but after a series of conferences between the National Labor Relations Board and the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget recommended an additional amount of \$128,420 to enable the Board to carry out its reorganization and classification according to the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

Even granting, for the sake of argument, that the majority of the Smith committee was correct in its recommendations to the House, if we follow those recommendations how can we consistently refuse to allow the National Labor Relations Board to go ahead with its reorganization and classification to conform to the recommendations of the majority of the Smith committee? That is all that was attempted. As I understand, all the Board is asking Congress to allow it to do is to carry out what the majority of the Smith committee recommended in the way of reorganization and classification of employees.

Last week we were considering the effect of strikes on the national-defense program. A bill was passed providing for the seizure and operation of plants by the Government. It is my opinion that if Congress had spent more time on the machinery of mediation and conciliation, and on the machinery set up under the National Labor Relations Board to make a proper approach to the labor question, we could have done a far more constructive job than we did by the passage of the bill which was passed last week.

As stated by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the National Labor Relations Board is a defense agency. Its work has already increased by 40 percent over that of the past fiscal year. As shown in the House report, it is asking for 22 additional employees to perform the work which has piled up on it as a result of the national-defense program. The House voted, without any question, to grant the increase, and complimented the Board on the work it was doing. Without taking one scintilla of evidence on that question the Senate committee struck out the increase.

Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Alabama in requesting the Senate to reinstate the appropriation as it came from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 79, line 6.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 12, after the word "reference" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board", on page 79, line 25, after the word "for", to strike out "newspapers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Railroad Adjustment Board", on page 80, line 25, after the word "equipment", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$207,780"; on page 81, line 1, after the word "which", to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$50,000", and in line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "\$110,000" and insert "\$111,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—Railroad Retirement Board", on page 82, line 10, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers, press clippings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—General Provisions", on page 84, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 702. None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary of any person appointed to a non-civil-service position, under the appropriations in the respective titles in this act, if the effect of such appointment is to increase the number of non-civil-service employees from the State of residence of any such non-civil-service appointee beyond the number of non-civil-service employees to which such State is entitled, under the appropriations in the respective titles of this act, on a basis of population: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any position, the appointment of which is made by the President: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to positions in the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Conciliation Service, the Public Health Service outside the District of Columbia, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, or Railroad Retirement Board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 9, to change the section number from "703" to "702."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 14, to change the section number from "704" to "703."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 1, to change the section number from "705" to "704."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 20, to change the section number from "706" to "705."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments reported by the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 5, after the figure "3" it is proposed to strike out "4, and 5" and insert in lieu thereof "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer a further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That such portion of this appropriation as may be necessary shall be available to the Social Security Board for all necessary expenses incurred by the Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, in connection with the operation of employment-office facilities and services essential to expediting the national-defense program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment is recommended by the Office of Production Management, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Secretary of Labor, and is approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer a further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

The paragraphs herein under the National Youth Administration may be cited as the National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that concludes the amendments offered on behalf of the committee.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I offer a number of amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 11, after the word "defense", it is proposed to strike out "workers" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

workers and for the preservice education and training of persons liable for training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, with a view to qualifying them for specialists' rat-

ings upon induction into the land or naval forces.

On page 29, line 5, after the word "defense", it is proposed to strike out "and."

On page 29, line 7, after the word "registers", it is proposed to insert:

and preservice courses for persons certified by local draft boards to be liable for training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, designed to qualify such persons for specialists' ratings upon induction into the land or naval forces.

On page 31, line 24, after the word "defense", it is proposed to strike out "workers" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

workers and persons liable for training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

On page 33, line 14, before the period, it is proposed to insert:

and upon the existing and anticipated need of the land and naval forces for persons qualified to hold specialists' ratings.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have examined the text of these amendments. They are recommended by the educational authorities. They do not add to the sums in the bill. They merely provide a different way of accomplishing the desired result. On behalf of the committee, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendments and take them to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Bilbo] are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the Work Projects Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment is similar to the provision included in the relief bill, and I see no objection to taking it to conference.

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

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 21, after the word "binding," it is proposed to strike out "\$176,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$276,500."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the President's Budget message to Congress of May 13, 1941, included an item of \$353,000 to intensify and implement the existing voluntary safety promotion program operating under the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in Defense Industries.

This amount was cut in half by the House Appropriations Committee to

\$176,500. The Bureau of the Budget, in collaboration with the Division of Labor Standards, had already reduced to the absolute minimum the amount needed to effectively bolster the Nation-wide voluntary safety program. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate has been asked to reinstate the balance.

The accident rate in defense industries is increasing alarmingly. In 1940 work injuries caused a loss of over 25,000,000 man-days. This was an increase of 10 percent over 1939, concurrent with a rise of only 6 percent in employment.

In 1940, 17,000 industrial workers were killed on job accidents, 93,000 received permanent crippling injuries, and 1,250,000 received injuries which caused loss of time from their jobs for an average of 20 days each.

There are today labor shortages in over 100 essential defense occupations. In 16 defense occupations there is not a single person registered in any employment office in the United States. Almost frantic effort is being made to replenish our supply of trained industrial workers through intensive training programs. The Federal Government has already made available approximately \$180,000,000 for the training of workers, but up to this time there has been no appropriation for saving the lives and limbs of workers already trained. It is not believed that any amount less than \$350,000 will be adequate to obtain the necessary results.

The National Safety Council has just announced that the accident rate in defense industries is up another 7 percent for the first 5 months of 1941. If this present rate of accidents continues, by the end of 1941 a half million of the total of 6,859,000 defense workers will be either permanently or temporarily disabled. Unless funds and personnel can be immediately available for stimulating safety programs in defense industries, this production leakage will seriously affect the delivery of defense material.

Every effort will be made to continue the volunteer program of the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in Defense Industries, and the approximately 325 special agents serving at \$1 a year in the capacity of accident-prevention experts will be urged to continue contacting industries having defense contracts and stimulating safety programs to cut down accident casualties among industrial workers. Already, however, the demands of conducting the safety programs in their own plants have greatly curtailed the amount of time which these volunteers can donate, and in some of the heavy industrial districts it has been impossible to secure enough unpaid safety specialists to handle the work effectively.

Approximately 40 safety engineers are needed immediately to place in the field to devote full time to contacting plants, and a Washington staff of 6 safety experts and hygiene engineers are needed to service both the full-time and the voluntary organization. Travel expense, printing of bulletins for distribution to the management and workers of defense industries, and stenographic help are essential. It will not be possible to do

an effective job unless twice the amount appropriated by the House—the \$353,000 originally asked for—is made available.

It should be pointed out that the \$353,000 asked for only means an expenditure of approximately 7 cents per defense worker for a program which will bring about safer and more healthful working conditions and information on accident causes and the development of safe work practices.

It has been estimated that the contribution being made by some of the larger plants of the country in loaning their safety specialists for part-time work with defense contractors represents a donation of approximately \$500,000. It is to effectively utilize this contribution in time, knowledge, and energy that Congress is being asked for funds to mechanize the program.

There are tried and tested techniques for the prevention of industrial accidents and disease. What is needed at this time is not new information and research on industrial health and safety but a wider application of existing knowledge in those defense plants which are rapidly expanding, and which have not previously instituted accident-control programs. The \$353,000 asked for is the least amount necessary to do this job effectively and well.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether or not the amount which he suggests is within the Budget estimate?

Mr. MEAD. It is less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. If so, I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. MEAD. I am satisfied with that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 79, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,173,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,302,020."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, when I previously had the floor I mentioned this item. The proposed increase would amount to \$128,420. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and was approved by the Budget Bureau only after long conferences between the Civil Service Commission and the National Labor Relations Board for the purpose of carrying out a classification and reorganization of the personnel of the Board.

I know what the attitude of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations has been toward the National Labor Relations Board.

I know that last year they struck out, as I recall, the entire item which financed the Economics Division of the National Labor Relations Board. If any Senator will take the time to read the hearings before the House committee and then read the statement of Dr. Leiserson, a

member of the Board, who appeared before the Senate committee, he cannot help come to the conclusion that the information before the House committee and also before the Senate committee was misconstrued. As I understand, the House committee felt the item was justified but that it should be asked for in the form of a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, Mr. President; if the Senator will yield, this is the statement in the House report:

The balance of the increase sought was designed to apply to positions which have been reclassified by the Civil Service Commission, acting in an advisory capacity only. Since there is no legal obligation upon the Government by the terms of the President's Executive order, and when such reclassification has been approved officially by the Civil Service Commission, then it will be proper to present to the deficiency committee a request for the amount of funds required to make the reclassification effective.

Mr. MURDOCK. In answer to the Senator, let me state that, due to that statement in the report of the House committee, Dr. Leiserson appeared before the Senate committee for the very purpose of correcting the House report. He pointed out that the Civil Service Commission had approved the reorganization and classification of the employees, and that if the reorganization and classification were correct, the Board was entitled to the additional amount. The Bureau of the Budget approved it and sent up a supplemental estimate.

The present Chairman of the Board was drafted to come in and take over the administration of the National Labor Relations Act. We asked that great American to come in and do the kind of job we wanted done. Then, following the recommendations of the Smith committee of the House, reorganization of the personnel was had and classification was made by the Civil Service Commission. Under all those circumstances, is it not incumbent upon us, if we are acting in good faith, to go along on this item which makes possible that reorganization? What harm can be done by the inclusion in the bill of this item, if following its adoption by the Senate the bill is taken to conference, and then the recommendation of Dr. Leiserson is carefully gone over? If the conferees of the two Houses then find that the item is not needed, that it is not a proper appropriation, it can be stricken out.

But I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona to agree that at least we may have this item taken to conference, and then, if it is not justified, strike it out there, rather than not to have it before the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a summary of N. Y. A. operations.

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

SUMMARY OF N. Y. A. OPERATIONS

During the fiscal year 1941 the National Youth Administration received a regular appropriation of \$102,000,000 and in addition two supplementary appropriations totalling \$55,000,000 for the operation of its out-of-school work program and student work program. With these funds the National Youth Administration has developed a defense-training program having in it 5,500 shops with a total of over 90,000 work stations. These shops are located in all parts of the country.

In the proposed N. Y. A. appropriations for the fiscal year 1942 the funds have been divided into two parts, one for defense and one for the regular program. However, the defense program will account for only about 30,000 of the work stations in the N. Y. A. shops. The balance of the stations will come under the regular program. Accordingly, any reduction in the appropriation for the regular program will have the effect of cutting down the shop program.

During April of this year, there were approximately 405,000 youth employed on out-of-school work program projects, of whom 157,000 were employed on shop projects. In New York State, including New York City, shop employment accounted for over 14,000 of the total employment of 33,559. Of particular significance in connection with the operation of defense industries is the rather large numbers of youth who are receiving training in machine-shop, sheet-metal, welding, foundry, radio and electrical work, and in woodworking and other shop fields.

The placement record of the out-of-school work program of the National Youth Administration provides evidence as to the success with which the program has provided youth with work experience qualifying for employment in private industry. During the 11 months of the fiscal year through May approximately 278,000 youth from the out-of-school work program have obtained employment in private industry. Of this total, over 27,000 were residents of New York State. These youth have obtained jobs in a variety of defense industries, such as metal working plants, machinery- and equipment-production plants, chemical and explosives plants, as well as many other plants which have had defense orders.

The National Youth Administration shops and other work projects have the capacity for employing many more youth than their budget will allow. At the end of May of this year there were over 377,000 youth who were certified as eligible for employment on the out-of-school work program but for whom jobs were not available because of insufficient funds. This total is approximately the same as the number of youth employed during May and probably represents only a small fraction of the youth who are eligible for N. Y. A. employment. The N. Y. A. budget as originally submitted to Congress for 1942 provided for a total of \$101,821,000 for the regular programs under the National Youth Administration and \$60,000,000 for the youth work-defense program. This budget would have provided for an average employment of 322,000 youth on the out-of-school work program including the work-defense program and an employment of 446,000 youth on the student-work program. However, \$10,000,000 of this total was transferred in the House from the National Youth Administration to the appropriations for the Office of Education. The purpose of this transfer was to pay local schools for providing related classroom instruction to youth employed on the out-of-school work program.

The further reduction of \$10,984 proposed by the Senate Appropriations Committee will result in a reduction of 37,000 youth from the out-of-school work-program average. Fol-

lowing is a summary of the employment which would be possible under the original budget and also under the budget reduced by \$21,984,000.

	Estimated employment for 1942		
	Original budget	Reduced budget	Reduction
Total.....	768,000	633,000	135,000
Out-of-school, total.....	322,000	267,000	55,000
Regular.....	230,000	175,000	55,000
Youth work, defense.....	92,000	92,000	—
Student work.....	446,000	366,000	80,000

SUMMARY OF CURRENT OPERATIONS—NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM IN STATE OF NEW YORK

I. EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
All programs, total.....	31,618	14,465	17,153
Out-of-school work program, total.....	14,777	6,439	8,338
Student work program, total.....	16,941	8,026	8,815
School work program.....	12,475	5,272	7,203
College and graduate work program.....	4,366	2,754	1,612

II. FUNDS EXPENDED, 1936 THROUGH APR. 30, 1941

Fiscal year	Amount		
	Total	Student work program	Out-of-school work program
1936.....	\$1,432,971	\$922,385	\$510,586
1937.....	3,235,281	1,000,560	2,234,721
1938.....	2,586,207	712,700	1,873,447
1939.....	3,640,586	882,698	2,757,897
1940.....	3,908,774	1,060,229	2,878,545
1941 (encumbrances through Apr. 30, 1941).....	4,779,880	761,273	4,018,607
Total, all years.....	19,643,768	5,369,905	14,273,863

Out-of-school work program

III-A. EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF PROJECT, APRIL 1941

Type of project	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
Total.....	14,777	6,439	8,338
Resident projects.....	979	811	168
Workshop production.....	6,130	3,349	2,781
Construction, total.....	1,542	1,505	37
Roads, streets, and bridges.....	178	176	2
Improvement of grounds.....	79	79	—
Building construction, repair.....	507	494	13
Recreational facilities other than buildings.....	554	537	17
Conservation, irrigation, and flood control.....	100	185	5
Water and sanitation.....	34	34	—
Professional-clerical, total.....	6,126	774	5,352
Clerical assistance.....	3,024	386	2,638
Public health and hospital assistance.....	1,285	71	1,214
Library service.....	324	51	273
Arts and crafts.....	161	59	102
Recreational assistance.....	436	184	252
Nursery school assistance.....	224	7	217
School lunch and food preparation.....	672	16	656

III-B. EMPLOYMENT ON WORKSHOP PRODUCTION PROJECTS BY TYPES OF PRODUCTION, APRIL 1941

Type of production	Number of youth employed			
	Total	Male	Female	Number of units
Total.....	6,795	3,907	2,888	305
Sheet metal.....	419	407	12	12
Welding.....	114	114	—	7
Foundry.....	23	23	—	2
Auto maintenance and repair.....	247	244	3	37
Aviation service.....	132	132	—	3
Farm implements and equipment.....	35	35	—	3
Machine shop.....	219	209	10	16
Electrical.....	114	100	14	10
Radio.....	109	106	3	4
Potteryware.....	58	12	46	1
Woodworking.....	2,149	1,810	339	58
Drafting, map-making, blueprinting.....	32	21	11	9
Sewing.....	2,241	30	2,211	55
Other production.....	903	664	239	88

III-C. EMPLOYMENT IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS, APRIL 1941

Type of military establishment	Number of youth employed	Number of establishments
Total.....	322	33
Navy.....	3	1
Army.....	292	22
Selective Service Boards.....	27	10

III-D. TERMINATIONS FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT, JULY 1940 THROUGH APRIL 1941

