

fending the health and morals of the military forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

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

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Gracious Father, Author of Peace and Lover of Concord, who alone canst teach the minds of men and incline their wills to do Thy pleasure: Look, we beseech Thee, with the eyes of Thy mercy upon our Nation, and bless the multitudes who have been called hither out of many lands. Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, greed, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord. Help us to realize that like as we are many members of one body and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, yet are one body and every one members one of another, having gifts differing according to the grace that is giver to us.

Where we are divided, do Thou unite us, that, in singleness of purpose and unity of heart, we may build a brotherhood in which the ills of the present time shall disappear. Do Thou make America to be cognizant of her unity, that, walking in Thy paths, she may become the earthly counterpart of the Kingdom which Thou hast revealed to us through Thy Son our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, June 19, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 17, 18, 20, 25, 33, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 66, 87, 93, 99, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 120, 121, 128, 129, 132, 141, and 145 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 6, 19, 103, 119, 130, 144, and 147 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the

House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 152 and 153 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

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;

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

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

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 West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], 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 public business.

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

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] are unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], 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 because of the death of his mother.

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Mrs. K. Kurt Baldauf, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against conveying ships to Europe by forces of the United States and against the union of the United States with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Earl McCune, of Stafford, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Memorials 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. MURRAY:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Montana, 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. HUGHES:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State 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; to the table.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, 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.

By Mr. CAPPER:

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

A petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (E. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

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

RESOLUTION OF DIRECTORS OF FOND DU LAC (WIS.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE—PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF CHEESE

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution of the directors of Association of Commerce, of Fond du Lac, Wis., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution passed by directors of Association of Commerce, Fond du Lac, Wis., Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has made public pronouncement to the Nation requesting that it reduce the consumption of cheese for the purpose of creating a surplus to be used for export to one of the nations engaged in the European war; and

Whereas the dairy farmers of Fond du Lac County have been contributing to a fund used by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture for the purpose of advertising and increasing the per capita consumption of cheese in the United States; and

Whereas Fond du Lac County ranks eleventh in cheese production among the 71 counties of Wisconsin, and the income from dairy products, especially cheese, vitally affects the economic life of the county of Fond du Lac as expressed by a production during 1940 of 13,123,000 pounds of cheese, using approximately 135,000,000 pounds of milk; and a reduction in consumption would vitally affect the earning capacity of 61,000 milk cows and large investments in modern farm and dairy equipment involving the highest sanitary standards in the Nation, and in addition would affect the income of a large number of people who are active in businesses kindred to the dairy-products industry, especially that of cheese, the revenue from which is accurately estimated to represent more than one-third of the total income from all dairy products of the country; and

Whereas the present level of national consumption of cheese will be necessary to avoid a precarious condition after the present foreign emergency is over: Be it

Resolved, The directors of the Fond du Lac Association of Commerce, representing the industrial, retail, wholesale, and professional men of the city, hereby enter their protest to Secretary Wickard's agricultural program asking for reduction of the consumption of cheese and resolve that the Secretary be respectfully requested to retract his request and as soon as possible consult with the dairy leaders of Wisconsin to the end that our present national per capita consumption may be preserved for the future and that the cheese required to meet the European emergency be obtained by some program of increased production of cheese; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Secretary Claude Wickard, Senators Alexander Wiley and Robert M. La Follette, and Congressman Frank Keefe.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS HOME DEMONSTRATION ADVISORY COUNCIL—MEDIATION OF THE EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Kansas Home Demonstration Advisory Council, an organization representing 23,000 farm-bureau women in Kansas, have sent me a copy of their resolution expressing their support of proposals to end the European war by mediation. The resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved, That the Kansas Home Demonstration Advisory Council go on record as giving full support to "the Christian campaign for peace through mediation" now being launched by leading churchmen of America, and that the following peace slogan be adopted:

"We do not want to participate; we cannot arbitrate; but we must make every effort to mediate."

I wish to say that I look with favor on these mediation proposals, and am in accord with the objectives of the council's resolution. I call attention also to the slogan suggested by the council, which reads:

We do not want to participate; we cannot arbitrate; but we must make every effort to mediate.

I think this slogan outlines a wise course. We might do well to give thought to it.

The people of Kansas are overwhelmingly opposed to our active participation in Europe's war. I believe the majority of the people of Kansas are in favor of mediating the European war. Certainly no one wants to see the killing and destruction continued.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. Brown), from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1619. A bill for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 474).

By Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4646. A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; without amendment (Rept. No. 475).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Execu-

tive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, 10 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 19, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1652. A bill to provide for medical care, subsistence, and treatment in private hospitals and medical attention by civilian physicians and surgeons for certain officers and enlisted men in the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Keffer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1654. A bill for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. Brown):

S. 1655. A bill for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former special disbursing agent, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 1656. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to retain Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, United States Army, on active duty with combat troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1657. A bill to provide for the issuance of insurance policies under section 300 of the World War Veterans' Act, as amended; to prohibit the issuance of insurance policies under the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1658. A bill authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency; to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced a private bill, Senate bill 1628, for the relief of S. R. Brackin, providing for the payment of a claim in the amount of \$346.20. The bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think it more properly belongs to the Committee on Claims. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was referred to the

Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 35, line 2, to strike out the words "24 hours", and insert in lieu thereof the words "30 days."

REPORT ON THE STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WASH. (S. DOC. NO. 70)

Mr. BAILEY presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 20, 1941, from the Chief of Engineers of the Army, on reexamination of Stillaguamish River, Wash., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON THE NANTICOKE RIVER, DEL. AND MD. (S. DOC. NO. 69)

Mr. BAILEY presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 20, 1941, from the Chief of Engineers of the Army, on reexamination of the Nanticoke River, Del. and Md., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

ARTICLE BY CHRISTINE SADLER ON PUTNAM COUNTY, TENN.

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Christine Sadler, published in the Washington Post of June 18, 1941, relative to Putnam County, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATION 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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I have on the desk an amendment, which I offer and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

In the administration of the program provided for by this act each State shall be recognized as an administrative unit.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, on what page is the amendment to come?

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Delaware did not indicate the page.

Mr. HUGHES. It should be inserted at the appropriate place.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Chair state the page on which the amendment is to be inserted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware asked that his amendment be inserted at the proper place.

Mr. MCKELLAR. May the amendment be read again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be restated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert:

In the administration of the program provided for by this act each State shall be recognized as an administrative unit.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, my object in offering the amendment is this: We all recognize, I take it—at least I do—that as a result of the reduction in the appropriation there will not be sufficient money to administer the W. P. A. properly. I voted for the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in the belief that the amount should be increased so that the class of our people affected could be properly and adequately taken care of.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—
Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me interrupt the Senator to say that so far as I am individually concerned, I have no objection to his amendment. As a matter of fact, it does not change the existing situation, because there is a separate administrative unit in every State; and so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to having the amendment put in the joint resolution.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator from Colorado and to the Senate that I have had some intimation that in the effort which will be made to administer this law by taking care of as many persons as possible, it may be that the administrative expenses will be reduced, and that one way in which it may be attempted to carry out that policy will be to group some States and do away with the administration of relief in one or two of them. In the case of a State such as my State of Delaware, for instance—which is a small State—there is always a temptation to place the administration of such laws in some one of the large adjoining States, so that we will have no part in the program, causing in the administration of the program our people to go into Pennsylvania or Maryland or some other State, would be very inconvenient. The purpose I have in offering the amendment is that each State's program shall be retained, so that there shall be a relief administration in each one of the States, and that it shall not be taken away from any one of them.

I heartily wish it were not necessary even to consider the matter, and that the program could be continued as it is now, which is highly satisfactory, especially in my State. I think I can very safely say that the administration of W. P. A. has been extremely satisfactory in Delaware, a State in which there has never been the slightest criticism of its administration. I think we have one of the best W. P. A. directors in the whole country, and that he is generally recognized as being so. In fact, while all the daily newspapers in Delaware are of the opposite party, it is a very common thing for them to commend the W. P. A. administrator in Delaware for his fair and honest and capable administration of the law. So the reason why I offer the amendment is that I want to be sure no effort will be made to set up administrative regions nearby and take the administration of the law from Delaware, for instance, and put it under agencies in other States.

That is my object in offering the amendment. The Senator from Colorado says it is already in the law.

Mr. ADAMS. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not say it is in the law, I

say it is in the established practice of the administration, and I have no idea that there will be a change.

Mr. HUGHES. As the amendment was originally drawn, it carried another provision, which is already in the joint resolution. I am satisfied that so far as the W. P. A. Commissioner can do so and is concerned, he would avoid doing such a thing as the amendment seeks to avoid, and that he would attempt to administer the law as it has been administered; but when the money to be administered is so drastically reduced as in this instance, there is a sore temptation to resort to some method of making it go as far as possible; and, in doing so, frequently an injustice is done to some one of the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES].

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

Provided further, That the funds appropriated by this section may be apportioned for a lesser period than the 12 months of the fiscal year 1942, but not for less than 8 months, as determined by the President, if in his judgment such action is required to meet unemployment conditions during such lesser period, but the funds so appropriated shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such Administration during such period.

And on page 10, line 20, after the date "1942", it is proposed to insert the words "except where a different apportionment is specifically permitted by this joint resolution."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in view of the very extensive argument yesterday on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, it is unnecessary for me at this time to go again into the details with regard to the situation which will develop as a result of the serious reduction in the appropriation for W. P. A. In many sections of the country, in States where national-defense contracts have not been allocated, a serious condition will result from the curtailment which will be made under the joint resolution as it now stands. Therefore I suggest that my amendment should be adopted. It would permit the President to exercise his discretion with regard to the use of these funds in a period of 8 months, if he found it was necessary to do so.

In my State of Montana I find that, as a result of the curtailed appropriations, it will be necessary to suspend entirely the W. P. A. activities in half the counties of the State. It will result in a very serious situation. In those counties unemployment is quite as serious today as it has been at any time during the last several years. If the joint resolution shall be enacted as it now stands, it will mean that those counties will have to go entirely without any W. P. A. activities. I think the same situation will be found in most of the States of the Union where defense

contracts have not been allocated. Therefore, I submit that the amendment should be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the following proviso:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this provision in the bill is certainly extraordinary. It seems to me there is no basis whatever for such a provision in an appropriation measure.

As the joint resolution stands, it provides every necessary safeguard to prevent the employment of persons in W. P. A. who are unworthy of such positions. Therefore, there could be no justification for singling out a particular individual and having the joint resolution provide that no part of the funds appropriated under it may be used for the payment of his salary.

I submit that such a provision would be vicious legislation. It is entirely uncalled for. The basis for it advanced in the House was that this man Lasser was supposed to have been in some manner connected with communistic or subversive organizations. The purpose of the provision was to prevent his employment by the W. P. A. There is absolutely no justification for that charge. I have before me a great number of articles which have appeared in the press of the country, showing that the contrary is the fact. Mr. Lasser at one time was the head of the Workers Alliance, and as the head of that organization it became necessary for him, whenever W. P. A. appropriations were being considered in Congress, to come here for the purpose of advocating increases and other amendments to the bills for the purpose of safeguarding and protecting the rights of those employed on W. P. A.

Necessarily in connection with his work in that regard he appeared before committees, and it seems that offense was taken by some of the members of the committees because of his excessive diligence in representing the rights of the workers. The purpose of the proviso in the joint resolution is to preclude him from employment in the W. P. A. Never since I have been in the Senate have I heard of legislation of this kind, and it seems to me it would be a vicious precedent for the Congress to establish. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be acted upon.

I should like also to call attention to a great number of articles which I have taken from the press showing that Mr. Lasser is not in any manner connected with communistic organizations. He has a record of having been interested only in protecting the rights and representing the interests of the unfortunate people

who are compelled to seek employment under the W. P. A.

I shall not read the articles, because it would consume too much of the time of the Senate, but I submit that the amendment should be accepted.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this is not an agreeable situation. I had hoped the amendment would not be offered. Ordinarily it is bad legislation to insert in a bill a provision dealing with the compensation of a particular individual, but there exists a situation which justifies a departure from the ordinary rules.

Mr. Lasser has denounced and condemned the Senate and the House and their committees repeatedly. Mr. Hunter, the head of the W. P. A., was advised that Mr. Lasser was an improper person to have on his roll. He has taken a man who has accused the Senate and the House and the W. P. A. Administration, under which he served, of graft and incompetency, and when the W. P. A. puts him in a place in the organization, which he has denounced, and gives him \$4,400 a year, and sends him about the country, Congress has no other alternative but to exercise its own power.

I am compelled to put into the RECORD a word or two from Mr. Lasser's own statement. He appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations, and speaking of the organization under which he operates, he said:

Mr. LASSER. We feel, first, that the set-up of W. P. A. is all wrong. You have a single man, a dictator, at the top. Mr. Hopkins might be as well-meaning and honest as you please, but we don't believe that one man should have the sole dictating power over the relief system of this country. He can be subject to too many pressures and too many failings. I think it is the only case in the country in which one man has the sole power and there is no board to check him.

Secondly, there has grown up because of the dictation which springs from the top and runs down to the bottom, all the graft, all the favoritism, all the politics, that has appeared in the papers. We have known about graft, we have known about favoritism, we have known about politics for a long time, and we feel that under the present system of operation of W. P. A., graft and politics are going to continue. There must be in this W. P. A. set-up some form of representation by the men who are actually employed. If we had a say, and we were free from the fear of discharge when we complained about inefficiency and graft and favoritism, I assure you that the W. P. A. workers would keep W. P. A. clean.

That is the organization under which he operates. He said further:

Now we feel that we have been betrayed; that after accepting this so-called security wage, and after working just a few months, 700,000 of the workers are now being laid off. We feel, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the Democratic Party has sold us out, and has sold us out in order to flirt during this election with big business.

That is the kind of a gentleman he is. Now let me read some of the releases.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. To what organization does this man belong?

Mr. ADAMS. I am not concerned with the kind of organization to which he belongs.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought the Senator was referring to the kind of organization to which he belongs.

Mr. ADAMS. He belongs to the W. P. A. We are complaining that this kind of a man has been given a place in the W. P. A., and the Members of the House have said that they are unwilling to have him continue in that organization. We feel that we should not force upon the W. P. A. a man who has denounced House Members as grafters and as Tories.

Mr. HUGHES. When was this statement made?

Mr. ADAMS. The particular statement was made several years ago, but he has been making similar statements year by year and month by month.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not wish the Senator to assume that I am taking up the cudgels for Mr. Lasser.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is free to do so.

Mr. HUGHES. No. I simply wanted to know when the statements were made and what they were.

Mr. ADAMS. They have been made continuously. I have been serving upon appropriations and other committees for 8 years. Mr. Lasser is the only man I know who has ever appeared before those committees and insulted not only the committees, but the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate a few more utterances of this gentleman. In a statement issued for release by the organization of which he was then the head, he said:

The 1940 relief and work-relief bill is the product of undemocratic, tricky, back-room maneuvers.

He said further:

The same may be said of the other provisions that were rejected and repudiated on the floor of the Senate and then smuggled into the bill behind the closed doors of the conference room.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. May I ask the Senator about whom he is talking?

Mr. ADAMS. About David Lasser.

Mr. GLASS. I understood the Senator to refer to Hunter.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Hunter is the man who employed Mr. Lasser, and I might have confused the names.

Mr. GLASS. All this vituperation, which, as I understood, was directed at Mr. Hunter, ought to have been directed at Lasser. I think we ought to cut him off if we can.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator whether that last quotation was from Mr. Lasser or from the Republican national platform? [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman further goes on and, speaking of the bill, says:

There were protests against the law foisted on us by the antilabor Garner-Woodrum-Taber clique dominant in Congress.

Mr. President, this gentleman came before the Senate committee, where he denounced Members of the House and

charged them with improper and dishonest conduct to such an extent that we had to delete the remarks he made. Things that Senators were not permitted to say we would not permit this man to come and put on the record. He has lost no occasion when he could denounce Members of the Senate and Members of the House as corrupt, as dishonest, as inefficient. When the Members of the House, whose leadership has repeatedly been denounced by this man, say in the bill that they do not want this man on the rolls, that they have not been able to get Mr. Hunter, the head of the organization, to take him off, I think it is our obligation to stand by the Members of the House and say that we will not employ a man who has insulted the membership of the House and the membership of the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that the objection the Senator from Colorado has against this man is that he appeared before the committee and freely expressed his views with reference to the W. P. A. and with reference to the matters then under consideration; and, merely because he exercised his right as a free American citizen to come before a committee of the Congress, he is now to be prohibited from having a position in any Government agency. I think that is a violent deprivation of his rights. It seems to me the Senate of the United States should not tolerate that kind of legislation.

As I understand his statement, the only objection the Senator from Colorado points out is that Mr. Lasser came before the committee and made these arguments openly and aboveboard before the committee. The same things have been said by thousands of other people all over the country. If we do what is now proposed to be done we shall establish a new principle in the Congress of the United States, and we will find that this kind of legislation will be proposed every time an appropriation bill comes up for consideration, when the committee is not satisfied with certain employees in various agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, I submit that my amendment should be sustained.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the statement which the Senator from Montana makes is quite at variance with the facts. The House objects to Mr. Lasser not only because he comes before committees and makes certain statements but because he is an improper man to serve in a responsible Government place, for the reason that he has no respect for this Government and has no respect for the organization under which he is employed. He had been allowed to come repeatedly before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and say whatever he saw fit to say, until the time came when he denounced Members of the House as corrupt, and then his statements were deleted. We said we would not hear the gentleman the next time he came back, but he came before the committee in company with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and was permitted to be heard because the Senator from Montana sponsored him and said he would be responsible for what he said. The Senator from Montana apolo-

gized for what Mr. Lasser had previously said, and assured us there would be no repetition. Only for that reason was the gentleman heard. At that time he was given full opportunity to speak, because of the friendship and support of the Senator from Montana.

It is not sought to take Mr. Lasser off the rolls because of what he has said to our committee, but because of what he has said about the membership of the House, the body to which we owe some loyalty and some allegiance. They ask that we concur with them in taking off the rolls the man who has charged them with being corrupt, with being disloyal. They ask that we take off the rolls the man who has said that the very organization under which he seeks to work is reeking with graft and incompetency.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator has demonstrated that the whole purpose of this provision is to punish a man for something that occurred several years ago. Such action will become the basis for similar legislation in the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is still before the Senate and open to further 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 joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) was passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, there appears in the Washington Post of this morning a brief comment concerning the cut in the W. P. A. appropriation, which I should like to have in the RECORD. I read from the article:

W. P. A. SLASH BURDEN PLACED ON CAPITAL—CUT IN ROLLS SCHEDULED FOR JULY 1; CITY FACES PROBLEM, HUNTER SAYS

By July 1 W. P. A. rolls throughout the country will be reduced from 1,413,000 workers to about 1,000,000, but defense projects under W. P. A. will be maintained, Hunter said. A national average of 1,000,000. * * *

This will bring the national W. P. A. roster to its lowest ebb in history, Hunter reported. The last previous low mark was 1,450,000 in September 1937.

Washington faces a 59.4 percent cut in personnel over July 1 of 1940, running fourth to Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Maryland. Maryland's slash from last year will be 64.9 percent.

Hunter also revealed that he planned to close down completely all W. P. A. projects in 1,500 counties throughout the country within 30 days.

He expressed an opinion, however, that none of the States or cities scheduled to receive drastic slashes will be able to absorb all their jobless in private employment.

The point I wish to make is that as the complaints begin to come in from the places in the country where W. P. A. is eliminated entirely, or reduced to but a skeleton force, I believe the amendment suggested yesterday by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] will be again presented, and such an amendment will be annexed without difficulty to a deficiency appropriation bill. At least I hope that will occur.

DEPARTURE FROM AND ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIENS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4973.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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 VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

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

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The first amendment reported by the Committee on the Judiciary will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, in section 1, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out the word "That."

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the first committee amendment being a purely clerical error, I ask that it be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 3.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "That" and insert "When the United States is at war or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "That any" and insert "Any."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2a, on page 2, line 19, after the words "Sec. 4", to strike out "That the" and insert "The."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, following the committee amendment previously agreed to, it is proposed to strike out "whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states" and insert in lieu thereof "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I objected to the consideration of the bill because of the fact that apparently the bill would deal with any situation, for all time to come, whenever there exists between two or more nations a state of war to which we are not a party. It seems to me that the bill should be confined to the present emergency.

Before the amendment of the act was proposed, the language applied only when the United States itself was at war. The House has tried to extend the power of the President to apply to any time when war exists anywhere in the world and the President desires to exercise the power.

Such powers are very extreme. They permit the President to prevent any citizen of the United States from traveling outside the United States, and to prescribe rules and regulations under which he may be prohibited from leaving the United States. The proposed powers are practically unlimited over all travel over the borders of the United States; and it seems to me they ought to exist only when there is a real emergency.

My amendment proposes to strike out the words "whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states" and insert in lieu thereof the words "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941." While that emergency continues the provisions of the proposed law would apply.

Even such a provision would give pretty radical power under present conditions. With my amendment, the bill would be satisfactory to me. I very much hope that the Senator in charge of the bill may be willing to accept my amendment. I think it would carry out every purpose sought to be attained by the bill and would apply as long as the present emergency should continue.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, this question was not raised in the Judiciary Committee. All morning I have been endeavoring to get in touch with members of the committee, but only a few of them were present at the time the session opened, so I cannot speak for the committee or for a majority of the committee.

Personally I cannot support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio for this reason: As the Senator from Ohio has said, it is proposed to amend the 1918 statute by inserting the words "or whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states." I am revealing no state secret, but I am supported by the Department of State in the assertion that there is more espionage and subversive activity in the United States today than at any previous time in our history. Such activities are not

altogether confined to aliens. Such activities are being engaged in, and propaganda is being spread, by native American citizens. It has been the practice, and is the practice today, for aliens and native-born American citizens to travel back and forth between the United States and other countries which are at least jealous of the United States, or not friendly to the United States, peddling information, news, and propaganda.

Every day of the session every Member of Congress is being flooded with correspondence begging Congress to do something to suppress subversive activities. This bill is the first step along that line. It is supported by the Department of State.

The same old stereotyped argument was raised yesterday, that the bill would be another step toward dictatorship. There is only one way to control this matter, and that is through the State Department and the executive department. We have on file in the printed report accompanying the bill the assurance from the State Department that the powers granted in the bill would not be used except for the objective which I have mentioned.

Personally I feel very strongly that the bill should be passed as it is written. Owing to the closing of certain consulates there are in this country today a large number of men who have been accused of—and I think in time will be proved guilty of—the most pernicious activities against the safety and welfare of this country that we have ever experienced in our history.

I see nothing wrong with the bill as it is written. It is imperative that the power be given as soon as possible. The House remained in session all yesterday afternoon waiting for the action of the Senate in order that the bill might become law today. The executive department and the State Department need it immediately. For that reason, and to avoid a conference and further delay, I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio may be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the argument of the Senator from Indiana. The amendment I have offered would not in any way prevent this bill from going into effect immediately. The emergency has already been declared, and I propose that during the emergency this power shall be given to the President. The only effect of the amendment is that when this emergency comes to an end the President's power will come to an end, and then Congress will or should deal by statute with the situation which may then exist.

We have on the books all kinds of statutes which were created for emergencies. As a general principle, it seems to me that in the present emergency, when we give any extraordinary powers, when in effect we delegate legislative powers to the President, such powers should be confined to the particular emergency for which we are asked to delegate them; and when the emergency is over they should terminate.

That is all the amendment would do. The amendment simply says that, instead of putting this provision into effect

whenever there are wars in other parts of the world, many of which wars may have only a most remote relation to the present emergency, this power shall repeatedly recur. There are always wars going on between two nations somewhere in the world; at least, there have been during the past 10 years. It seems to me it is a very simple thing to change the bill by eliminating that provision, and, instead, stating that the powers granted by the bill shall exist during the present emergency which the President has already declared, so that the bill will go into immediate effect, and the powers will be immediately granted, the moment we pass the bill with my amendment, just as much as if the amendment were not there.

It has been suggested to me that perhaps we might limit the amendment to American citizens. I am quite willing to do that; but it seems to me that to give the President arbitrary power to say that no American citizen shall travel outside this country at any time that any war exists anywhere in the world for all time to come is really asking us to delegate our legislative authority for a period far beyond the time of the actual emergency for which we are asked to delegate that power.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. I desire to have clear in my mind the question whether the bill would apply to the Dominion of Canada and the United States. There has always been freedom of transit across the line between the two countries, and all during the summer thousands of persons come here from Canada, and other thousands go from here to Canada. What would be the effect of the bill upon that condition?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I do not believe the able Senator from Minnesota was here yesterday when we touched upon that point, so I will repeat what was then said.

In the printed report accompanying the bill are stated facts gleaned from the State Department. The State Department makes this observation:

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.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The arguments presented by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Indiana, are directed to the bill itself; and under the existing circumstances I doubt that there is a Senator present who is not willing to see this proposed power delegated to the President. But, Mr. President, in granting these extraordinary powers in this emergency, I believe the Congress should be jealous in not extending these emergency powers in an unlimited fashion. The long and arduous efforts made by one of the most distinguished lawyers who ever served in this Chamber, the late Senator from Montana, Hon. Thomas J. Walsh, to secure the repeal of the blanket authority and the emergency powers which were extended during the last war, which repeal in many instances he was unable to secure, I think should give pause to those of us who are now confronted with this constant demand for the extension of Executive authority.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio would not impair the President's power in the slightest degree. It would simply provide that he shall have this power so long as the national emergency, which he himself has declared, and which only he can terminate, endures. That, it seems to me, is only a minor effort upon the part of Congress to restrict these great powers to the emergency itself. Why should we hesitate to do that?

Mr. President, the history of the world shows that parliamentary bodies have their power taken from them bit by bit. All of us recognize that in this situation extraordinary powers must be exercised by the President; but I do not believe the Congress should delegate these powers without limiting them to the emergency itself. Here is no proposal to limit the powers to a specific period of time. No year is proposed in which to terminate them. It is left within the power of the President himself to say when the national emergency is over; but, as various measures come along, unless we provide some such safeguards as this, we shall find that when the present emergency is over we shall have created enormous powers designed to be used for the emergency, but which will extend beyond it.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would not the Senator from Wisconsin be agreeable to a provision that as to citizens the powers conferred by the bill shall be good only during the period of the emergency, and leave out the aliens?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I want only to see

a general policy established that as we grant these powers which we are willing to give because of the extraordinary situation, Congress shall make certain that they do not extend in futuro beyond the emergency for which the powers were asked, and for which they were granted. This is not my amendment, and I am speaking only upon the general proposition that I hope that in granting these powers Congress will be jealous to make certain that they shall terminate when the emergency is over, and thus not enact a great body of statutes creating in the hands of the Executive extraordinary powers to be retained after the emergency itself shall have passed.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to modify my amendment as indicated on the copy which I gave the Senator from Indiana, which is the only copy I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The clerk will state the proposed modification.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "or", it is proposed to insert "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or, as to aliens."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is so modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when that amendment is adopted the section will read, in part, as follows:

When the United States is at war or during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or, as to aliens, whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall find—

And so forth. In other words, the amendment, as modified, still gives to the President when a state of war exists between two other nations the power to restrict the travel of aliens out of the United States, but it does not give him power, under those circumstances, to restrict the travel of American citizens out of the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I am of the impression that the amendment, as modified, meets the objection raised by certain Members of the body, and I will be very glad to accept the amendment, as modified, and take it to conference if a conference be necessary. I doubt, however, if one will be necessary, for I think the House will adopt the amendment without a conference. I ask that the order for the yeas and nays be withdrawn, if that can be done.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object. Let us have a record vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a point of order. The amendment has already been adopted, has it not? Did not the Chair announce, "Without objection, it is agreed to"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification to the amendment has been accepted.

Mr. NORRIS. That does not adopt the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Were not the yeas and nays ordered upon the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation. The Senator from Ohio had the right to modify his own amendment, which he did, and it was accepted by the Senator from Indiana, who has charge of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered. There is only one thing to do, unless the request for the yeas and nays is withdrawn by unanimous consent, and that is to call the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as a member of the committee which reported this bill, I wish to say it was given fair and honest consideration, I think, by the committee, which reported it unanimously. As the chairman of the committee has already said, the amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio, or the principle involved in it, was not brought up before the committee or considered by the committee. I think I am correct about that. But, Mr. President, as I listened to the reading of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, it seems to me it improves the bill. I do not believe any of us would want to pass such a bill as this in time of profound peace, when there was no trouble existing, and I do not believe we would want to confer this power upon anybody if, for instance, there was a war between two countries in Africa or Asia or Europe or Central or South America. Such wars have occurred frequently, but no one has suggested, so far as I know, the advisability or desirability of this kind of a law for the United States.

The Senator from Indiana, in answer to the Senator from Ohio, has made an argument for the bill. It is persuasive; I have no fault whatever to find with it; but, as I understand, it does not apply to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. The amendment makes only a slight difference after all; but, when we consider the fundamental question involved, it is an important difference, as I see it.

The President has declared an emergency. During that emergency, so long as it exists, Congress probably will be from time to time imposing upon the President various duties and various obligations and conferring upon him various powers; it will be necessary, it will be advisable to do so; but I do not believe anybody feels that we ought to enact a permanent law which would apply when there was no emergency and no war existing, or a war existing in a remote part of the world in which we would have no interest whatever. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should be rejected, the power proposed to be given to the President would continue; it would be perpetual.

I do not know how many Senators remember the fact to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred; but, after the World War, one of the finest Members of this body, one of the ablest lawyers of the country, one of the most studious and patriotic men, a member for

years of the Judiciary Committee, respected by everybody for his ability, devoted a great deal of time, in vain mostly, to bring about the repeal of a good many laws for which we voted during the war, during that emergency, but which he thought—and I now think he was right—ought not to be on the statute books in time of peace.

Really that is all this amendment does, as I see it. It seems to me it is plain that, instead of making a perpetual law that will continue on the statute books and come home to trouble us or those who follow us probably 50 years from now, we should make it terminate with the end of the emergency. Therefore, I cannot see any possible objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. It seems to me, if adopted, it would simplify the situation, and it ought to command the support of everybody.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I doubt whether the Senator from Nebraska heard my observation. I am going to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. NORRIS. As modified?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes; as modified.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the question. The amendment was offered by the Senator from Ohio, and thereafter the yeas and nays were ordered. Then, the Senator from Ohio proposed a modification; there was no objection to the modification, and, therefore, the amendment was ordered submitted, as modified. If there had been objection, it could not have been done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I beg pardon of the Chair. A Senator has the right to modify his amendment at any time before a vote has been taken by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not after the yeas and nays have been ordered. That, however, is not the question before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Ohio. On that question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief 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. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am informed that if he were present, he would vote as I have voted, so I will permit my vote to stand.

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 Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], 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 West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], 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.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] are unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], 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 because of the death of his mother.

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

I am advised that, if present, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—59

Adams	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hayden	Reynolds
Ball	Herring	Rosier
Bone	Hill	Russell
Bulw	Holman	Shipstead
Bunker	Hughes	Smathers
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrnes	La Follette	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Maloney	Truman
Danaher	Mead	Tunnell
Downey	Murdock	Vandenberg
Ellender	Murray	Van Nuys
George	Norris	Wheeler
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Glass	Overton	

NOT VOTING—37

Aiken	Bridges	Davis
Austin	Brooks	Gillette
Bankhead	Brown	Guffey
Barbour	Burton	Harrison
Barkley	Caraway	Hatch
Bilbo	Clark, Idaho	Houston
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Kilgore

Langer	Reed	Wallgren
Lee	Schwartz	Walsh
Lodge	Spencer	White
Lucas	Tobey	Willis
McCarran	Tydings	
Nye	Wagner	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS]; and I again remind him of our colloquy last evening, and his assurances, based upon the report of the State Department, that it is not contemplated that this new authority will be used to require passports for the ordinary Canadian-American traffic across the boundary. I simply want to call his attention to the fact that when we enact this bill we are textually reenacting section 2 of chapter 81 of the United States Statutes at Large, which affirmatively makes it unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States unless he bears a valid passport, except as the President specifically issues an exemption. Therefore, in order to accomplish the purpose which the Senator assures us is intended, affirmative action by the President will be necessary to create this exemption after we shall have passed the bill. I want to make that very plain.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is my understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is not an automatic exemption. We are voting to require a passport in connection with Canadian-American traffic unless the President affirmatively acts. Having set up that state of facts, I now assume that the Senator is saying to me, on the basis of what the State Department has written in its report, that we may depend upon that sort of affirmative action by the Executive.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator from Michigan is entirely correct in his premises and conclusions.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, how will this affirmative action be taken? Will it be taken for each individual who wants to enter Canada to go fishing, or to visit the Canadian parks; or will it be a blanket permission for anyone from the United States?