	1940	Number of youth
July.....	875	875
August.....	605	605
September.....	693	693
October.....	512	512
November.....	636	636
December.....	514	514
1941		
January.....	859	859
February.....	1,140	1,140
March.....	1,900	1,900
April.....	2,291	2,291
Total.....	10,925	10,925

III-E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941

	Number of youth
Private employment, total.....	4,413
Manufacturing industries, total.....	1,826
Food and kindred products, and tobacco.....	42
Textile and textile products.....	334
Lumber, furniture, and finished lumber products.....	69
Paper and allied products.....	71
Printing, publishing, and allied industries.....	55
Rayon and allied products.....	1
Chemical products (excluding rayon and allied products).....	56
Rubber products.....	16
Leather and leather products.....	162
Stone, clay, and glass products.....	41
Iron and steel and their products (excluding machinery).....	236
Nonferrous metals and their products (excluding machinery).....	31
Electrical machinery and equipment.....	147
Agricultural machinery and equipment.....	6
Metal-working machinery and equipment.....	19
Other machinery and equipment.....	80
Aircraft and parts.....	102
Automobiles and automobile equipment.....	84
Ship and boat building and repairing.....	3
Railroad and other transportation equipment.....	37
Other manufacturing industries.....	234
Nonmanufacturing industries, total.....	1,646
Agriculture, forestry, (excluding logging), and fishing.....	64
Construction.....	97
Air transportation and service.....	1
Railroads (interstate).....	40
Other transportation and services.....	46
Telephone, telegraph, and related services.....	28

III-E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941—continued

	Number of youth
Nonmanufacturing industries—Continued.....	
Electric, gas, and other local public utilities.....	7
Wholesale and retail trade.....	553
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	61
Service industries (excluding domestic service).....	561
Domestic service.....	129
Other nonmanufacturing industries.....	68
Unknown industry.....	641

III-F. CERTIFIED YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT, APRIL 1941

Total.....	3,247
Male.....	1,640
Female.....	2,207

III-G. VOCATIONAL BUILDINGS AND FARM SHOP CONSTRUCTION, JULY 1940 THROUGH FEB. 28, 1941

Type of work	Total	Completed	In progress
Total.....	13	5	8
New.....	12	4	8
Repair.....	1	1	—

IV. STUDENT WORK PROGRAM, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth			Number of institutions	Average earnings
	Total	Male	Female		
Total.....	16,941	8,026	8,815	1,868	\$7.13
School.....	12,475	5,272	7,203	816	4.85
College.....	4,271	2,686	1,585	51	13.52
Graduate.....	95	68	27	10	19.38

¹ This total represents the number of institutions reported on line 2 plus the unduplicated number of colleges and universities for which entries appear on lines 3 and 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4926) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees upon the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKEL-LAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

REGULATION OF WATER-BORNE COMMERCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:
In the administration of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws it has been found that the free movement of water-borne commerce is being hampered because of the restrictive provisions of some of these laws. They are in general

designed to promote safety at sea and to regulate water-borne commerce. Their structure is such that they are and should be strictly enforced during normal times. During this emergency, however, the priority of national security and national defense must be recognized.

It is impossible to foretell what emergency may arise from day to day and to what extent the navigation or vessel-inspection laws may have to be waived to meet the situation. I am convinced, after consultation with the heads of interested departments and agencies of the Government, that it is vital to the national defense that a statutory authority should be provided to waive compliance with any of those laws if the need should arise. This authority should be sufficiently broad in its scope to allow the waiver to be made promptly to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as may be deemed necessary for the national defense. The Secretary of Commerce now administers these laws, and I believe that he should be vested with this further authority to waive compliance with them upon direction of the President, or upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Maritime Commission, or the Office for Emergency Management.

I attach as of possible assistance to the Congress a draft of a bill to accomplish this purpose.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 17, 1941.

MR. AND MRS. T. EARL RODGERS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 68)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 829, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers.

The bill would provide for the payment of \$2,500 to Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers, of Huntington, W. Va., as compensation for the death of their daughter, Allura Jean Rodgers, as a result of her being struck by a United States mail truck.

It appears that Allura Jean Rodgers, a little girl of 8 years of age, sent on an errand by her mother, started diagonally across the street from behind a parked car; that the mail truck was coming from the other direction at a moderate rate of speed; that the driver of the truck made every effort to avoid an accident, to the extent of driving over the curb and crashing into a tree; but that she was, nevertheless, hit by the truck and died as a result of the accident.

An investigation of the accident by the postmaster at Huntington and by a post-office inspector exonerated the driver of the truck from any blame and upon the driver's arrest, the grand jury declined to return any indictment.

It is apparent, therefore, that there was no negligence on the part of the driver of the Government vehicle, and no basis for a recovery even if the Government were to waive its immunity to suit in tort. It was an unfortunate accident for which the Government was neither legally nor morally responsible and cannot justly be expected to make compensation.

Under these circumstances, I find it necessary, in spite of my sympathy for the bereaved parents of the little girl, to withhold my approval of this enactment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 19, 1941.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 178) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANHAM, Mr. BELL, and Mr. HOLMES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 43 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and to further amend the amended joint resolution approved May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 187), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 188. An act for the relief of Major R. Lee;

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Roche, Connell & Laub Construction Co.;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.;

H. R. 859. An act for the relief of Arthur Gose;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of James A. Mills;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman;

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie;

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 2739. An act for the relief of Jack Y. Upham;

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Roy Gard;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of John Klasek;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3847. An act to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds;

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; and

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

This joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and to further amend the amended joint resolution approved May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 187), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and for other purposes, was

read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1942.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, which is the emergency relief bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193), making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the joint resolution which is now the unfinished business makes appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The joint resolution contains the same amount appropriated by the House of Representatives; there is no change in the relief appropriations from those made by the House, though there are some differences in the way in which the money may be used. There has been recommended by the Senate committee a \$50,000,000 item for the Surplus Marketing Administration.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency", subhead "Work Projects Administration", on page 5, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$40,000,000", and insert "\$50,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$35,466,000" and insert "\$38,900,000"; in line 19, after the word "salaries" to strike out "\$29,016,000" and insert "\$32,240,000"; in line 20, after the word "service", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$600,000"; and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$2,800,000" and insert "\$2,910,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 8, after the word "Works", to strike out "Administrator" and insert "Administrator."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 11, line 3, after the word "Commissioner", to insert "with the approval of the Federal Works Administrator"; in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike

out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$8,500,000"; and in line 12, after the word "operation", to insert:

Provided, That \$3,500,000 of such amount shall be allocated to the Department of Agriculture for the continuation during the calendar year 1941 of existing projects now under the jurisdiction of such Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$540,000" and insert "\$576,000"; and on page 12, line 3, after the word "projects", to strike out "within the jurisdiction of such agencies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 15, after line 12, to strike out:

Sec. 10. (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be determined, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs and shall, where the relative needs are found to be the same, be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection) and unmarried widows of such veterans and the wives of such veterans as are unemployable who are in need and are American citizens; and (2) other American citizens, Indians and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need: *Provided*, That if the monthly income of any such employable veteran from all sources is less than the monthly earnings such veteran would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran shall be certified as in need of Work Projects Administration employment but shall not be permitted to earn in any month an amount in excess of the difference between the amount of his other monthly income and the Work Projects Administration monthly earnings as a project worker.

And insert:

Sec. 10 (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be given to veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection), and unmarried widows of any such veterans, and the wives of any such veterans who are unemployable, who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify: *Provided*, That if the total monthly income from all sources of any such veteran or of the unmarried widow of any such veteran, or if the total combined monthly income from all sources of any such unemployable veteran and his wife, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, is less than the monthly earnings the veteran, unmarried widow, or wife would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran, unmarried widow, or wife, as the case may be, shall be certified as in need of such employment, and when assigned to such employment he or she shall be employed for

such period as will permit the total monthly income of such veteran or unmarried widow, or the total combined monthly income of such unemployable veteran and his wife, to be at least equal to the amount which would be obtainable by full-time employment on any such project. Thereafter preference in such employment shall be given on the basis of relative needs, as far as practicable, to other American citizens, Indians and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need.

(b) Employable persons who have been certified as in need of employment for a period of 3 months or more, and who have not in that period been given employment on work projects, shall have preference in employment over persons who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10 (a), page 18, line 13, after the word "section", to insert "10 (a) or in section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 16 (a), page 23, line 13, after the word "laws", to insert "; except that this limitation shall not apply in the case of any person who is employed by another agency of the Government on the date of enactment of this joint resolution and who is thereafter assigned or detailed to the Work Projects Administration."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, since the committee adopted that amendment and recommended it to the Senate, I find there was a misapprehension of the facts. The text assumes that a person paid out of W. P. A. funds is assigned to the Work Projects Administration. As a matter of fact, the reference is to the regular employees of the departments and money enough to pay them is transferred, for example, from the W. P. A. over to the Department of Agriculture or to the Department of the Treasury for accountants, and so on. So the amendment as reported will not do what the committee intended.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Arizona that if we strike out the words "assigned or detailed to the" and replace them with the words "employed on work of the", I think it would meet the situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that would do it. We can take it to conference, in any event.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask that that amendment be made; that is, in the committee amendment, in line 16, strike out the words "assigned or detailed to the" and insert in lieu thereof the words "employed on work of the."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 22, page 26, line 21, after the word "affiliations", to strike out "except as provided in section 10 (f) and section 12 (b)" and insert "except as may be authorized or required by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 24, page 28, line 8, to strike out "Except as may be required by the provisions of section 10 (f), section 12 (b), and section 25 hereof," and insert "Except as may be authorized or required by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 22, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 33. No part of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be expended for undertaking or prosecuting, in whole or in part, any non-Federal project if all or a substantial part of the funds contributed by the sponsor of such project for the purpose of financing its share of the cost thereof have been or are to be paid to such sponsor, or are to be reimbursed to such sponsor, by or on behalf of any person who owns or was the former owner of any part of the real property included within such project, or of any real property adjacent thereto, or who, in the opinion of the Commissioner, would receive a direct and substantial financial benefit as a result of the prosecution of such project: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the prosecution of any non-Federal project if the contribution made by the sponsor of such project toward its share of the cost thereof is to be financed primarily by means of assessments against the owners of real property adjacent to such project or by any other bona fide method customarily used by municipalities and improvement districts to aid in financing local improvement projects.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 17, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 34. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1942, the sum of \$50,000,000, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended, such sum to be in addition to any funds appropriated by such section 32 and to be subject to all the provisions of law relating to the expenditure of such funds.

Mr. BILBO and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has the floor. Is the Senator from Oklahoma opposing the amendment just stated?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I desire the floor after the amendment is disposed of.

Mr. ADAMS. I understand the Senator from Mississippi desires to speak on the amendment.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in support of the wise action of the Appropriations Committee in reporting this amendment I desire to make a few remarks as to the advisability of spending \$50,000,000 for the purposes set forth.

As I offered the amendment it provided an appropriation of \$100,000,000. The committee was fair enough to meet me half way and to provide \$50,000,000. In the course of my remarks I shall refer to statements by the Secretary of Agriculture, the head of the Surplus Marketing Administration, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics advocating this proposal. I think the country

ought to have the opportunity of reading the argument and reasons set forth by these leaders in the agricultural life of our Nation.

The amendment would make an additional \$50,000,000 available to the Surplus Marketing Administration to extend its excellent work. The Surplus Marketing Administration helps farmers dispose of their surplus crops by making those crops available through its various programs to needy families throughout the country. These programs—the food-stamp plan, the cotton-stamp plan, the school-lunch program, the direct distribution of surplus commodities to needy families, the program of research to develop new uses for surplus products, the low-cost-milk programs—have made and are making important contribution to American agriculture and to the health defenses of the Nation. Only \$197,000,000 has been made available in the regular agricultural appropriation bill for all these surplus-removal programs. That sum is \$38,000,000 less than is available this year and is far from adequate for the expansion which I believe these programs merit. After careful study the Department of Agriculture originally asked the Budget Bureau for \$310,000,000 to carry on this work.

The food-stamp plan is a resourceful and sensible way to move surplus foods from the farms and bulging warehouses through the normal trade channels to the men, women, and children who need them most. Operating now in about 400 areas throughout the Nation in which there are about 7,500,000 in relief families, the plan has been requested by officials in 1,300 other areas. It has been outstandingly successful in operation and has received the enthusiastic support of farmer, business, labor, and consumer groups all over the country. I think the food-stamp plan should be expanded to all of the United States and the increased appropriation which is under consideration would permit that, I believe, if the expansion were staggered over the first 6 or 8 months of the new fiscal year.

This plan helps farmers by broadening their market. It helps business and labor by moving foodstuffs through the normal channels of trade. It improves the health of millions of our people by making it possible for them to buy with stamps more of the protective foods they need for health.

The Nation is suddenly becoming nutrition conscious. The shockingly high percentage of draft rejections for medical reasons is partly responsible for this. When approximately 40 percent of our young men called for military service are rejected by the Army as physically unfit it should be obvious to all of us that we have been neglecting our duties on the home health front. Underfed people on our farms and in our cities are not ready for the tremendous tasks which lie immediately ahead.

Millions of men, women, and children in this country do not get enough to eat. Some 45,000,000 persons here live below the danger line of adequate nutrition. The Surplus Marketing Ad-

ministration programs are giving only about a half of the 16,000,000 needy people in relief families a chance to eat part of the farmers' surplus. Its excellent school-lunch program is now giving over 4,000,000 undernourished children an opportunity to eat some of the fine, nutritious foods our farmers grow in such abundance. But that is less than half of the undernourished children in the country who are eligible for this assistance. The school-lunch program should be expanded.

Our low-income groups in cities and on farms need more food and our farmers need more income. On the basis of Federal studies, we now know that the Nation's food bill would have been increased by \$2,000,000,000 a year if food purchases of all the families making less than \$100 a month before defense spending began equaled those of families which did make \$100 a month. An area about as large as the State of Iowa would have been required to produce that extra amount of food needed to satisfy such an increased demand. Furthermore, the production of crops that will do the job best in overcoming malnutrition—the dairy production, fruits, and vegetables—will result in less loss of soil fertility than in the case of a number of crops which we have been producing for an export market that is now sharply curtailed by a world situation beyond our control.

The large future market for our farmers is among the low-income groups in our own Nation. They make up nearly two-thirds of the population. During the present year the food stamp plan is moving millions of pounds of surplus fruits, vegetables, dairy and poultry products to adults and children who badly need them. The children of today who are learning to eat these protective foods so vital to health, will be future customers for them.

A critical situation faces us. If the Surplus Marketing Administration has only \$197,000,000 available to it for the coming fiscal year, it will be obliged to immediately discharge about 17 percent of its present employees. This organization is run as economically as any in the Federal Government. Its total administrative expenses are limited by law to 3 percent of the funds available to it. Unless its appropriation is increased above \$197,000,000 by this amendment, the discharge of competent people in its field organization will materially hamper the important services it has been rendering our farmers. This would be a tragedy for American agriculture, particularly for the producers of our nonbasic crops.

I want to read from a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard on American Farm Bureau Federation suggestions which he made to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on February 25, 1941. He said in part:

The functions necessary to get food from the farmer to the consumer are about identical whether the foods pass through normal trade channels or whether government undertakes to do this work itself. In either event, food must be bought from the farmer, packed, processed, shipped, unloaded, stored, and dis-

tributed to individual families. Unless the Government intends to operate food stores on a basis similar in efficiency to the way it now runs post offices—establishing modern markets with refrigeration facilities to prevent spoilage, etc.—it is the opinion of the Department that this work can be done more economically through the existing private distribution system.