Mr. VAN NUYS. As debated yesterday, and as again referred to by the Senator from Michigan today, the mechanics of it is a matter of the rules and regulations to be set up by the State Department. Neither I nor anyone else is thoroughly advised at the present time; but I have been assured by the State Department—and it is so recorded in the regular printed report—that the rules and regulations and prohibitions will be so set up as not to affect adversely Canadians coming into this country, or vice versa, or Mexicans coming into this country, or persons going to or from any country of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If a man wants to go to Canada to go fishing, will he have to have a passport?

Mr. VAN NUYS. He does not have to have it today.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No; but if this bill becomes a law, will he have to have a passport?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Under the law today he is required to have a passport, but under rules and regulations he does not have to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Indiana think it would be a little better practice to have the State Department give out its rules and regulations simultaneously with the passage of the bill, or just prior thereto?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I will say to the Senator from California that I think it would have been very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As the Senator knows, Mr. Sumner Welles may not be in the State Department a few years hence, or a year or two hence; and Mr. Sumner Welles may change his mind, and we are to be at the mercy of the change of mind of Mr. Sumner Welles.

Mr. Sumner Welles is a most delightful gentleman, but to have our destinies in his hands, and to have him empowered to determine when and where and how we are to have the sort of thing that we now stipulate for is a horrible way to legislate.

This body, of course, had it not fallen into its peculiar situation of today, would resent immediately and continuously this way of legislating. We are told that the greatest travel points out of the United States and into it—Canada and Mexico—will under the bill be subject to regulation by Mr. Sumner Welles, who is a very excellent gentleman, and that when he withdraws his royal prerogative we will be out from under his regulation. That is no way to legislate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may again have the attention of the Senator from Indiana, of course the Senator is correct in saying that the only reason why such passports are not now required in Canadian-American transit is because of the existence of exempting rules and regulations. But the enactment of the bill now before us—and this is the point I am trying to make—certainly would suspend any existing rules and regulations which have been issued under the present status, and the moment the bill is enacted passports will be required unless there is simultaneous action by the State Department and the Executive to renew the exemptions. Am I not correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is entirely correct; and I have been assured that such exemptions will be provided. I was informed that under the act of 1918, during the last World War, passports were not required between Canada and the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Which was by reason of certain rules and regulations, and those are to be reenacted in the new rules and regulations set up under the bill. I have been assured time and again by the State Department that the situation mentioned by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Minnesota will not exist.

Mr. VANDENBERG. At the risk of being tedious, I wish to point out again that if it takes a week, or 10 days, or 2 weeks, for the State Department to develop its full rules and regulations for the benefit of the Chief Executive, under

the pending legislation, during the 10 days or 2 weeks passports will be required for transit across the international boundary unless there is immediate, simultaneous, independent action to renew the existing exemptions, after the proposed legislation shall have been enacted.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I have been assured that such a situation will not occur, and I could pretty nearly underwrite the proposition that as soon as the House accepts the amendments just agreed to, if it does, and the bill becomes law, that situation will be immediately taken care of.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I can hold the Senator from Indiana to that warrant, it is perfectly satisfactory to me, because I prefer his guaranty to some others which might be available.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to impress upon the Senator the fact that there are tens of thousands of persons traveling back and forth in the summer. Many people come from Canada into the United States, where they have summer homes. If they have passports from Canada, they can go back, and they will not have to have other passports, if the regulations now in effect shall continue in effect.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Would they have to have passports or permission to leave the United States if they came into the United States, unless they have special permission as individuals?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Not under the present rules and regulations, nor will they under the future rules and regulations. It will not change that situation or picture at all.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I hope the Senator is correct in that statement.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I have been so assured by the State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 (H. R. 4973) was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

THE MARITIME LABOR BOARD

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4107, to extend for 2 years the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4107) to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Commerce.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "five" and to insert "four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 1, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 1004 of such act is amended by striking out the words "the Board to encourage" in the opening lines of said section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Sections 1006, 1008, and 1009, and the last sentence of section 1010 of such act are hereby repealed: *Provided, however,* That the Maritime Labor Board may continue to act as mediator in any disputes wherein its mediation services have been requested and the mediation of which the Board has actively undertaken prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should enjoy a statement from the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, or the chairman of the subcommittee regarding the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the bill, as it came over from the House, extended for 2 years the life and activities of the Maritime Labor Board, and the Senate Committee on Commerce reported the bill with two amendments. The first amendment limits the life of the board to 1 additional year, instead of 2, and further limits the activities and functions of the Board to those other than the functions of mediation. All the mediatorial powers of the Board are taken away except insofar as the board may at the present time have taken jurisdiction in specific cases. This would be the effect of the bill as it stands before us at the present time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would I be correct in saying that the Maritime Commission is the principal authority in charge of the subject, and would I be correct in saying that the Maritime Commission considers the Maritime Labor Board to be less than a fifth wheel of a wagon, and that it would be very happy to see it pass out of existence?

Mr. BAILEY. I am not sure about the Maritime Commission, but my recollection is quite distinct as to what happened in the committee. The question was asked of the chairman of the subcommittee, that is, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], whether the Maritime Commission was not opposed to the further activity of this board. My recollection is quite distinct to the effect that the chairman of the subcommittee stated that Admiral Land has indicated in his testimony that he saw really no reason for the further existence or activities of the Board. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. Would it also be true to say that the shipowners are unanimously opposed to the continuation of this particular instrumentality, and that more than half of organized labor is opposed to its continuation?

Mr. BAILEY. That was the statement made, and I think it was made by the junior Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the subcommittee. I see he has risen, and I take it he wishes to say something, so I yield to him.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission did not appear and testify before the subcommittee. I am quite definitely under the impression, however, that he does not regard the activities of the Maritime Labor Board as having been helpful.

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

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator from Maryland describe to the Senate what powers and duties will be left to the Maritime Labor Board if the Senate shall adopt the Commerce Committee's amendments and shear the Board of practically every definitive power it possesses?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The duties of the Board are of a twofold nature. One duty is concerned with mediation, which has been discussed and which it is proposed to eliminate under the pending amendments. The other duties are of various kinds. Under existing law, it is the duty of the Maritime Labor Board to attempt to secure agreements for collective bargaining and other forms of agreements and arrangements which in the opinion of the Maritime Labor Board would be helpful in working out cooperation between employers and labor. Also, there is a provision that agreements shall be filed with the Maritime Labor Board.

One of the chief duties of the Maritime Labor Board has been the study of maritime labor conditions. A report on that subject has been submitted. That report, whatever may be the nature of its conclusions and whether we agree with the Board or not, indicates considerable industry, and certainly shows that much work has been spent upon it. The report attempts to analyze maritime-labor conditions, and to make certain recommendations. As I have said, whether we agree with the recommendations or do not agree with them, certainly very much work and great industry have been devoted to study and research.

Although I understand that the report has been submitted and that it is not contemplated at this particular time that there will be any modification of it, yet to my mind it seems desirable that the Maritime Labor Board should be able to continue those studies. It is not as though they were asked to take up a matter afresh. This is a matter upon which they have been engaged for a long time. In these times, when there are so many new questions arising with regard to maritime-labor conditions and so many other problems affecting maritime activities, it may very well be highly desirable that the Board should continue its research studies during this year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement on the subject. Of course this bill escaped death in the Commerce Committee by only a single vote. The general opinion of the Commerce Committee, as

reflected by its attitude and action, is that the Maritime Labor Board is more or less useless in its functionings. The action of the committee in striking down 80 percent of its definitive prerogatives is a clear demonstration of the attitude of the committee toward it.

Even after that had been done, its proponents were able to get the bill out of the committee by a margin of only a single vote. Why? Because the Maritime Commission, to which we look for responsibility in respect to these problems, appears to feel that the Maritime Labor Board is unnecessary. By the way, the Board consists of three gentlemen who draw \$10,000 a year for doing what most of us now believe to be non-essential work. Not only does the Maritime Commission appear to have this viewpoint, but the general ship operating industry seems to be a complete unit in its belief that the Maritime Labor Board is inadvisable for further light and action. At least half of organized labor in the maritime industry is opposed to the continuation of the Board. That leaves a very small sector of those elements in the Government and in the community which deal with maritime matters supporting the continuation of the life of this institution.

Mr. President, so far as labor mediation is concerned we have ample machinery and power and authority in other departments, and it is probably of advantage to simplify the contemplation.

The committee itself, under the bill as it now stands, has taken all mediation powers away from the Maritime Labor Board. That was the chief function for which it was created. The committee has reduced the span of extended life from 2 years to 1. I do not know how the committee could have more definitely demonstrated its belief that there is not any necessity or justification for the continuation of this institution unless it had frankly joined the minority in saying this bill should not pass.

The amendments have merely improved the bill, because they have made the Maritime Labor Board more or less innocuous, but I submit that at such a moment as this, at this time when there is a degree of utility in cutting off needless expenditures, if there is any institution under heaven which could be dispensed with this is one that could be sheared away without loss to anyone except the payrollers who are its beneficiaries.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Michigan referred to the fact that the bill in its present form passed the committee by a one-vote margin. I should like to make one point for the RECORD, because an effort may be made a year hence to continue this Board. Was it the Senator's impression, as it was mine, that it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the Board should cease to exist at the end of the year?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee, and I doubt if anyone will rise to challenge that statement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not rise to challenge any statement, but if the Senator has finished I wish to make a statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have concluded.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to make a statement concerning the report submitted by the Maritime Labor Board to the President and the Congress. Preparation of the report was one of the great objectives of the creation of the Board. I must say that the report is a most excellent one. It is very comprehensive and unusually thoroughgoing. I should like Senators to secure copies of it and I should be willing to stake my judgment that it is one of the best contributions which have been made in the last several years to the study of the labor problem in the country. This study is related to the maritime industry, but there is a great deal of very valuable information in it otherwise. I should like to call attention to chapter 13:

Railway labor legislation in the United States, with especial reference to the development of adjustment machinery.

In this chapter Senators will find an excellent historical review of the railway labor legislation. In one of the appendices is the summary of seamen's laws. I have found it difficult to obtain a good understanding of the seamen's laws of the United States, but this section tends to clarify my mind to a great extent.

There are also summaries of the laws of foreign nations—France, Great Britain, Sweden, and so on. I will not undertake to go into a review of the report generally, but I will say that it is an admirable contribution to the literature on the subject of labor and labor disputes. I am not agreeing with all its recommendations; I have some reservations about them; but I do not think it would be just to let the bill pass without saying that the Board has very greatly served the country and the Congress by submitting an unusually fine report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to what the House committee said in its report with reference to the bill. The committee recommended the bill and said that it had found that the Board had been effective in the settlement of labor disputes, and had done a good job in the work of mediation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has emphasized the value and importance of the studies which have been made. It is, our committee believes, reasonable and desirable at this time that those studies should continue. I do not know, and no one else can know, what may be developed or what the Maritime Labor Board may see fit to do, if anything, with respect to the recommendations which it has already made; but the fact is that the Maritime Labor Board has already demonstrated that it can do research work, and do it effectively. In these times, when so many questions are arising concerned with maritime labor, it seems very wise that this work of research should go on. We are not attempting to create a new board to do the work. We are simply telling a board which has done that kind of work

industriously and successfully that we want it to go on. The general emergency conditions are an argument for the continuation of the Board.

I should like to make one further comment which I think is pertinent. In creating the Maritime Labor Board, Congress saw fit to give it two types of duties which, to my mind, at least, are more or less inconsistent. One was in regard to research and the securing of agreements. The other was the authority to mediate, at times, at least, regarding the agreements which it had helped to secure. Those two duties are not consistent. If any mistake was made, it was the fault of the Congress in creating a board with two such clashing functions. I think the fact that the two functions, more or less antagonistic in nature, have existed side by side has probably been somewhat detrimental to the activities of the Board. Not only has the Board been required to devote certain time to mediation but it has also been put in a more or less awkward situation when it attempted to mediate agreements for collective bargaining, and so forth, which it had helped to secure. It has been unable to specialize and devote itself entirely to a task which would seem to be a very reasonable and natural one, that of doing research work, and also securing certain types of agreements. If mediation is eliminated and the Board is not then hampered by the necessity of attempting to perform various kinds of work which are more or less mutually inconsistent and antagonistic, it is reasonable to believe that it would be a very wise thing to give the Board another year to continue the work of research, which it has done very effectively.

In conclusion I should like to add that most of the objections which were raised to the Maritime Labor Board have not been to its activities in securing agreements or to its research work, but rather to its methods and its success, or lack of success, in mediation. If we can eliminate the element which has been more or less a source of discord, and restrict the Board to the kind of work which, in the opinion of most persons, it has done successfully, it is logical that such action should be taken. I sincerely hope that the bill will be passed, and that thereby the Board will be able to continue on the basis provided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment 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 VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4107) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend certain provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended."

SINKING OF THE AMERICAN SHIP "ROBIN MOOR" (S. DOC. NO. 71)

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have the message from the President read?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the message is read and referred, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Eone	Herring	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bulow	Holman	Smathers
Bunker	Hughes	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrnes	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McNary	Truman
Chavez	Malone	Tunnell
Connally	Mead	Tydings
Danaher	Murdock	Vandenberg
Downey	Murray	Van Nuys
Elliender	Norris	Wheeler
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley

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

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am under the necessity of bringing to the attention of the Congress the ruthless sinking by a German submarine on May 21 of an American ship, the *Robin Moor*, in the South Atlantic Ocean, 25°40' west, 6°10' north, while the vessel was on the high seas en route to South Africa.

According to the formal depositions of survivors, the vessel was sunk within 30 minutes from the time of the first warning given by the commander of the submarine to an officer of the *Robin Moor*.

The submarine did not display its flag, and the commander did not announce its nationality.

The *Robin Moor* was sunk without provision for the safety of the passengers and crew.

It was sunk despite the fact that its American nationality was admittedly known to the commander of the submarine and that its nationality was likewise clearly indicated by the flag and other markings.

The sinking of this American ship by a German submarine flagrantly violated the right of United States vessels freely to navigate the seas, subject only to a belligerent right accepted under international law. This belligerent right, as is known to the German Government, does not include the right deliberately to sink a merchant vessel, leaving the passengers and crew to the mercies of the elements. On the contrary, the belligerent is required to place the passengers and crew in places of safety.

The passengers and crew of the *Robin Moor* were left afloat in small lifeboats for approximately 2 to 3 weeks, when they were accidentally discovered and rescued by friendly vessels. This chance

rescue does not lessen the brutality of casting the boats adrift in midocean.

The total disregard shown for the most elementary principles of international law and of humanity brands the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as the act of an international outlaw.

The Government of the United States holds Germany responsible for the outrageous and indefensible sinking of the *Robin Moor*. Full reparation for the losses and damages suffered by American nationals will be expected from the German Government.

Our Government believes that freedom from cruelty and inhuman treatment is a natural right. It is not a grace to be given or withheld at the will of those temporarily in a position to exert force over defenseless people.

Were this incident capable of being regarded apart from a more general background, its implications might be less serious but it must be interpreted in the light of a declared and actively pursued policy of frigidness and intimidation which has been used by the German Reich as an instrument of international policy.

The present leaders of the German Reich have not hesitated to engage in acts of cruelty and many other forms of terror against the innocent and the helpless in other countries, apparently in the belief that methods of terrorism will lead to a state of affairs permitting the German Reich to exact acquiescence from the nations victimized.

This Government can only assume that the Government of the German Reich hopes through the commission of such infamous acts of cruelty to helpless and innocent men, women, and children to intimidate the United States and other nations into a course of nonresistance to German plans for universal conquest—a conquest based upon lawlessness and terror on land and piracy on the sea.

Such methods are fully in keeping with the methods of terrorism hitherto employed by the present leaders of the German Reich in the policy which they have pursued toward many other nations subsequently victimized.

The Government of the German Reich may, however, be assured that the United States will neither be intimidated nor will it acquiesce in the plans for world domination which the present leaders of Germany may have.

We are warranted in considering whether the case of the *Robin Moor* is not a step in a campaign against the United States analogous to campaigns against other nations. We cannot place reliance on official declarations to the contrary.

Like statements, declarations, and even solemn pledges have been forthcoming in respect of many nations, commencing with the statement that the Government of the German Reich considered its territorial aspirations satisfied when it seized Austria by force. Evidence that the Government of the German Reich continues to plan further conquest and domination is convincing, and, indeed, scarcely disputed.

Viewed in the light of the circumstances the sinking of the *Robin Moor*

becomes a disclosure of policy as well as an example of method. Heretofore, lawless acts of violence have been preludes to schemes of land conquest. This one appears to be a first step in assertion of the supreme purpose of the German Reich to seize control of the high seas, the conquest of Great Britain being an indispensable part of that seizure.

Its general purpose would appear to be to drive American commerce from the ocean wherever such commerce was considered a disadvantage to German designs; and its specific purpose would appear to be interruption of our trade with all friendly countries.

We must take it that notice has now been served upon us that no American ship or cargo on any of the seven seas can consider itself immune from acts of piracy. Notice is served on us, in effect, that the German Reich proposes so to intimidate the United States that we would be dissuaded from carrying out our chosen policy of helping Britain to survive.

In brief, we must take the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as a warning to the United States not to resist the Nazi movement of world conquest. It is a warning that the United States may use the high seas of the world only with Nazi consent.

Were we to yield on this we would inevitably submit to world domination at the hands of the present leaders of the German Reich.

We are not yielding and we do not propose to yield.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 20, 1941.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the report which the Senate has just heard discloses one more cruel, relentless blow of the sword of dictatorship and hardens the conviction which has eaten its way into the consciousness of many of us for so long—that Adolf Hitler must be destroyed, or eventually he will destroy us.

WILLIAM E. THOMAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 768) for the relief of William E. Thomas, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

MARGARET M. CUTTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree

to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. I submit a conference report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 28, 44, 45, 80, 90, 91, 122, 125, and 126.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 39, 40, 42, 43, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 123, 124, 127, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 148, 149, 150, and 151, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$247,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$3,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$265,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$107,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$57,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$42,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$110,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$484,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$949,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 5, 6, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 33, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 66, 87, 93, 99, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 119, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 132, 141, 144, 145, 147, 152, and 153.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT E. CARTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as I understand, there are one or two Senate amendments still in disagreement.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The situation is that the conference report I have presented embraces the amendments agreed upon by both bodies. The next step will follow when the Chair lays before the Senate the action taken by the House of Representatives on certain Senate amendments which were in disagreement. We have not as yet arrived at that point.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

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

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I move the adoption of the report. Then I will ask that the action of the House on certain of the Senate amendments be laid before the Senate by the Chair.

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Now I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message of the House respecting certain Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 19, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 18, 20, 25, 33, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 66, 87, 93, 99, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 120, 121, 128, 129, 132, 141, and 145 to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$325,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$64,505,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 1 of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment, after "bauxite", insert "aluminum clays"; and

In line 4 of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment, after "bauxites", insert "aluminum clays";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$2,400,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$5,531,500";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$8,281,500"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 152 and 153 to said bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 19, 103, 119, 130, 144, and 147.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask the able Senator whether the motion he has made, if agreed to, will dispose of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, there will have to be one more motion, which is that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 152 and 153.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain what the amendments are?

Mr. HAYDEN. For example, there was an amendment prohibiting the use of the contingent expense fund in the production of alumina from bauxite. That was amended to include certain kinds of clay. The House agreed to the Senate amendment with an amendment. That is the situation in the case of all the Senate amendments as to which the House receded from its disagreement and concurred with a slight further change.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand. Is one of the amendments that which related to historic sites?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, that is not included in the list. I am going to move, as the next motion, that the Senate recede from that amendment, which will dispose of the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to concur in the House amendments to certain Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 152 and 153. That will finally dispose of the bill, and permit it to go to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRNES (for Mr. McCARRAN) submitted the following report:

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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 28, 34, and 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 41, 44, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, and 54; and agree to the same.

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

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,724,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$600,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$15,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$990,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$14,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$520,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$3,729,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,968,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$7,279,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$7,424,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which at least \$100,000 shall be available exclusively to investigate the employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government, and report its findings to Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$4,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$7,485,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$14,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5 and 43.

PAT McCARRAN,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
STYLES BRIDGES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
KARL STEFAN,
ROBERT F. JONES,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRYPT FOR REMAINS OF GUTZON BORGLUM

Mr. BYRNES. On behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], from the Committee on the Library, I report without amendment House bill 3857 and with amendments Senate Joint Resolution 40. They are not controversial and will not call for the expenditure of any money. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 3857 and then shall ask that the Senate consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3857) authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon Borglum was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TWO HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF COMING OF DR. HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG

Mr. BYRNES. I now ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) providing for the rep-

resentation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the coming of Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg to the American colonies, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with amendments on page 3, after line 12, to strike out section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to be expended by the Commission for expenses, including actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, incurred while discharging its functions under this joint resolution. The Commission shall have power to select, hire, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as shall be necessary for the performance of its duties without regard to the provisions of other laws applicable to employment or compensation of officers or employees of the United States.

And in line 24, page 3 to change the section number from 6 to 5, so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Government and people of the United States unite with Muhlenberg College in a fitting and appropriate observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the arrival in the American Colonies of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Muhlenberg Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) to be composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States and four persons to be appointed by him, the President of the Senate and four Members of the Senate to be appointed by said President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and four Members of the House to be appointed by said Speaker.

SEC. 3. The Commission, on behalf of the United States, shall cooperate with representatives of Muhlenberg College to extend appropriate courtesies to the delegates of foreign universities and other foreign learned bodies or individuals attending the celebrations commemorating such anniversary.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number, but the President of the United States shall be designated as the "honorary chairman" of the Commission.

SEC. 5. Any vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments to such Commission are made.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF OLD-AGE-PENSIONS SYSTEM—MINIMUM PENSIONS

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 129, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 129) submitted by Mr. DOWNEY on June 19, 1941, was considered, and agreed to, 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 in-

vestigation 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 oath, 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.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 121, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 121) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS May 23, 1941.

The amendment reported by the committee was, on page 1, line 2, after the word "employ", to insert "until June 30, 1942", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs hereby is authorized to employ until June 30, 1942, an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,880 per annum, beginning May 18, 1941.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT BILLS—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the committees may have permission to file reports upon any bills and also that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think I favor the request; it is one usually made; but may I ask the able Senator in charge of the work of the Senate if the Senate is to meet on Monday?

Mr. BYRNES. My purpose is that following today's session the Senate shall adjourn until Monday, and on Monday I wish to express the hope that the Senator from Virginia will secure recognition to move the consideration of the so-called revaluation bill. At the conclu-

sion of that and one other bill, I shall then ask that the calendar be called. I believe we can dispose of the business now before the Senate on Monday, and then recess until Thursday.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the Senator if on Thursday there will be before the Senate for consideration the large military appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRNES. If the Appropriations Committee can complete its work, as it expects to do, upon the appropriation bill referred to by the Senator from Oregon, I assume that we will have that bill ready to take up on Thursday. The only other appropriation bill now in the Senate Appropriations Committee is the District of Columbia appropriations bill, and I had in mind that bill when I asked unanimous consent that the committees have permission to report, so that we can consider the Army bill and the District bill on Thursday, which would still give opportunity for the necessary conferences with the House before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to make a further inquiry. Assuming that the Senate passes those bills next week, during the following week, in which the Fourth of July will come, may it not be understood that there will be no important business transacted?

Mr. BYRNES. Monday will be June 30, the last day of the fiscal year, and, doubtless, there will be business before the Senate until that day. So far as I can now see, there is no reason why, after a session on Monday, we may not adjourn until the following Monday, or, at least, until Thursday, and then until Monday.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the request made by the able Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from South Carolina is granted.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 130) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Senate Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises shall report to the Senate by bill or otherwise its recommendations for legislation.

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is this a special committee?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in the last session of the Congress a special committee was appointed to investigate the financial problems of the small business enterprises of the country. Under the resolution as presented I judge that the committee does not have the right, as few investigating committees have the right, to report a bill. It is the committee's purpose, as I understand, to ask that the committee be given the right to report a bill.

Mr. McNARY. That is the purpose? It is desired that the report of the committee may be in the form of a bill?

Mr. MURRAY. That it may be made directly to the Senate in the form of a bill.

Mr. BYRNES. I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry with respect to the resolution. It is always the custom, is it not, when bills are introduced in the Senate, to have them go to the regular standing committees of this body?

I understand that the resolution which the Senator from Montana submits is to the effect that a particular bill shall be reported directly by a special committee. That, of course, means that if such a report were made, it would be made without the customary hearings upon the bill itself. That, it seems to me, is a rather wide divergence from the regular procedure. Special committees have been in the habit of filing their reports and their recommendations, which is a perfectly proper method. I can see no objection to the introduction by the committee of a bill; but it seems to me that to have a special committee report a bill merely means that the other Members of the Senate who do not now have any knowledge at all of what the bill may be will be deprived of the opportunity to participate in hearings upon the bill, and the Senate itself will be deprived of the opportunity of having the bill studied in committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I interrupt at this point, if it is agreeable to the Senator? The practice usually followed in a case of this kind, when a special committee reports a bill, is that it is then referred to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter. So in this case, if this resolution should be agreed to, the committee could report a bill, but the bill in turn would be referred to the committee that has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to suggest that if the Senator from Montana would modify his resolution so that it would provide that the committee may introduce a bill, there would be no objection to it, and then the bill would follow the regular course.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am saying that that is the practice and the right and the course which the bill would take, anyway; but if the Senator wants such a modification incorporated in the resolution, very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was not my understanding, from what has been said here, that the bill would take that course.

Mr. McNARY. No; I said that if the special committee should report a bill, the bill in turn would be referred to the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is the understanding, I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. It might be well, if there is to be any misunderstanding about it, to have that modification incorporated in the resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it really ought to be incorporated in the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no objection to having that done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well, then, Mr. President.

The resolution was modified by Mr. MURRAY by adding thereto the following words:

Provided, That any such bill shall be referred to the appropriate standing committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there came to my desk the statement of I. W. Wilson, vice president in charge of operations, Aluminum Co. of America, which he made before the Senate committee investigating the national-defense program. The statement is a reply to Secretary Ickes' statements. In the interest of fair play, I ask that Mr. Wilson's statement be placed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF I. W. WILSON, VICE PRESIDENT IN CHARGE OF OPERATIONS, ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

At the hearing Monday, Secretary Ickes made statements challenging the good faith of the Aluminum Co. of America in its efforts to aid in this country's defense program. We welcome the opportunity to refute these accusations, and we believe that when the facts are known no fair-minded person can fail to agree that the Aluminum Co. has done everything within its power, and more, probably, than any other corporation in the United States to uphold the President and the Congress in building up our defenses.

We first want to tell this committee some of the details of what this company has done and is doing to increase its production of aluminum.

In 1938, when our plants produced 286,881,690 pounds of aluminum, and our total shipments were only 175,525,773 pounds, the Aluminum Co. of America finished the year with an inventory of 277,538,066 pounds of aluminum, or more aluminum than normally would be used in a year.

As late as April 3, 1939, Congress had only authorized the Navy to build 3,000 planes, and the Army 6,000. Such a program required no expansion of production facilities, particularly when the Aluminum Co. of America already had more than a year's supply of metal on hand. Yet late in 1938 the company did inaugurate a program which, with the additions since made to it, calls for a capital expenditure of over \$200,000,000 of the company's money, and which has resulted in an increase in the number of its employees from 25,000 to about 50,000.

The Aluminum Co. of America is now producing well over double the amount of aluminum produced in 1938, and when its present program is completed the production of 1938 will be almost tripled. The expansion of the production of aluminum is not a simple matter as is the expansion of many other industries. As this committee is well aware, the production of aluminum requires enormous quantities of electric power. It takes not only large sums of money, but many years to build the extensive hydroelectric developments necessary to get blocks of power in the magnitude required. An aluminum plant without electric power is useless.

In addition to the acquisition of the needed power, this increase in the production of aluminum has already required the doubling of the production of alumina, the tripling of the steamship tonnage used to bring bauxite from South America to this country, and the doubling of the production of bauxite as well. A further expansion of all these facilities is a necessary part of the existing program.

This expansion included large additional facilities for manufacturing fabricated forms. Within a few months the company's capacity to produce strong alloy sheet and extruded shapes will be 6 times that of the beginning of 1938, while our ability to produce aluminum forgings will be 16 times that of the beginning of 1938. All of these products are of vital interest to the aircraft industry.

An inquiry has been made concerning the Aluminum Co.'s attitude with respect to the Fontana power project which will require 3 years to complete. Some months ago a declaration of intention was filed with the Federal Power Commission for this project in the belief that the Commission would not require a Federal license. Such a license permits the Government to take over the project at the end of the license period on terms that might be confiscatory. The Commission, however, made a ruling that would necessitate taking out such a license. The company felt then, and still feels, that in the light of its other huge expenditures for the defense program, it cannot, with proper regard for its financial stability, put up its own money to develop this project in the face of the Government's power to take over the property at the end of the license period. Notwithstanding this feeling, the Aluminum Co. has informed O. P. M., and also T. V. A., that it stands ready to take out a license and develop this project if the Government will assist in financing the development; or, the company will sell the project to T. V. A. so that Authority may develop it; or if neither of these alternatives is acceptable, the company is ready to cooperate in any other way that will make the power from this development available for the production of aluminum. The company now reiterates that position. This matter is, and for some time past has been, under consideration by Government agencies and the Aluminum Co. is ready to proceed in any manner that they may determine.

We have been criticized on the theory that estimates by various governmental agencies were in some way mistakes, attributable to the Aluminum Co. of America. This we emphatically deny.

Many of the things that have been said before this committee concerning aluminum seem to be based on the assumption that it is the function of a private industrial corporation, in this case the Aluminum Co. of America, to estimate not only what it will produce to meet the defense needs of the United States, but also, to set itself up as an authority for what those needs are. Under this assumption we should not only have been able to tell how much aluminum will be required, for instance, to build the number of airplanes needed to defend the democracies, but to forecast how many of these planes will be needed.

We have not presumed to tell Congress, the Army, or the Navy, how many planes are needed for defense. Our function as to forecasts is, and can only be, to tell what we will produce and how far we can expand under the instructions and requests of the Government, and then to produce such aluminum. There has never been a single month when we have not exceeded the amounts of such forecasts.

We understand that the present estimates of O. P. M. call for the production in this country of at least 1,400,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. Last October the Defense Commission advised the company that it should increase its production by an addi-

tional 100,000,000 pounds per year, or thus to a total of 850,000,000 pounds per year. The company thereupon submitted to the Defense Commission a program of further expansion which would have increased production by more than 100,000,000 pounds per year within a period of from 6 to 8 months. Since then O. P. M. has been advised by the company, again and again, that if O. P. M. would procure the necessary electrical power, the company would increase production by such further amounts as the Government wishes. But it has not yet, to this very hour, been possible to determine at what place, or in what amounts, electrical power will be made available and until this is known the company cannot proceed with the construction of the necessary plants in which to produce the additional aluminum desired by the Government.