The mechanism of the food-stamp program provides protection to farm income by using two stamps, an orange-colored stamp and a blue-colored stamp. The orange-colored stamps are bought by needy families in amounts equal to their normal food purchases; the blue-colored stamps represent the assistance by the Federal Government. Through the orange-colored stamp purchases, assurance is given that all of the Federal aid will benefit agriculture since the orange-stamp purchase makes certain that regular expenditures will be continued and that the blue-stamp funds will represent additional demand for those surplus products in the worst price position from a farmer's point of view. Where surplus foods are given away directly to individual families there is no assurance that any net increase in consumption takes place, and the farmer therefore has no guaranty of a broader home market. Under the stamp plan he does have such a guaranty. The use of two colored stamps assures a net increase in the amount of surplus foods bought and eaten. This is the reason that so many farm groups have given the food-stamp plan such whole-hearted support. In addition to countless resolutions of approval by State and local farm organizations, the National Grange, the Farmers Union, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives have passed commendatory resolutions regarding the food-stamp plan. The stamp program is the only device yet worked out which makes certain that all of the Federal subsidy goes directly toward enlarging the domestic market for farm products.

In addition to the surplus commodities moved through the medium of the surplus-food stamps, substantial additional quantities of those commodities are marketed to consumers other than the relief families who have the stamps. This increased movement of surplus commodities comes as a direct result of the aggressive merchandising methods, displays, and advertising of retail grocers who, in competing for the blue-stamp business, concentrate their sales efforts on surplus commodities.

The farmer does not sell to a marketing system. He sells through it to 130,000,000 people in this country, and the buying power of those people is one of the most important measures of the farmers' prosperity. Blue stamps put increased food-purchasing power in the hands of millions who previously had too little to eat. The level of farm prices is lifted by this greater demand and a new and permanent market for agricultural products is created. In distributing what the farmer produces through normal channels of trade rather than through Government-financed food depots the farmers get still another value. The advantage of sales drives on surplus products is well established. Such drives tied in with the food-stamp plan, and the resultant cooperation between Government, farmers, and business will mean the movement of far greater additional quantities of surplus foods to all consumers.

The Department has no intention, however, of abandoning the direct purchase and distribution programs. The most effective method of assisting producers of some surplus products is through direct purchase. For commodities so purchased the school-lunch program provides an excellent distribution outlet and this program is, therefore, being expanded.

The food-stamp program will be in operation by the end of this fiscal year in areas which will probably require an annual expenditure of about \$125,000,000. Based on experience during 1940, the proportion of the funds spent for each commodity or commodity group, and the dollar value of foodstuffs moving into consumption through blue-stamp expenditure alone is estimated as follows:

Commodity group	Percent of total expenditure	Dollar expenditures
Butter.....	14.9	\$18,600,000
Eggs.....	14.0	17,500,000
Cereals.....	17.3	21,600,000
Vegetables, including potatoes.....	9.7	12,100,000
Fresh deciduous fruits.....	4.1	5,200,000
Dried fruits.....	2.6	3,300,000
Oranges and grapefruit.....	6.3	7,800,000
Pork.....	25.3	31,700,000
Lard.....	5.8	7,200,000
Total.....	100.0	125,000,000

Nearly every farm in America produces one or more of the above products. All agriculture is benefited by their increased consumption.

The food-stamp plan is an assurance to the American farmer that an actual increase in consumption is taking place. In administering the Federal farm program, it is one of the methods used to bring about an improvement in farm income.

Since this statement was made, butter has been removed from the surplus list in order to get more dairy products to Britain. That simply means that for next year more of the new blue-stamp purchasing power will go to producers of other surplus crops who are in greater need of aid through this program.

Obviously, the Department of Agriculture has set up the stamp plan so as to benefit our farmers. I want now to read from an October 1940 report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They made an elaborate and objective study of the food-stamp plan as it affected farm income. This was before the defense program got under way and the relief rolls began declining. At that time they said in summarizing their findings:

The study here reported shows that farmers, low-income consumers, and food dealers would all benefit substantially from an expansion of the food-stamp plan. If the plan were made available to all relief and Work Projects Administration families in the United States, the cost to the Federal Treasury would be about \$400,000,000 a year. A plan of this size would be very effective in moving surplus foods into consumption and in improving the diets of low-income families. The authors believe that a \$400,000,000 annual subsidy for a national food-stamp plan could increase the income of farmers by at least the amount of the subsidy and possibly somewhat more.

Because of the rise in employment, a national food-stamp plan for persons getting public aid could be run today for about \$250,000,000 instead of \$400,000,000. By a year from now the cost probably would be a little under \$200,000,000. Families who have recently stopped buying their food with stamps and have gotten jobs are, of course, better customers for the farmer than they were before, since they can now afford to buy more of what he produces.

Help for the producers of our nonbasic crops is equally as important as help for the producers of our five basic commodities. Because of the perishable nature of their commodities, the producers of our nonbasic crops look largely to the Surplus Marketing Administration for Federal assistance. In this connection, I want to read from the testimony of Milo Perkins, Administrator, Surplus Marketing Administration, given on May 29, 1941, before the House Banking and Currency Committee. He said:

An entirely different approach is required to raise farm income for perishable crops than that which will work for nonperishable crops. Some crops, like cotton, can be stored indefinitely, whereas others, particularly the nonbasic crops, cannot. In the case of perishable and semiperishable foods, it is essential to move them into consumption, since they cannot be stored indefinitely. Price-pegging loans which will support farm income for the five basic crops, therefore, cannot have the same economic effect for most of the nonbasic crops. Agricultural products such as fresh fruits and vegetables must be used; they cannot be locked in storage without spoilage.

In other words, higher farm income can be achieved by a higher loan rate on commodities which can be stored for relatively long periods of time, but to get the same effect on perishable and semiperishable crops, greater purchase funds must be available to move these crops into consumption, just as greater loan funds are required to maintain farm income on crops that can be stored for longer periods. It takes money to achieve either result.

Obviously, prices on the five basic commodities could not be maintained at 85 percent of parity for the entire production without having enough money available to lend on the full portion of the crop offered for the loan. Similarly, parity prices or even 85-percent parity prices for nonbasic commodities could not be maintained without very sizable increases in the amount of purchase funds available so that all of the crops offered for sale at less than such prices could be bought. Nonbasic crops account for roughly 75 percent of total farm income. If it is desired to bring them above current price levels, money obviously must be appropriated for that purpose just as it is appropriated to maintain 85-percent loans on the five basic crops.

If mandatory legislation were passed directing the Department of Agriculture to buy nonbasic crops at a fixed price considerably above the commercial market, and if greatly increased appropriations for the purchases of such products were not made, two bad results for the American farmer would ensue:

A. Only a very limited amount of increased income by way of higher unit prices would go to the few farmers who were able to sell to the Government, and the majority of farmers would be very much dissatisfied.

B. After that limited amount of money was spent—and even if it were prorated among farmers selling the Government, which would be a costly administrative procedure—there would be no further support available for agricultural prices and farmers would be at the mercy of commercial buyers in a glutted market. The total quantity moved by purchases, rather than the unit prices received on the relatively small amount of Government purchases, is the determining factor in total farm income as it is affected by Government acquisition programs.

If mandatory legislation were passed directing the Department of Agriculture to buy at parity, a wholly untenable situation would result so far as unjust enrichment of processors is concerned. A great many processed

farm products, such as meats, canned tomatoes, flour, cheese, dried eggs, and evaporated milk are now being bought, largely for Britain. If these purchases were made at parity, when processors are not paying parity prices to farmers, the taxpayers' money would be thrown away paying unwarranted prices to certain business groups.

Flour bought at 100 percent of parity, for example, certainly would be absurd in the face of an 85-percent wheat loan. Mandatory legislation requiring the Department to buy at parity would wreck the British purchase program as it is now operated through the partial use of \$90,000,000 of Commodity Credit Corporation money as a revolving fund. The use of these funds in the last 2 months has added hundreds of millions of dollars to farm income rather than to the profits of speculators. This would not have been possible if lease-lend funds had been used exclusively. It will not be possible to achieve similar results unless they are so used in the future, although this is not as vitally important now as it was in the beginning of the food-for-defense program.

Parity, as figured by the current formula, is certainly too high for a great many specialty crops. Doubling or trebling the prices of some of these crops would increase production, curtail regular consumption, exhaust limited Government funds available for their purchase, and then leave farmers at the mercy of distressed market conditions. Farmers producing such crops would be injured by this action.

More important than this, however, is the principle involved in dealing with perishable and semiperishable crops as opposed to dealing with nonperishable crops, which can be stored under Government loans for long periods of time. The loan approach in the latter case gives a guaranteed kind of support to farm income. The only way to get similar results in the case of the nonbasic crops is to have adequate money available for moving perishable and semiperishable crops into consumption before they spoil.

In order to do this in a way to get the maximum effect upon farm income, Government purchasing power can be used to lead a market upward from any given level, but limited purchases—much above the level of commercial prices—would not improve total farm income as much as moving a larger quantity, even at a somewhat lesser price, in the event that increased purchasing funds were not available in an amount adequate to achieve full parity.

The greater the amount of money available for moving perishable or semiperishable crops into consumption, of course, the higher the level of prices it is possible to achieve. The sky is virtually the limit, although the Government would tend to become the farmer's chief customer if such a program were pushed to extremes.

Of fundamental importance in this connection is the problem of providing for the long-range protection of farm income through the continuance of both the purchase and loan programs. Any such programs could, of course, be swamped in the absence of adequate production adjustment by the greatly excessive supplies that would be called forth by parity prices for several crops. It should be emphasized that adequate production adjustment is difficult to obtain in the case of certain specialty crops, such as fresh fruits and vegetables and nuts and even poultry products, which are widely produced by a large number of small farmers.

Producers of nonbasic crops have, for the most part, several factors now operating in the direction of better income. These factors are:

A. A sharp rise in consumer purchasing power due to increased pay rolls. This particularly affects the price level of the nonbasic

crops of which there are acute nutritional deficiencies among low-income families.

B. A broader total market occasioned by Government purchases for:

- (1) Britain and other democracies resisting aggression.
- (2) Red Cross.
- (3) Domestic distribution to relief families.
- (4) School lunches.
- (5) Army and Navy requirements.

The Department of Agriculture is using and intends to continue using whatever purchase funds are available to it in such a fashion as to get the maximum possible effect upon total farm income. It cannot achieve a greater effect without a greater appropriation for this purpose, however, any more than it could maintain 85 percent of parity prices for the five basic crops without increased loan funds.

Mr. President, I consider that the food-stamp plan will be vitally important in the post-war period. We must preserve this program and continue its gradual expansion. I should like to quote from a statement by Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Surplus Marketing Administration, on this point:

Unfortunately, the administrative machinery of the stamp plan cannot be set up efficiently overnight. Once it is carefully established, however, it works on an accordion basis. In times of full employment, it can be contracted to serve as a business-like way of getting food to the handicapped and the unemployables. That keeps the program in existence at a minimum cost for times of depression when food must be gotten quickly to millions of people who have lost their jobs through no incompetence of their own. Times of heavy unemployment are times of heavy farm surpluses, and they require immediate as well as effective action.

The food-stamp plan therefore is national insurance against hunger in every area where the plan is operating. As part of the national farm program, it is additional insurance against collapse in farm income. That kind of insurance is particularly important in the present world situation. It will continue to be important until international trade is restored and we can find permanent ways here at home of providing useful work at good wages for all of our people all of the time. Meanwhile it is generally agreed that the sensible thing to do with farm surpluses is to give the undernourished a chance to eat them, so far as that is possible. Only a healthy people can meet the challenge of total defense that now faces us.

We have within the last year authorized some \$40,000,000,000 for national defense. My original amendment would amount to only one-fourth of 1 percent of that huge sum, and the committee has reduced by half what I proposed. It will enable the Surplus Marketing Administration to increase farm income, and it will help to carry out the program of the National Nutrition Conference which was recently called by the President. This Nation cannot make a wiser investment in the general welfare of our country than by using this \$50,000,000 for this purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 33, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I desire to offer an amendment. There are some

Senators interested in the amendment who are not on the floor, and when I offer the amendment I desire to have them present, if they wish to be present. I therefore 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	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Roster
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Herring	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Bulow	Houston	Stewart
Bunker	Hughes	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	La Follette	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	White
Davis	Murray	Wiley
Downey	Norris	
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in the administration of the W. P. A. set-up the Government has maintained, and now maintains, in each State a number of officials in the procurement department, in the auditing department, and in the accounting department of the Treasury Department. In each State capital we now have a number of employees representing these various departments of the Government. Last year, in making up the appropriation bill which included the W. P. A., it was proposed to take those employees from the State capitals and center them in regional offices. When that fact was discovered an amendment was submitted to the Senate providing that such employees in the States should remain where they were; in other words, the amendment was to prevent the centralization of certain officials and employees in regional offices located in the larger cities of the country.

When that amendment was presented upon a roll call the amendment carried by 67 to 7. A year ago only seven Members of this body were in favor of centralizing those officials and employees now located in the several State capitals in regional offices to be located in the larger cities of the Nation. In this joint resolution it is proposed to renew the policy suggested last year but not to go quite so far. In this joint resolution it is proposed to remove the auditing and accounting officers and employees from the several State capitals to certain regions not definitely mentioned in the joint resolution.

It will cost a little more money to keep these officials and employees in the respective State capitals where they are now, where they can be of immediate service in the State in the administra-

tion of the W. P. A. funds. If the joint resolution goes through as it is now pending before the Senate, a number of officials and employees of the Government in each State capital will have to be either discharged or removed to some central or regional office. The difference in cost is some \$485,000. If the matter stands in the joint resolution as it is now proposed, central or regional agencies will be established in perhaps the larger cities to perform in such regional offices the work which is now performed in the several State capitals.

I have not accurate estimates of the amount of money it will take to perform these particular and respective duties in the central or regional offices, but it must be more than a million dollars. So it will cost a large sum to administer this clerical work in the regions, but perhaps not quite as much as it will cost to perform the same service in the several State capitals.

If the provisions of the joint resolution are not amended a number of officials and employees will lose their positions or be forced to move. Of course, they cannot all move, because there will not be jobs for all of them in the regional offices.

So, Mr. President, in order to test the sentiment of the Senate, I propose an amendment increasing the amount in three places sufficiently to keep the set-ups in the respective States exactly as they are today. My amendment is similar to the one I offered a year ago. If it prevails, there will be no change in the procurement, in the auditing, or in the accounting offices now located and maintained in the several State capitals. They will be retained exactly as they are at the present time.

If the amendment does not prevail, the accounting and the auditing divisions will certainly be centralized in the various regions, and the procurement divisions would be retained in the States where they are now. But this is an entering wedge, and if this amendment is not adopted today, then next year we shall have a still further provision for centralization of these agencies, and no doubt we will have the procurement office taken to the regional office, as was proposed a year ago. With this statement, I submit the amendment for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,250,000"; on page 8, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,025,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$2,360,000"; on page 8, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,005,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$6,490,000"; on page 8, line 22, immediately preceding the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to defray the expenses of transferring or maintaining the performance of any of the functions appropriated for in (a), (b), and (c) of subdivision (2) of this section at points other than in the States where any of such functions are now performed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Upon my amendment, I shall ask for a yeas and nays vote at the proper time.