Mr. Ickes stated Monday to this committee: "I have a profound conviction that the Aluminum Co. of America would prevent the necessary expansion of our aluminum manufacturing facilities, regardless of the consequences to the country or the world, in order to get them all within its own domination and control." He further stated, referring to the Aluminum Co. of America, "It did its damndest to prevent us from making this contract for power with the Reynolds Metals Co."

"We want to state without reservation that the Aluminum Co. has no desire to prevent the necessary expansion of the aluminum manufacturing facilities in this country or to get them all within its domination and control. We are interested in but one thing, that there be sufficient aluminum produced to meet the defense needs of our country. Furthermore, the Aluminum Co. has never in any way done anything to make it difficult for the Reynolds Metals Co. or anyone else to go into the aluminum business and has never endeavored to prevent the Reynolds Metals Co. from obtaining power.

The company has no desire to use the present emergency for the purpose of increasing its own position in the industry. This is shown by the fact that the company has repeatedly offered to put all of its technical resources at the Government's command, to design and build plants for Government operation if it so desires, and to furnish the technical staff to make this possible, or, if the Government prefers, to operate for the Government under a management arrangement. The company has also offered to use its own resources, as far as they will go, in financing any expansion program adopted by the Government, in addition to the \$200,000,000 it has already used for expansion. No company could offer to do more.

Monday, Secretary Ickes referred to a request of February 4 from O. P. M. for an additional 65,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power and explained why he would not allot it to the Aluminum Co. He also said that later he was again asked to allot 65,000 kilowatts of additional power to the Aluminum Co. and gave another explanation as to why he would not do that. Secretary Ickes failed to point out, and perhaps he did not know, that the Aluminum Co. has continuously, over the last 6 months or more, told the governmental agencies that it would make all the aluminum for which power could be obtained.

In the face of that record, in the face of the fact that the Aluminum Co. has already doubled and will shortly triple its 1938 output, and in the face of the further fact that the Aluminum Co. is spending over \$200,000,000 of its own money to advance defense, it is hard to understand how Secretary Ickes could state to this committee Monday that "When the story of this war comes to be written, it may have to be written that it was lost because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Co. of America."

Secretary Ickes may know how wars are lost, but you gentlemen know that wars are won by using, as quickly as possible, every available resource for the production of war materials.

Allegations have been made that the Aluminum Co. of America is a monopoly and is a party to agreements with various foreign companies, or foreign agencies, under which it is claimed production of aluminum has been restricted in this country. These and other similar questions are now pending in the courts against the company and its officers. In view of the fact that these suits are still unadjudicated, we feel constrained to remain silent in the face of these charges, believing it to be improper to discuss, or make any representations, publicly regarding matters which are still pending before the courts for decision. Suffice it to say that all of the principal officers of the company have vigorously denied that any such agreements exist, and they likewise have denied such charges are justified. I can assure you that it is no easy matter to be compelled to keep quiet in the face of charges that we regard as unfounded, but the proprieties of the situation have unfortunately made this necessary.

The Aluminum Co. of America was the first company in the world ever to produce aluminum at a price which brought it into commercial use. It pioneered the industry. It is still the foremost company in the aluminum industry, in spite of the fact that it has had the most severe competition from foreign companies, at least one of which is government-owned.

The Aluminum Co. of America has given the United States leadership in this industry, both from the standpoint of knowledge and technique as well as quality of product. Until Germany came into the fruition of its enormous armament program in 1939 the productive capacity in the United States was the greatest of any country in the world. In pioneering this industry, the principal job of the Aluminum Co. of America has been to find new uses for the metal. The problem of the company, therefore, has heretofore been not the production of aluminum but the finding of people who would buy the metal and use it.

Let me assure you gentlemen that the sole desire of the Aluminum Co. of America is to be allowed to use its every resource in the production of aluminum for the defense of the country. We urge that we be allowed to do so.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a number of years we have had what has been called the regime of the great planners. Now, when every plan seems to have gone awry, more confusion is added to the national picture, in that the leaders in government, because they themselves have "missed the boat" take it upon themselves to criticize and damn someone else.

America is interested in defense. We have just received a message from the President in which he called our attention to a significant episode, and then we were told that Mr. Hitler must be destroyed. This is a time for reason and common sense to come into play. As someone in my section of the country once said, "if you are going to take a tiger by the tail you had better have something to knock his head off with."

We are interested in defense. The people want America strong. The people want to maintain their freedom. They do not want to have the leaders of the Nation going around lambasting people who disagree with them, nor do they

want to have the leaders in the Nation "pass the buck" when they themselves are to blame. What America needs now is to remember that much water has gone over the dam which will never be brought back. It is up to us now to knuckle down to the challenges of the present and become prepared.

The paint-brush and stinkpot methods were never the ways of Lincoln. If we tell the people the truth, that is all that is needed.

I do not know who is right in the controversy that Secretary Ickes has precipitated. I do know that all the planning of the great planners has gone steadily awry. All the great promises of the great promiser have never been fulfilled. So to divert, I suppose, the people's attention from those facts, the thought is to smear someone else, time and time again.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate for more than a few moments.

We are about to consider a tax bill in the very near future. I am just back from my own State. The people say they are ready to pay the taxes if—

First. We cut out a lot of unnecessary Government overhead.

Second. If we will reduce, where they can be reduced, nondefense items.

Third. If we will get value received for the taxpayer's dollar.

Fourth. If, in the program under the Lend Lease Act the President will be practical and get collateral where it can be gotten. Many months ago I called attention to the fact that Britain had \$4,000,000,000 in South American securities. I said that if Hitler got possession of that collateral he would win this war in South America without firing a shot in this hemisphere; or, if the war were a stalemate, and he got possession of those \$4,000,000,000 in stocks and bonds, he would own South America.

Fifth. The farmers are ready to do their share in relation to the tax bill, also, but they expect that the Government will use its head. For over 8 years now about 80 percent of the farmers, because they have not gotten the cost of production out of their milk, have been losing ground. The Government has been taking over farms. Insurance companies have acquired multitudes of them. Now, when there are \$500,000,000 available in the Lend Lease Act for farm products to give to Britain, the farmers expect that this Government will see to it that they get at least the cost of production for the products that the Government gives away, for the products that the Treasury of the United States buys with the people's money to give away.

Wisconsin's cheese is selling in London for a dollar a pound. If it costs the Wisconsin farmer a dollar and eighty-five cents a hundred pounds to produce his milk in this period, when wages and everything else are going up, he does not want the Government he is now asked to support to chisel in and take from him the opportunity to get the cost of production out of his product; and 100 pounds of milk will make over 20 pounds of cheese.

All America is defense conscious, but the folks who are paying the bill expect,

and have a right to demand, that the managers of government get rid of the planners who missed the boat for so many years, and become realistic in their approach to our problems. Frequently realism is merely a synonym for common sense or horse sense.

We have heard the saying so often that a day of reckoning is coming. If so, and I think it is coming, it is about time that we realistically considered what the phrase "day of reckoning" means.

In the last 8 years, under the present managers of government, we have run behind three and one-half billion dollars a year, on the average. It is estimated that this year we will spend in the neighborhood of \$25,000,000,000. How long we will continue to spend money on that vast scale no one can tell. But the necessities of the situation demand that we pay as much as we can out of earnings.

The second requirement is that we proceed reasonably and sensibly to stop the spiral of inflation. In this connection, the American people can buy defense bonds instead of spending all their earnings. Savings should again be a virtue.

If, as has been said, there are 15,000,000 wage earners in this country who will have their wages increased between \$300 and \$500 a year, when their earnings are shot into the economic bloodstream of the country there will be precipitated a fine spree, which will bring about inflation. During the last war we had a dollar worth 50 cents. If conditions continue as at present, as seems likely, unless we become realistic, we will have a dollar which will be worth 10 cents.

Third. Instead of attempting to carry out projects throughout the Nation which are not defense projects, we should in every community, city, county, and State accumulate these projects, and if possible accumulate in the treasuries of the various political units some money with which to pay for the projects when the present emergency shall have come to an end. The purpose of accumulating such projects is that when our boys come back from the Army and the Navy and the defense industries there will be something for them to do. We can by that method absorb a part of the shock which will come.

Mr. President, all over our country people are wondering which way we are going. We find extremists on both sides befuddling and confusing the intellects of our people. What we need now is simply to proceed cautiously, carefully, as we would proceed if we recognized that we were trustees of property of great value. We must not go down the way to war if it is possible to avoid it. Ninety-nine percent of the people of the country do not want to go to war unless war becomes necessary as a matter of self-defense.

DISCHARGE OR RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN AND PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER 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 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 the word "immediately" and insert "for six months."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. 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 MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations of officers in the Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

POSTMASTER AT DES MOINES, IOWA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there was favorably reported today by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the nomination of Edith M. Johnson to be postmaster at Des Moines, Iowa. At the request of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], I ask that the nomination be now confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Malcolm Elliott, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received June 20 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY MARINE CORPS

Maj. James W. Flett to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941.

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

Lofton R. Henderson
Francis M. McAllister

Capt. Jack P. Juhan to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of May 1941.

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

Paul E. Becker, Jr.
Cyril E. Emrich
James J. Owens
John W. Howe
Clarke J. Bennett

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of May 1941:

Staff Sergeant Wallace G. Fleissner
Corp. Robert H. Gray
Corp. Schuyler D. Ferris
Sgt. Eugene V. Boro
Corp. Frank T. Whiffen
Corp. Louie N. Casey

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Malcolm Elliott to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES
TO BE CAPTAINS

John S. Baylis
Charles G. Roemer

TO BE CAPTAINS (ENGINEERING)

Benjamin C. Thorn
Milton R. Daniels

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

William L. Sutter
Gilbert R. Evans
Wallace L. Hancock, Jr.
Adrian F. Werner
Woodrow W. Vennel
John Montrello

TO BE A CHIEF MACHINIST

Michael J. Hoosick

TO BE A CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Hamlett I. Allen

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
TO BE SURGEONS

Edwin G. Williams
Gerald M. Kunkel

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Edgar B. Johnwick	Harald M. Graning
Lawrence W. Brown	Karl Habel
Francis J. Weber	Francis T. Zinn
Thomas R. Dawber	Ralph E. Wenzel
Thomas H. Diseker	Robert T. Hewitt
Theodore F. Hilbish	Robert R. Smith
Michael L. Furcolow	Murray A. Diamond
George E. Tooley	Max R. Kieselbach
Robert L. Zobel	Frank L. Price
Thomas F. Crahan	Weldon A. Williamson
Raymond F. Kaiser	Robert D. Wright
Glenn S. Usher	Aaron W. Christensen
Charles C. Smith	Nobel W. Guthrie
Wendell A. Preston	Albert G. Love, Jr.
Murdo E. Street, Jr.	John P. Turner
James V. Lowry	

TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS

Fritz R. Jackson
John A. Hammer

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS

Edward J. Driscoll
William C. Neaf

POSTMASTER

Edith M. Johnson, Des Moines, Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, our heavenly Father, we offer our tribute of praise. Without Thee nothing is good, nothing is pure, and nothing can abide. Do Thou smite the false idols of this world which are blinding it to the wondrous simplicity which is in Christ our Lord, that it may be delivered and its soul may find the way that leads to enchanting and enriching freedom; then shall Thy teaching take a deep foothold in the conscience of man. Grant that our democracy may more and more be the torch bearer in the long line of all backward races, marching upward victoriously to the lands of promise.

Do Thou be with any of our number who may be ill; remain with them very graciously as an angel of light in their presence. Give them strength, O Lord, according to their need. We ask for them, that love which works for the regeneration of the soul, for purity, and sweetness which flower in beauty and in fragrance of character. Behold us with those eyes whose power is in their love and enable our innermost selves to triumph over all the evils of discouragement. Through Christ. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4926. An act 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 message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr. Russell, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Truman, Mr. Maloney, Mr. Lodge, and Mr. Bridges to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that Mr. Wheeler be excused from service as a conferee on the part of the Senate to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) entitled "An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k)," and that Mr. Bulow be named to the vacancy created thereon.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. JOHN H. FOLGER, Member-elect from the State of North Carolina, is present, and I ask unanimous consent that the oath of office may be administered to him, notwithstanding the fact that his certificate of election has not yet arrived.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER appeared in the Well of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

ASSISTANT READING CLERK

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts of the House I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 241) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise authorized by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the sum of \$3,600 per annum, payable monthly, as compensation to an assistant reading clerk to be appointed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That the authorization and appropriation herein contained shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs in a position of reading clerk.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 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, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. TARVER, HARE, THOMAS of Texas, HARRINGTON, ENGEL, and KEEFE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from Mr. Bruce H. Mills, representing the Ventura County Lemon Growers, relating to the interference with their production and harvesting operations. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of his report.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, under special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] has unanimous consent to address the House today. I request that the order be vacated and in lieu thereof that the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] be allowed to address the House on Tuesday, July 1, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and all legislative business of the day.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a very informative letter regarding the threatened shortage of oil and gasoline in Massachusetts from the Department of Labor and Industries.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article in the American Mercury for July, entitled "Ordeal of American Air Power," by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 25, after the legislative program of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

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

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

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas is full of well-equipped, well-manned machine shops capable of turning out great volumes of vital defense machines. Hundreds of these shops and factories have waited patiently to help with the Government defense program. Most of us have thought that the Office of Production Management was going out into the highways and byways of this country to seek aid in this economic struggle. It seems we are wrong. Perhaps the explanation of no business for the machine shops of Texas comes from the following statement made by Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Director of Purchases for the O. P. M.:

Defense business is not going to seek any man out. In the very nature of things that is impossible. No manufacturer is likely to get many defense contracts unless he is willing to display the same ingenuity, persistence, and energy in going after them that he would display in seeking any normal kind of commercial business.

This is an inexcusable attitude. These services should be sought and no man should have to "sell" vital employment of men and machines to the Government at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address delivered by Dr. Montgomery in my district on Monday last, and also an address made by myself at the same time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Report From Putnam County," by Christine Sadler, in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSUMPTION OF CHEESE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to insert in the RECORD a resolution passed by the directors of the Chamber of Commerce, Fond du Lac, Wis., June 17, 1941; also a news item appearing in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks, and the matter referred to, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks relative to highways in general and particularly to Highway 60, through Oklahoma, and also to insert necessary quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech I delivered to the farmers of eastern North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 242, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands is authorized as a committee, by subcommittee or otherwise, to continue until January 3, 1943, the investigation begun under House Resolution 284 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by House Resolution 284 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Any unexpended balance authorized for use of the said committee under House Resolution 285 of the Seventy-sixth Congress is hereby continued for such purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some extracts from the Gallup poll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article written by me on the St. Lawrence River project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LAMBERTSON and Mr. BENDER were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I desire to insert in the RECORD the statement made by Amos Pinchot.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 31, 35, 36, 46, 48, 49, 54, 57, 64, 72, and 79.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 43, 51, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 71, 77, 83, 89, 91, 95, and 96, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "and also including printing and binding in cloth, with illustrations, twenty thousand copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which fifteen thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand for the use of the Senate, \$20,000, and including printing and binding in cloth, with illustrations, thirty-five thousand copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which twenty-six thousand two hundred shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and eight thousand eight hundred for the use of the Senate, \$30,000,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$48,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert

"\$304,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$5,241,455"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$11,050,411, of which \$14,411 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation. 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$99,558, of which \$1,558 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation. 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$782,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$249,337, of which \$2,337 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$14,051,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$870,651"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$2,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$7,790 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics', and not to exceed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$1,797,348, of which \$9,348 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$18,589,609"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$9,990,165, of which \$34,665 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$314,469"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$877,733"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$182,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$690,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$5,329,978"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,284,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$685,668"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$483,332"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$749,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,133,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$533,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$6,421,308"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$1,633,362"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$23,516,775, of which \$58,425 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$25,602,109"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$499,388,671, of which \$467,451 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$100,150,000, of which \$116,850 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$47,962,910, of which \$33,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$5,559,827, of which \$59,827 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$2,488,912, of which \$38,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$747,453, of which \$8,764 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$2,752,412, of which \$574,173 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$5,988,777"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$64,000,000, of which \$115,171 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$120,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$3,887,900, of which \$77,900 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics'; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 21, 80, 93, 94, 97, 98, and 100.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
R. A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Correction of totals, etc.

The following amendments relate to the correction of totals, allocations, corrections of text, etc.: Amendments Nos. 3, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 32, 39, 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 53, 62, 73, 74, 76, 88, and 95.

Press clippings

Amendments Nos. 2, 91, and 96: Strike out the House provisions authorizing the purchase of press clippings. As to these amendments the House has receded.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1, salaries: Appropriates \$8,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the services of an assistant to whom the Secretary of Agriculture, under the provisions of the Schwellenbach Act, may delegate certain regulatory functions which the Secretary is required by law to perform.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 4: Retains the Senate language authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to transfer to the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Solicitor from the funds available for the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration such sums as may be necessary for the legal services of these agencies; and providing that no salary for legal services for the Department shall be paid in excess of that authorized by law for the Solicitor of the Department.

Office of information

Amendment No. 5, horse and cattle books: Provides \$20,000 for printing and binding "Diseases of the Horse" and \$30,000 for printing and binding "Diseases of Cattle", as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000 for each, as proposed by the House, and divides them, 15,000 of the horse books for the House and 5,000 for the Senate, and 26,200 of the cattle books for the House and 8,800 for the Senate, as proposed by the Senate, instead of dividing them equally among the entire membership of both Houses, as proposed by the House.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendment No. 6, Hawaii: Appropriates \$67,500 as proposed by the House, instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Special research fund

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$1,200,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Extension Service

Amendment No. 12, Puerto Rico: Appropriates \$100,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$128,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, administration and coordination of extension work: Appropriates \$550,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Appropriates \$857,105, together with \$1,762,895 transferred from certain other appropriations, as provided in those several appropriations, making in all \$2,620,000 as proposed by the House, instead of a direct appropriation of \$3,120,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 22, inspection and quarantine: Retains the Senate increase of \$8,000 for intensification of work along the Mexican border.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 25, cereal crops and diseases: Retains the Senate increase of \$9,000 for increased seed flax investigations.

Amendment No. 26, drug and related plants: Provides an increase of \$5,000, instead of \$6,500 as proposed by the Senate, for herb and spice plant investigations.

Amendment No. 27, dry-land agriculture: Retains the Senate increase of \$2,400 for increased work at the Sherman County Branch Experiment Station, Moro, Ore.

Amendment No. 28, forage crops and diseases: Provides an increase of \$4,000, instead of an increase of \$6,500 as proposed by the Senate, for additional turf grass investigations.

Amendment No. 29, forest pathology: Retains the Senate increase of \$10,000 for cactus

disease investigations of the saguaro and organ-pipe cacti of the Southwest.

Amendment No. 30, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: Retains the Senate increase of \$10,000 for azalea disease investigations.

Amendment No. 31, tobacco investigations: Eliminates the Senate increase of \$5,000 for tobacco investigations in Pennsylvania.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 33, national forest protection and management: Appropriates \$11,050,411, instead of \$11,004,500 as proposed by the House and \$11,086,000 as proposed by the Senate. Retains \$50,000 of the Senate increase of \$75,000 for cooperation with the Work Projects Administration in mining and forestry areas. Eliminates the Senate increase of \$25,000 for intensifying the management of national forest ranges.

Amendment No. 34, private forestry cooperation: Appropriates \$99,558, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$98,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$1,558 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$2,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35, forest management: Eliminates the Senate increase of \$50,000 for investigations of cutting and management of Douglas-fir forests.

Amendment No. 36, range investigations: Eliminates the Senate increase of \$10,000 for range investigations in the national forests of Oregon and Washington.

Amendment No. 37, forest products: Provides an increase of \$150,000, instead of \$367,500 as proposed by the Senate, for the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

Amendment No. 38, forest survey: Appropriates \$249,337, instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House and \$247,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$2,337 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$3,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42, forest fire cooperation: Appropriates \$2,425,000, instead of \$2,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,490,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers not to exceed \$7,790 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$10,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43, acquisition of lands for national forests: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the language inserted by the House, "under sound commercial title satisfactory to the Attorney General as provided in said Act". This elimination is in conformity with the act of October 9, 1940 (Public, 825, 76th Cong.), which more effectively meets the situation which the language stricken from the bill was designed to do.

Amendment No. 44, acquisition of lands for national forests: Appropriates \$1,797,348, instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,988,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$9,348 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," instead of not to exceed \$12,000 as proposed by the House.

Forest roads and trails

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$9,990,165, instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,955,500 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$34,665 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," instead of not to exceed \$44,500 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering

Amendment No. 50, agricultural engineering investigations: Retains the Senate increase of \$10,000 for additional investigations on the development of more efficient methods

and machinery for the pulling and processing of fiber flax; provides \$10,000, instead of \$14,981 as proposed by the Senate, to expedite the development of machinery for the production and harvesting of sweet potatoes; and eliminates the Senate increase of \$14,500 for investigations on machinery for the collection of agricultural residues.

Amendment No. 51, naval-stores investigations: Retains the Senate increase of \$23,000 for investigations to improve the methods of production and to increase the consumption of turpentine, rosin, etc.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendment No. 54, Mexican fruitfly control: Appropriates \$167,960 as proposed by the House, instead of \$175,460 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55, citrus canker eradication: Appropriates \$13,485 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56, Dutch elm disease eradication: Appropriates \$300,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57, European corn borer control: Appropriates \$10,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$27,939 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58, barberry eradication: Appropriates \$182,500, instead of \$162,500 as proposed by the House and \$225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59, bee culture: Appropriates \$83,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 60, insecticide and fungicide investigations: Appropriates \$130,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61, foreign plant quarantines: Appropriates \$690,000, instead of \$680,000 as proposed by the House and \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

White pine blister rust control

Amendments Nos. 63, 64, 65, and 66: Appropriates \$1,284,000, instead of \$1,159,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,409,000 as proposed by the Senate; allocates to the Department of the Interior, \$115,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$215,000 as proposed by the Senate, to the Forest Service, \$635,668, instead of \$644,000 as proposed by the House and \$694,000 as proposed by the Senate, and to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, \$483,332, instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House and \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 67, crop and livestock estimates: Retains \$10,000 of the Senate increase of \$20,000 for preharvest wheat surveys.

Amendment No. 68, market news service: Retains the Senate increases of \$7,500 for market news service on livestock in the Detroit market area and of \$1,000 for extension of the period of market reports on apples at Martinsburg, W. Va.; and eliminates the Senate increases of \$12,500 for market news service on hogs at Columbus, Ohio, of \$7,500 for market news service on livestock at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and of \$6,500 for additional market news service in Oregon.

Amendment No. 69, Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts: Appropriates \$533,000, instead of \$439,000 as proposed by the House and \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate, the increase granted to be prorated to markets for the several types of tobacco in proportion to the total number of existing markets for each type in the several areas.

Amendment No. 70, Federal Seed Act: Appropriates \$80,000, instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the House and \$85,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71, Packers and Stockyards Act: Appropriates \$381,879 as proposed by

the Senate, instead of \$356,879 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72, enforcement of the Insecticide Act: Appropriates \$168,180 as proposed by the House, instead of \$193,180 as proposed by the Senate.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 75, soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: Appropriates \$23,516,775, instead of \$23,533,350 as proposed by the House and \$23,458,350 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$58,425 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," instead of not to exceed \$75,000 as proposed by the House.

Soil conservation payments

Amendment No. 77, automobile for the Administrator: Allows \$1,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$499,388,671, instead of \$499,521,220 as proposed by the House and \$498,921,220 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$467,451 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79, regional laboratories: Allows \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Disposal of Surplus Commodities

Amendment No. 81, disposal of surplus commodities: Appropriates \$100,150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$135,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$116,850 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$150,000 as proposed by the House.

Sugar Act of 1937

Amendment No. 82: Appropriates \$47,962,910, instead of \$47,973,960 as proposed by the House and \$47,923,960 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$38,950 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 83: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the language of the House, as follows:

"Provided, That conditional payments in connection with the 1941 sugar program shall not be made if, by proclamation under section 509 of said Act, title II or title III shall have been suspended and shall remain suspended until July 4, 1941."

Federal Crop Insurance Act

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$5,559,827, instead of \$5,576,800 as proposed by the House and \$5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$59,827 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$76,800 as proposed by the House.

Farm Tenant Act

Amendment No. 85, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,488,912, instead of \$2,499,962 as proposed by the House and \$2,449,962 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$38,950 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 86, liquidation and management of resettlement projects: Appropriates \$747,453, instead of \$749,939 as proposed by the House and \$738,689 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$8,764 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$11,250 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 87, land utilization and retirement of submarginal land: Appropriates \$2,752,412, instead of \$2,836,675 as proposed by the House and \$2,278,239 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$574,173 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$737,000 as proposed by the House.

Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 89: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the House language "and to other needy persons", so as to limit the appropriation to needy farmers.

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$64,000, instead of \$58,846,130 as proposed by the House and \$66,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$115,171 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$147,845 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 92, rural rehabilitation loans: Authorizes and directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance \$120,000,000, instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farm Credit Administration

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$3,887,900, instead of \$3,910,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,810,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers \$77,900 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments in disagreement

The conferees have not agreed with respect to the following Senate amendments:

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 13, 17, 21, 93, and 98 relate to totals and an allocation which are dependent upon action taken upon the remaining amendments in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7, payments to States, agricultural experiment stations, under Title I, Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates \$2,463,708, instead of \$2,400,000 as proposed by the House, and provides that \$63,708 of the total amount shall be allotted to the several States and Territories in such manner that no State or Territory shall receive a smaller amount in 1942 than was allotted to it under the like appropriation for 1941.

Amendment No. 11, extension work Act of April 24, 1939: Appropriates \$555,000 instead of \$203,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 80, parity payments: The House made a direct appropriation of \$49,991,160 and authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make additional commitments or incur additional obligations of not to exceed \$162,000,000, with respect to parity payments in connection with the 1942 crop. The Senate struck out the entire House provision and made a direct appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the 1942 crop and a supplemental appropriation of \$150,000,000 for the 1941 crop. The House provision that, if the acreage allotment for any farm under the agricultural conservation program has been exceeded by less than 10 per centum, parity payments with respect to such farm shall be reduced by not more than 10 per centum for each 1 per centum, or fraction thereof, of such excess, is incorporated in the Senate language with respect to both the appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the 1942 crop and that of \$150,000,000 for the 1941 crop. The Senate language also makes the provision applicable to the appropriation of \$212,000,000 made a year ago for the 1941 crop. The House language contains a provision, not included by the Senate, which transfers not to exceed \$125,000 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

Amendment No. 94, cooperative farm forestry: Appropriates \$700,000 instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 97, salaries and expenses, Rural Electrification Administration: Appro-

priates \$3,946,000, instead of \$3,923,425 as proposed by the House, and strikes out the House provision which transfers not to exceed \$50,000 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

Amendment No. 100: Section 3 of the bill, inserted by the Senate, prohibiting the use of any appropriation made in the bill, to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, together with certain penalties if such person or persons who accepts employment under any of the appropriations made in the bill.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House present a conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, providing for a total appropriation of \$1,060,500,063, the largest amount ever carried in an agricultural appropriation bill in the history of the Congress. The bill as agreed to in conference appropriates an amount in excess of that carried in the bill last year by \$23,541,141, and exceeds the Budget recommendations by \$2,748,092.

The bill as it originally passed the House was approximately \$5,000,000 under the Budget estimates but was increased by the Senate to a total of something like \$285,000,000 above the Budget recommendations. As submitted today it is \$7,676,026 above the House bill and \$280,122,681 below the Senate bill.

This bill implements the parity program and supplements the loan bill recently enacted and signed by the President just a week or two ago.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, who has contributed so ably to the success of the parity program.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman just made the statement that this bill implemented the parity program and supplements the mandatory parity-loan law, the 85-per cent provision. I am sure the gentleman recognizes that that act was passed since the Budget Director gave his estimates upon one item in this bill, the Federal grading of tobacco, and that it is necessary to have a Federal grade placed upon tobacco before the Commodity Credit Corporation can make a loan upon that commodity. Otherwise, they would not discriminate between \$4 tobacco and \$40 tobacco. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the item brought back in the conference report of \$533,000 is sufficient to bring to the markets Federal grading of tobacco?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I regret to say that under the changed conditions brought about since the Budget estimate was received on this bill the amount we provide in this bill is not adequate to take care of the burley tobacco crop. It

does supply sufficient funds to provide the necessary inspection of all other classes of tobacco. The bill before us would provide a total of \$145,000 for burley tobacco. Of that amount \$113,000 was included in the original Budget and the remaining \$32,000 is the proportion allocated to the burley markets from the increase above the Budget which is included in the bill. A recent investigation which I have made discloses the need for \$131,000 additional for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman, in his survey, has also come to the conclusion, I believe, that that is absolutely necessary for the burley markets, in order that the burley farmers may participate in the loan program which the Congress has directed?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. Under the regulations prescribed by the Department and under the law a loan cannot be made until the tobacco has been inspected and graded. Unless this tobacco is inspected it will not be eligible to receive loans through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In order to provide that grading, which I thoroughly agree with the gentleman should be provided, it will be necessary to appropriate an additional \$131,000.

Mr. GORE. And we cannot have a separate vote on this item in the conference report, under the parliamentary situation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately that is true, and any further money for the purpose will have to be supplied through a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. GORE. And the gentleman feels we can get a sympathetic hearing before that committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, I can only speak as one member of the committee. As far as I am personally concerned, I am very sympathetic with the gentleman's position. In justice to the producers of one of the principal agricultural crops of the Nation, some provision must be made for this indispensable service.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. When the bill to which this report pertains left this Chamber it contained an item of \$10,000 for research in the field of onion disease. That comes under the heading of "Bureau of Plant Industry." May I have the gentleman's assurance that the item of \$10,000 for onion-disease research originally agreed to in the House is now in the bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say we were able to make ample provision for that item and that we appropriated the full amount advocated by the gentleman for that purpose. It is one of the most justifiable items in the bill.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. Did I understand the gentleman to say there was no way, under the present parliamentary situation, to remedy Senate amendment No. 69 on tobacco grading, here in the House now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We would, of course, vote down the conference report and then take up the amendments singly, but that is not practical, and I am certain the gentleman would prefer to make application to the deficiency committee which is in position to remedy the matter.

Mr. CREAL. That is the point. I am for all the report, understand, including that item, and, of course, would not even offer a motion to vote down a whole conference report because it had one speck on it.

I would also say, if the gentleman will permit a further interruption, that what he has just said is what I said when the item came up on the floor of the House and we attempted to raise those figures. The gentleman at that time—which he now admits—was very much in error. It was defeated by 17 votes here on the floor. Everything he says now I said then, but it fell on deaf ears.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately, the entire situation has changed since that time. The gentleman was in error at the time the bill was originally considered in the House.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Amendment 81 on page 81 under the subhead "Disposal of surplus commodities," is one on which the Senate receded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Senate receded.

Mr. COCHRAN. And it is included in this conference report as in agreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The conferees agreed on that item.