Mr. ADAMS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to offer an amendment along the line of that offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. It is different from his amendment, but I want it to lie on the table, to be acted on. I send it to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add, at the proper place, the following:

In the administration of the program provided for by this act each State shall be recognized as an administrative unit and administrative employees in each State shall be chosen from among residents of the State where employed

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would not be in order, I think as a substitute for the amendment now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware was merely read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. HUGHES. It is an independent amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma presents a very clear, simple question, whether the Senate wishes to spend \$485,000 of the taxpayer's money in order to maintain some bookkeepers in some of the States. The bill as it comes before the Senate contemplates that there will be a consolidation of bookkeeping and disbursing agencies, and those only. No consolidation of procurement offices is proposed. The reduction in expense which will develop from this consolidation will be \$485,000. There will be no decrease in the efficiency of the service.

The objection made is that if we consolidate as is suggested, we will reduce the number of offices in which accounts are kept and from which checks are sent, from 50 to approximately 25. It means that some employees will be moved from some States to other States, and probably as many States will have a slight increase as will have a decrease. To illustrate, in one State in the West there is an office where eight persons are employed, and the proposal would result in the removal of four. That would be the extent of the effect of the provision as it comes from the House, and as it was approved by the Senate committee. So that it is merely a question whether the Senate proposes to spend, in fact, to waste, \$485,000 of the taxpayers' money, in order to keep some bookkeepers and check writers in certain States, rather than have them go to other States in order to increase efficiency in administration, and reduce overhead. The members of the Senate committee felt that they could not, and I cannot, as an individual Senator, vote to waste, or to spend \$485,000 to keep some bookkeepers and check writers in any Senator's State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask for yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained. He has a pair on this question with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I also announce the general pair of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator

from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Hill	Rosier
Bailey	Hughes	Shipstead
Bulow	Kilgore	Smathers
Bunker	La Follette	Smith
Capper	McFarland	Stewart
Caraway	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Murray	Truman
Green	Norris	Tunnell
Gurney	O'Mahoney	
Hayden	Pepper	

NAYS—26

Adams	Ellender	Reynolds
Ball	George	Russell
Barbour	Gerry	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Byrd	McNary	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Overton	Wiley
Danaher	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—39

Aiken	Davis	McCarran
Austin	Gillette	McKellar
Bankhead	Glass	Nye
Barkley	Guffey	Reed
Bilbo	Harrison	Schwartz
Bone	Hatch	Spencer
Bridges	Herring	Tobey
Brooks	Houston	Wagner
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Wallgren
Butler	Langer	Walsh
Chandler	Lee	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	White
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Willis

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I shall read. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I know that in essence it is sound. If not in the best of shape, I believe it can be reframed in conference. The amendment reads as follows:

No part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used by the Works Progress Administration to pay for labor furnished on any project for the production and manufacture of construction material, such as sand, gravel, and crushed stone, where such material can be purchased from any commercial producer or dealer in such material delivered at the site of the proposed work for less than could otherwise be obtained.

In most of the W. P. A. work the men are employed in mending roads or building roads, which is proper, but they have opened up a number of quarries in which W. P. A. workers are engaged in the business of quarrying stone. The amendment provides that they shall not be permitted to manufacture the building material unless they can provide it more cheaply, all things considered, than the same material can be bought from private sources. The effect of the amendment would not be to cut down the amount of work. In my opinion, it would make more work in the building of roads. However, I believe that the quarrymen are among the groups with which the Government has competed most sharply. I ask that the Senate agree to the amendment, and that when it goes to conference, if for any reason it is found to be impractical, the conferees are at liberty to drop it. I do believe, however, that this small group of

men are, out of W. P. A. funds, subjected to greater competition by the Government than any other group and that they are entitled to consideration.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reason more money is spent by the W. P. A. on road work is that we require 25-percent sponsor contribution, and the cities, towns, and counties which desire better roads are willing to sponsor that kind of work. The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to make it more difficult for the cities, counties, and towns to sponsor such work.

Mr. TYDINGS. This provision would apply only to the use of W. P. A. labor to quarry the material.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand; but that is included in the whole job.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator from Arizona what I said to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill. Perhaps this may be an impractical matter. I do not think it is. If the committee will take the item to conference, and consider it with the W. P. A. officials, if it is found not to be practical and the conferees desire to drop it, I shall not make any point on the conference committee report when it comes back to the floor.

We all know that the quarrying is one business which has greater Government competition as the result of W. P. A. undertakings than any other business in America. The essence of W. P. A. is road work in most of the communities of the Nation, and I believe an honest attempt should be made to give the quarrymen as much protection as can be given them without interfering with the purpose of the program. That was the thought back of the amendment. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

I say again that, when it is taken to conference, if for any reason it is found not to be feasible or practicable, I shall make no point on the floor if the conferees decide that the provision should be eliminated. I think that is perfectly fair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Maryland as to his attitude toward the handling of the amendment in conference is very fair. However, if the House conferees were to decide to embrace the amendment without affording the Senate an opportunity to recede, in my opinion, they would absolutely disrupt about three-quarters of all the W. P. A. projects throughout the United States. I do not like to oppose the Senator's amendment, but—

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that would happen, but if the House is overwhelmingly in favor of the amendment I am quite sure it ought to stay in the bill. If that contingency should happen I cannot imagine any better recommendation with respect to the amendment than to have the conferees of the House say that they want to accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. But we have committees of the Senate and of the House whose function it is to conduct hearings on matters of this kind. The Sen-

ator from Maryland is an able and outstanding member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the proposed amendment was handed to me only this afternoon. To my certain knowledge the men who handed it to me have had the matter up with the W. P. A. for 2 years, with the help of my office. They have tried to find a formula which would be universally satisfactory. I asked for a list of all the quarries which the W. P. A. was operating in the five States surrounding Maryland. W. P. A. material was being taken out of the ground at more than a hundred quarries. In the western section of the State of Maryland the situation is very much aggravated. There is more quarrying going on by W. P. A. in that section than in any similar section of the country. Private operators have tried in every way they can to prevent their bread and butter being taken away from them through a welfare program. I think they are entitled to protest. I do not think the Government ought to use welfare funds to take legitimate business away from a private operator who has invested all he has in a quarry, who has built up a trade, and who through the years has been furnishing the State and county with material. I do not think that the welfare program ought to be used for that purpose.

In my amendment I have provided that such materials must be bought from private sources only when they can be furnished more cheaply from private sources than from a W. P. A. quarry. I am trying to be perfectly candid about the matter. If the amendment had come to me earlier I should have been before the committee and should have offered it. However, for the past 2 years, I have had this question up with W. P. A. officials, who recognized the evil but have not given us any solution. I have a stack of correspondence at least 2 inches thick on the subject. The private operators have been patient. I am anxious to have the matter considered in this bill, and to have the W. P. A. people called before the conferees to see if any formula can be worked out. If no formula can be worked out, I shall make no point of insisting upon the amendment. I hope the Senator will go along with us in this respect.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the question of competition with private industry arises in connection with any conceivable project which might be inaugurated under the Work Projects Administration. Those who are in the business of manufacturing clothing always complain very bitterly, and with some merit and justice, when a W. P. A. sewing room is opened. The cotton mattress program has caused the manufacturers of cotton mattresses to register strong protests in Washington against the Federal Government going into the business of making mattresses. Many counties have already leased gravel pits, granite quarries, and lime-rock quarries, and have paid public funds for deposits of stone, granite, or lime rock in anticipation of W. P. A. projects which are

now under way, having in view the use of W. P. A. labor to mine the granite, gravel, lime rock, or other substance which goes into the paving of roads or the surfacing of airfields.

This amendment is presented on the floor. I have no figures before me, but, in my opinion, the amendment would affect a great many projects under construction by the W. P. A. I dislike to disagree with my friend from Maryland, but I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, if the gravel could be produced more cheaply by the W. P. A., under my amendment, it would have the right to continue to operate the quarries.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the one part of the Senator's amendment which I am afraid of. It is very hastily drawn. I could not draw a proper amendment on the floor of the Senate. Who is to determine whether or not it is cheaper? What factors would enter into the determination? Would the amount paid by the county for the gravel pit or the granite quarry be considered in the ultimate cost of the material? What factors would be considered?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there would be any great difficulty over that question. I think that all the factors which enter into the cost of the gravel would be considered on the one side, and all the factors which enter into the cost of the gravel on the W. P. A. side would be considered. Certainly the Government itself would be the judge as to which of the two agencies could furnish the material more cheaply. The civil-service laws provide that the prevailing wage in communities shall apply. The Government itself determines what the prevailing wage is. It varies in different communities; but the Government is arbiter of the matter, just as it would be in this case.

Let me ask the Senator from Georgia a question. Suppose he owned a quarry. Suppose he had invested \$10,000 or \$12,000 in crushing machinery, quarrying machinery, delivery trucks, and what not, and over a period of 10 or 15 or 20 years had built up a small business, from which he was making a legitimate living, furnishing stone to a municipality, county, or State. Then suppose that business were suddenly thrown completely out of gear, through no fault of the operator, but through the intervention of a governmental program, and the business were almost completely destroyed. Certainly the owner of a legitimate business would have the right to complain. The quarrying and gravel business is not a big trust. It is carried on by a great number of small operators. A man would have a legitimate complaint if his Government should take away from him his means of livelihood.

What are the private operators saying? They are saying, "If you can produce gravel for welfare purposes at a figure less than what we can produce and sell it for, then go ahead and produce it; but if we can furnish it more cheaply you ought to use the welfare funds for more labor. You ought not to use them in the

production of the actual material. You ought to use the employment incident to the quarrying of the material in laying the material."

It seems to me that if the Senator owned a quarry he would feel just as the private operators feel, and in my opinion rightly so. The Government should not exercise its power to compete with them to the extent of taking their business from them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have the utmost sympathy with the objective which the Senator has in mind. This problem has not been confined to the State of Maryland. It so happens that in my own State a number of granite quarries are operating. Three of four of them are in the vicinity of Stone Mountain, the largest solid body of rock in the world. The operators have been to see me and have discussed the problem with me. I have also had the question up with the Work Projects Administration, and have regretted that some formula has not been evolved; but I think we should be acting very hastily if we should undertake to solve the question in this shotgun manner on the floor of the Senate. I think the Senator ought to introduce a bill in the regular way and have hearings before a committee to work out the problem.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not think we can quite take the Senator's argument as we might otherwise take it. He says that the question has been under consideration for 2 years. He himself has had numerous conferences with representatives of the administration, and has had correspondence in an effort to solve the question. The question has been open for 2 years, and he has no solution. After 2 years of effort on the part of the Senator, myself, and many others similarly situated, all I am asking is that we make an effort to solve the problem.

The problem is not confined to Maryland. I know that in West Virginia particularly there has been much complaint about W. P. A. quarries. There has been complaint in Pennsylvania. In the entire State of Pennsylvania, one of the largest States in the Union, there are only 20 W. P. A. quarries. Complaint was made to the Representatives in Congress, and the W. P. A. closed quarries in Pennsylvania. I do not know why. But why keep 20 quarries in one little section of Maryland when in all the State of Pennsylvania only 20 quarries are open? I think we ought to make either fish or fowl of this thing. We ought to have a policy. I do not think the present policy is just, in view of the very facts which have been presented to me by the W. P. A. officials. I did not bring the papers with me; but only a week ago I was sent a list of all the quarries in West Virginia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. It was astounding to me to find that in proportion to the area more W. P. A. quarries were located in the little area about which I am talking than in any similar area in the great State of Pennsylvania, with its mountain ranges, where protest after protest had been made by the representatives of the people of that State and the number of

quarries had been reduced to the irreducible minimum.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to inquire whether or not the adoption of this amendment would result in laying down a principle which would arise to plague us in connection with other industries. For instance, would we be laying down a principle to the effect that if a product can be commercially procured for less than the cost of producing it by W. P. A. operations, it shall be commercially purchased?

The next question might be whether work can be done more cheaply by commercial means. For instance, all over the United States airports are being constructed. W. P. A. labor is being used on many of them. We differ as to the result of W. P. A. labor. There is a very sharp divergence of opinion. Some insist that W. P. A. labor is far more expensive than normal contract labor, and we have such instances brought to our attention. In the last day or two Mr. Hunter insisted before our committee that W. P. A. labor is, if anything, more efficient than the other. In other words, the question of fact is raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer him?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the very purpose of the bill is to make work for those who are unemployed; and I cannot imagine that the rule mentioned by the Senator from Colorado would result in making it impossible for those who are unemployed to get work. I shall not discuss that fundamental at all. Under my amendment there would be just as much work for the W. P. A. as there would be without the amendment. As a matter of fact, in my opinion, under my amendment there would be more work for the W. P. A. than there would be without it, for the simple reason that according to the formula adopted the materials would cost less than they now cost, with the result that that much money would be left to be utilized for spreading and utilizing materials rather than producing them.

But in order that I may discharge my duty on the floor let me say, that I believe that we all understand what is involved. I should be glad to submit this matter to a voice vote; and if the majority of Senators present do not agree with the contention I have attempted to make, we shall have to abide by their vote. However, I desire to have the W. P. A. officials begin to learn that they cannot further temporize with this problem, and that if they do not do something between now and the next bill, a real fight will be made on this floor to see that equal and exact justice is applied to all persons. All I am asking is that we have a vote on the question.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. What I desire to say is neither in support of nor in opposition to

the argument of the Senator from Maryland. The W. P. A. provides employment for a class of workers who now are not eligible for work in the defense industries.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. That class is comprised of persons between 45 and 65 or 70 years of age. They are really outlawed. Industry will not employ them. Social Security will not pension them. So there must be some agency to provide for the utilization of their services. Otherwise, they would be a relief cost.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is entirely correct; and that is the reason we have this very bill.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland. (Putting the question.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I call for a division. I do not insist on the yeas and nays.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 2, strike out the figures "\$875,000,000" and insert the figures "\$1,250,000,000."

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long in discussing this amendment. I realize full well that there is a general feeling in the country that the national-defense program is providing or will provide employment for those who are on W. P. A. rolls. The defense program will provide employment for some; but our experience under the program, insofar as it has progressed, clearly indicates that large numbers of persons on W. P. A. will not under any circumstances secure employment as a result of the national-defense program. This is due to numerous factors. I shall mention only a few of them.

In the first place, when employment rises and when there is an increased demand for labor, those persons on W. P. A. who have sufficient skill to be employed are usually drawn off; and usually they are drawn from the younger age groups.

I am informed that the average age of the persons receiving employment on W. P. A. now is 43. This means, of course, that many of them are much older than 43. Senators are familiar with the fact that industry is reluctant to employ, if not adamant in refusing to employ, workers who have passed the peak of their physical and mental prowess. As a matter of fact, modern industry has become such a high-speed, technical operation that only those who are fortunate enough to be young and vigorous can function in mass production and highly technological industries.

What are the facts? During the present year the Work Projects Administration has received a total of \$1,350,650,000, and has provided employment for an average of 1,700,000 persons. It is a fact that it provided work for less than one-fourth of the unemployed persons in the United States.

As of April 30, 1941, when the W. P. A. rolls carried 1,610,000 persons, there was an additional number of 1,264,000 persons who were eligible for W. P. A. employment, but who could not be hired because of the inadequacy of funds.

At present estimates of unemployment vary from 7,000,000 to 9,000,000 persons. None of the estimates of average employment properly reflects the actual number of persons unemployed from day to day. The best estimates at present indicate that the present level of unemployment will not decrease by more than 2,800,000 during the next fiscal year. That will still leave from 4,200,000—if we wish to take the most conservative estimate—to 7,000,000 persons unemployed in the United States. This unemployment will prevail even though the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production will be at an all-time high.

There will not be a proportionate decrease in W. P. A. eligibles. The present number of eligibles will decrease a maximum of 374,000 to a level of 2,500,000 net. An appropriation of \$875,000,000 will provide for an average of only 1,000,000. Thus, under the proposed appropriation of \$875,000,000, less than 40 percent of those eligible to W. P. A. employment, will be given an opportunity to work. About 56 percent of the eligibles are being taken care of at the present time.

In other words, Mr. President, we are now providing employment for 56 percent of those persons in the United States who are in all respects qualified and eligible for W. P. A.; but if this appropriation is left at the figure passed by the House of Representatives and now recommended by the Senate committee it will take care of only 40 percent of those who are eligible. An appropriation of \$1,250,000,000, \$375,000,000 more than proposed in the joint resolution as passed by the House and as recommended by the Senate committee, would provide work for approximately the same percentage of eligibles in the next fiscal year as we have been able to take care of under W. P. A. in the fiscal year now drawing to a close.

Mr. President, as mentioned some little time ago, the defense program even insofar as it provides employment for those who are on W. P. A. is not, and, I admit, cannot be, distributed in the United States according to population. I wish to quote from the report of the House Committee on Appropriations on this point:

A very potent factor militating against the general absorption of unemployed workers eligible for W. P. A. in defense industry is the lack of distribution of the defense contracts. Due to the speed of the program, it has been necessary to place contracts where facilities were already available or could be made speedily available taking into consideration such factors as available labor, power supply, transportation facilities, etc.

I interpolate at this point, Mr. President, a statement of my own. I think there has been a shocking lack of appreciation upon the part of those responsible for the allocation of defense contracts and defense plants of the intensification of the economic headache

which the entire defense program will inevitably bring because of the over-concentration and expansion of defense employment.

I return to the House report:

As of March 31, 1941, 20 industrial areas had received 69 percent of all defense orders, yet these areas had only 28 percent of the population and 24 percent of the W. P. A. workers. Only 761 counties out of the 3,073 in the United States had received defense contracts. This statement is indicative of the spotty nature of the distribution but not entirely significant of the effect of the contracts, because under many of them subcontracts will extend to other regions and the materials for fulfillment of the contracts will fan out much more generally. A factor against the migration of persons eligible for W. P. A. to the places where defense contracts have been placed is the disinclination and inability of this group with dependents and home ties to transport themselves to places of employment.

To interpolate again, I am sure Senators realize full well that those who have been forced to accept W. P. A. as the only means of subsistence have not been in a position to save money by which they could transport either themselves or their families to points where defense work might be available, assuming that they were qualified therefor.

The average age of persons on W. P. A. is nearly 43, and the number of dependents is estimated at 3.5 for each head of family.

I wish to show at this point how the situation affects my own State, merely as a typical example. Wisconsin has not fared very well so far as total value of defense contracts are concerned, despite the fact that it is the tenth State of the Union in the added value of manufactures.

How much effect has the national-defense program had on unemployment conditions in Wisconsin? Except in 4 counties, it has had little or no effect, and we have 72 counties in that State. About 85 percent of all defense contracts in Wisconsin are concentrated in four counties—Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Racine, and Rock. In 37 counties there are no defense contracts, while in 21 counties there are next to none. In only 7 counties—Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Racine, Rock, Dane, Douglas, and Winnebago—do defense contracts exceed the \$5,000,000 mark.

Mr. President, I point to another aspect of the situation: Technological processes have displaced jobs, and the young people who have come into the labor market have acquired jobs that the present W. P. A. workers might normally have performed in past years. I wish to quote again from the House report:

Technological processes account for the failure of employment to keep pace with increased expenditures and accelerated volume of production. A comparison with 1929 is illustrative of what has taken place in this respect. Industrial production in March 1941, according to the index of the Federal Reserve Board, stood at 143, which is 25 percent above the 1929 high point. Despite this peak of production the number of unemployed workers is estimated at between 7,000,000 and 9,000,000. This production has

been arrived at by not using anything like the Nation's available manpower. The worker has been caught between the squeeze of a rapidly increasing labor force and the accelerated mechanical productivity of the industrial plant.

In other words, the workers upon W. P. A. have been caught in-between two factors—an increase that normally comes in the age group eligible for employment, the younger workers, and the constant march of science and invention and technological improvements in industrial processes.

Using the factor of net increase of 600,000 in the labor force each year, there has been an increase in the labor force in the country of about 7,000,000 workers as compared with 1929. The peak of total employment in the calendar year 1929 was 50,000,000, which was reached in September, and the average for the entire year was 47,733,000. Comparable figures for the calendar year 1941 will not be available until the year closes, but it does not seem probable that either total high employment or total average employment for 1941 will reach the levels of 1929.

The following comparison with 1929 is of interest:

1. Total employment (46,559,000) in March 1941 was only 578,000 more than the total employment (45,981,000) in March 1929.
2. Nonagricultural employment (37,218,000) in March 1941 was only 1,541,000 more than such employment (35,677,000) in March 1929.

And yet I again digress to say that the Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production is at the all-time high, and is many points above the high of 1929. In other words, Mr. President, what has happened? Because of technological advance in industry, because of the use of automatic and semiautomatic machinery, because of the utilization of mass production and continuous-belt conveyor assembly-line design of our factories, we are today producing in this country a great deal more of industrial products than we were producing in 1929, and yet we are producing them with less men.

The House report continues:

3. Agriculture employment (9,341,000) in March 1941 was 963,000 less than such employment (10,304,000) in March 1929.

Similarly in agriculture, the march of science and invention, the application of the power-age techniques, has likewise resulted in a diminution of the opportunities for employment in our agricultural pursuits.

The House report says:

Only in recent months has factory employment reached the level attained in 1920 (21 years ago), although manufacturing production in 1940 averaged 66 percent higher than in 1920.

The significant fact is that industry has produced and is producing more goods with much less labor. This is the condition that makes it impossible to expect that employment will be furnished in the coming fiscal year under the defense program for all that may want jobs or that unemployment under that program will completely disappear.

Mr. President, I desire now to call attention to just what will be the immediate effect of this appropriation if it is all that is obtained. I refer to that passed by the House and recommended by the Senate committee.

In the present month, June of 1941—which, of course, was adjusted to the last Budget, and was also adjusted to the employment conditions—an average of 1,413,500 persons will be employed on W. P. A.; but next month that number will have to be cut to 1,000,000 individuals. In other words, in the coming month 413,500 persons will have to be cut off from W. P. A.

Let us take a few States, to give typical examples. Take the case of region 1, which is New England, and which, as I said before in connection with another amendment and another bill, has received a very substantial increase in its normal economic activity as a result of the huge contracts and contract authorizations which have gone to that region of the country. Nevertheless, Mr. President, in June of 1941, this month, there are 8,000 persons on W. P. A. in Connecticut. Next month there can be only 4,000 persons, or a cut of 4,000 individuals in the coming month. In Maine, 3,500 will be employed in July, as against 5,000 persons on the rolls for the month of June.

Massachusetts has 58,700 persons on the W. P. A. rolls. Next month, if we accept the committee's recommendation and the action of the House, there can be only 34,000 persons employed on the W. P. A. in Massachusetts, a reduction of 24,700 individuals. Even if Senators do not share my apprehension that increased employment is not going to absorb W. P. A. workers, is there any Senator so optimistic as to believe that between this month and next month 24,700 persons can be absorbed by private employment in the State of Massachusetts?

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator give me the figures for the State of California?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There are on the rolls in California in June of 1941, a total of 57,950 persons. This number will be cut to 39,000 persons next month.

I wish to mention in passing that in my own State in this month there are 31,900 persons on W. P. A., and next month there will be 21,400 persons. It is just out of the question; there is not any possible dumping of defense contracts into the State of Wisconsin which could possibly provide employment for the more than 10,500 persons who will find themselves severed from the W. P. A. rolls next month if this appropriation stands at \$875,000,000.

Of course, Senators are aware of the fact that we are now entering, even in the Northern States, the months when there is the lowest demand each year so far as W. P. A. employment is concerned. I venture the prediction that if this amendment is rejected, such a situation will be created in the various States of the Union, as a result of this drastic curtailment of W. P. A. and the failure of private industry to absorb persons now on the rolls, that we shall be confronted when we meet again in January—or, if we are still in session, we shall be confronted in the winter months—with the necessity of passing

a supplemental appropriation, a deficiency appropriation. In the meantime, Mr. President, who will have suffered? The people who will be cut off from W. P. A., who will be unable to find employment in their communities, and who will be forced to fall back on the already inadequate resources of their various communities so far as direct relief is concerned.

Let me emphasize that there are many areas in which no amount of defense activity could under any circumstances take care of the situation. So I plead with the Senate to consider this amendment and to support it.

In conclusion let me say that we are seeking national unity in this country; we are seeking to build up the morale not only of those who have been drawn into the armed forces but of those citizens who remain at home and who must be responsible for production and for the functioning of our economy.

Do Senators think it will increase the morale of our armed forces for a soldier to learn that a dependent father and his family have been severed from W. P. A. and are unable to find adequate relief provided from the locality where the family resides? Will such a soldier, drawing \$21 a month, be able to meet that situation and to assist his family in any measurable degree? We all know that he will not.

Mr. President, will it help the morale in the various communities, cities, counties, States, and townships of this country, to have perfectly worthy individuals severed from W. P. A. and thrown back upon inadequate local resources for a few grocery orders?

I say that if we are to obtain morale, if we are to obtain national unity, one of the ways to do it is to avoid drastic and unjustified cuts in those agencies which are providing for the underprivileged segment of our communities, their only opportunity to keep themselves in some fashion from the humiliation and undernourishment of direct relief.

Mr. President, I wish to obtain a record vote on the amendment, and at the appropriate time I shall seek to secure recognition from the Chair in order to make the request.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin seeks to increase the basic appropriation from \$875,000,000 to \$1,250,000,000. The amount which the committee recommends is the full amount that was recommended by the President of the United States, the full amount recommended by the subcommittee of the House, the full amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the full amount recommended by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and by the Senate Committee on Appropriations itself.

Naturally, Members of the Senate and members of the committee do not have detailed information on matters coming before us; we are forced to rely upon the information which comes to us. I do

not think anyone can say that the President of the United States has been niggardly in recommending the expenditure of public funds for various forms of relief. I do not have the President's exact language in mind, but he points out the very obvious and very appropriate fact that today the United States is, by reason of the defense activities and other industrial improvements, in such a condition that employment is greater than it has been at any time since 1929, with every indication that employment will increase. We are today considering, in the subcommittee presided over by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], a bill providing an additional defense appropriation of \$10,000,000,000, all of which will ultimately go into the employment of labor. If we trace the dollar back, with few exceptions we will find that it goes into employment.

The President, in his recommendation, and the House of Representatives, have fixed the appropriation recommended upon the basis of 1,000,000 men. At the end of the current month of June the number on the W. P. A. rolls will be 1,150,000. The bill before us will require, not a reduction of 400,000, but a reduction of 150,000. If the tremendous program upon which we have entered cannot absorb even a greater proportion of the unemployed than is contemplated in the appropriation, what are we to look forward to when there will be a slackening in employment and in Government expenditures?

It seemed to the committee that the President was putting the figures high, rather than low. It has never been the policy of the Congress to provide employment for every man out of employment. We know that there have always been more men out of employment than were upon the W. P. A. rolls. There is a difference in theories. There are some who think very earnestly that the Government is obligated to provide a job for every unemployed man, regardless of his financial situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am sure the Senator does not mean to leave the impression that the amount which I am asking to have appropriated would provide employment for all those who are eligible. All the pending amendment would provide for would be the same percentage of eligibles as has been provided for in the last fiscal year, namely, 56 percent.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not know about the percentage, and I am willing to accept the Senator's statement as correct; but that is a thing which we should not anticipate. Surely our condition should be better during the coming fiscal year than it was during the past. Surely, with the enormous expenditures we are making, which are running from \$20,000,000,000 to \$26,000,000,000, and which will mean employment beyond what this country has ever seen, much of the unemployment should be taken care of. Earlier in the day the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], in arguing for the necessity of training young men, de-

tailed a list of 2,683,000 jobs available for men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ADAMS. Gladly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly do not want the Senator to get the impression from anything I have said that I do not hope that some of these people will be employed on the defense program, but the program has been in progress for some time, and in this month, June, there are 17,400 persons employed on W. P. A. in the Senator's own State. In July, this coming month, there will be 11,000.

Mr. ADAMS. There will be 11,000 who will be unemployed, or who will be on W. P. A.?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; on W. P. A. There will be a reduction of 6,400 persons. Does the Senator think there is any kind of program that can come along in July, or for the next 6 months, or for the next year, that will provide those people with employment?

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator I think his figures are quite erroneous, with all due regard to the source from which he obtained them, because in the whole United States we are reducing W. P. A. employment from the end of June to the first of July by 150,000. In other words, in my State, which represents practically 1 percent of the total population of the United States, the maximum reduction would be 1,500.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am talking about the average number of persons who are on W. P. A.

Mr. ADAMS. So am I.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And My information is that we will cut 413,000 persons off of W. P. A. next month.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is wrong. We will cut off 150,000, according to a statement which Mr. Hunter made before our committee within 4 days.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator mean that is the total number who will be cut off as the result of reducing the appropriation to \$875,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am certain there must be some conflict of information or understanding.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator and I are perhaps 30 days or more apart. We are stepping from the close of the current fiscal year to the beginning of the next fiscal year. Mr. Hunter said to us that at the close of this year on June 30 he would have 1,150,000 on the W. P. A., and that the average for the next year would be 1,000,000. He was asked, "Your drop then in July will be 150,000?" He said, "Yes." I am merely giving to the Senator the statement made by Mr. Hunter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That certainly does not square with the information which I have, Mr. President, because the indications are, according to the table which I have before me, that there are authorized to be employed in the month of June 1941, in the continental United States an average of 1,376,000 persons, and that in July 1941, in the continental United States, the authorization for employment will be 970,500.

Mr. ADAMS. I am merely relating to the Senator the figures as they were given to us.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not speaking about the employment on a particular day. I am speaking about the average employment for the month of June 1941, as compared with the average employment—

Mr. ADAMS. That is a different figure. If the Senator is taking the average for the current fiscal year he begins with 1,700,000. The Senator might just as well go back to that figure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but if we take the average for June and compare it with the average for July, we ascertain the average cut which will be made between June and July.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. That is a different story. I am talking about what the actual cut is going to be from this fiscal year to the next, from one appropriation under which we are living, to the appropriation we have under consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is talking about 2 successive days, June 30 and July 1.

Mr. ADAMS. About 2 fiscal years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the fact remains that taking the Senator's suggestion as an example, the average employment in Colorado was 17,400 for the current month of June, and for the month of July the average employment will be 11,000. So far as the persons who are dropped from W. P. A. are concerned, they will not be so much interested in our difference of statistical figures, but they will be interested in the fact that they have been dropped from W. P. A. and are not able to find employment anywhere else.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, averages are fine things, but what we are dealing with is facts. The question in my State is how many persons are going to be dropped from W. P. A. when this new appropriation goes into effect; not how many have been dropped off under the present appropriation. There has been a decline, as the Senator has explained, in my State. I will go down closer and speak of my county. In my county 4,000 persons were on the relief rolls at one time. Nine hundred and fifty persons are on the relief rolls now. According to last accounts, there were only 31 persons seeking to get on the relief rolls. It is an industrial community, but it is representative of hundreds of other communities where demands on W. P. A. have been reduced. It is true there are other communities where the reduction has not been made, but there have not been increases. The reduction in the industrial communities will be spread over into the other communities.