Mr. COCHRAN. The amendment not being in disagreement, naturally we cannot have a separate vote unless the conference report is voted down. I am not going to advocate the voting down of the conference report because I feel confident that the amendment eliminated by the Senate's receding will be inserted either in the relief bill or in the deficiency bill on the other side of the Capitol. I do believe, however, that the conferees made a mistake in not agreeing to the Senate amendment to give this organization the same amount of money it had during the present fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take an additional 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri, my distinguished colleague from St. Louis, is in the same situation in which the gentleman from Kentucky who just discussed the tobacco-inspection amendment finds himself. The situation has changed, unforeseen conditions have arisen, but we have provided in this bill precisely the same amount for food stamps, \$125,000,000, which was provided for that purpose in the last bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. But, my colleagues, do not be misled. The gentleman's statement is correct but he it remembered the relief bill as it passed the House did not contain the additional money for food

stamps that it did last year, so up to now they are short.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But that bill was not the Agricultural bill, and the item was not a farm item. It was a relief item, and I am advised that the Senate in acting on the relief bill has inserted \$50,000,000 for the purpose desired by the gentleman. That is where it belongs. That gives the gentleman a clear profit of \$15,000,000 on the transaction. The Senate amendment to this carried only \$35,000,000. The Senate amendment to the relief bill is for \$50,000,000. So then you have gained \$15,000,000 through the action of the conferees in rejecting the Senate amendment to this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. The solution, then, is that instead of being carried in this bill it will be carried in another bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly. Agricultural items should be carried in the Agricultural bill, and relief items in the relief bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. If I had my way, if I had the opportunity and the parliamentary situation permitted, I would make a preferential motion to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has always been a friend of the farmer and I want to express grateful appreciation for the support he has always consistently accorded farm legislation. Like most metropolitans, he may not have a great deal of technical information on the needs of the farmer and conditions which affect him—he may not know which end of the mule contains the dynamite—but I am certain his heart is in the right place, and that when he understands the merits of the matter he will want to put things where they belong. And appropriations for the relief of the city consumer do not belong in the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I suppose surplus commodities are grown on the sidewalks and in the streets of the large cities. The farmer gets no benefit at all, I am to believe.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Surplus commodities, when they are taken from the farmer at less than cost of production and distributed to the gentleman's constituents free and without price, are for the benefit of the city and not for the benefit of the farmer, and that is what his amendment would do.

Mr. COCHRAN. When surplus commodities are purchased, they are purchased from the farmer who raises them; and when you lower the supply, you naturally increase the price, and there is benefit to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I call the attention of all who support the Senate amendment to the fact, that every dollar of the vast sums which have been spent on food stamps up to date have been spent to take food away from the farmer who produced it at less than parity prices; and whenever you take food away from the farmer at less than parity price you are subsidizing the man who eats it, subsidizing the constituents of my beloved colleague from Missouri; and not the farmer and his wife who worked 14 hours a day to produce it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman in his extension of remarks tell us, if he can, how much above parity the ultimate consumer pays when he places the commodities on his table?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Plenty. I sell eggs from my farm at home at 18 cents a dozen and pay 40 cents a dozen in Washington. I get 10 cents for my hogs and pay Washington merchants 35 cents for bacon. I get \$1 for wheat and pay at the rate of \$16 for breakfast food.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the trouble.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the middleman as well as the beneficiary of the stamp plan is from the gentleman's district. This bill is for agriculture, not for the middleman or the relief client, and appropriations for their benefit properly belong in the relief bill, where the Senate has placed them.

Mr. COCHRAN. The consumer is paying a price for what the farmer raises far above parity and if you farm boys will find a way to get some of that money that the consumer pays for the farm products back into the hands of the farmer, the farmer will not be asking for any assistance from the Federal Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take 5 additional minutes in order to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does the bill carry in the way of appropriations for agriculture outside of administrative expenses, we might say? In other words, what is the net amount outside of administrative expenses?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The figures have not been segregated on that basis, and it would be very difficult to make such a computation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman give us a rough idea?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. About the only accurate criterion that could be cited would be the fact that this bill is in excess of the bill which last year carried practically the same items by \$23,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I take time to make one observation? I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement with reference to the operation of the stamp plan. It seems to me that an enormous quantity of the surplus commodities purchased by the Surplus Commodities Corporation from the farmer is purchased at a time when the price reaches just about the bottom, and, as the stamp plan operates, it operates to monetize the price of those farm products at the price sold at the retail grocery. The real benefit does not go to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Supplementing what the gentleman has very well said, the farmer not only loses the amount between the parity price and the price actually paid, but that low price fixes the price of all the rest of his crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am interested to find out if the committee is going to advocate an increase in parity payments, and I want to see the parity prices increased for two reasons. I have just been home and I have noticed some recent changes in the farm situation. While the parity price for farm products is fixed by a broad average, weighing it against the labor price, a broad average of labor prices, the things the farmer buys, like transportation and other items that I might mention, are the things that have been subjected to great increases recently. Whereas average labor prices have raised a little, labor costs and prices on tractors and other things farmers buy have raised a great deal.

I went over with a farmer, who keeps a good cost-accounting system, his situation, and we went over the wages, and so forth. He found his laboring men, on account of the things they have to buy, are going to have to have their wages raised. This is partly because of the defense wages, which are drawing labor off the farm, and partly because of an increase in their cost of living and the things they buy. On the farm next to ours they are raising wages \$1 a day for farm labor. Other farmers will find it necessary to do the same. I do not think the farmer can operate under these conditions, so changed since this parity matter was voted by the House. I wonder if the committee took into consideration those circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to the gentlewoman's inquiry, it should be noted that the farmer is very modest in his requests. All he asks is bare parity, while industry takes all the market will bear, and labor asks all the situation will permit. The farmer alone has been moderate and reasonable in his legislative program. As a matter of merit he is, of course, entitled to as fair a price for his products as industry and as honest a wage for his labor toil as labor, and as decent a standard of living as any other for his family as anyone else.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the parity price is a variable figure. If the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is functioning properly, the parity price will raise, and if the items the distinguished gentlewoman has mentioned, or if the reports for the next few months should show a raise, there will be a raise on all parity prices in the basic commodities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Georgia is correct. That is what parity involves.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to whom we are indebted for the parity-loan bill.

Mr. FULMER. Replying to the gentleman from Illinois, may I say that the 85-percent parity bill passed some time ago and does not have anything to do

with actually fixing parity at this time. I believe parity now on cotton is 16 cents. Because of what the gentlewoman said awhile ago about these increases, it may be that the parity price on cotton should be 17 cents or 18 cents a pound and, if so, under the 85-percent parity bill it would mean 85 percent or 17 or 18 cents, or whatever it may be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take 1 additional minute, in order to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I notice that the Senate struck out the entire House provision and made a direct appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the 1942 crop and a supplemental appropriation of \$150,000,000 for the 1941 crop.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do I understand that is \$450,000,000 for the 2 years?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; the Senate amendment, providing \$450,000,000 for parity payments in lieu of the House appropriation of \$212,000,000 for that purpose, would have supplied sufficient funds to have made up the entire deficit between market prices and parity prices. The enactment of the 85-percent-of-parity bill made such an appropriation unnecessary, as the \$212,000,000 carried by the House, in connection with the funds provided for soil-conservation payments, was sufficient to insure full parity prices without the additional funds contemplated in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 more minute to reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST], who, in my opinion, has contributed as much to beneficial farm legislation as any Member of either the House or the Senate.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I would like to have my distinguished friend from Missouri tell me, approximately, how much is in this bill which is charged up against agriculture which is really something else, like forests, highways, and some other things of that nature.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that there are vast sums appropriated in this bill which are not primarily farm items. While the full amount of the appropriation is supposed to be for the exclusive benefit of agriculture, there are numerous appropriations in the measure for many activities which benefit the Nation as a whole.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Most of the criticism of the bill relates to the enormous sums appropriated, but, as I understand it, these sums really go to other matters.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. There are, for example, millions in the bill for highways alone which do not benefit the farmer any more than any other citizen or industry, if as much, and various other similar items too numerous to mention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take one more minute in order to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am interested in inquiring about some amendments in disagreement. I am particularly interested in two of them regarding extension work and research work in the land-grant college. I understand that the conference report will have to be voted up or down. What will then happen to the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that the amendments to which he refers, amendments 7 and 11, have not been included in the conference report. Those amendments have been brought back separately and after we agree to the conference report we will then take them up, and the House conferees will offer motions for their disposition. I may say it is the intention of the conferees to move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take a minute to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Notwithstanding all of the provisions that the Congress has made with respect to attempting to give the farmer parity prices for his products, yet in view of the prices of all the things that the farmer has to buy, including his labor prices and his taxes, he still does not get parity for his products.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He does not get parity in the market, but under the provisions of the bill reported by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], for which he is entitled to the thanks both of the Nation and the industry, in connection with the conservation and parity payments authorized by this bill the farmer at the end of the year will have received full parity.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But he does not get it under this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. After he has received the 85 percent authorized by the Fulmer bill, he then receives the remaining 15 percent under this bill. Of course, he should receive full parity in the open market, without having to depend on appropriations from the Treasury.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. May I state to the gentleman that it is not the fault of the legislation we passed but the fault is in fixing parity by the Department of Agriculture. If the farmers should today receive \$1.50 for wheat and 18 cents for cotton, which would be fair, then it would be up to the Department to formulate that parity price and the Congress to work it out.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I compliment the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for what he has done and what his

committee has done, and I also compliment the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress for what they are doing for the farmer, but in the face of all that the farmer does not receive full parity for his products, though this Congress has done more and gone farther for the farmer than any other Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take sufficient time to make an additional statement.

The reaction of the metropolitan press to the legislation reported out by Chairman FULMER, of the Committee on Agriculture, providing 85 percent parity prices for farmers has been nothing short of reprehensible. Editorials couched in the most unbridled language have referred to "predatory farmers," "greedy, grabbing, grasping, farmers," and their "gimme policies," although this legislation gives the farmer only 85 percent of parity, whereas industrial prices are in many instances 200 percent of parity and recent union wage scales are 300 percent of parity. And the prices charged by these same newspapers for advertising are approximately 200 percent of parity.

One of the statements on which all these abusive diatribes agree is that giving the farmer even this inadequate percentage of parity will start a price spiral which will bring on inflation. A survey of the retail prices of foods in the open markets will show how erroneous these statements are. While there have been, naturally, slight advances in some food costs along with all other costs in the last few months, food is today selling, on an average, lower than it was in 1937. The daily market reports in the New York Times show that in the late spring of this year beef, for example, was selling for less than it sold for in the same period in 3 out of the 7 preceding years.

These figures are corroborated by the latest reports just received from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, as follows:

Chuck roast: Retail price per pound at New York, 1933-41

[The 3 years in which the price was higher than the 1941 price are italicized]

Year	March	April	May
	<i>Cents</i>	<i>Cents</i>	<i>Cents</i>
1933	18.9	18.2	18.1
1934	17.3	18.2	18.9
1935	24.8	26.4	29.8
1936	22.7	23.3	21.9
1937	25.0	25.6	26.4
1938	21.4	22.6	23.5
1939	25.0	25.2	25.1
1940	22.4	22.8	22.9
1941	26.1	25.6	25.2

Round steak: Retail price per pound at New York, 1933-41

Year	March	April	May
	<i>Cents</i>	<i>Cents</i>	<i>Cents</i>
1933	29.3	28.5	28.0
1934	27.8	29.3	32.9
1935	39.1	39.2	41.6
1936	35.6	36.3	36.5
1937	39.1	40.0	40.2
1938	35.1	36.4	37.1
1939	39.1	39.9	39.2
1940	36.1	35.9	37.1
1941	39.9	39.4	39.0

Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from records of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The New York Times for May 17, 1941, carries a table showing the following comparative showing retail prices of meats as follows:

	1940 prices	1941 prices
	<i>Cents</i>	<i>Cents</i>
Rib roast, pound	30	31
Porterhouse steak, pound	43	44
Sirloin steak, pound	37	37
Round steak, pound	38	36
Leg of lamb, pound	29	29
Loin chops, pound	45	45
Shoulder chops, pound	32	31
Breast, pound	15	13
Fores, pound	20	19

And yet labor and industry complain that the cost of food is so greatly increased as to justify increases in prices already 200 percent of parity, and the editor, receiving the largest salary ever paid for his position or his services, is apprehensive lest meat prices will start a price spiral.

On June 14, the Labor Department reported that wages were rising faster than the cost of living. According to the statement, "Industrial wages are more than keeping pace with rising living costs."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported living costs in mid-May were 2.4 percent higher than in June of 1940. At the same time, Secretary of Labor Perkins said weekly earnings in manufacturing industries in April averaged \$29.10, or an increase of 15.8 percent since April 1940.

Wage increases were given more than 800,000 workers in the March-April period, Madam Perkins said, and average hourly earnings went up to 70.8 cents, a gain of 7.0 percent over April 1940.

Agriculture heartily approves these gains in wages of labor and profits of industry but wonders at the savage abuse hurled at the farmer when he is given even 85 percent of the lowest price every economist, and Congress itself, has said he should have.

Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman from Kansas desire?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] desires 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take 5 minutes. I rise to say in connection with such work as I, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, have been able to do on this committee of conference, that I approached the matter feeling very strongly that the Subcommittee on Appropriations had gone as far as it ought to go in respect to spending the people's money. I realize that the only way to get the matter out of hand and along the way was to compromise. I do not approve of, and I voted for some of these matters with mental reservations.

I recognize the fact that agriculture is not a nondefense element in this emergency. On the contrary, it is basically and fundamentally our first internal line of defense. Of course, appropriations should be made for agricultural support to the extent that they are incident to and do promote our defense, and I am,

generally speaking, for all appropriations of that nature.

However, there are items included in this bill of which I do not approve, and for the reason that at this time we must cut somewhere if we would not have our own throats cut by the knife of indeterminate and extortionate and extravagant spending. We should save the taxpayers every possible dollar, for God knows they will need every one in order to contribute to the revenue, called taxes, which comes from their pockets.

We cannot go along as we have been going, and there is no sense in assuming that we can. Some projects will have to be curtailed. Some projects which were and are still very worth while and which should be fathered and fostered in non-emergent days, should now be permitted to continue only at low tide and at the lowest possible cost, without expansion or extension, and that at the lowest possible expense consistent with the preservation of the project at status quo or less, and for such further development in the future as may be justified by the financial condition in which we may find ourselves at the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for anybody, at the taxpayers' expense or at the peril of the loss of our liberty, to demonstrate the practicability or impracticability of his theories.

Does it contribute to our defense and will it continue so to do? These are the practical questions we must ask every time we are solicited to spend a dollar, and if the answer is, "No," there should be no appropriation further than that necessary to keep alive the project, if and when by reason of failure to keep it alive our loss would be greater than to let it die.

Just one more word, Mr. Speaker, suggested by a recent speech on the floor. Over and over again I have asked what is parity, and it has occurred to me more than once that the real farmers are being skinned alive by the parity payments that were provided. I have also observed that they have seemed to like it, and a good many of them could not see it as I did.

What is parity? Will we ever get parity if wages continue to rise? The answer is, "No"; but you cannot make a lot of people believe it.

There are a lot of other things I might talk about, and I have only spoken about parity because one of the last speakers talked a lot about it and said nothing. Everybody who has ever tried to explain to me what parity means has eventually left me in the same state of mind and with the same opinion I had when they commenced to talk, possibly because I am dumb. I do not admit it.

However, dumb or not, I finally signed my name to the conference report as such and shall support it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are a dozen or more amendments in disagreement. There are three or four groups which should be considered together. I ask unanimous consent that those groups which cover the same subject be considered simultaneously, and I send the request to that effect to the desk, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asks unanimous consent that amendments numbered 7, 8, and 9, relating to the appropriation for experiment stations and the correction of totals relating thereto be considered together;

That amendments numbered 11, 13, 17, and 21, relating to the appropriation for extension service and the correction of totals relating thereto be considered together;

That amendments numbered 93 and 94 relating to the shelterbelt appropriation under cooperative farm forestry and the correction of an allocation relating thereto be considered together; and

That amendments numbered 97 and 98 relating to the appropriation for the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration and the correction of the total for that agency be considered together.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first group of amendments, 7, 8, and 9, in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 7: Page 12, line 24, strike out "\$2,400,000" and insert "\$2,463,708: *Provided*, That of this amount \$63,708 shall be allotted to States and Territories for which allotments under the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, for the fiscal year 1942, are less than the allotment of the respective State or Territory in the fiscal year 1941, each such State or Territory to receive a total allotment under the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, in 1942 at least equal to the allotment for the respective State or Territory in 1941."

Senate amendment numbered 8: Line 9, page 13, strike out "\$6,862,500" and insert "\$6,933,708."

Senate amendment numbered 9: Page 14, line 24, strike out "\$7,107,235" and insert "\$7,178,443."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 8, and 9, and agree to the same with an amendment to amendment No. 9, as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by amendment numbered 9, insert "\$7,170,943."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next group of amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 11: Page 16, line 19, strike out "\$203,000" and insert "as amended, \$555,000."

Senate amendment numbered 13: Page 17, line 20, strike out "\$13,806,918" and insert "\$14,186,918."

Senate amendment numbered 17: Strike out "\$14,596,918" and insert "\$15,046,918."

Senate amendment numbered 21: Strike out "\$26,890,268" and insert "\$29,882,371."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments 11, 13, 17, and 21, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On amendment numbered 13, in lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert "\$14,158,918."

On amendment numbered 17, in lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert "\$14,948,918."

On amendment numbered 21, in lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert "\$27,313,976."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next group of amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 93: Page 90, line 19, strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$600,000."

Senate amendment numbered 94: Page 91, line 8, strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$700,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Washington to offer a motion on those amendments.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments 93 and 94, and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next group of amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 97: Strike out "\$3,923,425, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", and insert "\$3,946,000."

Senate amendment numbered 98: Page 93, beginning in line 14, strike out "\$3,923,425" and insert "\$3,946,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 97 and 98 and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by amendment numbered 97, insert "\$3,962,375, of which \$38,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.'"

And in lieu of the sum inserted by amendment numbered 98, insert "\$3,962,375."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 80: On page 76, beginning in line 12, under the caption "Parity payments", strike out the entire paragraph down through line 9 on page 77 and insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, \$49,991,160, of which not to exceed \$125,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics,' to remain available until June 30, 1944, and the said Secretary is authorized to make additional commitments or incur additional obligations, not to exceed \$162,000,000, with respect to parity payments in connection with the 1942 crops of the commodities herein named: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded by less than 10 percent, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Omit the matter stricken out and the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, \$212,000,000, of which \$97,375 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics,' to remain available until June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment. The Secretary may also provide by regulations for similar deductions for planting in excess of the acreage allotment for the commodity on other farms or for planting in excess of the acreage allotment or limit for any other commodity for which allotments or limits are established under the agricultural conservation program on the same or any other farm.

"If the sum of the prevailing basic-loan rate for the crop year 1942 and the applicable rate of the payments announced under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the agricultural conservation program and the parity payments herein appropriated, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so

adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

"The proviso contained in the paragraph headed 'Parity payments' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, is amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1941 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment': *Provided*, That the item entitled 'Parity payments' contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, is amended by inserting, immediately following the figures '\$212,000,000' and before the colon, a comma and the following: 'together with the unobligated balances of the appropriation made under this head by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1940, approved June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 939).'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I would like to have the chairman, than whom there is no better farm friend in America, explain this long and intricate amendment that he is proposing about parity payments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the amendment provides in brief that the farmer shall have parity price for his products. It provides that price from three sources. First, his price in the market. Second, the checks which he receives from the Federal Treasury for compliance with the Soil Conservation Act. Third, his Government checks from the amount appropriated by this bill for parity payments sufficient to bring the price of his products up to parity.

The verbiage of the amendment provides that the farmer shall not receive above parity out of the Federal Treasury. It is the consensus of opinion of this Congress and of the American people that the farmer ought to receive his price in the open market, as every other industry does; that he should not have to resort to the Federal Treasury in order to get a fair price for his products and a fair wage for his labor. But lack of legislation for agriculture similar to legislation already provided for industry, transportation, and labor makes it necessary in order to secure a parity price to subsidize the remainder of the price from the Federal Treasury. It is our hope and expectation that we will have that legislation this Congress, and the Committee on Agriculture assures us they will shortly bring in legislation to that effect, permitting the farmer to collect his price in the open market and not out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. It is the understanding of the distinguished chairman

of this subcommittee that parity will be reached chiefly by virtue of commodity loans on these principal commodities; that the commodity-loan provisions will bring up the price of those commodities toward parity, together with the benefit payments, as we may call them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The commodity loans will supplement the first source mentioned—that is, the price in the open market. Commodity loans will insure his getting in the open market 85 percent of parity. Then we will add to 85 percent of parity, secured by the bill just passed by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the checks which the farmer receives for soil-conservation payments. After you have added to 85 percent of parity his soil-conservation payments, he is still short of parity, and in order to bring it up to parity we provide for additional checks in the form of parity payments out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The amendment that is here offered is of such length that no one can follow it or digest it from the mere reading of it here this afternoon by the Clerk. But I am willing to take the word of the friend of agriculture from Missouri, who is in charge of the bill. I am willing to accept his statement that he believes this, as now formulated in this amendment, will bring parity to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It will give us parity beyond peradventure of a doubt.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I gladly yield to the chairman of the committee which reported and passed the parity-loan bill.

Mr. FULMER. I wanted to call to the attention of the House the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, and a friend of the farmers of this country, that parity will be reached through parity payments, the soil-conservation checks, and the loans under the 85-percent parity loan provision. As far as I am concerned, it is very unfair to the farmer to include in parity the soil-conservation checks and the loans under the 85-percent parity loan provision. As far as I am concerned it is very unfair to the farmer to include in parity the soil-conservation checks because the farmers in earning the soil-conservation checks have to do all types of work and buy all kinds of materials. I have contended all along and I contend now that soil conservation should not be included in what is paid as parity; and I hope when we bring in a major bill we may give to the farmer his soil-conservation check for the actual work and material he buys out of that program, which is what was really intended.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from South Carolina, and that was the unanimous attitude of the conferees on the part of the House, but to give more than parity price including that item would necessarily be an additional amount above parity out of the Treasury.

All the farmer asks is that we take from the Treasury merely enough to give

him bare parity. Notwithstanding the charges that have been made in the newspapers in the last 2 weeks since the passage of the bill reported by the gentleman from South Carolina, that the farmer is profiteering, the truth is he has been exceedingly moderate, he has been very conservative. He asks only bare parity, and we include in this bill language which will preclude his receiving out of the Federal Treasury money that will carry the price of his products above parity. We hope the economic law of supply and demand which still operates to some extent will work in his favor in addition to the minimum that comes out of the Federal Treasury, and I congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina that the Committee on Agriculture is preparing major legislation which will give the farmer full parity prices excluding soil conservation payments.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. The bill we passed a little while ago providing for 85-percent parity loans is good for only 1 year, if I remember.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. PIERCE. Does this amendment carry authorization for an appropriation from the Treasury next spring on basic commodities? The money is paid to the growers of wheat, for instance, in the spring. Does this bill carry a sufficient amount of money to give them that parity payment a year from now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill carries money to provide for each commodity the parity payment as it becomes due.

Mr. PIERCE. We want to be sure the wheat growers, for instance, will get their 85-percent parity loans next spring.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman may be assured of that.

Mr. PIERCE. Is this amendment supposed to be sufficient in the absence of the certificate bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This provides for 1 year. Beyond that we must have permanent legislation. We feel confident we can accept the assurance of the Committee on Agriculture that they will bring out permanent legislation to deal with the problem.

Mr. PIERCE. But it does carry parity payments for 1942.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has often expressed the thought that in the present emergency labor and industry are running ahead of the farmers in the matter of profits.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Far ahead.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does this legislation at least for 1 year provide that there shall be some evening up, some equalizing in regard to these three?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For 1 year it provides bare parity. In the meantime industrial wages and prices have reached the highest levels ever known in the economic history of the Nation, and are still advancing.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the chairman and the committee on the excellent way in which they have handled the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We appreciate the gentleman's cooperation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has made a very clear statement pointing out the three sources through which parity is to be achieved: Market price supplemented by 85-percent loans, conservation payments, and finally these parity payments. Was it the opinion of the conferees that this \$212,000,000 would more than meet the amount required to supplement those other sources? Or how was the \$212,000,000 arrived at?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. According to the estimates submitted to us by the Department of Agriculture, \$212,000,000, with 85 percent of parity provided by the bill submitted by the Committee on Agriculture and with the conservation payments would provide just a little in excess of parity. Of course, under the law, none of this money can be expended on a commodity-selling at parity, and any excess remaining after the five basic commodities have reached parity will revert to the Treasury.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think, if we had time, I could show the House that within the next 6 months parity will simply not be enough for the farmer, he will not be put on an equality with industry from which he has to buy; so I should like to know from the chairman of the committee if there is any possibility of getting a deficiency appropriation for additional parity payments within the next 6 months?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every day that goes by decreases the need for parity payments.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Within the last 2 weeks butter and eggs have reached parity. Cattle is now above parity; hogs have gone up to \$10. So with every increase in the price of agricultural products the need for an additional amount for parity payment decreases. Beyond a peradventure of doubt the \$212,000,000 provided in the House bill and approved by the conference committee will more than provide sufficient funds for the purpose.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But it is the cost of production that is rising. Farmers' wages, in comparison with the wages and the price of farm implements, are rising. Within the next 6 months we will have to have higher payments to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman from South Carolina explained, as the cost of the product rises the parity price rises, but there is a corresponding rise in the 85-percent loans available under the loan bill.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I want to join with my chairman. It is most unfortunate that the committee felt it necessary to include soil-conservation payments in calculating parity prices for the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and every member of the conference committee agrees with him. We are waiting for the Committee on Agriculture to bring in legislation which will obviate that requirement.

Mr. PACE. The amendment the gentleman sent to the desk retains the last four lines of the original Senate amendment, which extends the power of the Department of Agriculture in making parity payments. It goes beyond the range of the basic commodities that have received parity, and authorizes the Department not only to compel compliance with the parity crops but also to compel compliance with any crop under which any limitation is put into effect under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I would like to know why the chairman feels it is timely to place this additional authority in the Secretary of Agriculture whereby in order to earn a parity payment a producer must not only comply with his cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco but he must comply in acreage allotments under this language with every single crop that comes under the terms of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act on which no parity payments are made? It is quite a departure from the practice of the past, it is quite new legislation, new farm legislation, and I am quite sure the farmers of the Nation would want to have an explanation of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I fully share the regret of the gentleman that it is necessary to include this provision; but as long as you are taking money from the Federal Treasury you must necessarily circumscribe that process by reasonable precautions. The gentleman has the remedy in his own hands. He is one of the most influential, one of the best qualified members of the great Committee on Agriculture. That committee promises to solve the problem and we are waiting for it to bring in the solution, and when it does we will back it to the last vote in the House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Entirely aside from the merits or demerits of parity for the farmers on these basic commodities, may I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this bill as it has come back to us from conference represents the high-water mark in Government benefits to the farmer? And has the gentleman taken into account the effect of such a great outlay of the public's money, not only in the farm-parity payments but soil conservation, or call it what you will, on the taxpayers who are being called on now to make the highest contribution to the country that they have ever been called upon to make and at a time when the interests of the

Government are increasing in every direction.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is in error in his assumption. While this bill as a whole carries a larger amount than has been carried by any former bill, the amount for parity payments in this bill is only \$212,000,000, whereas we previously carried \$225,000,000. The soil-conservation payments at this time are \$500,000,000, and that is identical with the amount carried for the last several years. Soil conservation has been \$500,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to be clear on this. It may have been covered by some of the statements the gentleman has made. Do I understand that provision has been made in what is called the loan bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and provision made in this bill to provide parity payments for the commodities covered in the two bills for the years 1941 and 1942?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We take care of the 1941 and 1942 crops.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to compliment the gentleman as one of the best friends the farmer has in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. He and his committee have done splendid work for the farmers in this bill, and I may say that goes for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and every member of his committee. We are all doing our utmost to place the farmer in the same position as other groups. The farmer has nothing whatever to do with fixing the price of his products. That is done by others who have little sympathy for his condition. When he goes to buy anything he pays the other fellow's price for that article, whatever it is. Consequently his only forum is the Congress to which he can present his complaints and troubles. This Congress has responded honestly and sincerely to help him solve his problems. These are the first real attempts that the Congress ever made to help the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to consume 5 minutes, but I do desire to address a question to the gentleman from Missouri with respect to the colloquy between him and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], concerning the impression under which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] was laboring to the effect that parity payments could not be made on any commodity if the acreage allotment to any other crop on any particular farm on which the commodity is planted would be exceeded.

I conceive that the gentleman from Georgia is laboring under a mistaken impression. I think the language of the gentleman's amendment which is now pending before the House makes it clear that it is only required that the acreage allotment for the particular commodity

on which the parity payment is to be made shall not be exceeded. I know that it was the purpose of our subcommittee to bring about that result. While certain discretionary power is in a later portion of the amendment vested in the Secretary, it is not expected that this will be used to nullify the provision for full payment when the acreage allotment for the particular crop has not been exceeded.

The contrary result, which has been in effect through the regulations issued by the Department is, in my judgment, not justified by existing law. The two provisions are to some extent in conflict. It was my impression that the language which is proposed here by the committee will make very clear the fact that the only thing that is required in the way of compliance in order to authorize payment to a producer of his parity payment is that he shall not exceed the quota for the particular crop on which the parity payment is being paid. I read:

Provided, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1941 is not in excess of the farm-acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program—

And so forth. I do not see how that language could be susceptible of any other construction except that which I have given it. While subsequent language vests some discretionary power in the Secretary, it is a power which ought not to be exercised except in extreme cases, and I do not see how any departmental regulation could be made and enforced which requires absolute compliance with all regulations of the A. A. A. as to other crops, and if so construed the second provision would be in conflict with the first providing for full payment to the producer of the crop of the particular commodity upon which the parity payment is being made, if he shall have complied with the requirements of the program as to the planting of that particular commodity. Perhaps the two provisions construed together are not clear. I think the RECORD ought to disclose that it is the purpose and intent of the subcommittee proposing this amendment that the exercise of the discretionary power later vested in the Secretary shall not nullify the mandatory proviso quoted.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I should like the gentleman to get a statement from the chairman that that is his interpretation.

Mr. TARVER. That is what I am trying to do. For example, Mr. Speaker, where a producer of cotton has complied with the requirements of the program and has not exceeded his allotted acreage of cotton, he is, as I construe this language, entitled to his parity payment, although he may have planted some other commodity on which he is not receiving a parity payment in excess of the acreage allotment to his farm for that commodity. He, of course, would not receive a parity payment on the other commod-

ity. The matter was discussed in conference as well as in our subcommittee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

The thing to which our friend, the gentleman from Georgia refers is the provision on page 79, as I understand, which reads as follows:

The Secretary may also provide by regulations for similar reductions for planting in excess of the acreage allotment for the commodity on other farms or for planting in excess of the acreage allotment or limit for any other commodity for which allotments or limits are established under the agricultural conservation program on the same or any other farm.

I do not believe we had in mind just what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] inquired about, but in my response to the gentleman from Georgia I answered him on this proposition.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Georgia misunderstood the inquiry, and I have already answered that inquiry. The amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. TARVER. I simply wanted to make it clear that it was the purpose of the committee, no matter how some provision of the amendment may be construed, that the only thing that should be required of the producer of any commodity is compliance with the acreage allotment with reference to that particular commodity. That is right, is it not?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In that case you are getting the whole contract all mixed up. The contract I signed this spring provides several things, that I have to keep my soil-depleting acreage under a certain point, I have to keep my acreage of corn under a certain point, and I have to keep my acreage of wheat under a certain point.

Mr. TARVER. I am talking about the contracts to be made under this bill, which has not yet been enacted into law, not contracts made this year, which I think have been made under a mistaken construction of existing law by the Department. I hope that these contracts will not be repeated by the Department, and I do not feel that they should be, under the language of this amendment.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. As I understand, my colleague states that it is his understanding and it is the assurance of the chairman of the committee that it is the understanding of the committee that, in order for the producer to qualify for the parity payments so far as his planting is concerned, he is required only to stay within the acreage allotment for that particular commodity, and his production or planting of other commodities will have no relation thereto?

Mr. TARVER. That is certainly my understanding. I am sure it was the understanding of the subcommittee.

That is the language of the first proviso quoted—that "payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount" if the acreage planted to that commodity is not in excess of the allotment. The addition of language vesting certain discretionary powers in the Secretary may, as I have said, conflict with this mandate. If so, the mandate should control. Certainly if it is intended to mandatorily require compliance with regulations of the A. A. A. regarding all other crops, the proper place for such a requirement would be in the proviso first quoted. The second provision vesting certain discretionary powers not very clearly defined should not be construed to destroy the quoted proviso.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the chairman of the subcommittee that I think he is to be complimented on the work he has done and the effort he has put forth in trying to clarify his position, which, I think, should be the position of all of us in regard to the food that is distributed through the stamp plan. This plan belongs in the relief bill and should be in the relief bill. The appropriations for the stamp plan should not be included in the agricultural bill for two reasons: One, the farmer up to this time received a small amount of the money; two, the public criticizes the agricultural appropriation amounts, and this stamp plan increases the total.

Furthermore, in connection with these parity and soil-conservation payments, I think the following is a clarifying statement about that. I would like to have him correct me if this is not right: On the basis of all the farms in the United States we have around \$80 per farm soil checks or \$500,000,000 for a little over 6,000,000 farms. We have about \$35 for parity checks, which makes \$110 per farm on the average for the United States. The soil checks are not distributed in that way and neither are the parity checks, but so far as the consumer is concerned, the effort at the present time by the chairman of the committee is to take the prices of agricultural products and add on, we will say, on the average, \$110 per farm, if necessary, to give the farmer parity for these products.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only 2 minutes, because I do not wish to go into the details of this report. Lately I have had opportunity to read the RECORD rather carefully, and I have been greatly interested in the progress of this particular item.

I have always been interested in the magic word "parity." It is not so wonderful to other classes of people who are taxed to pay it out of the Treasury of the United States. I am very willing that the needy farmer gets considerable aid, but I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], who made an appeal the other day, that we omit the farmer who has great acreage and

those who do not and should not receive such outright gifts. I am willing for the farmer who works at farming as a vocation to get the money, but why give it to so many of the wealthy people of the Nation who simply operate farms as an avocation? But you will rise and tell us that they will not conform to the soil program unless you pay them to do it. I object to such payments, however.

I was amazed at the excuse that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] received from the House when I read the RECORD. Of course, it is indefensible. The minority party has ever been very good to the majority in its program to aid the farmer. But we are receiving great criticism for our lack of protest. The minority voted for economy day in and day out last year until this parity question came along, and then we capitulated ingloriously. No wonder the newspapers of the United States condemn us as a minority party for our lack of courageous action in this matter. Therefore, as one member of the minority party, I repeat that I desire that the needy farmer, who farms as his vocation, get this money, but I cannot understand why we cannot find a way to stop handing over this money to these luxury-loving people who are farming just for the pleasure of it. They contribute to overproduction and lower prices, yet we hand them millions in largess. It would be interesting to know what proportion of these funds go to this class of farm acreage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no reasonable man or woman in this House who wants the farmer to come to the Treasury of the United States to be recompensed for more than the difference between parity and the price he receives under parity for the food he produces for the rest of the Nation. I know I for one would be ashamed to get up here and ask at any time that my own personal profession receive more from this Congress than what I call a square deal, but I cannot agree with the sentiments expressed by the last speaker, neither can I agree with the sentiments as expressed in the eastern newspapers in the peculiarly inspired and perfectly timed editorials terming the farmers as grabbers and what not, just because we have demanded and have received, I am glad to say, from this Congress, the 85-percent loans. These loans, coupled with the parity and soil conservation payments, will give us—for the first time in 10 years—parity, not on all basic crops, but simply upon five or six of the major crops. Surely that is not asking too much for the people of our Nation whose hours are from sunrise to sunset, and not 40 hours per week.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois. If all of the Members of this House were as interested in the welfare of agriculture as she has proven herself to be, there

would be no question as to the farmer receiving his fair share of the national income. The lady very ably represents her great agricultural district.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The Government is asking and getting tractor factories to build tanks and they are doing this for cost-plus. The Government is paying cost-plus for all their articles of defense, but they are asking the farmers to produce cheese and to raise wheat and paying them less than the cost of production in order to help England.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentlewoman is absolutely right, and I do not see the opponents of parity or these eastern newspapers getting up here and making speeches or writing editorials protesting against the 10 percent cost-plus to all of the industrialists who have the large national-defense contracts. Billions of the taxpayers' money are involved in such contracts, but there is no great outcry concerning the hundreds of millions of profits guaranteed by the Government to big business.

I do not see any of these same people asking for excess-profits taxes, to refund some of these excessive profits to the Treasury. Yet the press of the East bewail giving the farmer an even break.

I do not see or hear these same people or these newspapers protesting against giving \$7,000,000,000 to the people of another nation.

If they want to be consistent, why do they not protest against the Government squandering tens of millions of dollars in Army camp construction under the diabolic cost-plus system? All that we are asking for is not a profit above cost of production, but simply a square deal, and that is a parity with other lines of industry. Agriculture is the basic industry of all, and I am glad to see that it is beginning to be recognized by this Congress as such.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no man in the House for whom I have a higher regard than the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. He is one of the best friends of agriculture in the House, and I regret the time is not available to yield to him. There is one question I want to ask of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I also thank him for the hard work he has done for years for the 30,000,000 farm people of America. He states in his amendment that this particular \$212,000,000 will be available providing parity does not require otherwise, and in that case it will be shaved down in the payments to the farmers. Is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the price of a commodity nears parity, the amount will be decreased.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Have we any assurance from the Department of Agriculture that it will bring in a new basis for parity regularly and at stated intervals? Parity on the farm that I operate is a little different today from what it was 2 months back. Prices for everything the farmer must buy, labor, and other commodities, have risen sharply. That is the question I want the chairman of the subcommittee to answer

before they begin to take away from the farmers the little payments that they receive for parity. Let us make sure they know exactly what parity is as of that date before any deductions are made from the none too large payments to cooperating farmers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The computations as to parity are made at stated periods by the Department.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I well know that; but the assurance of regular computations as to what parity is constitutes my main concern in this regard.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to express my appreciation for the fine work this subcommittee has done. I want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], upon the diplomatic way in which he has ironed out the controversies involved in this conference report before bringing it to the floor. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee has made certain concessions with respect to the shelterbelt project, for which I am very grateful. His sound reasoning and fairness is exemplified in this conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, in addition to what the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota said a moment ago, all of which I heartily endorse, about farmers and parity payments, I want to add a final thought. When this Congress or this country gets ready to repeal all of these artificial laws that grant benefits to a thousand different industries and groups of people, when the men from Massachusetts or New Mexico, or wherever they may come from, are ready to repeal the laws that increase the prices which the farmer must pay for the things which he buys, when they get ready to repeal the tariffs and all the other factitious things and laws that bolster up industry and trade and manufactures and transportation and wage labor, then the farmers will not ask for or expect any sort of benefit payments. The farmer will take care of himself. Do not worry about that; he will feed himself and clothe himself and house himself. He will then be on a parity with the fellows who are constantly bawling about farm legislation. I am not in favor of repealing these tariffs and these other things that I refer to. I am in favor of them; they make a better America for all of us; but I do say to the advocates of these one-sided arguments that when you get ready to repeal these other things, then we will meet you and repeal the farm benefits. Let everybody be on a parity basis. Special privilege for none and parity for all.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. To keep the RECORD straight and to make it perfectly

fair to all of the farmers concerned, there is one group of farmers that are getting parity now; measured by their standards, above parity, as the result of the action of Congress.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not know to whom you refer.

Mr. REED of New York. I do. They are the farmers of South America.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I might admit what the gentleman said be true. I thought he was going to say something about farmers in America.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And I would like to say to some of these eastern farmers that the same steak that costs \$1.65 in the meat market here brings only about 30 cents on the farm. It is not the farmers who are getting that difference.

Mr. GILCHRIST. And I do not know whether you gentlemen know what a clevis is, but it used to cost me 15 cents, but now you pay \$1.35 for a little hairpin of iron that the farmer used to buy for 15 cents.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 100: Page 102, line 7, insert:

"SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 100 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

At the end of the first proviso in said amendment, after the colon, insert: "*Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department of Agriculture as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SINKING OF THE AMERICAN SHIP "ROBIN MOOR"—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 285)

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

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am under the necessity of bringing to the attention of the Congress the ruthless sinking by a German submarine on May 21 of an American ship, the *Robin Moor*, in the South Atlantic Ocean (25°40' W., 6°10' N.) while the vessel was on the high seas en route to South Africa.

According to the formal depositions of survivors the vessel was sunk within 30 minutes from the time of the first warning given by the commander of the submarine to an officer of the *Robin Moor*.

The submarine did not display its flag and the commander did not announce its nationality.

The *Robin Moor* was sunk without provision for the safety of the passengers and crew.

It was sunk despite the fact that its American nationality was admittedly known to the commander of the submarine and that its nationality was likewise clearly indicated by the flag and other markings.

The sinking of this American ship by a German submarine flagrantly violated the right of United States vessels freely to navigate the seas, subject only to a belligerent right accepted under international law. This belligerent right, as is known to the German Government, does not include the right deliberately to sink a merchant vessel, leaving the passengers and crew to the mercies of the elements. On the contrary, the belligerent is required to place the passengers and crew in places of safety.

The passengers and crew of the *Robin Moor* were left afloat in small lifeboats from approximately 2 to 3 weeks when they were accidentally discovered and rescued by friendly vessels. This chance rescue does not lessen the brutality of casting the boats adrift in midocean.

The total disregard shown for the most elementary principles of international law and of humanity brands the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as the act of an international outlaw.

The Government of the United States holds Germany responsible for the outrageous and indefensible sinking of the *Robin Moor*. Full reparation for the losses and damages suffered by American nationals will be expected from the German Government.

Our Government believes that freedom from cruelty and inhuman treatment is a natural right. It is not a grace to be given or withheld at the will of those temporarily in a position to exert force over defenseless people.

Were this incident capable of being regarded apart from a more general background, its implications might be less serious—but it must be interpreted in the light of a declared and actively pursued policy of frightfulness and intimidation which has been used by the German Reich as an instrument of international policy.

The present leaders of the German Reich have not hesitated to engage in acts of cruelty and many other forms of terror against the innocent and the helpless in other countries, apparently in the belief that methods of terrorism will lead to a state of affairs permitting the German Reich to exact acquiescence from the nations victimized.

This Government can only assume that the Government of the German Reich hopes through the commission of such infamous acts of cruelty to helpless and innocent men, women, and children to intimidate the United States and other nations into a course of nonresistance to German plans for universal conquest—a conquest based upon lawlessness and terror on land and piracy on the sea.

Such methods are fully in keeping with the methods of terrorism hitherto employed by the present leaders of the German Reich in the policy which they have pursued toward many other nations subsequently victimized.

The Government of the German Reich may, however, be assured that the United States will neither be intimidated nor will it acquiesce in the plans for world domination which the present leaders of Germany may have.

We are warranted in considering whether the case of the *Robin Moor* is not a step in a campaign against the United States analogous to campaigns against other nations. We cannot place reliance on official declarations to the contrary.

Like statements, declarations, and even solemn pledges have been forthcoming in respect of many nations, commencing with the statement that the Government of the German Reich considered its territorial aspirations satisfied when it seized Austria by force. Evidence that the Government of the German Reich continues to plan further conquest and domination is convincing, and, indeed, scarcely disputed.

Viewed in the light of the circumstances the sinking of the *Robin Moor* becomes a disclosure of policy as well as an example of method. Heretofore, lawless acts of violence have been preludes to schemes of land conquest. This one appears to be a first step in assertion of the supreme purpose of the German Reich to seize control of the high seas, the conquest of Great Britain being an indispensable part of that seizure.

Its general purpose would appear to be to drive American commerce from the ocean wherever such commerce was considered a disadvantage to German designs; and its specific purpose would appear to be interruption of our trade with all friendly countries.

We must take it that notice has now been served upon us that no American ship or cargo on any of the seven seas can consider itself immune from acts of piracy. Notice is served on us, in effect, that the German Reich proposes so to intimidate the United States that we would be dissuaded from carrying out our chosen policy of helping Britain to survive.

In brief, we must take the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as a warning to the United States not to resist the Nazi movement of world conquest. It is a warning that the United States may use the high seas of the world only with Nazi consent.

Were we to yield on this we would inevitably submit to world domination at the hands of the present leaders of the German Reich.

We are not yielding and we do not propose to yield.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 20, 1941.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by me over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DISNEY asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT BASES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 203, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3537, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "exceed", strike out the words "one hour" and insert the words "two hours."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will make in order consideration of the bill commonly referred to as the blimp-base bill, which comes from the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There is always some controversy when considering legislation dealing with lighter-than-air craft. This bill comes from the Committee on Naval Affairs, I understand, with a unanimous report. Of course, it deals with a subject that is essential to national defense. I understand it is the purpose of the legislative committee to offer an amendment which will authorize the Navy Department to conduct some experiments of a pretty general nature in regard to lighter-than-air craft generally, including gliders. I shall not undertake to discuss the merits of the bill. It comes from a legislative committee that has an enviable record in the House for presenting its legislation in splendid fashion. There are members of that committee who are far more able than I to inform the House as to the purpose and effect of this legislation. Certainly it is a subject that the Congress ought to consider, because of its national-defense nature. I can think of few subjects more pertinent than that of investigating the possibilities of lighter-than-air craft in regard to military operations.

What I am interested in is the adoption of this rule. I think there will be no particular controversy, as far as I know, about the fact that the rule ought to be adopted and that this important subject should be considered for at least 2 hours by the House, in order that it may pass judgment upon the question of whether these bases should be established or not.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], this rule was reported unanimously. The Naval Affairs Committee will explain the details of the bill. However, I am sure that the Naval Affairs Committee will give the Naval Affairs Committee view entirely. I have no requests for time on this side and shall therefore offer a few general observations.

As I understand the situation it is about like this: Some legislation passed in the last session in one of the naval bills, which authorizes 48 of these lighter-than-air ships. That is, ships similar to these blimps which we see hovering over Washington. Possibly some of them are a little larger and perhaps some of them a little smaller. Under the authorization, contracts have been entered into for the construction of a number of these

lighter-than-air craft. The chairman of the committee advises me that there are 6 such contracts in existence. This bill as reported by the committee and as presented to the Rules Committee would authorize the construction, erection, and establishment of bases for these blimps. In other words, if there are 48 blimps authorized, this bill now before the House, without amendment, would authorize the construction and location of 48 bases for these lighter-than-air craft.

I am one of those who has doubted the wisdom of lighter-than-air craft as a necessary or advantageous adjunct to our military forces at this time. I cannot help but remember that Germany was the pioneer in lighter-than-air craft and that Germany some time ago abandoned entirely, as a military weapon, lighter-than-air craft. If I am not correct, the gentleman from Georgia will inform me.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think the reason that Germany abandoned them is the fact that she did not have any helium?

Mr. MICHENER. Well, I was coming to that. I am not a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. I gleaned the information I have from the members of the Naval Affairs Committee when they appeared before the Rules Committee. Germany has abandoned lighter-than-air craft as a military weapon. This is the fact. As to their reasons, there may be several, one of which undoubtedly is that Germany does not have helium available. They use hydrogen. Hydrogen is explosive and this characteristic reduces the value of lighter-than-air craft immensely.

From what I can learn from the members of the Naval Affairs Committee who appeared before the Rules Committee, if we had these lighter-than-air craft and got into the kind of conflict we must today indulge in if we engage in warfare, we would have to hide the blimp; we would have to hide these lighter-than-air balloons because they would have no chance against the swiftly maneuverable airplane.

The purpose, we are told, is to use these particular craft in a particular region. In a homely way let me describe the region. For instance, today the American first line of defense—our frontier—is out where the Western Hemisphere begins. This is rather indefinite, but as near as I can figure out, our first line is out in the ocean where the Western Hemisphere begins. Out there at this good hour, plying to and fro, our Navy is patrolling the ocean. We do not know what naval craft are out there but we do know some are there, and I for one do not believe there is any doubt but what as a part of that patrol are airplane carriers with airplanes. Between that line out yonder at sea and the American shore line lies a vast expanse of ocean. It is intended to use these lighter-than-air blimps to hover over this expanse of ocean to keep a watchful eye on the ripples of the sea to determine if possible whether any of these German or Axis submarines have penetrated the first line

of defense and are lurking in that body of water between that line and shore. If this purpose can be served, it would be a laudable one, but I for one am not convinced we should expend hundreds of millions of dollars at this particular time when labor is needed, when material is needed, when men are needed, when facilities are needed, and when such money as we have is needed in other lines. I am not convinced we should expend all these millions in constructing this type of military defense implement. I do not speak as an authority, I speak as just a common, ordinary, everyday, garden-variety American citizen who wants proper defense, wants it now, and who wants a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio who comes from Akron where they construct these lighter-than-air craft. He should know something about it and if all of the 48 blimps are not built it will not be his fault.

Mr. HARTER. Is it not a fact that with the blimps the Navy will be able to patrol thousands of square miles of ocean at far less cost than by the use of surface vessels which cost many times the price of hundreds of these blimps?

Mr. MICHENER. I still cling to the old philosophy the Naval Affairs Committee advocated a number of years ago—before we had all these airplanes we have now—that lighter-than-air craft were valuable for certain limited purposes.

In my estimation this is a blitz war, a mechanized war, where strokes are made with terrifying speed and ferocity. I cannot conceive that 48 balloons hovering over this ocean territory could be of much service against airplanes engaged in combat overhead.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Has the gentleman considered the relative cost of patrol as between blimps and surface vessels?

Mr. MICHENER. No. I know nothing about costs and am not qualified even to guess about them; but I have given some consideration to the potentialities of the two types of aircraft. We are not thinking much about costs now; all we are thinking about is national defense that will defend. I cannot conceive of building 48 bases suitable for these blimps at this time. The hangars would have to be built underground, they would have to be built where no one could find them, and in the event of real trouble we would have to hide these lighter-than-air balloons if we did not deflate them and lose the helium they contained.

Mr. KERR. Assuming that the relative cost is a point to be considered, would not the gentleman choose that efficient system which cost less? Does not the gentleman believe that one question involved in this matter of patrolling the seas is the matter of cost?

Mr. MICHENER. I undoubtedly used unfortunate language because the gentleman certainly has not understood my view when he suggests that it is gener-

ally admitted that blimps and airplanes are equally valuable as defense weapons and that now we should consider the cost. If the matter of cost were the sole question involved, as the gentleman's premise would indicate, I would, of course, agree with him; but I do not believe his premise is right. I do not believe the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee will say that the gentleman's premise is right. I believe these blimps are an experimental thing. I believe some of us have been trying—and I was one who in the beginning tried—to keep this great airdrome, if that is what they call it, at Akron, Ohio, functioning.

I thought there was a real reason for it, I thought there was logic for it, but the whole thing has changed since Hitler moved suddenly and quickly with his mechanized armies. It is panzer divisions now, not balloons. All things have changed. We do not want a slow-moving air balloon to hover over dangerous territory. We want airplanes that go quickly, that go fast, that carry death and destruction with them, that are able to go thousands of miles and return quickly. We do not want an air balloon that we must get out of the road as soon as the fighting begins or the enemy appears.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. As the gentleman knows, I, too, have some doubt in my mind about the military value of these vessels, but the gentleman also recognizes the fact, does he not, that there are already some six of them being constructed and that it is necessary to have some place to house these blimps.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. That is what this bill does. I entertain the same doubts the gentleman does about the value of them, but I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with me it is necessary, since we are already constructing them, to have some place to house them?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I am just coming to that. The gentleman from Mississippi is also a member of the Rules Committee, and he knows at least as much about this thing, and he has as much information as I have. I think we agree as to the military value of these blimps.

If I may use another homely illustration, we have bought the horses, we have contracted for six balloons, we have six balloons in the process of manufacture. We do not know what we are going to do with them. We have not the stables to put them in. We have not the places to tie them. We have not the locations to place them. We do not know what we are going to do with them. Therefore, an amendment will be offered to the bill providing for, first, the location, then the construction for the six stables to put these beautiful horses in when they are completed, and for which the taxpayers' money is now being expended.

Mr. HARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman does not think for a minute that these lighter-than-air craft are going to be sent into combat with heavier-than-air planes, does he? I take it from his statement he did have that idea. These blimps are to be used not for combat purposes but for patrol purposes, for the detection of submarines in parts of the ocean and in areas where enemy heavier-than-air craft will not operate because they cannot conveniently operate at such great distances from their bases. The gentleman must realize our national-defense problems, with the two great oceans forming our frontiers, are quite different than Germany's and all other closely connected European nations.

Mr. MICHENER. We did not have any such information as that from the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I do not believe he will give the House any such information. The information was that these blimps were to hover in territory which I have described and in the manner in which I have described. If I am not correct, I hope he will correct me now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman from Michigan has stated exactly the military mission of them. The military mission as contemplated by the Navy Department is to work between the front line and the shore line in the area that the gentleman has referred to. For instance, if the fleet is five or six hundred miles out on patrol duty in the Atlantic, then the military operation of these blimps will be to patrol the waters from there back to the shore to keep submarines from coming in or detecting submarines and locating mines.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman. He is always fair.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say that it was contemplated by the Naval Affairs Committee to reduce the number of bases to six?

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the matter, contracts have been let or negotiated for six of these craft. If I am not correct, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee will correct me.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. Appropriations have been made for the construction of 6. To state it accurately, in the bill passed last June we authorized 48 blimps. The Appropriations Committee made the money available for the construction of 6, and 6 are in contemplation or being constructed now by the Goodyear-Zeppelin Co. This bill merely seeks to give bases for the entire program which dealt with 48. Of course, if you have only 6, and that is the end of your program, why, it would not probably cost as much, but the next program is to bring in an appropriation for 21; then the question of military value can be raised if anyone desires to do so.

Mr. LEWIS. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say, however, that there were six bases contemplated.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.
Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I understood the gentleman to so state. I have been under the impression, as the gentleman from Colorado evidently has been, that all known objections to the bill were probably satisfied with the agreement made on the part of the Naval Affairs Committee that it would move to amend the bill to reduce the number of fields from six to three.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS. I wanted to clear up that there were only three bases contemplated.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. I had reached the part in my talk where I intended to say that we already have the horses, and I favor building the stables for the three we have on order; but I am not in favor of appropriating millions of dollars or possibly hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out the rest of the authorized program.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am satisfied that the House beyond a shadow of doubt on a roll-call vote will approve the program as mapped out by the Navy Department with reference to the construction of 21 blimps. When that issue rises I will be more than glad to submit it to the House. But that is not the question before us right now, which the gentleman clearly recognizes. The only question now is whether we will provide facilities or bases to take care of what we are doing right today.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course; and my only purpose in talking today is to meet the very thing that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has suggested—to wit, that when the Committee on Naval Affairs brings in any bill in the name of national defense which has the approval of the Navy Department this House will overwhelmingly pass it on a roll call; and I will possibly be one of those voting for it. Why? Because we are placed in the anomalous position of being compelled to forget our own views and go along with the admirals at this particular time in the name of national defense.

But I do want to call the attention of the country, I do want to call the attention of the Navy Department, and I do want to call the attention of the President of the Nation at this particular time to the apparent futility, as I see it, of spending this vast amount of money for carrying out this blimp future program. When the day does come and the hour does arrive that the gentleman from Georgia rises in behalf of his committee and asks that we construct the remainder of these 48 lighter-than-air blimps, I hope the House will be so advised, and that we will be able to act intelligently, not because of any national-defense war hysteria or any pressure brought by any group or any manufacturers or anyone else who wants to sell something to the Government.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has put the wrong interpretation on it that this matter is here because it is

being advocated by some manufacturer. It is here based exclusively upon the recommendation of the general board of the Navy and every Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics on its merits, on its military function. I am perfectly willing to let it stand exactly on its military needs, and if it cannot be justified from a military standpoint it should be defeated and not even a place to put these six aircraft should be provided for.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course; and I agree with the gentleman; but I remember also—and he was here and I was here—when there was a man down in the War Department by the name of "Billy" Mitchell. I wonder if the spirit of "Billy" Mitchell does not hover over the country today. Had the admirals in the Navy and his generals in the Army adhered to the advice and the counsel of "Billy" Mitchell our national defense would not be in the deplorable condition it is in today. The only lesson to be learned is that we must give some consideration to these things other than to follow blindly the theories of these men, even though they are our military experts. They are not infallible. I have great respect for them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman inform the House and the country wherein the generals or the admirals have failed to follow any suggestion made by "Billy" Mitchell except for a united air force?

Mr. MICHENER. I would not attempt to cross swords with the gentleman who is now addressing me on anything in connection with naval or military affairs, but I do recall that Billy Mitchell was forced out of the Army; he was obliged to leave his own Army, because the progressive notions he had about heavier-than-air craft did not coincide with and conform to the ideas of the generals and the admirals who are today dictating the policy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman believe the policy the admirals and the generals have followed is a wise policy, because today the Navy has the greatest aeronautical branch in the world.

Mr. MICHENER. Far be it from me, a humble Member, to make a recommendation. I am making suggestions only—I am calling attention to some things that are facts.

The gentleman says we have the finest Army and Navy. Of course; but the Germans, as much as we dislike them, followed Billy Mitchell's philosophy, and look where they are today so far as military equipment is concerned.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But Germany does not have a large navy as does the United States Government.

Mr. FADDIS rose.

Mr. MICHENER. I cannot discuss military or naval tactics with the distinguished military authority, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Colonel FADDIS] who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and always believes in, stands up for, and insists upon the rightness on every occasion of anything the generals of the Army contend for. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FADDIS. I thank the gentleman for his compliment, but I must assure the

gentleman that I do not always stand up for what the General Staff wants.

In connection with the gentleman's statement about the late General Mitchell, I make this statement to inform the gentleman that some time before his death General Mitchell made this statement before the House Committee on Military Affairs, and it is a matter of record. He said, "All we need in the matter of national defense is 2,000 airplanes and 50 zeppelins."

Mr. MICHENER. That is all we did need at that time, and had we had that number at that time we would have had a lot more than all the rest of the world had put together. We are living in a different day. Mitchell's philosophy was correct, and had we accepted it the principle would have been adopted.

Mr. FADDIS. I merely make that statement at this time to call the attention of the gentleman and of Members of the House to the fact that after all he was not the greatest prophet this country ever produced. He was in error sometimes as to the needs of the national defense.

Mr. MICHENER. Billy Mitchell was human, as was natural. He had courage. He got kicked out of the Army and was disgraced because he had that courage. If it has not already been done, the time will come in this House when we will pass legislation and the two gentlemen who have just queried me will join in some kind of honor to Billy Mitchell and the things he stood for.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken more time than I intended. I have digressed from what is just before the House. I do hope that we shall all think of this matter before it comes before the Congress in another form at another date. I hope this rule will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who undoubtedly does not agree with me. He is in the shadow of Akron. He knows more about lighter-than-air craft and where they are manufactured than I do.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope my dear friend from Michigan does not mean to insinuate by the fact that I am from Ohio that I am under the shadow of Akron in the sense of being dominated by the Goodyear Co. Akron has a very able Congressman here to speak for it. I wish to stress two thoughts on this subject that have nothing to do with Akron. First, we should never forget that popular prevailing theories about flying are subject to repeal without notice by the irrepressible daring and ingenuity of man. When I first started to fly 25 years ago, we studied a textbook which proved that you could not loop the loop, but a man named Pegoud spoiled the entire text by looping the loop in France while we were studying the book in America. Our country developed the attack airplane and then abandoned it, and then the Germans showed how valuable it is in modern warfare, and we had to start over again. Our country developed the glider but failed to see the possibilities of it. Now, just because lighter-than-air craft are passing through a period of unpopularity is

certainly no reason why our country should not continue to pioneer in that great field. Just because the Germans have been smart on certain aviation developments, and are apparently not stressing lighter-than-air, is no reason why we should do the same. I do not think we have to ape the Germans in everything they do in the air. It may be that we can be smarter than they are and can develop uses for lighter-than-air craft that even those astute students of the air have not been able to develop.

Second, the military situation affecting the use of blimps in this hemisphere is entirely different from Europe.

In naval scouting over the vast expanses of the sea in the Western Hemisphere we have an entirely different problem from scouting the close and narrow waters around Europe. We have got to cover an awful lot of territory and see what is going on, and blimps afford a cheap and efficient method for scouting such vast areas. Speed is not nearly as important as ability to go slowly when you are looking for something. Whether it is a hairpin or a submarine you are looking for, you can hunt a whole lot more effectively if you can go slowly. You cannot go slowly in an airplane. You can in a blimp.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think this bill is a wise step, not because it looks so attractive right at this moment from a popular standpoint, but because it has great possibilities in the peculiar problems of defense in the Western Hemisphere, and I hope we will not do anything at this time that would prevent the carrying out of the modest experimental program that is here laid out for us to consider.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MAY 22, 1918 (40 STAT. 559)

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "That."
Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "That" and insert "When the United States is at war or during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or as to aliens."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the words "That any" and insert "Any."

Page 2, line 17, strike out the words "That the" and insert the word "The."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that one of the amendments is longer than what the gentleman read to me.

Mr. BLOOM. I may explain to the gentleman that the Senate, when they took up the bill H. R. 4973 this morning, inserted the words "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or as to aliens." In other words, they have limited the time of this resolution to the national emergency, and then after that it only applies to aliens and not to citizens.

Mr. MICHENER. And it is satisfactory to the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I have taken the matter up with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was that done by unanimous vote of the Senate?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, there has been something added to the bill since yesterday when the gentleman showed it to me?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; but I have taken it up with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and other members of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I notice the bill puts this national emergency in the same category as a state of war. Is that a new idea or was that in the original bill that was passed here?

Mr. BLOOM. This simply limits this resolution to the emergency that exists at the present time. After the emergency is over then it only applies to aliens and not to citizens of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I wish the gentleman would read that language where you have a national emergency coupled with a declaration of war.

Mr. BLOOM. The language is—

When the United States is at war or during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941—

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I am raising the point about. There you put the national emergency on the same level as a state of war. Was that the original language?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I wanted to bring to the attention of the House. I did not remember just what had been done. I am not as well versed in these matters, of course, as is the gentleman, but it seems to me you are putting the present emergency on the same basis as a state of war. Is that a new idea or was that in the other measure?

Mr. BLOOM. No; it is not a new idea at all.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is not this the situation: The present national emer-

gency is not the same as a state of war, but is stated as the opposite situation, another entirely different situation. There is a possible war situation and there is this national emergency, and then there is a third situation when two countries are at war and the President finds certain things.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. So there are three circumstances under which this law would go into effect. One is during a war, when it goes into effect automatically. The second is during the present national emergency, and it goes into effect automatically. The third is when two countries are at war and the President finds our interests are involved. Then he has discretion to put it into effect.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. And does it not simmer down to this—we are at war, are we at war, when we will be at war, and where are we if we are not at war?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an address by Rev. F. S. Brown, of Knoxville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR SHIPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 3537, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3537, with Mr. Cox in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes. If the membership of the committee will bear with me and give me their attention for a few moments, I think I can separate some of the chaff from the wheat, so that Members can clearly understand what the bill does. First, I think it important to call attention to the fact that I am

thoroughly in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan when it comes to the military needs and necessities of blimps, and I think that possibly with one exception every member of the Naval Committee is also.

Mr. Chairman, the President and the Congress have often repeated their determination to provide our country with a total defense. This clearly involves a Naval Establishment complete not only in numbers and tonnage, but also in all types of weapons, offensive and defensive, that can be useful for our protection. Today I bring up such an item required to round out the effectiveness of our Naval Establishment. It is a subject which, unfortunately, has not yet had the priority and attention to which we of the Naval Affairs Committee believe it entitled.

In expanding our naval aeronautical arm the Congress provided for not only thousands upon thousands of airplanes, together with their many necessary shore facilities, but also in the act approved June 15, 1940, and upon the recommendation of the Navy Department itself, committed us to a program calling for 48 nonrigid lighter-than-air ships. These craft, in common with all the seagoing units of the Navy, must be supported by adequate, strategically located shore facilities to permit their efficient operation. With only 1 lighter-than-air station now in existence, it is obvious that additional facilities are required. It is the purpose of this bill, H. R. 3537, as amended, to carry out our obligation and authorize the shore facilities required for the already authorized 48 nonrigid airships. It is needless for me to say that this program of facilities has been carefully worked out and recommended by the Navy Department.