The same amount of money is not required in the State of Colorado, because of the reduction which was made in my county and in other counties. In industrial communities men are being sought. We were told in the Appropriations Committee not long ago that we were forced to build shipyards in some southern areas because if they were constructed in the northern and north-eastern areas there would not be enough men available for employment in the

shipyards; therefore we had to build yards where there were employable persons. There is a community near where I live which is complaining—because of what? Because men are leaving the community, where they cannot obtain employment, and are going to other communities where they can obtain employment. That is, there is a constant and continuous increase in employment, and a consequent reduction in the W. P. A. requirement.

I come back finally to the fact that we have a definite finding by the executive in charge of the information services, who tells us that \$875,000,000 is adequate; and the House of Representatives, which goes much more thoroughly into these matters than we do in the Senate, says that \$875,000,000 is adequate. It seems to me that unless we are literally going to repudiate the idea that conditions are better, that increased employment is here, we should not go back, as the Senator from Wisconsin would have us go back—where? To the same amount of money that was expended for these purposes in the present fiscal year; that is, in substance, that we would maintain a continuous W. P. A. appropriation, abandoning the hope of betterment; disregarding the betterment of conditions which now exist. Of course, it is up to the Senate to exercise its judgment. As a member of the Appropriation Committee I have followed those whose judgments were founded upon investigation, who were as interested as could possibly be in the question. As a member of the committee I am interested in avoidance of waste of public funds, and at the same time I am interested in seeing the Government perform its obligations to its citizens.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amendment provides, as I understand, about \$100,000,000 less than last year.

Mr. ADAMS. I think that statement is accurate. I think that last year the amount for the full year was \$1,350,000,000. I was accepting the Senator's statement to the effect that his proposal would maintain the W. P. A. at approximately the level of the current year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; if the Senator will pardon me, what I said was that if the proposed cut should go into effect the W. P. A. would be able to take only 40 percent of those eligible, whereas at present 56 percent of those eligible are given an opportunity on W. P. A. My amendment would make it possible for at least 56 percent of those eligible to obtain employment on W. P. A.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, the Senator and I perhaps do not agree as to the extent to which employment will be furnished during the current year. I am merely reporting these things to the Senate for its action, and saying that the committee's judgment is represented in the amount shown in the bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I have figures and statistics with reference to

the application of the appropriation and the amendment to my State.

I merely wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the efficiency and effectiveness of the W. P. A. in connection with our national-defense program. If we go back to the very beginning of W. P. A. and try to visualize in our minds the magnificent contribution of W. P. A. to our national defense, including its contribution in the construction of highways and its effort in the construction of airports and military training grounds, we realize that W. P. A. is a very useful agency and that instead of curtailing it in the midst of a vastly expanding military program we ought to be considering expanding it. At least we should not restrict it to the degree recommended by the committee.

I disagree with the statement that all the various agencies of government have unanimously agreed upon the figure in the bill. Although the figure in the bill has the approval of the Budget Bureau, a very substantial minority in the House indicated a desire to arrive at the figure recommended by the Senator from Wisconsin.

To go back to the national defense, I believe it will be agreed that prior to the time when we appropriated large sums of money for the Army and Navy the W. P. A. was the one bright contributing spot in the whole defense picture.

Another point I wish to make is that W. P. A. is the last refuge of the older worker. It is the only place where a man between the ages of 40 and 65 can find a job. Our failure to adopt the pending amendment would either condemn a great number of them to idleness or consign them to relief.

There are 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 men and women between the ages of 40 and 65—wage earners with dependents—who must look to W. P. A. for employment opportunities. We find no Navy recruiting officer interested in their services. They are not provided for by the N. Y. A., the C. C. C., or any other agency about which we have been talking. Their only opportunity for employment is in the expanding defense program, for which we can provide by the adoption of the pending amendment.

I believe that we shall need more projects in the future than we have needed in the past. As explained by the Senator from Wisconsin, the upsurge in prosperity is of necessity spotty. Defense contracts are highly concentrated in a comparatively small area of the country. Also, by reason of our restricted priority arrangements, nondefense industries will in some cases be actually closed up.

In addition, our cities and communities find it necessary to do a great deal of work as a result of national-defense activities, in the immediate neighborhood. I believe we ought to put men to work. There is no economic advantage for the Nation in consigning three or four million men to idleness. If we think the problem through, the result is either idleness and a diminished morale, with a depressing number on the relief rolls, or greater unity, greater contribution to our national defense, and the

privilege for men and women to enjoy some of the expanding economy and prosperity about which we talk. I believe that these workers should be utilized, that national defense should be improved, and that if we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin we shall make a mighty contribution to the well-being of the Nation.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I think perhaps Florida is in a little different situation from that of most of the other States. In the past decade the population of Florida has increased by nearly half a million. It has increased more than 28 percent. With few exceptions those who have gone there have not been of the wealthy class, although some wealthy individuals have gone to Miami, Palm Beach, and a few other such places.

Many persons go to Florida in the wintertime, and they do not wish to leave when the large hotels, the citrus packing houses, and the apartment houses are closed. Many of them stay. Every summer we have a serious problem in finding work for those people. They come from nearly every State in the Union. The normal increase in population, due to births, during a period of 10 years, would not be as large as the increase I have indicated.

Another situation which has been mentioned is the preparedness program, involving contracts for ships, munitions, machinery, airplanes, and such things. New Jersey alone has more than \$1,000,000,000 worth of contracts, more than have 10 Southern States together. Ohio has more contracts, and has benefited to a greater extent than have 10 Southern States together. We are unable to take care of our people, who will have to be idle if the appropriation is cut too low.

Another point to which I wish to invite attention is that, so far as Florida is concerned, the work of constructing the camps and airports which are now being constructed will soon be over. Some of the camps are completed, and a great number of persons will have to find work somewhere else. Of course, they can go to other sections of the United States, but that is not always practicable for poor people who do not want to live in a part of the country to which they are not accustomed.

We are confronted by a serious problem. At one time last winter 20,000 men were employed in the construction of Camp Blanding, which will soon be completed. Employment is dropping off. It is very small compared to what it was when the construction was begun.

The same situation applies to the great airport at Jacksonville, which is being completed a number of months ahead of time. So a great number of people will have to find work. Every Senator knows that when a man or woman more than 50 years of age tries to find a position he meets with obstructions which are very difficult to overcome.

It is almost impossible. They cannot be obtained through civil service, and they are absolutely outcasts when it comes to securing positions even with

the Federal Government. They are outcasts also when it comes to trying to secure positions in the industries, because they do not want men and women over 45 years of age. The older they get the more some of them become in need. It is up to us. It is economy for us to give these persons work, and make them happy in their last days.

The W. P. A. now is doing different work than that which it did in the first days of its operation, when it had workers cutting weeds in vacant lots and cutting grass in the parkways. The W. P. A. has been one of the greatest factors in constructing airports and camps in the State of Florida, and I am sure it has been also in other parts of the United States. Money appropriated for the W. P. A. is not money thrown away. The W. P. A. workers are doing their work. They have done a fine job in my State. Some of the work has been delicate. It has been work that required skilled persons to perform; and these men and women, who by reason of the depression had everything swept away from them almost overnight in 1929, are still struggling. Nobody has handed them anything. They have worked for what they have gotten.

I trust the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will prevail. I think it is justice, and I think it is economy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word.

I am interested in this matter especially from the standpoint of its effect in my own State of Montana. In Montana, as a result of this joint resolution, the employment on W. P. A. will be cut practically in half. Our State is one of the States of the Union which has failed to receive any benefits from the national-defense program. Not a single contract has come to our State as a result of the vast defense program which has been talked about so much.

So much has been said against W. P. A. in the past several years that it seems that no one wants to defend it. As a matter of fact, I consider W. P. A. one of the finest programs the Government has maintained throughout the period of the depression. It has built all the great Army and naval bases and air bases in the United States during the years of the depression. If it had not been for the W. P. A. we would not today have the great Army air base at Tacoma, Wash., one of the finest Army air bases in the country, or, in fact, in the world.

I could talk at some length with reference to what W. P. A. has accomplished for this country in the way of a vast program of construction during the past several years, but I do not think it is necessary. I think every one who has given any thought to the subject of the work which has been accomplished by W. P. A. will agree with me that it has been one of the finest things the Government has maintained during this period.

Why should we, then, at this time make such a drastic cut in the employ-

ment of men engaged in such worthwhile work under W. P. A., especially in my State, as I say? I think it is true there, as in the case of a great many other States, that it will create a resentment that will do more damage than anything else I can think of. I think the W. P. A. program should be continued on its present scale which is meager enough in the face of admitted facts.

Therefore I desire to say that I am supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I think it should be agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] if it is contemplated to complete the consideration of this joint resolution today?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not know whether that will be possible. I understand from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that he desires to have a record vote, and I understand from the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that he will therefore suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from Wisconsin is anxious that this particular amendment be disposed of this afternoon. Then I propose to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, so far as I know, this is the only amendment to be presented to the joint resolution; and I desire to occupy only a few moments, since it is now 5 o'clock.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I know of two amendments that will be offered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in glancing through the Evening Star of today I find a map of the United States, together with a chart. The chart is under a heading, as follows:

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PLANT AND EQUIPMENT
IN 1939 BY STATES

And then, in parentheses:

(Figures are in millions of dollars)

I find that a number of States have received a very large amount of money in the way of expenditures for the construction of plants and equipment. At the time this chart was made, the State of New York had received \$125,800,000; the State of Pennsylvania had received \$120,600,000; the State of South Carolina had received \$33,600,000; Ohio, \$112,600,000; Michigan, \$114,800,000; Indiana, \$72,200,000; Wisconsin, \$32,500,000; Illinois, \$109,200,000; Texas, \$52,100,000; California, \$65,200,000. Then the chart gives the figures for a number of other States, some receiving between twenty and thirty million dollars each, some between ten and twenty million dollars each, and some under \$10,000,000 each.

I find that about one-half the States of the United States have received less than \$10,000,000 each. Mississippi has received \$6,100,000; Florida, \$8,800,000; Kentucky, \$9,900,000; Oklahoma, \$6,000,000; Kansas, \$7,900,000; North Dakota, \$600,000; Montana, \$3,300,000; Wyoming,

\$900,000; Colorado, \$6,400,000; New Mexico, \$1,100,000; Arizona, \$1,200,000; Nevada, \$300,000; Idaho, \$1,900,000; Delaware, \$81,600,000.

The chart shows the amount of money which had been expended in the respective States for defense establishments at the time the chart was made.

Mr. President, a number of States are getting but very little benefit from the defense program. I shall not go into that feature now. It may come up later in connection with the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill, which will be before the Senate at a later date.

In connection with the consideration of this particular measure, the fact of the unequal distribution of W. P. A. funds was dwelt upon to some extent. It is true that as a rule the States have had their lists open for certification. Some of the States have had a very large certification. That means that a large number of persons were investigated by the social-service departments, and the heads of the families were found to be in want. My State was found to be in that class. At one-time upward of 100,000 persons in my State had been investigated and certified as being eligible for W. P. A. work, but at no time were any considerable part of that number employed.

Mr. President, it seems to me wholly unfair for the Government to set up a program of relief, make an examination of the persons eligible for relief, and then provide funds for only a portion of that relief. To me that is governmental favoritism. What can be going through the mind of a W. P. A. worker or a man certified for W. P. A. work who never gets a job? Of course, the funds which have been appropriated have been used to the best purpose that the Administrator could provide; but I think in no State have all those who have been certified been able to get jobs.

In the consideration of this particular joint resolution, as a member of the subcommittee, I asked Mr. Hunter some questions. I desire to place in the RECORD a few of the questions, and likewise a few of the answers.

On page 59 of the hearings I asked Mr. Hunter this question:

How much money would it take to employ all those certified and those that you know are eligible for certification and should be certified if the rolls were open?

Mr. Hunter replied:

\$1,750,000,000.

So, Mr. President, according to the testimony of the Commissioner, this joint resolution carries only one-half the amount of money necessary to employ those who have been investigated and certified as being eligible and in need of W. P. A. relief. If the joint resolution carries only \$875,000,000 it is obvious that one-half those who have been certified as being eligible and deserving of W. P. A. work cannot get W. P. A. work. Those who get it will be the favored few. Those who do not get the W. P. A. benefits will have to live in some way, but no doubt they

themselves do not know how they are to exist during the next few months.

The next question I asked Mr. Hunter was this:

I am asking this question: Should the Congress make that much money available for your organization?

Mr. Hunter had previously said it would take \$1,750,000,000 to do the job. Then I asked him if the Congress should appropriate that much money. Mr. Hunter replied as follows:

Senator, I am supporting the Budget Bureau and the President's request for the money.

Of course, I knew that unless the bars were let down Mr. Hunter could not go any stronger than the Budget recommendation. So, in reply to that suggestion, I said to Mr. Hunter:

I am asking you that question. You are relieved of the responsibility.

And before I finished my question, Mr. Hunter replied:

Yes—

The question was:

Should the Congress make that much money available for your organization?

That is, "Should the Congress appropriate \$1,750,000,000?" When pressed for a reply, Mr. Hunter said:

Yes—

With the following qualification:

I think I would say this, and this is a personal opinion: I think it is probably more important now to employ a substantial number of the unemployed than it was even 2 or 3 years ago, because my personal feeling is that to establish a real national unity in this country on a total all-out defense program, one of the most important things is to have total employment, and until people can get it, I think there is a sound reason for their having some chance to work. I think that also applies to health and housing, as well as to employment.

Further on in the hearings I submitted some other questions to Mr. Hunter. I shall refer to only a few of them.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that in the defense establishments only real young men have a chance to secure employment. The defense establishments prefer men either under 21 years of age or scarcely over 21 years of age. When a man reaches the age of 25 he is somewhat passé. When he gets a little over that age he is turned down without even an examination. So I asked Mr. Hunter this question:

Is it not a fact that in these defense industries the rule is that the men they employ are men just coming of age and under 25 years of age?

Mr. HUNTER. In the majority of the strictly defense industries, such as aircraft and plane manufacture, they do employ people pretty strictly under an age limit. What that age limit is in specific industries, I do not know, but it is much under the average W. P. A. age.

The next question:

Is it not a fact that before any man could get a job in any established job today he must first undergo an examination almost as strict as if he were going into the Air Corps?

The answer:

That is certainly true of the defense industries; yes, sir.

The next question:

There are a lot of apparently able-bodied men and comparatively young, too, yet they cannot get a job because of some defect that does not appear on the surface, and the only way they can get a job is by doing this temporary work referred to by Senator HOLMAN—

A member of the committee—

or get a job on the W. P. A. Is not that true?

Mr. Hunter's reply was:

Yes, sir.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I will refer to one or two more questions.

Mr. Hunter stated, in reply to one of my questions, as follows:

The only recourse is local relief.

That is, for the men who are slightly above age, who have some physical defect. They cannot do a satisfactory day's work in industry as demanded by the present defense organization. Replying to a question by me, Mr. Hunter stated:

The only recourse is local relief, where it is available, or surplus commodities; just hand-outs. I frankly can't answer the question as to how the man who does not get any relief of any kind gets along except that statistics on public health show a terrific break-down in health in families. The poor generally find someone to take care of the neighbors who are starving to death, but they obviously do not do it very well.

Mr. President, during the past years we have heard many stories about W. P. A. workers not being efficient; we have heard jokes about W. P. A. workers, and we have seen cartoons of W. P. A. workers leaning on shovels. Mr. President, I wonder in what condition some Members of the Senate would find themselves—men, say, of 70, perhaps with some ailment that does not show on the surface; they are still able to walk around—underfed, undernourished with perhaps no breakfast or only a little breakfast, going out on a W. P. A. job with a long-handled shovel. I can readily understand why men of that type, not because they desire to do so but because they are forced to do so, spend part of their time leaning on a shovel, or leaning upon some other instrument or object to assist them to remain standing. I can thoroughly understand that.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me, and it has seemed to me from the time this program started, that if we adopt a program of relief and provide an agency to make examinations of people, when we find them eligible under the law and under the examination it is unfair, if not dishonest, to provide only a partial sum to take care of those who may be so favored as to get on the eligible list.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. 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	Ellender	Norris
Andrews	George	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Gurney	Reynolds
Brooks	Hayden	Rosier
Bulow	Herring	Russell
Bunker	Hill	Smathers
Burton	Holman	Smith
Byrd	Hughes	Stewart
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capper	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murdoch	Van Nuys
Downey	Murray	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not take over 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate, because I dare say that whatever is said will not influence vitally the decision of the Senate on this item, although I wish it would. But I would not be true to my own conscience and my own judgment if I did not embrace this opportunity to say that I intend to support the amendment, and it seems to me that it should be the policy of the Senate to adopt it.

In my State we have had some pathetic instances of how women in the sewing room, and older people generally, particularly on the W. P. A. rolls, have been thrown out of employment literally by the thousands during the progress of the defense program, simply because the W. P. A. funds have been reduced. There never has been a time even when we reached our maximum appropriation for W. P. A. purposes when we have approximated employing the number of people who have been investigated and certified as eligible for W. P. A. benefits by the certifying agencies of the States. Now we are not only falling below last year's appropriation, but we are falling very materially below it, and therefore aggravating the distress.

I know that in my own State the reduced appropriation will simply mean tragedy, in some instances approaching starvation, and the extinguishment of the light of hope to thousands of people who cannot find a place in the defense program or in private enterprise, either because the jobs do not exist, or because they are not skilled so as to be able to fill the places of skilled workers.

The W. P. A. is just as inevitably a product of the times as traffic lights are a product of the times. Our economy has become so complicated, the work that is to be done to maintain this economy so specialized, that in my opinion we cannot hope ever to reach a state of prosperity which will mean employment for all our people without made work, particularly applicable to the handicapped, or those who have had lesser opportunities.

The defense program will not take care of the people to whom I am referring. We just deceive ourselves when we think or say it will. It will not. This is a matter about which we have evidence as

to the facts. The W. P. A. has the evidence. The States have the evidence. This evidence shows that this proposed appropriation will not begin to take care of the certified people—the needy. What does that mean? It means that if we vote an appropriation which will not take care of them we will be deliberately turning our backs on those people. We have a right to do that, at least we have the power to do it, but we should not deceive ourselves under any mistaken conception that those people are going to find jobs in some other work, because they are not. They have not found such jobs, the W. P. A. tells us they are not going to find them, and all of our knowledge about the nature of our economy teaches us that they are not going to find them. It merely means therefore, that we will be deliberately leaving them without the one means by which they might find an opportunity to make a livelihood.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the word "certification" has been used repeatedly. The impression is conveyed that those who are certified have been certified by the Federal agencies as meeting all the requirements necessary to enable them to go on W. P. A. That is not the situation. The certification spoken of means approval by local relief agencies, and in many parts of the country any one who asks a local agency is certified. In other words, there is an effort on the part of the local authorities to pass over to the Federal rolls all those they can possibly certify. So that there is an exaggerated figure as to the need.

I merely wish to call attention to one statement the President made in his message. He said:

After weighing all factors—

Not part of the factors, but—

After weighing all factors I recommend an appropriation of \$886,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator advise what the net increase would be under the proposed amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. The net increase would be from \$875,000,000 to \$1,250,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. There would be an increase of \$375,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in line with what was said by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]. In my State there was no such attempt as that he speaks of to shift the burden from the State to the Federal Government by certification. I have made inquiry and do not believe there will be the slightest change made. Those who are not now employed will not secure employment elsewhere. Those who are taken off the rolls because of lack of funds will secure no employment anywhere else.

In connection with what has been said about defense projects, I wish to say that the other day I noticed in the newspapers some reference to Delaware having a large share in such projects

through the Du Pont Co. The contracts which the Du Pont Co. has received do not help any workers in Delaware, because the contracts are not carried out in Delaware. The headquarters of the company are in Delaware. The company makes no powder, munitions or anything else in Delaware. So, the contracts received by it will give no employment to people in Delaware except in the main offices of the company.

Mr. President, I usually support the committee, but I cannot refrain from supporting the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, because we have this problem now, and we will continue to have it. In view of the fact that many persons of my State will be thrown out of employment by reason of cutting this appropriation, and that many persons who are out of employment have not been able to get on the rolls, although they have been certified, I cannot justify my vote for the cuts made by the House and by the Senate committee. I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FOLLETTE] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], who is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is detained on important public business. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and permit my vote to stand. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia may vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Mary-

land [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is necessarily absent. He has a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on account of the death of his mother.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on account of the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—22

Andrews	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Rosier
Caraway	La Follette	Smathers
Chavez	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Murray	Tunnell
Ellender	Norris	
Hughes	Pepper	

NAYS—31

Adams	George	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gerry	Russell
Ball	Green	Smith
Bulow	Gurney	Stewart
Bunker	Hayden	Taft
Burton	Herring	Truman
Byrd	Hill	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Holman	Van Nuys
Capper	McFarland	Wiley
Chandler	Maloney	
Connally	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—43

Aiken	Glass	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Schwartz
Bankhead	Harrison	Shipstead
Barbour	Hatch	Spencer
Barkley	Houston	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Brewster	Langer	Tydings
Bridges	Lee	Wagner
Brooks	Lodge	Wallgren
Brown	Lucas	Walsh
Butler	McCarran	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	White
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Willis
Davis	Nye	
Gillette	Overtton	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment was rejected.

DISCHARGE OR RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN AND PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the

Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 239) to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases, which were on page 2, line 9, after the word "the" to insert "average", and in line 10, to strike out "immediately" and insert "for 6 months."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Senate bill 239 was introduced by the late Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], former chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, at the request of the War Department. It relates to the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases, after 20 years service. The Senate passed the bill, and it went to the House. The bill calls for 75 percent of the base pay at the time of retirement. The House saw fit, and I think properly, to insert in the bill an amendment to the effect that in order to receive 75 percent of base pay at time of retirement as the result of disability, the soldier to be retired would be obliged to show that he received the base pay for six months prior to his retirement. I think it was well that the House did so, because I understand that in some instances in which retirement is assured as a result of disability some of the men are promoted, and hold the higher office for only a week or two, in order that their pay may be increased and that they may obtain 75 percent of the increased base pay. I consulted with representatives of the War Department with regard to whether the amendment of the House was acceptable, and they said it was. Therefore I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is this a conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is an amendment of the House of Representatives to a Senate bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am impressed by the fact that the Senate has been working all day upon two very important appropriation bills. I wonder if the Senator from North Carolina will consent to have this matter wait until the Senate shall have disposed of the important appropriation bill which is now pending.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is perfectly agreeable to me, Mr. President; but the matter was called to my attention when it was laid before the Senate by the Presiding Officer. I knew it would not require much time. I thought that the present time was as good as any to dispose of it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason why I make the suggestion has nothing to do with this particular bill; but I observed that as soon as the vote was announced upon an amendment, Senators all over the Chamber were rising to their feet to ask unanimous consent to insert matters in the Record or to act upon other bills. I merely felt that in the interest of orderly procedure it would be more desirable to dispose of the pending business than to take up irrelevant matters.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a privileged matter and may be called up at any time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I hope to have an opportunity to call it to the attention of the Senate immediately after the pending business shall have been disposed of.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in section 10 of the pending joint resolution, on page 18, subsection (f), we find the following:

(f) No alien, no Communist, and no member of any Nazi Bund Organization shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship and to the effect that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi Bund Organization, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship, and that he is not a Communist, and not a member of any Nazi Bund Organization.

Obviously, then, the pending joint resolution applies to Americans. Obviously the amendment which we have just acted upon equally applies to Americans. It is a matter of regret to me that they cannot be brought within the provisions of the \$7,000,000,000 lease-lend grant.

DEPARTURE FROM AND ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIENS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today it is my intention to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. On the calendar is House bill 4973, Calendar No. 459. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside so that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, may ask for consideration of this bill, which is very important and should be considered by the Senate at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let us have an explanation of the bill for the benefit of those of us who are not on the committee. The citation of the statute means absolutely nothing.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, this bill was sent to the Judiciary Committee from the Department of State. An identical bill was introduced in the House at the request of the State Department

and passed. It is now proposed to act on the House bill.

The bill relates solely to the departure from and entry into the United States of aliens. The statute of May 22, 1918, was passed during the World War, when President Wilson was in office. The bill makes one change following the enacting clause of the act of May 22, 1918. The act of 1918 begins:

When the United States is at war—

It is proposed to amend the first paragraph of section 1, so as to read:

When the United States is at war or whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall find that the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this act be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, it shall, until otherwise ordered by the President or Congress, be unlawful.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as I am concerned, I am fully satisfied. I have no further objection.

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

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says that the bill applies only to aliens. The language refers to restrictions and prohibitions imposed upon the departure of "persons" from and their entry into the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is entirely correct. It would apply to Americans; but the main objective is to reach certain elements of aliens.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the bill mean that at a busy international crossing such as that between Windsor, Ontario, and Detroit, Mich., where there are probably 10,000 passages a day, hereafter there would be a requirement for passports?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Indeed not. If the Senator from Michigan will examine the report on the bill, he will find that the rules and regulations and the administration would be largely under the Department of State. It is specifically stated that there is no desire to impede the traffic between Canada, Mexico, or the Latin American countries and the United States, because we court their friendship and nothing should be done to alienate it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So the proposed law would not apply to transborder migrations as between Canada and the United States?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is correct. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that there is nothing in the bill itself which would guarantee that result, but we have the guarantee of the State Department that that matter would be taken care of in the rules and regulations.

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

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the bill is proposed as permanent law. Whenever there was a war anywhere in the world, the President would be given unlimited power to prescribe restrictions and the terms on which any person might leave the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is not correct. If the Senator from Ohio will read the bill, it says:

When the United States is at war or whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall find that the interests of the United States requires that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this act be imposed—

And so forth.

For example, if there should be a minor war between a couple of islands in the South Seas, I doubt whether the President could find that it adversely affected the safety and best interests of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the President is not required to find that the war has any relation to the interest of the United States. He simply finds that the interests of the United States require certain restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those imposed by Congress. It seems to me this would be another statute which would give the President unlimited power, under any circumstances, to make the law of the United States and to prescribe the terms upon which any person—an American or any other person—might leave the United States. I can see possible justification for the enactment of such a law to apply to the present situation; but it seems to me that to enact a permanent statute giving the President the power to prescribe such restrictions at any time when any war exists anywhere in the world would be delegating a legislative power, which the Congress ought not to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, supplementing my colloquy with the able Senator from Indiana, I ask that the final paragraph of the committee report be printed in the RECORD. It is upon that statement that the Senator from Indiana bases his assurance to me that the purpose is not to interfere with transboundary traffic.

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

It is not contemplated, should the proposed legislation be enacted into law, to restrict or to prohibit or in any way to impede the legitimate travel of citizens of the United States or the legitimate and necessary entry into or departure from the United States of aliens. The Department of State in nowise discourages travel of American citizens to countries of the Western Hemisphere or the travel of the inhabitants of such countries to the United States. Such travel is considered advantageous not only to the United States but also to all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere in drawing them together more closely in sympathy and understanding, and is encouraged rather than discouraged. It can, therefore, be anticipated that any rules or regulations issued under the proposed legislation would be drawn up in such a manner as to avoid undue inconveniences and difficulties in the

matter of the departure from and entry into the United States of citizens of the United States and aliens, and that particular regard would be given to the matter of affording every convenience to American citizens who desire to enter Canada or Mexico from the United States and to the citizens of Canada and Mexico who desire to travel in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 4973?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. A point of order. There is unfinished business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to take up another bill is always in order.

Mr. BYRNES. If my motion should prevail, the bill would displace the pending business, so I merely give notice that tomorrow, after the disposition of the pending appropriation bill, a motion will be made to proceed to the consideration of the bill reported by the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry surgeons, passed assistant surgeons, dental surgeons, and passed assistant dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. HILL from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Coast Guard; and Col. Malcolm Elliott, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the Mississippi River Commission, as provided for by law, vice Col. Roger G. Powell, Corps of Engineers relieved.

DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE FOR NEBRASKA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs the nomination of Brig. Gen. Guy N. Henninger, Adjutant General of Nebraska, to be State director of selective service for Nebraska, and I ask for immediate consideration and confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears

none, and there being no objection the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

THE ARMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably sundry nominations. This is a list of routine appointments, promotions, and transfers in the Army. I ask that the reading of the names be dispensed with, and that the nominations be considered en bloc at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask that the President be informed forthwith of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

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

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas F. Britt to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank E. DeKay to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received June 19 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

To be commanders, to rank as such from May 1, 1941

Lt. Comdr. George E. McCabe

Lt. Comdr. Lee H. Baker

Lt. Comdr. Martin W. Rasmussen

To be commanders, to rank as such from May 25, 1941

Lt. Comdr. Donald C. McNeil

Lt. Comdr. Harley E. Grogan

Lt. Comdr. Harold G. Belford

To be lieutenant commanders, to rank as such from May 1, 1941

Lt. Chester A. A. Anderson
Lt. Edward E. Hahn, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders, to rank as such from May 25, 1941

Lt. Emanuel Desses
Lt. Wilbur C. Hogan
Lt. Kenneth P. Maley
Lt. Samuel F. Gray
Lt. Earl K. Rhodes
Lt. Leon H. Morine
Lt. Walter C. Capron

To be a lieutenant, to rank as such from December 1, 1940

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Gilbert F. Schumacher

To be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 1, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Charles Tighe

To be lieutenants, to rank as such from May 1, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Fred L. Westbrook
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Richard Baxter

To be lieutenants, to rank as such from May 25, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Oscar D. Weed, Jr.
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ralph D. Dean
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Joseph R. Scullion
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William J. Conley, Jr.
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Richard L. Mellen
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Glenn L. Rollins
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ernest A. Cascini
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Robert F. Shunk
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Justus P. White
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William J. Lawrence

To be lieutenants, to rank as such from June 8, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Guy L. Ottinger
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Clifford S. Gerde
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edward C. Thompson, Jr.
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) James P. Stow III
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Gerald T. Applegate

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Department, with rank from date of appointment

Maj. Allen Wood Rigsby, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be captain with rank from June 11, 1941

First Lt. Richard Byington Carhart, Quartermaster Corps (captain, Army of the United States), subject to examination required by law.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Guy C. Williams, to be postmaster at Kensett, Ark., in place of J. H. Wiseman, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Herbert F. Kenny, to be postmaster at Balboa, Calif., in place of A. M. Hamann. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

John H. Vaughan, to be postmaster at Chico, Calif., in place of J. H. Vaughan. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Mary L. Jordan to be postmaster at Fairfax, Calif., in place of M. L. Jordan. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Charles M. Gorham to be postmaster at Mar Vista, Calif., in place of C. M. Gorham. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1939.

GEORGIA

Joseph M. Poston to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, Ga., in place of R. G. Hudson, resigned.