For the benefit of those who have not had the opportunity to investigate the subject of lighter-than-air craft, let me add a few remarks as to their value in our national defense. Now mark well the distinction between the rigid type of dirigible such as was represented by the *Akron* and the *Macon* with which we admittedly had some pioneering hard luck, and the widely different, smaller cousin, nonrigid or blimp type. The 48 authorized airships are of this blimp type and the facilities to be authorized by H. R. 3537 are for blimps. The record of blimps during and since the World War of 1914-18 has been an imposing and successful one. Blimps can do an effective job in our defense under today's conditions also.

By this time it should be apparent to anyone who wishes to see that once we become engaged in actual hostilities we shall most probably be seriously confronted, from the very opening moment, with actual danger from enemy submarines and mines, both highly developed and modernized, and both in vastly greater numbers than some 25 years ago. I trust that the public as well as we in the Congress have not forgotten the enemy submarine attacks against us in the summer of 1918. Then in even only a half-hearted diversion rather than in a determined campaign, a half dozen German submarines roamed our coastal ship-

ping lanes in the Atlantic from the Carolinas to Canada, and frequently within the very sight of our shores, stealthily laid mines, torpedoed and otherwise sank a hundred ships of 200,000 tons, and took 435 lives. On the forenoon of July 21, 1918, in broad daylight, thousands of American citizens summering on Cape Cod, were amazed witnesses to an attack by the German submarine *U-156* on an American tug with a string of barges in tow. So close was this action to the shore, that residents ducked into cellars and shelter for fear of stray shells. The United States armored cruiser *San Diego* was sunk by a German mine off Fire Island, and our battleship *Minnesota* was damaged by striking another German mine off the coast of Virginia.

No one can deny that today also a determined enemy could attack our shipping in our own coastal sea lanes, and also strew deadly mines therein, by means of greater numbers of highly improved modern submarines. We know also, only too well, the terrible plight of British shipping wherein terrific losses, largely due to modern enemy mines and submarines, threaten Britain's very life line of supply.

Nor can anyone dispute our unmistakable duty of preparing every possible precaution against every possible enemy act and agency, particularly for those which we can foresee.

In shaping such a total defense we must realize that geographical and other factors may make one weapon quite suitable for our own defense whereas it might be of little use in combat zones around the British Isles. There is no such thing as a universally useful weapon or type. We must realize that each weapon in our Army and our Navy is a specialist which because of its own emphasized characteristics, under certain conditions which we expect to arise in naval warfare can do certain jobs better than can any other type. Even though today they are of no use to us, we do not, for example, decry the use of camel corps by the British who find a usefulness for them in their desert theaters of war. Similarly, we cannot rule out lighter-than-air ships from our own defense simply because lack of helium and overwhelming enemy airplane superiority may today deprive the British of use of airships. Mere mimicry in our national defense might conceivably lead to disaster.

We shall use our 48 nonrigid airships as members of the inshore patrol to guard our densely packed coastal shipping lines and the approaches to our numerous important harbors from attack by lurking enemy submarines and planted enemy mines. This inshore patrol team will be composed of several types of surface vessels and aircraft, it is true, but each is needed for some particular phase of the job. Unlike any other practicable aircraft today, the blimp can hover motionless in the air or proceed at slow speeds and thus afford its crew an unequalled opportunity to sight on or beneath the surface such objects as submarines and mines and to make a thorough investigation of the meager, suspicious clues that may lead to detection of these lurking

enemy denizens of the deep. At a speed of 75 or more miles per hour, the blimp can also proceed to attack submarines by means of depth bombs while summoning mosquito boats and seaplanes, if necessary, to finish off the enemy. If we do not have sufficient numbers of highly efficient aerial observation posts in our coastal lanes, we would need enormous numbers of surface vessels, such as destroyers, which cannot possibly do as effective a job of observation, and, besides, are far more expensive than blimps and badly needed elsewhere in concentration with our three great fleets, where their highly effective combat abilities must ever be in readiness. As an anti-mine agency, it is recorded that 1 airship located and marked 368 mines in a single day. With the aid of modern science, it is not unreasonable to expect new additional uses for modern blimps.

It is significant that every Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics has officially expressed his belief in the usefulness of blimps. The General Board, that group of elder statesmen of the Navy, says:

In discussing the use of airships for naval purposes, it is appropriate to point out that small airships (blimps) are relatively cheap to build and to operate. Within the limits of their cruising range they can perform effective service off harbors and along coastal sea lanes in observation and patrol duties in areas where enemy aircraft attack is not anticipated, cooperating with small surface craft to make an effective patrol. The blimp, therefore, in war, would be an important factor for antisubmarine work and for locating enemy mines off our own coasts. By flying at slow speeds, they can operate for long periods with little expenditure of fuel, keeping careful watch over an area much more economically than airplanes. For these reasons and for this purpose, the further development by the Navy of nonrigid airships or blimps, in the opinion of the Board, is fully justified.

Now, I am well aware of a common opinion that lighter-than-air craft are vulnerable craft. Of course, they are, but not nearly so much as some believe, nor sufficiently so to preclude their use in the field where they belong and can do important work. Every vessel or airplane one can mention is vulnerable to something; none is immune. In war, we expect and accept losses of useful weapons. We think little of exposing almost totally unarmored destroyers, for example, to violent enemy attack, and we expect high losses. Both belligerents are losing airplanes by the hundreds; the accepted antidote there is mainly increased output of replacements. Blimps are vulnerable only to enemy guns or enemy airplanes. We certainly are not going to send our blimps out against enemy shore batteries. We are going to use our blimps in our coastal waters; if enemy men-of-war and enemy airplanes ever get into our coastal sea lanes where they can attack our blimps, then something strange would have happened to our deep-sea Navy that I cannot visualize. But we cannot close our eyes to the high probability that enemy submarines can penetrate into our coastal sea lanes.

This bill contemplates the establishment of airship shore facilities in such strategic continental locations as these:

Boston area; New York area, already in existence at Lakehurst, N. J.; Norfolk-Hatteras area; Florida area; Puget Sound area; San Francisco area; southern California area. The Navy Department has divided this program of facilities (and airships) into two increments, the first one involving Boston, Hatteras, and San Francisco areas, and will initially ask for funds for this portion only. The President has advised the Secretary of the Navy of his hearty approval of this first increment of the program. H. R. 3537 proposes to authorize facilities for the second increment also. I, for one, am confident that this also meets with the approval of the President who realizes the value of this type of craft to our defense. I need not dwell upon the obvious advantages to the Navy Department of having such authorization also for this part of its duty in preparing our naval defense; a far more efficient and economical job of planning can be done on this broader basis rather than piecemeal. Training of personnel alone is one of the involved phases that particularly requires careful, advance planning.

As to the proposed location of airship facilities outside the continental limits, this provision has been included at the express wish of Admiral Stark, our far-seeing Chief of Naval Operations, who of course has an unparalleled preview, if anyone has, of what our naval needs may require.

On several occasions the Naval Affairs Committee has reviewed the lighter-than-air situation; but it has been a long time since the country has taken any really worth-while action toward furthering developments of this little-understood type of aircraft. This is no time to temporize over any weapon that has potential usefulness in our defense. Our God-given advantage of abundant non-inflammable helium gas makes the dirigible an exclusively American type. We want no chinks in our armor; no Achilles' heel in our defense. The committee unhesitatingly recommends and urges the enactment at this time of this bill as amended, in the necessary interest of rounding out our naval defense.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Would the gentleman care to express his opinion as to the possible use of the autogiro, based largely on the same merits as those advanced with reference to blimps? In other words, I take it the report of the general board on the blimp indicated that its low cost of operation, its ability to fly at low altitudes, and its work in connection with the sea lanes immediately adjacent to the land, provides a justification for its use. I wonder whether or not the gentleman feels, if we are going into lighter-than-air work, that some thought should not also be given to the use of the autogiro.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] for bringing up that question. Some weeks ago, after consultation with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and other Members of the House, I ap-

pointed a subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SURPHIN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] and other members of the Naval Committee to go into that subject, and after a week's hearings, calling in all of the experts of the country, it was concluded that we will propose an amendment to authorize the expenditure of \$100,000 for experimental work along the line suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true, however, that in the present situation the blimp operates much more economically than the autogiro?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I do not know about that, but we should go forward and try to develop all these things. Therefore, we are asking this committee to incorporate an amendment based upon suggestions made by other members of the committee, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and we are asking \$100,000 for this purpose. So we will propose an amendment along this line:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to conduct aeronautical experiments in the field of other than standard heavier-than-air craft, such as but not limited to rotor-wing-type aircraft, gliders, metal hulls, and other than conventionally propelled lighter-than-air craft, the cost not to exceed \$100,000.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the so-called blimp would be helpless in an attack by an airplane?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under certain conditions the blimp would not. Under certain conditions it would. It all depends upon conditions.

Mr. WHITE. Can you conceive of any condition where a blimp could take the offensive against an airplane or protect itself?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me call attention to this: You see a little blimp flying through the air. You say, "It can be shot down immediately." Do you know that a blimp is so constructed that a great many holes could be shot into it and it would not come to the ground, because it contains helium? You would have to almost rip it to pieces before it would come down. But what is its military mission? Its military mission is to patrol, not at the scene of battle. Any admiral would be foolish to put an airplane carrier in the line of battle, because it is vulnerable and can be destroyed, but it has a certain mission of getting the airplane within a radius of two or three hundred miles of the battle. During the World War one blimp alone located some two or three hundred mines. The military purpose of a blimp would be to fly from the coast out to where the ships are patrolling, in that large area, where they would see the submarines lurking, and to see if they could locate mines. Going as slowly as they would go, around 60 or 70 miles an hour, they can see many fathoms into the water. No other ship can do so. Therefore if they locate a

mine or locate a submarine, instead of engaging in battle they would communicate to the destroyer, the submarine, or the airplane that is to do the fighting that here in a certain longitude or latitude is a mine or a submarine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his information. That was the purpose of my question.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman knows my interest with regard to lighter-than-air craft, with particular emphasis on all-metal ships. What has happened to the authorization with regard to the construction of all-metal lighter-than-air craft?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Some years ago the Naval Affairs Committee brought in a bill to authorize an experimental expenditure of \$300,000 for a metal-clad ship. I think it was about 18 or 20 years ago. That ship is still flying. This amendment permits further experiments to be carried on with that and with others.

Mr. DINGELL. But will the Navy do it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope so.

Mr. DINGELL. So do I; but I forced them to do it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have no force over anybody, not even myself.

Mr. DINGELL. Well, the committee and the Congress certainly has.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All we can do is request these technical people to make investigations, but forcing people to do things is a different story.

Mr. DINGELL. Their recommendation was favorable to the development of the all-metal ship, but the reactionary brass hats in the Navy are standing pat and will never build it until the Congress asserts itself.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I hope the Congress will assert itself and pass this bill with this amendment, and we will get somewhere.

Now, this bill takes care of 6 ships or more. In June last year I brought in a bill, by direction of the Naval Affairs Committee, authorizing some 10,000 airplanes and 48 blimps. The Appropriations Committee made available money to build 6 blimps. They have a program to build 21 more. That program has not been submitted to the Appropriations Committee. This bill provides housing facilities.

In this program we sought to include the whole program, but when we came to the Rules Committee, in view of the fact that it had not been authorized by the Budget, we agreed to take out the second-year program. So all this bill does is to provide for three stations, one in the Boston area, one in the Norfolk area, and to transfer back from the Army to the Navy the Sunnyside station that was built years ago. That is all this bill does, and that is all it provides for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Now, let me call attention to this: These blimps cost \$325,000. Their cruising radius is from 1,800 to 2,000 miles.

They only have a crew of some eight men. To do the same military work that this ship would do, which only costs \$325,000, would require a destroyer or a submarine.

A destroyer costs around \$5,000,000. A submarine may cost a little more or a little less than \$5,000,000. There would be a personnel of at least 150 to 250 men on such water craft, yet neither ship could cover as much territory as one of these blimps. The cruising radius of a destroyer is much more limited, nothing compared to that of the blimp; and the speed of a submarine or a destroyer is not more than 20 or 25 knots an hour, whereas a blimp 3,000 or 4,000 feet in the air has a speed of 60 knots an hour.

This bill has been well thought out, recommended by the Budget, and approved by the Navy experts.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. I feel that the committee is to be commended for requiring the Department to send figures bearing on the cost of the several stations. I do think it is significant that in many instances the figures are exactly the same, irrespective of the fact that local conditions may be entirely different. For instance, we note that the railroad connections to each of these proposed stations are exactly the same, \$150,000, even though the station in one instance might be entirely different, more removed, or more difficult to get to than in the other. Would it not therefore be well for the legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee also to try to exact from the Department something more in the way of specific information, actual figures rather than these figures which in most instances appear to be shots in the dark?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. Here is the situation: Whenever the Navy Department comes before the committee asking for any money we make them break the item down to show how every dollar is to be spent—that is the authorization committee. We do not appropriate, we are the authorizing committee; but we do this as a guide to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, so he will be in a position to make them justify, just as he pointed out, why it should cost this amount at this place and the same amount at another place.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require within the hour. I have no formal statement to make but shall be glad to answer questions.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I shall be pleased to yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We were talking about this bill in the cloak room, and it was suggested that these blimps could fly both low and slowly.

Mr. MAAS. The gentlewoman remembers the old slogan, "Fly low and slow, mother dear."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes. It was suggested their speed could be controlled

while they were doing police work. We were wondering if this did not offer the possibility of their use as highway patrols thus releasing State police for duty with the Army and Navy.

Mr. MAAS. They could be used for that purpose, but their great value is on in-shore and off-shore patrol. Their tremendous value lies in locating submarines that are submerged, and particularly in locating mine fields which are very difficult to see in any other way. During the last war we could spot submarines from planes, but our plane flew only 80 miles an hour, whereas today planes fly from 300 to 400 miles an hour and at that speed the observer could not recognize a submarine submerged.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. These will cruise at about 55 miles an hour, will they not?

Mr. MAAS. That would be about their cruising speed, but they could slow down to nothing, they could hover, they could stand still, they could come down and rest on the water, they could take on additional salt water ballast if necessary; they could come down close over a surface ship, cut off their engine, and with a megaphone talk to the captain and crew of the ship. They have tremendous value.

They are not intended to come in contact with hostile aircraft. They would of course be vulnerable to hostile aircraft, although less vulnerable than one might think. These ships filled with helium would be very difficult to shoot down. The ordinary machine gun could riddle it and not seriously affect it. Incendiary bullets would have no effect, because of the absence of hydrogen. Most of us keep thinking about the old hydrogen-filled balloon.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am glad the gentleman is willing to answer questions for I wish to ask some and mine are asked merely to obtain some information.

Mr. MAAS. Since the last quiz program we were on together I think the gentleman needs it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am sure the gentleman was in the same class with me on the quiz program.

Mr. MAAS. I admit it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Do these blimps have any striking power?

Mr. MAAS. No. They can carry depth charges against submarines and would carry machine guns. They might carry light defensive armament. Their purpose is not combat, but they could carry depth charges that could be used effectively against submarines.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Where will they cruise, along the trade lanes?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; offshore, perhaps out as far as 500 miles, but principally in patrolling the approaches to our major harbors, and the trade lanes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is, they would be part of a patrol system to discover mines; is that right?

Mr. MAAS. That is correct. That would be one of their missions, to discover mines and submarines.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This is purely a lay question. How could a blimp

flying at 3,000 feet discover a submerged submarine except under the most ideal conditions?

Mr. MAAS. Well, it could not. If the water was rough, or if the sea was very deep, or it had the wrong kind of a surface, it probably could not; but the point is it opens up a new avenue for the discovery of submarines that you have no other way of doing, and whatever you get out of it is velvet.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Its principal purpose is to discover enemy ships and mines; is that right?

Mr. MAAS. Enemy surface ships, submarines, or mine fields.

Mr. SUTPHIN. They are being used extensively in conjunction with the submarine program at New London, Conn.?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. SUTPHIN. In tracing torpedoes which have been fired which cost more than \$20,000 each. They discover dozens and dozens of them which would normally have been lost.

Mr. MAAS. I think they more than pay their cost, and, as a matter of fact, they have been a very valuable and potent part of our neutrality patrol from the time it was organized and are still functioning as part of it.

Mr. CURTIS. I notice on page 2, lines 11 to 14, provides for the establishment of these bases outside the continental limits of the United States. Where might they be located?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is what is known as the second-year program, and we are striking that out.

Mr. CURTIS. That is going out?

Mr. MAAS. It is going out of this bill, but when the time comes it may be used in connection with some of our British island bases.

Mr. CURTIS. One more question. How long will it take to construct the bases and the lighter-than-air craft that is provided for by this bill?

Mr. MAAS. There is no lighter-than-air craft provided in the bill. It is just the bases for the lighter-than-air craft. The lighter-than-air craft itself has been authorized, and some of it already under construction or under contract now. It is necessary that we pass this bill in order to start the construction of some of these bases so that we will have the bases when the ships themselves are delivered to the Navy.

Mr. O'HARA. How many of these so-called blimps have we ordered; how many are in use and how many are on order?

Mr. MAAS. We have authorized 48. At the present time I believe we have 6. There are 6 under contract. The authorized total program is 48.

Mr. O'HARA. We have four stations to be created; is that right?

Mr. MAAS. Three.

Mr. O'HARA. Boston, Florida—

Mr. MAAS. That is out of this year's program. Florida is cut out of this year's program.

Mr. O'HARA. What has the Navy done in the development and the use of these blimps since the last World War, or during the last 10 years?

Mr. MAAS. The Navy has been using the blimp as distinguished from the dirigible, which we are not discussing at all.

Mr. O'HARA. We have had some tragedy with the dirigibles.

Mr. MAAS. We had a lot of tragedy with automobiles, but we have not discontinued them.

Mr. O'HARA. The Navy quit using the dirigibles.

Mr. MAAS. They have quit building them because we would not give them the money to build any more. But in connection with the blimp as distinguished from the dirigible, they have been carrying on a constant program since the World War. We use them for training. We have six in operation now. We have had approximately that number or around that number all the time. They are used in training lighter-than-air pilot personnel, ground crews, and in patrol work. As I say they have been used as a part of the neutrality patrol from the day it was organized, and it is a very valuable part.

Mr. O'HARA. The only other part I was trying to find out from the distinguished member of the committee is why the committee waited so long to start this program? I am curious to know why the Navy Department has waited until now to develop this program.

Mr. MAAS. The Navy has not waited until now. The Navy has been developing them constantly, in line with the general expansion of the whole of the Navy. This program for expanded development comes before us just now as the two-ocean Navy proposition came before us last year. It is nothing new. It is carrying on a continuous program of the Navy Department.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish the gentleman would give us the essential difference between the dirigible and the blimp.

Mr. MAAS. The dirigible is a large, rigid airship. The blimp is nonrigid; it is much smaller; and, of course, they have entirely different missions because they have a different range. A dirigible, which may be anywhere from 3,000,000 to 10,000,000 cubic feet, can circumnavigate the globe; it can carry airplanes; while the blimp is a small proposition, generally referred to as being useful for offshore patrol.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the difference in cost?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The technical difference would be that a dirigible has ribs in it made of steel, like hoops, with a covering put over it. A blimp is one solid fabricated thing without any sections in it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the difference in the character of gas that keeps them in the air?

Mr. MAAS. They use the same—helium. The difference in cost would be comparable to the difference in cost of a Ford and a Lincoln Zephyr, or perhaps more so.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the usual cost of a dirigible and what is the cost of a blimp? The blimp is about \$325,000.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Three million seven hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MAAS. Three and one-half million dollars for a dirigible.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I may say also that the blimps are also being used in the marine parachute school.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. They have found them to be very useful for the training of parachutists.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would it not be fair to say that you could keep a man who is scouting—that is, just generally looking for things—in the air more cheaply with a blimp than you can with any heavier-than-air craft?

Mr. MAAS. Generally speaking, that is true. There is no conflict between the blimp and the autogiro, for instance. They serve two different purposes. They have different missions. They are not in competition with each other. They should both be developed. They both have invaluable purposes.

Let me illustrate. We might find it necessary to drop parachutists in some tropical island with a heavy undergrowth. In order to get those men out again we could not reach them with planes, but they themselves with their machetes could hack out a clearing large enough—a clearing the size of this room would be sufficient—for an autogiro to come down and get them, pick them up, and take them out again; whereas they could not possibly undertake the clearing of a landing field sufficient for ordinary planes. That is just one possibility of the use of an autogiro against a blimp or any other type. They all have their separate missions, and we should not overlook the possibility of any kind of a weapon or defense device.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I had the pleasure of seeing Mr. Pitcairn's autogiro. I believe that is what it is called.

Mr. MAAS. The self-catapulting autogiro.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes. It does not move 1 foot forward or backward; but like an elastic that gets wound up, it jumps into the air. It occurred to me that that type of plane could be put upon a merchant ship. The autogiro could carry depth bombs, for one thing, in a special apparatus on the deck. It could just jump off the deck or land upon it. I wonder what the Navy is doing with respect to the development of that type of ship?

Mr. MAAS. The subcommittee of which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN] is chairman, and of which I have the honor of being a member, has just concluded extensive hearings on that subject. We are convinced, as is the gentleman, that it has such possibilities. We are recommending to the Navy Department a further study and a report back to the Congress on that very project.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. There is no conflict between the autogiro and the blimp?

Mr. MAAS. Not at all. They are in two separate fields.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. What is the cruising speed of the blimp?

Mr. MAAS. The top speed is 72, and the cruising speed would be about 55.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I voted against this bill in committee, and, I think, for a very good reason. My distinguished chairman has discussed this bill on the floor for 20 minutes and it is significant that he never mentioned what effect these balloons have had in the present war.

If you want to tickle Hitler, let the word go across the water that our Army is getting ready to fight with horses and our Navy is getting ready to fight with balloons. Of course, that will be good news for him.

For several years the Navy has been slow about developing these balloons. Since the President has been in office he has been slow to approve their use, but they have gotten after the President and burned him up about this program, and they are pushing this thing through. They are getting ready now to set up along the Atlantic coast and along the Pacific coast a number of balloon bases that will have to have large hangars, and they will have to buy considerable land at high prices, so they will be starting on a program of expenses that will carry this country far afield with its present Budget.

We all know that when this war started England had a lot of balloons, but what happened to them? They were shot down immediately, and what are left are in shelters and in cellars. Who needs to look for mines any worse than England does? Who needs to look for submarines any worse than England? Why does not she do it with balloons? Because they are a complete failure.

The gentleman from Michigan stated a few minutes ago that we had these balloons and we had to build barns and stables for them just as if they were horses. England is begging us to send her every effective weapon she can get her hands on to repel invasion, yet to this good hour she has never asked us to send her any balloons. It is simply foolish to expend millions for a useless weapon that cannot be used in battle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the feasibility and usefulness of blimps for naval-patrol duty it appears to me that the conclusions of one of our outstanding experts on this subject would be timely. For the information of the Congress and the country I include herewith an article by Capt. C. E. Rosendahl, of the Navy Department, who is a recognized authority on lighter-than-air-craft development:

THE CASE FOR THE AIRSHIP TODAY

(Presented at the National Aviation Forum at Washington, D. C., Wednesday, May 29, 1940, by Capt. C. E. Rosendahl, U. S. N.)

(NOTE.—The opinions or assertions made herein are the private ones of the writer and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or of the Naval Service at large.)

In any appraisal of American air power, modern airships demand serious consideration. Up to date the current war has developed nothing to minimize continued contentions that for the United States, lighter-than-air craft can perform very valuable

naval tasks. Indeed, our older main ideas of airship functions have been reinforced and new ones seem indicated.

When one reflects on the enormous strides made by the United States in other aeronautical fields, he cannot but be perplexed over the chaotic status of the American lighter-than-air-craft project. This is all the more amazing upon realization that through Nature's bestowal of an unlimited supply of helium solely on the United States, the modern airship has become a unique and exclusively American type of aircraft. Yet, it remains a deplorable fact that even after years of half-hearted dabbling in dirigible effort there is no such thing as a recognized airship program, or even an American airship policy. Believe it or not, nowhere in the governmental framework for aeronautical development has the airship yet been granted recognized standing.

Under current world conditions it would seem merely common sense that we vigorously pursue the development of every type of military and naval instrumentality that even appears potentially useful in our national defense. Day by day this grows increasingly so in the case of aircraft.

Who would have dreamed until recently, for example, that a handful of silk, originally developed into the parachute as a peaceful, life-saving device, would appear on the battlefield as an instrument of war?

Employment of air power in the present war has so suddenly and dramatically shattered some of yesterday's conceptions that today it is vitally important to re-evaluate the whole terrifying air situation and every known air instrumentality. Who can say that some of our previously conceived airplanes may not now have been rendered obsolete? Who can say that modern lighter-than-air craft may not have become increasingly important to the United States?

That we should wittingly or otherwise pass up a type of aircraft which has already demonstrated a substantial degree of utility seems unthinkable. Nothing less than a state of mental atrophy would be suggested were we to confine our arming efforts merely to mass production of only those types which have in the past proven themselves popular, if in so doing we curtail accelerated research and experimentation with less popularly understood types. While I do not even suggest the existence of mental lethargy or blind prejudice in airship matters, it is nevertheless difficult to understand why a country which has produced such aeronautical triumphs in the heavier-than-air field should manifest such indifference to the distinctly American modern helium-filled lighter-than-air vessel in either our sea-going air commerce or our national defense.

In neither the Army or the Navy is there any weapon or type whose usefulness is universal. Neither on the surface nor in the air is there any commercial or military vehicle that is fully effective or useful under all conditions. Widespread as their uses have become, airplanes are distinctly specialists, and no airplane yet conceived embodies all the virtues we should like an aircraft to possess.

And so I fail to see how, in these days of recognized and stimulated specialization, our country has not yet grasped and admitted the essential fact that the airship is another specialist possessing virtues that adapt it better than any other type to the accomplishment of certain special tasks.

Most significantly, an American war correspondent in Europe recently stated that it seems apparent that one side went to war on a 1918 basis, while the other military machine is geared to 1940.

Just as the airplanes of the first World War, so it is granted that the crude 1918 airships, utterly dependent as they were on the use of fiercely and readily inflammable hydrogen, today are truly obsolete. But the modern American airship, inflated with fire-

proof American helium, endowed with modern equipment and the American development of carrying its own airplanes, is not a zeppelin but a vastly superior craft of the 1940 period.

Before the first World War the Germans are reported to have had little faith in submarines, never trusting them out of contact with surface vessels. Very quickly, however, submarine exploits brought about a complete change of opinion and the submarine achieved enormous importance. But by the latter part of the war the 1918 German submarine had been toppled from its throne and its usefulness almost completely nullified. Its defeat certainly was at least as bad as that of those hydrogen-filled Zeppelins that had been used for bombing raids, a job for which they were not well suited.

Yet, unabated, the important powers pursued their feverish development of the submarine, and now look at the importance of today's subsurface vessels in the navies of 1940. Comparably, the advent of helium alone did more to modernize the airship than any basic submarine improvement in sight at the end of the war held out hope for the submarine. Today's airships, just as today's submarines, belong in today's American naval strength.

It is important to realize that the modernized airship has not yet had a work-out in naval warfare. To reject it solely on theory or conjecture would be a reflection on our whole armament-expansion brain work. I challenge any statement or contention that our meager peacetime exercises have proven airships unworthy of further development or lacking in either naval or commercial utility to the United States. In my opinion, any further neglect of airships could be based only on superficial judgment and decision or on disregard of the facts.

Compared with the lavish funds and efforts already expended on the development of airplanes and their extensive and expensive necessities of life, the outlay on airship development is almost infinitesimally small; yet actually the returns from even this lean investment have been large. Pioneering mistakes and casualties have occurred, it is true, but many practical lessons have thus been learned through the inevitable school of hard knocks, similar to the history of submarines and airplanes, and we are now ready and able to go ahead on a firmer basis.

Judging by the appended list of important groups who have endorsed American airship development, it is hard to see how anything but the country's indifference, bred of misunderstanding, procrastination, indecision, and dodging of the issue, are responsible for finding the American airship cause floundering about without either rudder or compass and without even any idea of where it is headed. The equivalent cost of a single cruiser could by this time have determined the extent of usefulness of large airships to our Navy. The cost of a single modern merchantman would have gone far toward a decision concerning the commercial airship under the American flag.

You and I both sometimes hear the statement, "No other nation has airships, so why should we?" Is such an idea meant to imply that we should be slaves to fashion even in the matter of national defense? If so, we might conceivably ape the wrong fellow sometimes.

Nothing could be more fallacious than the initially lazy assertion that just because no other nation possesses them, the United States, too, should deprive itself of modern airships. The simple fact is that today airships belong in the commerce and armament of but few nations. At least one country was frustrated by following the mirage of a short-cut "royal road" to airship success and airships to them became "sour grapes." The one nation that paid the price of continuity and effort achieved outstanding airship re-

sults. But now, unless the elusive but long-sought fireproofing of hydrogen has been attained, their lack of adequate helium stymies every other country on earth today, and the only country that can provide itself with modern airships is the United States.

Obviously, the national defense of each country must be fashioned to fit its own particular situation, needs, and strategy. In its relatively smaller areas warfare at sea in Europe today is not an adequate gage of what would be expected of our naval arms in warfare in the enormous oceanic expanses surrounding us. A watchdog may not be of use to me in an apartment house, but on your country estate you may value such a warning safeguard. Airships simply do not fit into the restricted combat pattern of the current European war, but they are decidedly valuable to our own defense or offense at sea in our vast oceanic sphere where long range is an enormously vital factor in which field the big modern airship continues to excel.

But, at the same time, possibly not all the surprises of this war have yet been revealed. We should not overlook the possibility that large airships may yet at any time turn up in the European picture in at least an auxiliary capacity for rapid, long-range, large-load aerial transportation in the safer regions behind the combat zones.

From my experience I definitely consider that two general types and sizes of airships are important in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

The smaller or nonrigid airship, commonly called a blimp, has maximum and cruising speeds of about 75 and 60 land-miles per hour, respectively, together with a cruising range of some 800 to 3,000 miles, dependent on size. Able to land on water, ride to a sea anchor, moor out at a mooring mast in very high winds, today's helium blimp is a vastly improved descendant of the 1918 model.

Ability to make observations of the water or the ground from an airship exceeds that afforded by any heavier-than-air craft. Sustained aloft by its buoyant helium, an outstanding virtue is the airship's ability to remain in light at any speed from zero up to its maximum. Hovering or cruising along leisurely—and as low as desired—the blimp is an unequalled aerial observation post quite in contrast to today's fast airplanes, which move at such speeds that in turning his head for only a moment the observer may totally miss objects on or beneath the surface. You can read the signboards and take in the scenery along the road better at moderate than at breakneck speeds.

From protected comfortable stations the blimp look-outs scan the surface of the sea and the depths below for enemy mines in shipping lanes and harbor approaches; they watch also for readily detected air bubbles, oil slicks, the tell-tale periscope "feather," the wakes of enemy submarines that may be lurking on or beneath the surface to torpedo hapless surface vessels. Approaching a sighted submarine, the blimp delivers a greeting in the form of machine-gun fire, bombs, or depth charges; it then throttles down, flies low and slow, keeping the sub continuously under observation while the destroyers it has summoned by radio are on their way for more violent attack on the sub and the hunt to the finish.

Not only can the blimp sight and mark mines, as well as submarines, but has demonstrated in wartime that it can sink them. Generally, mine fields are marked by flagged buoys dropped from the blimp so that anti-mine vessels can readily find and destroy them. On one occasion, in the first World War, a lone airship in 1 flight sighted and marked 368 mines.

During the 1914-18 war allied blimps operating over the English Channel spotted 49 submarines and dropped bombs on 27. There is abundant proof that submarine captains on both sides had wholesome fear of

airships. After the Allies began escorting their merchant convoys by airship, no successful submarine attack was ever made against such a convoy. Translating the scene from yesterday to our own American locale today, I feel certain that blimps can serve more effectively than any airplane in harbor, coastal, and inner patrol work, convoy escort, antisubmarine and antimine tasks. Besides, the blimp can perform a variety of general utility tasks at a real advantage over other aircraft.

Fortunately, it appears that the blimp is about to achieve recognition although to be effective the project has to gather vastly more support and momentum. The blimp situation seems well summed up in the words of the late Secretary of the Navy Swanson in his 1937 annual report:

"There has been a revived interest in non-rigid airships, or blimps, and a growing appreciation of the value of this type in certain activities."

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish, develop, or increase naval aviation facilities, with which shall be included the authority to acquire land, and to construct or acquire buildings and accessories, with approximate costs as indicated, at or in the vicinity of the following areas:

Norfolk, Va.—Cape Hatteras, N. C., naval air station, \$5,205,000.

Boston, Mass., naval air station, \$5,205,000.
San Francisco, Calif., naval air station, \$5,905,000.

Various locations, auxiliary lighter-than-air servicing sites, \$750,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, at the end of line 4, after "facilities", insert "designed primarily for lighter-than-air purposes."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this committee amendment. It will take me about 1 minute to explain why. I have been through the hearings on this bill. As I understand, this language was not in the original draft of the bill. The committee inserted it to be sure that the Navy Department would use these bases for lighter-than-air purposes.

I do not see what harm it would do to leave this language out. Personally, I share with the gentleman from Kentucky, who just spoke to you considerable doubt about the effectiveness of lighter-than-air craft. I am no expert on the subject, of course, but I am just doubtful on the basis of the record of performance.

Now, if this amendment were not put in the bill, the result would be to leave the Navy Department somewhat more free to develop these bases, if they saw fit to do so, for other than lighter-than-air purposes, or if they thought that was the desirable thing to do. In other words, by not putting this amendment into the bill, you simply would not tie the hands of the Navy Department; and if they found, on the basis of further consideration, it was not wise to do all this for lighter-than-air craft, then they could use it for heavier-than-air craft.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then the objection of the gentleman from California is to the language "designed primarily for lighter-than-air-craft purposes."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, that is all the bill deals with. The bill does not deal with heavier-than-air craft, because heavier than air means airplanes, and it has no desire to deal with heavier than air in this kind of language.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is it not true, I will ask the gentleman, that that language was not in the original bill, and that there was discussion in the committee as to whether or not the Navy Department might not decide to have some development for heavier-than-air purposes, and you included this language so that it would not do that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We want to concentrate on this one thing. Of course, if that language were left out, with the language in the bill as it is now, the Department would concentrate on it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree that it probably would.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But we want to be specific and positive that the whole expenditure here is for dealing with lighter than air, and for that reason we did not want these bases built with a dual capacity in mind. We wanted them built exclusively for lighter than air and not for heavier than air.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But the difference between—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is a big difference between the two.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For instance, in connection with the lighter than air you do not have to have a runway, whereas with a heavier than air you have got to have a runway at least 1 mile long and about 300 feet wide. So the committee knew exactly what it was doing, and we did not want to mislead the Congress and say that this is a lighter-than-air bill when the Navy Department later on could say they wanted it for heavier than air.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that very well and I appreciate the committee's purpose. It just happens that my own feeling about the matter is that I would rather leave more discretion in the Navy Department about this because, as I said before, I frankly question the effectiveness of this type of ship.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Naval Affairs Committee feels that the Congress should know positively and as much as possible everything the Navy does. It is our responsibility. We fix the policy. Why should we delegate the authority to someone down here after we have proceeded on one line and then the Navy may go and do something absolutely to the contrary?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My only reason for opposing this committee amendment is because of my basic concern about the effectiveness of lighter-than-air craft. I felt that by not putting

this language in the bill we would leave the Navy Department with more freedom in the matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to enter into any discussion of the merits or demerits of aircraft, lighter or heavier than air, but there are Members here today who remember my discourse in regard to the metal-clad ZMC-2. It is today the oldest flying thing in all the world; in spite of its 13 years of service it is still above maximum requirement at the time it was launched. I think it has been flying consistently and in the hands of students, receiving the hardest kind of wear and tear, and according to such men as Commander Rosendahl, who is foremost in this field and who ought long ago to have been recognized and been made an admiral, and such men as former Assistant Secretary of the Navy Edison, former Army Chief of Staff, Douglas McArthur, and other experts who have passed on the question, it is acknowledged that it has definite and special off-shore patrol value. To a certain extent, they are almost indestructible rather than to say they are really vulnerable, especially when they are inflated with helium gas.

We have men in the House here today who would have you believe that we ought not to have blimps of any kind, either all-metal or fabric-covered. That is the sheerest kind of bunk and nonsense. The fact of the matter is, it is a dangerous philosophy when this Government of ours spends billions for tanks and for airplanes and billions for surface craft of all kinds without spending even nominal or small or trivial amounts for the training of personnel to handle blimps. Ships of the blimp type and trained crews may be desperately needed some day and then we may not have either ships or trained hands. There are times when an airplane can neither take off nor land—when a ship of this type can take off and land at will and can inflict effective damage to an oncoming enemy, and can be used for observation and for general reconnaissance, for locating mines and lurking submarines which a plane at high speed could not begin to detect effectively.

It seems to me the amount of money asked by the committee is very reasonable and very small. It is only an experimental amount that is requested and the House cannot afford to turn it down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, strike out "\$5,205,000" and insert "\$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "\$5,205,000" and insert "\$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "San Francisco, Calif., Naval Air Station, \$5,905,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Various locations, auxiliary lighter-than-air servicing sites, \$750,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, insert "Florida area, Naval Air Station, \$6,500,000."

Line 8, insert "Southern California area, Naval Air Station, \$6,500,000."

"Puget Sound area, Naval Air Station, \$6,500,000."

"In such vicinities outside the continental limits of the United States as the Secretary of the Navy may in his discretion deem desirable, not to exceed five Naval Air Stations, \$15,000,000."

"Various locations, auxiliary lighter-than-air facilities, \$3,000,000."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out on page 2, line 7, the words "Florida area, Naval Air Station, \$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 7, strike out "Florida area, Naval Air Station, \$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the committee amendment. I do so for several reasons. One of them is to ask something of the distinguished chairman of the committee if I may have his attention. The question is whether or not the Budget has approved the Florida item.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Naval Affairs Committee included in this the items of what is known as the first and second year program. That is due to the fact that in the hearings the Department asked the Naval Affairs Committee to map out a whole program, a first- and second-year program. The Boston, Mass., area, the San Francisco area were included in the first-year program and they were approved by the Budget. To try to do the thing in good shape we thought we might put the whole program in. The second-year part of

the program has not been approved by the Budget. The Department has requested that the second-year program be stricken out entirely, because it may be changed. Therefore, we are asking that all of the second-year program referred to in this bill be stricken out and I hope the committee will strike it out.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. And may I ask the chairman what other projects in the main program are affected as a result of this striking out?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We will strike out the Florida area, the southern California area, the Puget Sound area, and to take the place of the California area in line 3 we are asking to transfer back to the Navy what is known as the Sunnyside base. That leaves only three, and I trust the Committee of the Whole will sustain the Naval Committee on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Southern California area, naval air station, \$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 8, strike out "Southern California area, naval air station, \$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on page 2, line 10, I move to strike out "Puget Sound area, naval air station, \$6,500,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 10, strike out "Puget Sound area, naval air station, \$6,500,000."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The way this bill is being formulated now, it means that the entire Northwest area, which is closer to Japan and closer to the Orient, is going to be out of the picture. Is that right?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For the first year's program it is.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, that is for quite some time, is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. We hope some time later on, just as soon as the Budget makes a recommendation and the administration approves it, to include the Puget Sound area.

Mr. JACKSON. When does the chairman contemplate that actual construction will be started?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On all these projects?

Mr. JACKSON. No; the projects that are being stricken, particularly the Puget Sound area.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say that the Navy Department has definitely determined at what place in the Florida area, the California area, and the Puget Sound area bases shall be located. Just as soon as the Budget and the administration approve it, they will come before the committee and the committee will hold hearings on it and bring it before the House.

Mr. JACKSON. I have been advised that the Navy has not decided upon the area in the Puget Sound section.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then I am misinformed. I thought they had.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the chairman have any idea when the work will actually be started?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On Puget Sound?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I could not answer that. I do not have any positive information as to when it is going to start, but I know they cannot start until the Budget has approved it, because they cannot send it in here.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me that here you have the entire northwest area, which is in a very vulnerable spot, and nothing is being done, while in other areas they are establishing bases.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, you cannot do it all in one day or all at one time. We are doing it as fast as possible and if we can make some headway today, we can start part of it today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am only taking this time for the purpose of asking the chairman a question or two by way of explanation. As I understood from the gentleman's statement a moment ago, he stated that the naval officials had appeared before his committee with a map on which it was definitely indicated that the changes that are now indicated in this bill are necessary. Is that right?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The gentleman misunderstood what I said. I said that the Navy Department laid out a 2-year program. We incorporated it all, but as the Budget has only recommended for the 1-year program, we have decided to abandon that part of the bill which the Budget has not recommended. Those items in italics are the ones put in which have not been recommended by the Budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that, and I thank the gentleman. May I ask this question: Where did the proposed sites finally wind up after the committee made its changes and recommendations?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not have the slightest idea where they will put it in the Puget Sound area, but from Captain Rosendahl my information is that all the places have been located. What we are doing in California is this—bear in mind that the bill as sent up by the committee provided for the San Francisco area \$5,000,000. What we did there was this: The Army had a lighter-than-air base known as Sunnyside, and that

was transferred by Executive order. Instead of building a new one out there we have a provision in the second paragraph that transfers that back to the Navy, and then we will reimburse the Army so it can build a place to suit its needs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was only 2 years ago that Sunnysvale was the property of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true. Now we are putting it back, because it was built exclusively for lighter-than-air craft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the gentleman's comments in response to my inquiry, I am assuming that those particular sites have no definite location that the chairman knows of at this time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know whether they have been marked by metes and bounds. For instance, in the Boston area I do not know what particular place has been selected, or in the Norfolk area. That is a matter that the committee does not try to deal with, and we do not have that information. We leave that to the military men to determine, because they are better qualified. I can say one thing, there is going to be no logrolling in connection with it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, I was not intimating that there was logrolling. I was just curious, because we people out on the coast figure we are entitled to this information because of our exposed condition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question arises on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 11, strike out all of lines 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTPHIN: Page 1, line 7, after the word "acquire", insert "under contracts entered into as a result of competitive bidding."

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions representatives of departments have urged Congress to grant them authority to enter into negotiated contracts stating that time was of the essence. Time certainly is not of the essence in the construction of these facilities, as the ships themselves will not be available for 2, 3, or possibly 4 years. If this amendment is adopted and this construction work is built on a competitive-bid basis, we shall have then an opportunity of determining which method is the cheaper and the better.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is wise wherever possible to have competitive bids. We have been forced in certain types of construction to have negotiated contracts, but where no delay is caused we shall adhere to the competitive bid. So it is with pleasure I accept the amendment and hope it will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. The custody and control of the former naval air station at Sunnysvale, Calif., now known as Moffett Field, are hereby transferred from the Secretary of War to the Secretary of the Navy, who is authorized to re-establish the same as a naval air station, and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to establish at such location as he may, with the approval of the President, deem best suited to the purpose, basic heavier-than-air training facilities in lieu of those at Moffett Field at a cost not to exceed \$6,500,000. Physical possession of Moffett Field shall be transferred when, in the opinion of the President, the facilities herein authorized for the War Department are sufficiently complete to permit of their use for the purposes specified, but not later than 8 months after the approval of this act."

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTER: Page 3, line 5, after the word "after", strike out "the approval of this act" and insert "money is made available to the War Department to provide such facilities."

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to give the Army time within which to provide itself with facilities for heavier-than-air training in lieu of Moffett Field which under the provisions of the committee amendment is to be turned over to the Navy. The Army is now using Moffett Field for the training of heavier-than-air pilots. Under the provisions of the amendment as proposed by the committee the Army is directed to turn Moffett Field over not later than 8 months after the approval of this act. Under my amendment it would be 8 months after the money is made available to the War Department to provide such facilities. In other words, this is an authorization. Under the committee amendment the time would start to run from the approval of the act, but under my amendment it would not start to run until the money is made available.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The amendment is perfectly agreeable because, of course, the Army should not be ejected from the field until they have had time to make other arrangements.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 3, line 6, change "section 3" to "section 4" and insert new "section 3" to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to conduct aeronautical experiments in the field of other than standard heavier-than-air craft, such as, but not limited to, rotary-wing type aircraft, gliders,

metal-hulled and other than conventionally propelled lighter-than-air craft and the like at a cost not to exceed \$100,000."

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee explain the reason for offering this amendment inasmuch as it was never considered in the committee, and some of us did not know it was to be offered?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This amendment, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, grows out of the fact that last week a subcommittee was appointed to inquire into the types of lighter-than-air craft referred to here. On this committee were the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and others. The subcommittee had a hearing and heard experts with reference to gliders and the types of craft specified in the amendment. I felt it was justified to have experimental work going on so that the country would know that the Congress was trying to keep abreast of the times by at least making money available for experimental work of this character.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee is going into that matter at quite some length. I further understand that they have not as yet made a report. It seems to me before we accept an amendment of this kind to this bill that we ought to have the benefit of the opinion of that subcommittee from the Naval Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The gentleman is mistaken, because the report has been written and filed by that committee.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know when that was.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The gentleman is not a member of the subcommittee. It has been sitting for 2 weeks. We have been going on just the same.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If the report has been filed and it is favorable to this amendment, I have no objection to it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know whether the report endorses this amendment or not.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wanted to inquire whether or not the subcommittee has endorsed this amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The inference left by the gentleman from New Jersey was that the subcommittee had endorsed it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not offering the amendment as a committee amendment. I am offering it on my own responsibility as a Member of the House. I think this is a very important amendment because it enables the Navy to go forward and make these investigations if the facts, in the opinion of the Navy Department, justify it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In view of the fact a subcommittee has been ap-

pointed for the purpose of exploring into the advisability of such action, it seems to me that the Naval Affairs Committee might well withhold an amendment of this kind. I would like to know whether or not the subcommittee has reported it and, if so, whether they are favorable to the amendment.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I am favorable to the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 6, strike out "2", and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Cox, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3537, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 203, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the program for next week.

Monday will be District day. There will be two or three small bills called up, but the important one will be the so-called small loan bill.

The Whittington bill will be called up in a few minutes. That is the so-called flood-control bill, and if that does not pass this afternoon, it will be taken up after District business is considered on Monday.

If that bill is disposed of, then the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be the next one in order, and that bill will probably take the remainder of Monday, if the District of Columbia Commit-

tee does not consume the entire day, and Tuesday.

A deficiency bill will be called up on Wednesday, and the consideration of that bill will probably take Wednesday and Thursday.

Following that there will be the May bill reported out of the Military Affairs Committee, which will be next in order.

There is the Casey resolution, which we are hopeful will be considered some time the latter part of next week. That has to do with an investigation of price ranges and so forth.

All of this is subject to such conference reports as may be called up during the week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include an article on lighter-than-air craft.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may be permitted to extend his remarks relative to the birthday of West Virginia and to include therein a short poem by Harry E. Leeper, of Fairmont, W. Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

DEFERMENT OF MEN BY AGE GROUP OR GROUPS UNDER SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 243, Rept. No. 811), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute.

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by myself.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RESERVOIRS, LEVEES, AND FLOOD WALLS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 234.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Flood Control, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side. I believe it is understood and agreed that the rule should be adopted.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4911, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on June 22, 1936, for the first time Congress adopted a national flood-control policy and authorized \$300,000,000 for flood-control improvements. An emergency act followed that bill in 1937 applicable to the lower Ohio Valley. In 1938 the second major

flood-control bill was passed, and Congress authorized for flood-control works in the principal river basins in the United States \$396,000,000. An emergency bill was passed in 1939. It was the policy of the committee to report a bill in 1940. Extensive hearings were conducted. All who desired to be heard from New England to Los Angeles and from Florida to Seattle were heard. The bill H. R. 9640 was reported on May 7, 1940, and the hearings were published.

About the time the bill was reported France fell, and our thoughts turned to national defense. The committee decided to withhold a request for the consideration of the bill during the last session. During the present session there have been conducted hearings on all projects that have been favorably reported to the Congress since the bill to which I have just referred was reported in 1940. Hearings have been published and are available on that bill. In a word, the bill under consideration embraces all of the projects, with the exception of two items that have been enacted into law as emergency projects, that were contained in the bill H. R. 9640, reported a year ago, and in addition thereto it embraces the projects on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted favorable reports and the committee has made investigations since May 7, 1940.

The bill under consideration provides for authorizations aggregating \$260,000,000. At present there are authorizations of approximately \$310,000,000 for flood control, but about \$180,000,000 of that amount is definitely required to complete projects that are under construction, so in all parts of the country there are available authorization for new projects in the amount of about \$130,000,000.

It is the program, as was stated by the President in his Budget message, that following the existing emergency there shall be carefully studied and carefully planned projects on the shelf, so that in addition to providing for projects that are now under construction that should be completed, after the emergency is passed there will be worthy, constructive public works that will enable the country to meet the problem of unemployment that must inevitably follow the emergency.

This is a rather long bill, but it has just eight sections. It is a simple bill. I shall give you an analysis of the bill in a few words, and I believe you can follow me. After all, if you take the bill and the report of the committee, you get a definite statement covering each project authorized in the bill. The reports are available. The bill is definite.

I repeat, to emphasize, that no project was included in this bill until that project had been studied on the ground by the district engineer, in the field by the division engineer, and by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and approved by the Chief of Engineers and investigated and studied by our committee.

If members of the committee will turn to the bill, in just a few words I shall undertake to explain it.

Section 1 of the bill is substantially existing law. It provides for the continuation of the policy adopted in 1936.

Section 2 is an administrative provision in the bill, and it is most important. It is necessary to adopt this section. The law was supposed to be amended by section 2 in the bill we reported a year ago.

The yardstick for local contributions is the same in all parts of the country. Local interests are required to provide under the general law rights-of-way and lands for levees and flood walls. The Federal Government since 1936 has paid for the cost of reservoirs.

In 1938, when we provided for the first time that the Federal Government should pay for the cost of reservoirs, an innocent amendment was added to the bill. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who was on the committee at that time, and is now sitting before me, will recall that that amendment was inserted on the floor of the Senate, and before the conferees agreed to it we undertook to get all the information we could that that was really an innocent amendment and would not cost very much. It provided that the Government should pay the cost of channelization. It has developed that that amendment has cost the Government millions of dollars.

Section 2, the administrative provision of this bill, undertakes to amend the act of 1938 to restore the general law or the act of 1936. There is a novel provision that occurs for the first time in a flood-control bill, in section 2. It provides that if a project is authorized and the local community does not make its contribution after 5 years, that project is definitely eliminated and will not stand in the way of other worthy projects that have been approved.

There is another worthy provision in section 2 that will enable the Chief of Engineers upon the acquiring of a site to proceed with the construction in line with river-and-harbor work.

Section 3 deals with projects that are approved, and that section covers some 23 pages in the bill. Every project that is authorized is described in section 3, and reference is made to the reports of the Chief of Engineers recommending these projects or any other reports referred to in the bill, so that Members of Congress can take the bill and the report of the committee and find out and be fully advised with respect to any project.

I want to say this, in passing, with respect to one project in New England along the Connecticut River: We authorized in 1936 something like \$10,000,000 for reservoirs. Among those reservoirs was a reservoir in New Hampshire, the Bethlehem Junction. The same document was approved in the act of 1938, but a subsequent discovery by the Chief of Engineers developed that a better reservoir site might be adopted for some of those reservoirs, and among others Sugar Hill. The committee heard the testimony with respect to this project, and we approved the document; but I call your attention to that fact, and I have the document in my hand, and that document, House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session,

suggested the substitution of Sugar Hill for Bethlehem Junction. This was an interim report.

There was objection by the people in New Hampshire to the construction of Sugar Hill, and as a member of that committee I shared the objection. It would have utilized one of the most beautiful valleys in the White Mountains, one of the most magnificent areas I ever saw. So the Committee on Flood Control adopted a resolution calling upon the Chief of Engineers to provide for a restudy of the Sugar Hill Reservoir with a view to substituting another reservoir in place of the Sugar Hill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

So I can state that under the terms of this bill Sugar Hill is not authorized to be constructed.

We have provided for projects in section 3 in the Connecticut River Basin, the Thames River Basin, and the Pawtuxet River Basin, Lake Champlain Basin, the Oswego River Basin in central and upper New York, and the yardstick for local contributions there where the Chief of Engineers states in his report that the works are largely local is the same yardstick that obtains for local contributions in other parts of the country, and I know of no area in the United States that has been more generously dealt with than central New York or west central New York and northern Pennsylvania, because in the Flood Control Act of 1936 we authorized projects in that general area following the disastrous flood of 1935, that provided that the Federal Government should spend \$27,000,000 and the local interests contribute about \$1,000,000.

There are some eight projects in the Finger Lakes area and then there are projects in the Susquehanna River Basin, the Delaware River Basin, the Mobile River Basin, the Allatoona Reservoir, and there are the Tombigbee River, the Colorado River Basin, the Brady Creek, and the Brazos River projects.

Now, just a word in passing with respect to the lower Mississippi. Until 1936 Congress provided for flood control only in the lower Mississippi River and the Sacramento River, the lower Mississippi being the father of rivers and the father of floods in our country.

Under the act of 1928, supplemented by the act of 1936, the Mississippi River was divided into three sections, from Cairo to the mouth of the Arkansas, from the mouth of the Arkansas to the mouth of the Red, from the mouth of the Red to the Gulf of Mexico, and was provided with a project that would protect it against the maximum flood. The upper section has been practically completed. The lower section has no difficulties. In the middle section of the river there were authorized, through the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, floodways first through the Boeuf Basin and then through the Eudora Basin for the diversion of floodwaters, and I call your attention to the fact that as a result of a provision that Congress made in the Flood Control Act of 1928, for studies and investigations, the establishment of the

greatest flood-control laboratories on earth, the Mississippi River, the longest navigable river in our country, between the Arkansas and the Red, as you will recall from your geography, has been shortened by cut-offs a distance in 370 miles of 137 miles and navigation has been afforded at the same time, because today in the lower Mississippi there is more navigation than there was in the halcyon days of the steamboat, long before the railroads came to supplant the steamboats. The navigation is largely by barges. As a result of these cut-offs, the Chief of Engineers and the president of the Mississippi River Commission in charge of that part of the lower Mississippi Valley, recommended that there could be adopted any one of three projects and thus elimination of these large areas of land for diversions would occur, because they said that the flood heights had been reduced from 5 to 10 feet as a result of these cut-offs.

So, without increasing the authorization for the main Mississippi River, this bill provides for the adoption of the report of the engineers for increasing the height of levees in the lower Mississippi Valley and the elimination of the diversions. Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi, the States primarily interested, have agreed to the provision. In the Red Ouachita Basin there is a reservoir project. Flood projects are authorized along the White River Basin, the Arkansas River Basin, the Ohio River Basin, and one project along the Tennessee River Basin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think I shall save time if I yield myself 5 minutes more. One of the most dangerous flood-control programs in the United States today is Chattanooga, Tenn., and that, notwithstanding the T. V. A. for both the Chief of Engineers and the T. V. A. report to our committee and testified that levees 20 feet high are essential to protect the city of Chattanooga. I shall extend my remarks in that regard because we are dealing primarily with flood control, and any reservoirs that are authorized in this bill are primarily for flood control. But wherever power can be developed, penstocks are to be installed, and provisions are to be made for the development of power, because water is one of the greatest natural resources of our country, and they are resources that belong to the people and they should be utilized for the benefit of the whole people whenever there is an opportunity. [Applause.]

Provision is made for increasing the authorizations along the Ohio River, the Missouri River, the White River, and in Los Angeles. I now yield to my friend from Los Angeles, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It was not about that that I wanted to ask the gentleman to yield. It is about another matter.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then, just one moment. Important work has been done in and about Los Angeles, and provisions are made also for work along the Sacra-

mento River and along the Willamette and one or two prospects along the Columbia.

I now come to section 4. Probably more Members are interested in this section than in any other section of the bill. There is a flood problem in practically every district in the United States. Members of Congress desire their rivers surveyed and studied, and section 4 includes every bill introduced by Members of Congress which has been submitted to the Chief of Engineers, when he recommends that a study and examination be made of the flood problem. I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND] on his feet, and I yield to him.

Mr. BOLAND. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the Lackawanna River. It flows through my district. It is a tributary of the Susquehanna. A survey was made. I asked for a survey and they have embodied it in the Susquehanna report. What is the status of that survey?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has been most diligent. As I recall, in the act of 1936, three times you will find provisions for surveys of the Susquehanna River and tributaries. The gentleman introduced a special bill for the Lackawanna River, which is a tributary of the Susquehanna. One of the criticisms of the Corps of Engineers by some sources is that instead of studying the problem in the entire watershed they pick out a unit here and there, so that when the Chief of Engineers came to report on the Lackawanna River he found he was directed to report on the Susquehanna. So, unfortunately, without any fault on the part of the gentleman, the report on the Lackawanna River has been delayed because the report on the Susquehanna of which it is a part has not been completed. I know that the gentleman has a worthy project, and that is the only reason the committee was unable to consider it, and personally I think the report should be facilitated and submitted to the Congress at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BOLAND. Might I ask the gentleman, then, for a serious consideration of the matter when it does come before the committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, I do not give any other kind of consideration than serious and careful consideration.

Mr. BOLAND. I was about to ask the gentleman for favorable consideration.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall do the best I can. I yield now to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Before I ask my question, as a member of this committee, permit me to say that I appreciate more than I can say the splendid leadership that our chairman has given us. I do not believe there is another committee in the House that is as efficiently and effectively carried on as this committee. I just wanted to ask a question about section 2, because in his remarks on section 2 I believe the gentleman stated that the provisions of our section 2 in this bill would restore the law to what it was in 1936.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Only in one regard.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Only with regard to channel rectification?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But not with regard to reservoirs?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, not at all; simply channelization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very interesting and illuminating statement. He has done fine work. There is nothing for the Merrimac River in this bill, but the engineers tell me they have all the authorization they require for that river.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is true. But reservoirs are authorized in the acts of 1936 and 1938 at a total cost of \$11,000,000. I do not know of any river that has more flood-control help than the Merrimac River. It is one of the finest rivers in the United States and is in the gentleman's district. None has been more diligent or successful for flood control than she.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am apprehensive about the limitation in section 2 which says that "the authorization for any flood-control project heretofore or herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date of approval of this act unless local interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required cooperation will be furnished." I am wondering whether or not that should not be 5 years after the appropriation has been made, because of the uncertainty of the period of time between authorization and appropriation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Flood-control projects have been authorized generally since 1936. That is the limitation with respect to rivers and harbors, and it has worked out very satisfactorily. Those interested in this legislation think it will facilitate matters. Some objection is made to new authorizations, because we have projects that have been authorized and never yet constructed. The local interests can prevent it if they say they are willing to make the contribution. In fact the President, among others, suggested the limitation.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. And they do not have to make it; simply say they are willing?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; just so they are willing, and ready to comply, and furnish assurances.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman has made a very fine statement about flood conditions in Ohio. Anybody who knows anything about it knows that the Ohio River is the greatest transportation carrying river in the world. What is the latest development, may I ask the gentleman, with reference to the Blue Stone Dam?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Blue Stone Dam was authorized in 1936, and because of litigation was authorized again in 1938. We did not have any investigation

about that, because there was no occasion for us to go into it. But it is my understanding that the Blue Stone Dam is under way, at least, it is authorized.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And as far as the gentleman knows, there is no impediment to the Blue Stone Dam except this litigation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; and certainly not in view of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Dennison Dam case.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Board of Engineers and the division engineer have made a study and investigation of all these projects. The Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers recommended every one of these projects?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; all were recommended or agreed to by the Chief of Engineers. They would not be in the bill if the Chief of Engineers had not agreed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. On April 14 I introduced a bill, H. R. 4348, which authorized additional funds for the Department of Agriculture. Would the gentleman explain where in this bill matters affecting the Department of Agriculture are contained?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has anticipated me. I will come to it. Five million dollars is authorized for the purpose you have in mind, it is in the last section of the bill. If you can get that, go to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. I am trying to facilitate the passage of this bill. Some of you know of the difficulties under which I am working at the present time, and of my feelings for a friend desperately ill at this moment.

Section 5 contains a new authorization for the first time. If there is a flood on any river in the United States where there are flood-control improvements, without coming to Congress the Corps of Engineers can go out and help repair and maintain. That is section 5.

Section 6 makes applicable to flood-control work the acts mentioned that are now applicable on river and harbor improvements, in the acquiring of lands, taking possession of them, and so forth.

Section 7 is a clarifying amendment, so as to enable the Department of Agriculture to use funds heretofore as well as herein authorized for the purpose, under the act of 1936, as amended.

The last section of the bill, section 8, authorizes \$260,000,000 for flood-control works, \$10,000,000 to be equally divided between the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture for preliminary examinations and surveys; \$5,000,000 for works for the Department of Agriculture.

I beg your pardon for having detained you, but it occurred to me that under the circumstances I could save time by explaining the sections of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to pay my respects to the gentleman's committee for the courteous manner in which they have taken care of the Santa Ana River Basin. Our last flood cost 36 lives and \$627,000,000. For those things which you have put into this bill we are extremely grateful, and we thank you.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the Members for their consideration, and unless there be some further question by some member of the committee, I will yield the floor, but before yielding I trust that the bill may be passed by the unanimous vote of the committee and of the House, as it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Flood Control. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend, at the risk of repetition, I should like to emphasize the need of additional authorizations, the necessity of Public Works following the existing emergency, the need for amending provisions of existing flood-control acts, and I would like to analyze the bill a little more in detail.

On June 22, 1936, as I have said Congress passed the first national flood-control bill and authorized \$300,000,000 for the construction of improvements in the principal regions of the country.

A sound policy was announced. Investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water retardation and soil erosion prevention on watersheds were placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. The investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways were placed under the jurisdiction of the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The Departments of War and Agriculture have cooperated, their works are coordinated, there is no duplication. Progress in flood-control prevention and protection has been made.

In 1938 Congress passed the second national flood-control bill following an emergency act that was passed in 1937.

Rivers are being investigated and streams are being studied. There is need for orderly development of the national policy. Annual authorization bills might properly be introduced, however, in 1939 no general authorization bill was introduced but a bill was passed to amend existing laws and to provide for examinations and surveys.

Under the adopted policy, after extensive hearings, a flood-control bill, H. R. 9640, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, was reported on May 7, 1940. On account of the national emergency and the second World War the bill was not pressed. The bill under consideration embraces all of the provisions of the said bill reported in May 1940 except an emergency project and except a statutory provision that were passed as matters of urgency and defense.

In addition to the projects reported in the bill of 1940 the pending bill contains projects on all reports favorably submitted by the Chief of Engineers since hearings were conducted on the said bill reported in 1940. The bill in 1940 authorized appropriations amounting to \$196,000,000. The bill under consideration authorizes appropriations for flood-control improvements aggregating \$260,000,000, and \$10,000,000 for examinations and surveys and \$5,000,000 for soil-erosion works by the Department of Agriculture.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS

The act of 1936 and subsequent acts authorizes \$693,926,000 for flood control throughout the United States, exclusive of the Lower Mississippi River. Including appropriations for the fiscal year 1942, some \$383,000,000 have been appropriated for general flood control. There is thus left about \$310,000,000 as a backlog. The Chief of Engineers estimates that it will cost about \$180,000,000 to complete projects under construction or scheduled for construction in the fiscal year 1942. There is thus left a backlog of only \$130,000,000 of authority available for new flood-control projects.

Many important projects cannot be constructed without additional authorizations. Generally, flood-control projects must be constructed consecutively. Reservoirs require long periods to be completed. Benefits do not accrue until reservoirs are completed. It took 6 years to complete the Fort Peck Reservoir.