IDAHO

Sheldon J. McMillan to be postmaster at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in place of J. V. Hawkins, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Joseph S. Flaherty to be postmaster at Harvey, Ill., in place of J. S. Flaherty. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Charles Paul Janes, to be postmaster at Industry, Ill., in place of G. E. Roe, resigned.
Albert G. Lucas to be postmaster at Lake Forest, Ill., in place of A. G. Lucas. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Arthur M. Kloepper to be postmaster at Winnetka, Ill., in place of A. M. Kloepper. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

INDIANA

Robert T. Phillippe to be postmaster at Bicknell, Ind., in place of R. T. Phillippe. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Harry O. Storm to be postmaster at Clay City, Ind., in place of H. O. Storm. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Robert C. Mayhall to be postmaster at Edinburg, Ind., in place of R. C. Mayhall. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Mel M. Carter to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ind., in place of M. M. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

IOWA

Charles Monroe Boyer to be postmaster at Clutier, Iowa, in place of Fannie Hach. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1938.

Edith M. Johnson to be postmaster at Des Moines, Iowa, in place of L. S. Hill, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Clarence H. McElroy to be postmaster at Morganfield, Ky., in place of J. T. Phipps, deceased.

MAINE

Guy C. Bean to be postmaster at Freeport, Maine, in place of G. C. Bean. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

MARYLAND

M. Elizabeth Gorsuch to be postmaster at Glencoe, Md., in place of G. M. Mowell, deceased.

A. Franklin Bowers to be postmaster at Riverdale, Md., in place of M. L. Boshier, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

Paul Kauppinen to be postmaster at Baldwinville, Mass., in place of L. O. Kauppinen, deceased.

Grace Hartley Howe to be postmaster at Fall River, Mass., in place of G. H. Howe. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1941.

MICHIGAN

Carl H. Renbarger to be postmaster at Galien, Mich., in place of C. H. Renbarger. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

William J. Barber, to be postmaster at Mason, Mich., in place of E. B. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

MINNESOTA

Earl J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Brainerd, Minn., in place of H. P. Dunn, deceased.

Howard R. Terrill to be postmaster at Nopeming, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Mae M. Stewart to be postmaster at Pine River, Minn., in place of L. E. Dougherty, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Sam D. Hamilton to be postmaster at Tutwiler, Miss., in place of S. D. Hamilton. In-

cumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

MISSOURI

Felix J. Schaul to be postmaster at Hannibal, Mo., in place of F. J. Schaul. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1941.

NEBRASKA

Rex Shubert to be postmaster at Fairfield, Nebr., in place of Rex Shubert. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Clive E. Lantz to be postmaster at Hildreth, Nebr., in place of F. W. Purdy, removed.

Bessie A. Freed to be postmaster at Pender, Nebr., in place of B. A. Freed. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1940.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Peter J. Hickey to be postmaster at Portsmouth, N. H., in place of P. J. Hickey. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

William P. Major to be postmaster at Bergenfield, N. J., in place of W. S. Nevins. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

NEW MEXICO

Byron F. Hughes to be postmaster at Eunice, N. Mex., in place of B. F. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

NEW YORK

Celestine Reynolds to be postmaster at Corfu, N. Y., in place of T. J. McManus, Jr., deceased.

Harry B. Hickey to be postmaster at Fredonia, N. Y., in place of H. B. Hickey. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Lorin Eggleston to be postmaster at Westport, N. Y., in place of Lorin Eggleston. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Raymond B. Cooper to be postmaster at Williamson, N. Y., in place of C. K. Cooper, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Fred L. Key to be postmaster at Boonville, N. C., in place of F. L. Key. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1941.

Claude W. Walston to be postmaster at Pinetops, N. C., in place of C. W. Walston. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

George C. Herritage to be postmaster at Trenton, N. C., in place of G. C. Herritage. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1941.

NORTH DAKOTA

William C. Drake to be postmaster at Bowdon, N. Dak., in place of W. C. Drake. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Richard T. L. Noyes to be postmaster at Cando, N. Dak., in place of R. T. L. Noyes. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1941.

George Knauss to be postmaster at Hannaford, N. Dak., in place of George Knauss. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Lawrence C. Lerud to be postmaster at Hoople, N. Dak., in place of L. C. Lerud. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Joseph E. DeMers to be postmaster at St. John, N. Dak., in place of J. E. DeMers. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1941.

Sigrid Vick to be postmaster at Sheyenne, N. Dak., in place of Sigrid Vick. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Hulda E. Heze to be postmaster at Zealand, N. Dak., in place of H. E. Heze. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

OHIO

Verne H. Parker to be postmaster at Orwell, Ohio, in place of H. R. Shipman, deceased.

John E. Doyle to be postmaster at Youngstown, Ohio, in place of A. W. Craver, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

J. Woodrow Wright to be postmaster at Adair, Okla., in place of J. W. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Lewis E. Sloan to be postmaster at Alex, Okla., in place of L. E. Sloan. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Otis E. Cox to be postmaster at Barnsdall, Okla., in place of O. D. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Thomas J. Hurst to be postmaster at Calumet, Okla., in place of T. J. Hurst. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Nettie I. McHenry to be postmaster at Chelsea, Okla., in place of N. I. McHenry. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

Esther L. Hatchett to be postmaster at Gracemont, Okla., in place of E. L. Hatchett. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Forrest Thomas, Jr., to be postmaster at Healdton, Okla., in place of Forrest Thomas, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Roy L. Knecht to be postmaster at Heavener, Okla., in place of R. L. Knecht. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Lafayette F. George to be postmaster at Henryetta, Okla., in place of L. F. George. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Ernest F. Lyon to be postmaster at Hinton, Okla., in place of E. F. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

John S. Keller to be postmaster at Lexington, Okla., in place of J. S. Keller. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Samuel M. Scholl to be postmaster at Lookaba, Okla., in place of S. M. Scholl. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Ernest B. Willis to be postmaster at Noble, Okla., in place of E. B. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Walter G. Baustert to be postmaster at Okeene, Okla., in place of W. G. Baustert. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Douglas Thomas to be postmaster at Ryan, Okla., in place of Douglas Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Robert H. Greenlee to be postmaster at Stonewall, Okla., in place of R. H. Greenlee. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

William H. Wester to be postmaster at Tuttle, Okla., in place of W. H. Wester. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Floyd G. Ransbarger to be postmaster at Verden, Okla., in place of F. G. Ransbarger. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Alfred Claude Davis to be postmaster at Woodward, Okla., in place of A. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

OREGON

Kathleen M. Barrett to be postmaster at Athena, Oreg., in place of K. M. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Ivan L. Swift to be postmaster at Gresham, Oreg., in place of I. L. Swift. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Donald E. Miller to be postmaster at Maupin, Oreg., in place of B. F. Turner, removed.

Elizabeth G. Howard to be postmaster at Milton, Oreg., in place of E. G. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Florence A. Parker to be postmaster at North Powder, Oreg., in place of V. E. Lee, deceased.

Arthur H. Tift to be postmaster at Redmond, Oreg., in place of A. H. Tift. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Raymond A. McHale to be postmaster at Archbald, Pa., in place of R. A. McHale. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Joseph E. Burnside to be postmaster at Emporium, Pa., in place of J. E. Burnside. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Joseph R. Thurston to be postmaster at Factoryville, Pa., in place of J. R. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Willis S. Saxon to be postmaster at Fredericktown, Pa., in place of E. N. Dickey. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Frederic W. Moser to be postmaster at Greenville, Pa., in place of F. W. Moser. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Paul A. Saupp to be postmaster at Houtzdale, Pa., in place of J. E. Madigan, deceased.

John B. Cassidy to be postmaster at Shiremanstown, Pa., in place of John Cassidy. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Galen L. Brookmyer to be postmaster at Smoketown, Pa., in place of G. L. Brookmyer. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Charles S. Doyle to be postmaster at South Langhorne, Pa., in place of C. S. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Burnett W. Weber to be postmaster at Sykesville, Pa., in place of B. W. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

May E. Reisinger to be postmaster at Wrightsville, Pa., in place of M. E. Reisinger. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

PUERTO RICO

Joaquin Fernandez to be postmaster at Rio Piedras, P. R., in place of Antonio Godinez, retired.

Laura Molini Diaz to be postmaster at Yauco, P. R., in place of Simon Semidel, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

Arnold Sherman Knowles, Jr., to be postmaster at Kingston, R. I., in place of A. S. Knowles, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1941.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grady R. Hogue to be postmaster at Blacksburg, S. C., in place of G. R. Hogue. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Carl W. Reeves to be postmaster at Gray Court, S. C., in place of C. W. Reeves. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William C. McCaffrey to be postmaster at Alexandria, S. Dak., in place of W. C. McCaffrey. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Carl L. Freiwald to be postmaster at Big Stone City, S. Dak., in place of C. L. Freiwald. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

TENNESSEE

Frank Rickman to be postmaster at Chapel Hill, Tenn., in place of Frank Rickman. Incumbent's commission expired August 13, 1939.

Robert L. Woods to be postmaster at Concord, Tenn., in place of R. L. Woods. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1941.

Hugh N. Reeves to be postmaster at Dickson, Tenn., in place of H. N. Reeves. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

Jesse S. McMurry to be postmaster at Hartsville, Tenn., in place of J. S. McMurry. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

Edward B. Weisiger to be postmaster at Hendersonville, Tenn., in place of E. B. Weisiger. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

John E. Hale to be postmaster at Liberty, Tenn., in place of J. E. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

Charles B. Stone to be postmaster at Woodbury, Tenn., in place of C. B. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

TEXAS

Tod E. Lawson to be postmaster at Annona, Tex., in place of T. E. Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Louise W. Fisher to be postmaster at Burton, Tex., in place of L. W. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1940.

John H. Parrish to be postmaster at Denison, Tex., in place of F. B. Hughes, deceased.

Rudolph R. Kubena to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Tex., in place of R. R. Kubena. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Thomas H. McCarty to be postmaster at Lawn, Tex., in place of T. H. McCarty. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Charlie L. Smith to be postmaster at Rising Star, Tex., in place of C. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Jennie L. Murphy to be postmaster at Roaring Springs, Tex., in place of J. L. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Carlos S. Baker, Sr., to be postmaster at Stockdale, Tex., in place of C. S. Baker, Sr. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Willis Walker to be postmaster at Turkey, Tex., in place of Willis Walker. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Carlyle B. Moore to be postmaster at Van Alstyne, Tex., in place of C. B. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

John J. Dutton to be postmaster at Vanderbilt, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

VERMONT

Neal B. Smith to be postmaster at Willamstown, Vt., in place of N. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1941.

VIRGINIA

Leo A. Arthur to be postmaster at Altavista, Va., in place of L. A. Arthur. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Charles W. Crush to be postmaster at Christiansburg, Va., in place of C. W. Crush. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

William F. Cox to be postmaster at Jonesville, Va., in place of W. F. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1941.

WASHINGTON

Arthur J. Kralowec to be postmaster at Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Raymond V. Rosso to be postmaster at Black Diamond, Wash., in place of R. V. Rosso. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Harvey Lewis to be postmaster at Kirkland, Wash., in place of Harvey Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Andrew Hunter to be postmaster at Puyallup, Wash., in place of Andrew Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

John E. Ober to be postmaster at Vashon, Wash., in place of J. E. Ober. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

WISCONSIN

Allen G. Wald to be postmaster at Alma, Wis., in place of A. G. Wald. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Alice S. Port to be postmaster at Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

Andy J. Fogerty to be postmaster at Dresser, Wis., in place of A. J. Fogerty. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Reinhold R. Hoffman to be postmaster at Fairchild, Wis., in place of J. D. McGaver, removed.

John Lindow to be postmaster at Manawa, Wis., in place of E. A. J. Samsow. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Ernest G. Henline to be postmaster at Medford, Wis., in place of C. E. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1940.

Delia G. Guay to be postmaster at Peshtigo, Wis., in place of D. G. Guay. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Thomas F. Britt to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz.

Frank E. DeKay to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Guy N. Henninger to be State director of Selective Service for Nebraska.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT AS LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Lesley James McNair.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

George Good Cressy to be lieutenant colonel.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Thomas West Hammond, Jr.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Ray Olander Welch

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. William Charles Haneke

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. James Louis McGehee

First Lt. Alexander James Stuart, Jr.

First Lt. Francis Joseph McMorrow.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Loren Boyd Hillsinger

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Clarence Woodson Hardy

Robert Edward Lee

Robert Edwin Peyton

Harold Hanson Twitchell

Clement Franklin St. John

To be captains

John Austin Booth

Robert James Goldson

Robert Scurry Anderson

Arthur Thomas Jones

Charles Culmer Scamahorn

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Eugene Edward Manning

To be captains

Calvin George Hagerman

Herbert Lester Gullickson

Lawrence Carlton Radford

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

Harvie Russell Ellis

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Abraham Garfinkel, Philippine Scouts.

Edward James Oliver, Infantry.

Frederic Waldo Whitney, Cavalry.

Clifford Mitchell Tuteur, Field Artillery.

Arthur Eugene Rowland, Coast Artillery Corps.

Leon R. Cole, Field Artillery.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

James E. Wick, Albion.

Martin Ferentchak, Argo.

Harold F. Mayer, Bartlett.

William W. McIntire, Belvidere.

Kenneth Henkhaus, Bethalto.

Norbert C. Knapp, Glen Ellyn.

Harry F. DuQuoin, Greenview.

Guy R. Knappenberger, Kirkland.

George A. Boeke, Lena.

Robert L. Davis, Lincoln.

Harold Vogel, Minonk

Arthur T. Ellis, Necca.

Charlotte H. Eekhoff, Nokomis.

Bessie B. Kampmeier, Pearl City.

Peter L. Kelly, Piper City.

Monroe R. Hanneman, Silvis.

Louis L. Eubanks, Sparland.

MISSISSIPPI

Leo G. Ford, Bay St. Louis.

George Y. Banks, Columbus.

Mercer L. Gwin, De Kalb.

Nathan B. Williams, Fernwood.

Dewey W. Tullos, Mize.

Aubrey O. Hammack, Scooba.

Albert F. Zachry, Stonewall.

OHIO

Cleo M. Richter, Pickerington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O Lord, our God, that we may gratefully behold the invisible realities of life. This life is for the senses; that is for the spirit; this is for the flesh, which perisheth; that is for the immortal soul which is imperishable; this passes; that abides and good shall come at last and every winter changed to spring. While the beauty and the glory of this world is being frayed, do Thou, through its eye, see through its life, listen through its ear, O speak through its voice and suffuse it with Thy blessed spirit. Everywhere in our dear homeland, dismiss the cloud of scorn that darkens brows, the poison of hate that falls from the lips of envy and the demon of unchastity that dwells in the bosom where habit forms the direction of the soul. We pray that benevolence, the mother of virtues, that controlling law of love, which likens us unto the image of the Master, may bless us and open the understanding of those who are misled and are unsustainable by the ever-living truth that this is God's world and that it can never be covered

with the curtain of darkness. As the world seems to be turning the bend of history, hold us to the eternal verity that while knowledge is power, life is more than thought; we rejoice that it is the breath of our Heavenly Father in the souls of His children. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 14, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States; and

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 23, 1896.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is a red-letter day in the history of the House and in the life of our beloved colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. This is his natal day. He is today four score and three years old, and in the certainty of exceeding by a score of years the ancient Biblical tradition of three score years and ten.

He is the dean of the House, the only living Member of the Congress born in the decade preceding the Civil War. At the time of his birth James Buchanan was President of the United States, and James L. Orr, of South Carolina, a name once potent but now completely forgotten, was Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Chairman TAYLOR is serving his seventeenth successive term. Only 4 other Members in the history of the House of Representatives, from the administration of Washington down to the present time, have served 17 successive terms. But Chairman TAYLOR bears the added distinction of being the only man to serve 34 successive years after passing his fiftieth milestone.

Henry Harrison Bingham, of Pennsylvania, served 17 successive terms, but entered Congress at the age of 38.

Gilbert Nils Haugen, of Iowa, served 17 successive terms, but came to the House at the age of 40 years.