Devastating floods may jeopardize the national defense by halting industrial production, by shutting down power plants, by crippling railroads, by destroying highways, and by interrupting communications. Additional authorizations both for national defense and the general welfare should be made at this time.

As stated, the bill reported last year was not pressed on account of national defense. The hearings conducted on the 1940 bill are available in connection with the pending bill. The Committee on Flood Control did not report, but hearings were conducted on all reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings were conducted on the bill reported in 1940 and the Flood Control Act of 1938. Hearings are, therefore, available covering all projects embraced in the pending bill.

FAVORABLE REPORTS

No projects have been included in the pending bill except modifications of existing or new projects, on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

Under the terms of the bill, when there are additional authorizations for drainage basins in which projects have already been authorized and appropriations have been insufficient for their construction, the selection is left to the Chief of Engineers. The provisions of the act of June 28, 1938, obtain, except as amended. It is contemplated that priority projects will have first consideration. Authorizations in one drainage basin cannot be transferred to another.

MULTIPLE-USE PROJECTS

The reservoirs provided for in the pending bill are primarily for flood con-

trol. It will be kept in mind that water is the most valuable of natural resources; it should not be wasted, and it should not be polluted; it should be made to serve and not destroy.

Reservoirs may be built for flood control, for navigation, for the generation of power, and for the conservation of water for reclamation or other uses; they may be operated primarily for one purpose or for several purposes. It is often practical and economical to build reservoirs with sufficient capacity to detain floodwaters and store water for other purposes. If operated for several purposes they are called multiple-use reservoirs.

Wherever power can be provided in dams that are for flood control, provision is made for such power. Studies are conducted by the Federal Power Commission. Penstocks are installed wherever the Federal Power Commission and the Chief of Engineers believe that a multiple-use reservoir is practicable.

The Federal Power Commission does not construct reservoirs. It can make a great contribution in solving the use and marketing problem of electric power. It is not necessary for the Commission to engage in construction. It has authority to license and it might well be vested with the authority to dispose of the power. The final solution may require time but it is not necessary to permit the assets of falling waters to go to waste. The public is entitled to the benefits of economical power that can be developed from their natural resources. Water power is not only valuable in itself, but it contributes to needed public improvements that might otherwise not be built for flood control, navigation, and irrigation.

The power possibilities along the White River in Missouri and Arkansas are remarkable, and demands for power not only exist but will increase as the power is developed. It will take many years to construct the reservoirs. By the time the projects have been completed all of the power that can be developed will be needed. It is wise to authorize multiple-use projects now so that they can be constructed in an orderly manner to meet the emergency needs for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and power.

PUBLIC WORKS

The President of the United States, in his Budget message in January 1941, recommended reductions in appropriations for flood control, river and harbor, and reclamation work. He put national defense first. He did recommend that the projects under construction go forward to completion. The President also emphasized the need for surveys, investigation, and planning of new projects, so that following the national emergency construction could be resumed without delay. I quote from his message:

This will produce a long list of public-works projects apart from defense construction, arranged according to priorities. Such a list could be submitted to a future Congress for appropriation of funds to put it into operation.

The President, therefore, made it clear that planning in connection with domestic public-works projects would continue. He wanted plans and engi-

neering works complete and on the shelf so that they could be used when the national-defense emergency is over. When the defense employment ends it will be possible to take these projects off the shelf and put people back to work on useful public works.

The bill under consideration, therefore, not only provides for the orderly development of flood-control improvements but it makes authorizations for useful works so that they will be ready for execution when the appropriations are made.

THE BILL

The urgent need for additional authorizations for prosecution of approved plans is recognized and the bill makes provision for additional authorizations which the Chief of Engineers considers essential for orderly prosecution of work in a number of the most important river basins. In addition, individual projects which have been found to be economical and desirable are authorized.

As stated, the last general Flood Control Act was passed in 1938. A large number of reports on surveys authorized by Congress have been completed and reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and reports with favorable recommendations have been transmitted to Congress. These projects are included in the pending bill. All have been carefully examined with the view to producing the greatest good to the greatest number of people. The plans are practical and comprehensive. A number of the plans include multiple-purpose reservoirs which will permit the development of economical hydroelectric power in addition to providing storage for flood-control, municipal and irrigation water supply, pollution control, and other purposes. New projects are authorized in the principal drainage basins in the country.

The bill continues the procedure of authorizing additional surveys and examinations for flood control and, as I have stated, authorizes the sum of \$260,000,000 to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of the act.

ANALYSIS

Section 1. Policy

Section 1 is identical with existing law. It contains the declaration of policy respecting flood control and provides for the investigation, planning, and prosecution by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army of flood control and other allied works.

Section 2. Administrative changes

Section 2 provides that section 3 of the act of June 22, 1936, as amended by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1938, shall apply to all works authorized by the pending bill and that the provisions of (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of the act of June 22, 1936, shall apply to channel improvement or channel rectification projects except as otherwise provided by law. This provision merely reenacts the original intent of Congress with respect to local contribution requirements for the various types of flood-control works.

This section also repeals the provisions of the flood-control acts of 1937 and 1939

which give the President authority to waive certain requirements with respect to local cooperation for certain flood-control projects in the Ohio River Basin. The repeal of this emergency provision will place the Ohio River projects on the same basis as similar projects in other parts of the country. The same yardstick applies to all flood-control projects under all flood-control bills.

There is a unique provision embraced for the first time in section 2. All authorizations requiring local contribution expire 5 years from the date of approval unless the local interests within that time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required local contribution will be furnished.

There is also a provision in section 2 that will permit the initiation and partial accomplishment of projects which might otherwise be delayed for long periods of time due to lack of sufficient advance appropriations for the completion of large projects.

It is economical and advisable for the Government to secure the land rights for flood-control and power reservoirs as early as practicable and well in advance of prospective construction. Moreover, there are reservoir sites where it may be practicable and advantageous to construct dams smaller than those planned for full utilization of all the possibilities.

The railroads were first built as single tracks and then double tracks were constructed. The famous Aswan Dam across the Nile in Egypt has been raised three times during its life.

Section 2 gives the Chief of Engineers the authority to begin and prosecute projects in whichever way he may determine to be advantageous under the conditions and circumstances that obtain from time to time.

Section 3. Authorizations

Section 3 adopts and authorizes the improvements set forth in the bill and continues the provisions for pen stocks in the reservoirs authorized.

In the Connecticut River Basin, \$6,000,000 is authorized for local protective works and \$10,000,000 for reservoirs for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved by the act of 1938 for the Connecticut River Basin and the comprehensive plan is modified to include the works recommended in House Document No. 653, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with such modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. The said House Document No. 724 includes reservoirs at Sugar Hill and Honey Hill, N. H. It also includes reservoirs at Williamstown, Vt., and Barre Falls, Mass.

While Sugar Hill Reservoir is embraced in House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, the Committee on Flood Control, at the request of the local interests, passed a resolution calling upon the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and previous reports on the Connecticut River with the view of finding a substitute reservoir which can be built in place of the Sugar Hill project.

The Chief of Engineers stated in said Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and I quote:

This second interim report considers changes in certain figures of the approved general reservoir plan for flood control in the Connecticut River Basin and additional local protective works now found desirable. A final report to be submitted under this and other authorities will cover the Connecticut River as a whole.

In view of the fact that the report embracing Sugar Hill is an interim report and in view of the further fact that the Committee on Flood Control has requested a review as stated in the report on the pending bill by the Committee on Flood Control none of the funds authorized are to be used for the construction of the Sugar Hill Dam.

It may be well to say in this connection that the Bethlehem Junction Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938. This authorization has not been repealed. The committee understood that both Bethlehem Junction and the Sugar Hill would not be constructed. Several substitutes for Sugar Hill have been suggested. The committee, therefore, declined to authorize funds for the Sugar Hill Dam and Reservoir. No part of the \$10,000,000 authorized and no part of funds previously authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1936 or under any other act is available for the construction of the Sugar Hill Reservoir.

The \$10,000,000 will cover two reservoirs. The probability is one of these reservoirs will be at Williamstown, Vt., and the other may be at Honey Hill, N. H., or it may be that the Chief of Engineers will decide to construct the Bethlehem Junction Reservoir unless he is able to find a better and more satisfactory substitute, but definitely the Sugar Hill Reservoir is not authorized and will not be constructed without further authority from Congress.

Oswego River Watershed, New York

Among the projects authorized is the Oswego River watershed, New York. The projects authorized are covered by House Document No. 846, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session. Congress has been most liberal in past authorizations in west and central New York. The act of 1936 authorized flood-control works at Binghamton, Cornell, and other areas in southern New York and Pennsylvania at an estimated Federal cost of \$27,000,000, with only \$1,000,000 local contribution. The Oswego River project is embraced in the bill just as recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The principal project is the Syracuse project. It will be kept in mind that this project is constructed under the provisions of the act of 1936, as amended, with respect to channelization in the pending bill. Lands for reservoir sites are paid for by the Federal Government. The yardstick that is applicable therefore to the Syracuse project is the general yardstick that is applicable to all flood-control projects in the United States. The local interests are required to furnish the lands for channelization, for bridge alterations, and highway relocations where there is channelization. For 2 years, from 1938 to 1940, as a

result of a provision in the act of 1938, a great deal of channelization was done at Federal expense. Such was not the intent of Congress and the present bill amends, as I have already stated, the act of 1938 to eliminate channelization at Federal cost and restore the provisions of the act of 1936 applicable to channelization.

The projects in the Oswego River watershed are local in their nature. As stated by the Chief of Engineers there is no general flood problem in the Oswego River Basin requiring comprehensive measures for flood control. There are a number of independent problems where measures providing for protection have been considered. There are eight localities. As stated by the Chief of Engineers the benefits from the projects are largely local in character and would accrue within a limited area. The committee, therefore, followed the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the provisions for local contribution in the Oswego project are on all fours with similar projects in other regions of the United States. I may add that as stated by the Chief of Engineers and as stated by the President of the United States before he transmitted the report to Congress, properties in Syracuse will be greatly enhanced in value as a result of the construction. The local contribution is about 20 percent, or one-fifth of the Federal cost. I repeat that it is on all fours with channelization and reservoir projects elsewhere. The same yardstick applies.

Lower Mississippi River

The act of May 15, 1928, authorized the plan of the Army engineers for flood control in the lower Mississippi River. The project was divided into three sections—the northern, from Cape Girardeau to the Arkansas River; the middle, from the Arkansas River to the Red River; and the southern, from the Red River to the Head of the Passes. The project has been practically completed in the northern section and there are no difficulties in the southern section.

In the middle section the adopted project provided for a diversion, without compensation to the landowners, through the Boeuf Basin. The act of June 15, 1936, substituted the Eudora diversion and extension for the Boeuf diversion, and this act was amended by the act of June 28, 1938, to provide for compensation for flowage rights in the Eudora diversion.

As a result of cut-offs in the middle section of the river, which is 370 miles, the river has been shortened between the Arkansas and the Red Rivers 137 miles. It is now well established that the work which has been done on the main river between the Arkansas and the Red has greatly increased its flood-carrying capacity and as a consequence has reduced the height of flood lines of all floods confined between the main levees.

The States of Louisiana and Arkansas, in which the Boeuf and Eudora diversions are located, always protested against the construction of these diversions, and as a result of their opposition the diversions have not been constructed. It is maintained that such diversions are no longer

necessary in view of the reduced heights resulting from the cut-offs. The State of Mississippi, on the other hand, maintained that while cut-offs are beneficial, they have not been tested by a major flood between the Arkansas and the Red, and they advocated diversions to supplement levees. Pending a major flood, Mississippi further advocated protection against the maximum flood while cut-offs were being tested by major floods.

The lower Mississippi River project is under the direct supervision of the Mississippi River Commission, subject to the general supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

The Chief of Engineers was requested by the Flood Control Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate to review the adopted project in the Flood Control Act of 1928, as amended, in the lower Mississippi River, and on March 7, 1941, a review report was submitted by the Mississippi River Commission to the Chief of Engineers and it is contained in the hearings. This report was in response to resolutions adopted according to law.

In submitting the report it was emphasized that no modification of the existing project, which does not safeguard the interests of navigation, was considered. It was pointed out that a larger tonnage was carried on the Mississippi River than at any time since the halcyon days before the advent of the railroads.

It was further stated in the review report that if cut-offs had existed in 1928, serious consideration would probably have been given to confining floods between main line levees.

The report submitted three alternatives for protection against the project flood. A fourth, or interim plan, was suggested which provided for higher levees on the east bank to give to the east bank the protection that would have been accorded to it in the event the diversions on the west bank had been constructed. The differential on the east bank would have protected a densely populated area, including the city of Greenville. The very heart of the Mississippi Delta lies opposite the mouth of the Arkansas and White Rivers. Because of its location, populations, improvements, and topography a higher levee on the east bank is justified.

The committee, therefore, followed the review report and adopted alternative plan 4 which provides for levees only except that provision is made for a 3-foot freeboard on the east bank of the Mississippi River from the Coahoma-Bolivar County line to Vicksburg, thus preserving to the east bank whatever superiority in topography and in grade it is entitled to and at the same time the project protects both banks against the project or largest predicted flood.

The bill contains no authorization for any appropriation for the main Mississippi River. Backwater area projects are authorized for the Yazoo and for the Red Rivers. A similar project was authorized for the backwater area of the White River in 1936.

Provision is made for the Federal Government paying the costs of setback levees and the recommendation of the

report respecting maintenance was followed by the committee and hereafter, as provided by the bill, maintenance shall not be considered as reducing present remaining balances of authorizations.

The projects authorized in the bill aggregate \$254,890,100 but inasmuch as the costs in a number of cases are estimated the committee included an authorization for \$260,000,000.

Projects are authorized in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, in the southeastern section of the United States; along the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, along the Arkansas, the White, the Ouachita, the Little Missouri, the Tennessee, the Mobile, along rivers in Texas that flow into the Gulf, along rivers in the Rocky Mountain regions, including the Denver, Colo., area, in the Los Angeles area, along the Sacramento and the San Joaquin, along the Willamette River, and in the Pacific Northwest. Projects are authorized, therefore, in the principal drainage basins of the United States.

I should like to point out that the projects authorized and the reports included in the pending bill are described in the comprehensive report of the committee on flood control and I suggest that all interested read the report in connection with the bill.

Section 4. Preliminary examinations and surveys

Section 4 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to cause preliminary examinations and surveys at the localities designated in the section. Probably more Members of Congress are interested in this section than in any other section of the bill. Members introduce bills to provide for preliminary examinations and surveys. Reports are requested as to whether such surveys are advisable. All streams on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted favorable reports for preliminary examinations and surveys are included in this section.

Members ask about projects in which they are particularly interested. I recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative WALTER, has been interested in a project to project the city of Bethlehem. No report has been submitted to the committee covering this project.

I recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative PAT BOLAND, has been in frequent contact with the committee respecting a project for the protection of the city of Scranton, Pa. In the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and again by special bill on June 25, 1936, the Lackawanna River was to be investigated and surveyed, but in the act of 1936 the Susquehanna River in New York and Pennsylvania, and the Susquehanna River by three descriptions in that act alone was ordered to be studied and reported on.

The Lackawanna River is a tributary of the Susquehanna. The President of the United States has insisted that a river system shall be studied as a whole, and that reports shall cover the entire river system. The National Resources Board is on record as favoring comprehensive reports covering entire river basins. No report has been submitted on the Lack-

awanna because it is a part of the Susquehanna River system, and in accordance with the policy announced by the President, individual tributary rivers will not be considered where reports have been requested on comprehensive river systems. The committee, therefore, was unable to report a project in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BOLAND, was interested because no report had been submitted on it.

Section 5. Emergency fund

This is a new section. It has not occurred in any previous flood bill. It provides for emergency repair and maintenance work in flood. This is an important provision.

Section 6. Extension of certain river and harbor laws to flood-control work

Section 6 provides for the application to flood-control work of certain existing laws for river and harbor work pertaining to the inclusion of lands, right of entry to land, and manner of determining just compensation for lands required for authorized flood-control projects, and for the disposal of lands no longer needed for such work.

Section 7. Extension of law affecting the Department of Agriculture

This is a clarifying provision. It extends the authority of section 5 of the act of June 28, 1938, to all funds heretofore appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement.

Section 8. Total authorization in bill and maintenance

Section 8 authorizes \$260,000,000 for appropriations. It authorizes \$10,000,000 for examinations and surveys. It authorizes \$5,000,000 to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture in carrying on works of improvement. It also authorizes appropriations necessary for the operation and maintenance of flood-control works to be operated and maintained by the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this flood-control bill was reported unanimously to the House by the Committee on Flood Control after very exhaustive hearings. We heard witnesses from practically every section of the United States—local people, engineers representing flood-control boards and levee districts, and citizens of all types who were interested in the measure. Every section of the country was given consideration. I do not believe that for many years there has been a bill for public improvements prepared with the care that has been given to the present measure. This bill is a flood-control bill in the full sense of the word, but some projects carry possible future hydroelectric developments. The bill has a distinct national-defense character in the protection of industrial areas from floods.

I want to compliment the chairman of the committee for the care with which he studies these projects. He is a student of the flood problems in every section of the country. He is extremely conscientious. He consults with the Corps of Engineers daily during the hearings,

and he is unbiased in his opinions. In my judgment, this bill should pass by a unanimous vote of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I add my word of appreciation to those that have already been said in behalf of the chairman of this committee. I have appeared before a great many committees in the course of my congressional experience, but I can truthfully and honestly say that I never was more courteously treated, nor could the witnesses I brought forward have been more courteously treated than they were by the present chairman of the Flood Control Committee. This is entirely irrespective of the fact that the projects in which I am interested have been favorably considered by the committee. It is purely academic in complimenting the chairman of the committee for the efficient manner in which he serves the House, and as well for the courteous fashion in which he treats the witnesses who appear before the committee.

The problems that are of interest to me are two, that of the Connecticut River which appears on page 4 of the bill, and the Hudson River Basin which includes the Hoosic River, and appears on page 5. I think the best authority for the inclusion of these projects in the present bill is given by the House report where it refers to both projects as being deserving of the consideration of the Congress and also as contributing to national defense.

Proof of the need of the Connecticut River project is the experience over the period of the past few years along this river and its tributaries. The city of Holyoke is one of the largest industrial cities in the country so far as concentration of manufacturing is concerned. I do not mean it is the largest in size, but I mean it has great concentration of industrial production. The mayor of the city of Holyoke appeared before the committee and I think the picture he presented at the last hearing is still in the hearing room of the committee. This river is practically one continuous paper mill throughout the entire length of the section where the retaining wall is needed to protect these industries. One of the large businessmen of the city who appeared as a witness, testified that one mill had bought \$1,000,000 worth of cotton to be used in the production of national-defense contracts, but that they were obliged to hire space in the upper part of the city to store this cotton, so afraid were they of a repetition of the floods that have come down through the Connecticut Valley over a period of years. There was a tremendous flood there in 1936, and the legislation of that year covered the conditions that resulted from the high water of that time, the highest water they had up to that time ever known. Two years later, in 1938, an even greater flood descended on them, a flood that destroyed millions of dollars' worth of property. There is testimony to the effect that the floods of 1927 and 1936 caused direct damage of \$60,000,000

in that particular area. So it is not a matter of conjecture as to the danger existing in the minds of the business people of that area.

Further than that, in Holyoke one part of this project has been finished, but it so happens that from an engineering standpoint the completion of that project makes the possible damage to the city greater than if nothing had ever been done. I believe the chairman of the committee will confirm this statement. This places an additional obligation on the Federal Government to carry out its original project. I therefore urge very strongly the inclusion of this item in the bill. Witnesses have appeared before the congressional committee on two different occasions. Engineers have all reported favorably as to the need of it, and I call it to the attention of the House at this time for inclusion in this bill.

Now, a word in relation to the Hoosic River. The bill follows the recommendations of the Army engineers in House Document 182 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and authorizes an appropriation of \$2,178,000.

Flood damages in the past have occurred along the Hoosic River on an average of once in every 3 to 5 years. Until the 1927 flood, however, such damages had not been of sufficient magnitude to arouse the communities to concerted action in the matter of flood protection. With a disastrous flood in 1936 and another of even greater violence in 1938, the entire Hoosic River Valley became intensely interested in such protection.

The tributary area of the Hoosic River is mountainous in character, with steep slopes from the mountain ridges to the relatively narrow valleys below. In the section in which I am especially interested the valley is not over 2 miles wide and the mountain grades are steep, so that when the floods come the force of water is terrific and the resulting damage to property beyond description.

In my district the Hoosic River runs through the industrial communities of Adams and North Adams. The industries and a large portion of the employees are housed in the narrow confines of the valley, so that both groups suffer the full force of the floodwaters. The mills and factories in these communities are working night and day on defense contracts. The communities themselves, with such aid as the State has been able to give, have done what they could, but the problem is of such magnitude that only the Federal Government can provide the necessary protection.

Therefore I join with the members of the Flood Control Committee, especially as regards my particular interest in this bill, in hoping that a unanimous agreement of the House will be reached and a unanimous vote will be cast this afternoon for this very meritorious measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to speak at any length in regard to this bill, perhaps not the full 5 minutes which have been allotted me.

I, like others who have served on more than one committee of the House, find myself in an awkward position in comparing the work of the chairman of the Flood Control Committee with the work of chairmen of other committees. I do not believe it is an overstatement of the fact to say that in the gentleman from Mississippi, Judge WHITTINGTON, the Flood Control Committee has one of the finest men in charge of a committee it is possible for Congress to produce. I have served on this committee now for 5 years. I have never seen anything which looked like partisanship come into any discussions before the committee. As a presiding officer he is without equal.

So far as the flood-control program is concerned, it has developed to a point where we are discussing not only flood control, as we did 5 years ago, but the multiple use of water in our various streams. We find that we are not only obtaining benefits for our citizens by spending money on flood-control measures, saving them from losses which they have been incurring from great floods over many years, but we are also securing actual dividends from the use of water for purposes for which it is needed. This includes navigation, to which the chairman referred. Today our rivers are coming back to a point where they carry more traffic than they did in the days of the steamboat and before the railroads supplanted the steamboats. Likewise we find that by joining our flood-control dams with hydroelectric power we are able to produce power for the citizens of these different valleys at a cheaper rate than it is possible for the utilities to provide similar electricity from steam-generated plants. That is true in the Connecticut Valley today.

In the valley of the Connecticut during two floods alone, in 1927 and in 1936, the direct losses were \$60,000,000 and the direct plus the indirect losses \$120,000,000, which is in excess of the total amount of money to be expended for flood control in that valley. Since 1936 we have had an equally great flood, and the worst of all time. That was in 1938.

The result will be that when the entire system is completed seven cities and towns will be absolutely protected from any possible flood that has been envisaged by the Army engineers and the reservoirs to be constructed will take about 8½ feet off the crest of any flood which they have planned for. This being so, we find that with the ability to control all this high water, the smaller towns where the farming is done and where it is not possible to protect them with local works, will probably suffer no losses in the future from springtime freshets and will be safe from all floods other than extraordinary ones.

I am sure that the people of the Connecticut Valley feel that the Congress in this flood-control bill and in other bills which have gone before it is doing a wonderful piece of work for the whole of the United States. In addition to the Connecticut River we find for the first time in this bill the Thames River. When this project is carried out four reservoirs will be built in Massachusetts and three in Connecticut.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as he may desire.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill has been very carefully worked out, and I join with the chairman in urging the House to adopt it by a unanimous vote. I would be violating my own conscience if I did not take a moment to pay tribute to the fine work of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], the chairman of our committee. The manner in which he conducts the work of his committee, his fairness, his knowledge of the problems involved, his patience, and the thoroughness he displays in undertaking a problem is most gratifying to all of us.

I would also like to compliment the Corps of Army Engineers for their work in flood control. They are both dependable and successful. Their cooperation with the committee has been most helpful.

For the purpose of the RECORD I wish to speak on the part of this flood-control bill, H. R. 4911, that deals with the territory which I represent. This bill carries an authorization for an appropriation of \$7,000,000 for initial work on the Republican River, this being a part of the Missouri River Basin. The particular language which I refer to is as follows:

Including the project for the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River, Nebr., recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 842, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and such other supplemental flood works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

It is not my purpose to reiterate all of the flood damages that have been suffered in the Republican Valley in recent years. Very frequently flash floods occur in that watershed, and do a great deal of damage. The greatest flood from the standpoint of the loss of human life, occurred in 1935. During that flood, 112 Nebraskans lost their lives. Great damages were sustained by farm land, buildings, roads, bridges, railroads, livestock, farm machinery and everything that came within the path of that great flood. Since that time, there have been several devastating floods in the Republican watershed of Nebraska and Kansas. Only a few weeks ago, following heavy rains over a wide territory, the river again went out of its banks. In those tributaries of the Republican which experienced these recent heavy rains, damages to farm lands surpassed those of 1935 for specific localities. Likewise, numerous tributaries during 1940 witnessed more extensive damages than in 1935. So the 1935 flood can be used as a barometer only insofar as the loss of lives far surpassed other periods of high water.

These floods have been one of the major factors in the loss of the top soil in this area. The problem has been neglected for so long, that the soil situation is serious and an investment in flood control for this basin would pay dividends in many ways. It not only protects life and property from the ravages of high water, but it conserves the soil, and impounds the water to be used on the parched land in the dry periods which always follow.

The testimony from the Office of the Chief of Engineers described the flood problem in the Republican Basin as twofold. It involves impounding the water and protecting the lower valley from great floods, particularly the area around Kansas City. The second portion of the problem is local protection for the upper Republican River and its tributaries. The language quoted above from the bill was intended to meet that two-fold problem. It calls for: First, the construction of an on-river dam at Republican City, Nebr., sometimes known as the Harlan County Reservoir, and second "such other supplemental flood-control works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable."

The 1938 flood-control bill authorized an on-river dam near Milford, Kans., for the protection of the Kansas City area. House Document 842, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, recommends the Harlan County Reservoir instead of the Milford, Kans., dam. H. R. 4911 authorizes this change. This will bring the benefits of flood control to four Nebraska counties, considerable territory in Kansas, and at the same time result in practically the same amount of protection to the Kansas City area as would the Milford, Kans., dam. The site for the reservoir in Harlan County is claimed superior by the Engineer Corps, and the storage costs would be less.

In the report filed by the committee, and accompanying this bill, we find the following statement concerning the necessity for the early construction of the Harlan County Dam:

Destructive flooding is a constant threat to farm lands and urban property in the Republican, Kansas, and Missouri River Valleys. The flood danger to 154,000 acres in the Republican River Valley would be completely removed by the construction of the Harlan County Reservoir on that river, 236 miles above its mouth. In addition, this reservoir, together with two other reservoirs in the Kansas River Basin—the Kanopolis Reservoir, now under construction, and the proposed Tuttle Creek Reservoir—would provide partial protection for agricultural lands in the Kansas and Missouri River Basins, and would enhance flood protection at such important municipalities as Topeka and the Kansas Cities, where the design of local protection works now under construction is predicated on the eventual construction of upstream reservoirs. Many industries and facilities vital to the national defense lie within the area to be protected. Improvements for flood control would be beneficial to—Substantial portions of the military reservation and all of the Air Corps flying field at Fort Riley, Kans.; to two airports at the Kansas Cities; to defense training schools; to a large assembly plant for military aircraft, now under construction near Kansas City; to the stockyards and packing plants and the major portion of the grain-storage and flour-milling facilities at the Kansas Cities; and to the important transportation network at the Kansas Cities and in the Kansas and Missouri River Valleys.

The Harlan County Dam should be built as soon as possible.

It has been the opinion of the Army engineers that complete flood protection to the lower portion of the basin could not be obtained without an on-river reservoir on the Republican River. If a reservoir were built at Milford, Kans., it

would give protection to industrial Kansas City, but not to anyone upstream. The engineers believe that the Harlan County Dam is the point farthest west that they could go for an on-river reservoir which would at the same time give full protection to the lower basin as would the Milford Reservoir. The very favorable ratio of benefits to costs for a large on-river dam exists because of the protection it gives to the more expensive industrial properties of Kansas City.

The engineering details for flood protection for the upper Republican River and its tributaries have yet to be worked out by the Army engineers. This upper territory has suffered each year from floods. In the 1935 flood, previously mentioned, most of the lives were lost in this upper portion of the basin. The loss of land, crops, soil erosion, and other problems in the upper basin likewise has been very heavy throughout the years.

While it is true that other agencies may bring some flood protection to the upper basin, the work of the Army engineers will not be completed until they extend flood protection to the entire valley. It is hoped that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture will, before long, contribute to the solution of the flood problems in the upper portion, but the task of the Army engineers is not completed until flood protection is given to the entire Republican watershed. The language of this bill establishes such a policy and conforms to the twofold idea of the problem as expressed by the Office of the Chief of Army Engineers. That is why the language has been used—

In addition to the Harlan County Reservoir such other supplemental flood-control works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

I am told that the district engineer at Kansas City has advised Nebraska State officials, as well as residents of the upper watershed above Republican City, that the Engineer Corps can find feasible the construction of an on-river dam as well as a number of tributary dams, with the benefits from such construction equaling estimated costs. The corps is now at work studying flood-protection needs of the entire watershed. The Army has been directed to harmonize its studies and conclusions with those of the Bureau of Reclamation so that ultimate construction would provide joint flood control and irrigation. Only through such a program can the agricultural economy of this entire valley be restored and stabilized.

Residents of the upper valley are cognizant of the necessity for flood control at Kansas City because of national-defense industries located there, and so are perfectly agreeable to the construction of an on-river dam at Republican City for that purpose. However, they will continue to demand that all feasible flood control be provided to meet their most pressing needs upstream. For this reason, it seems essential that the Engineer Corps bring forth as quickly as possible a program of flood control for the entire watershed, to make habitable once again those equally rich upstream farm areas.

Mr. Chairman, the earth's surface is limited. At the present time, and

throughout the ages, nations have fought expensive wars to gain rich, fertile land. We are not true to our highest responsibilities until we have done everything that we can to conserve the water and soil of America. It is an established policy of our Republic. I think it is rightly so. On July 1, 1854, Abraham Lincoln said:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacity. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House is, in my opinion, the best flood-control bill that has been presented to Congress since I have been a Member of this body. The committee has worked long and diligently. In fact, this bill is the result of the hearings for 2 years. Last year we held hearings for about 3 weeks and, as you know, we did not report out a bill. This year we held additional hearings for 3 or 4 weeks and I can therefore assure the Members of the House that every item in this bill has been most carefully considered. I hope that the bill will receive the united support of the membership.

When I came to Congress, I inherited a tremendous flood-control problem for Louisiana. Some years ago Congress provided for overland floodways to accommodate the excessive waters on the Mississippi River. This Congress has heard before of the Eudora floodway. When I came here, I came determined to do my best to free Louisiana from the blight of this floodway. To me, it seemed a terrible thing to destroy nearly a million acres of the finest land in the Mississippi River Valley by converting it into a sort of river. It was unfortunate that the interests of the great States of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana did not harmonize on this question. The overland floodway through a portion of Arkansas and Louisiana gave protection to our sister State of Mississippi but it created a very bad situation for Louisiana. We have sought repeatedly to solve that problem. We wanted to do justice by each State. This bill does not give us exactly what we had asked, but it is the nearest possible approach to it. This bill, insofar as this particular flood-control problem is concerned, is somewhat of a compromise, but I want to say that this bill puts Louisiana in the very best position it has ever been in in its entire history. The bill eliminates entirely the Eudora floodway. The people in the Delta section of Louisiana can therefore have more peace than ever before. They get protection from floods and that is what they want. Mr. Chairman, this is therefore a happy moment for me when I can stand in this House and see the culmination of my efforts to get rid of the Eudora floodway. Chairman WHITTINGTON, Senator OVERTON, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], have cooperated with me in these

matters, and I am happy that our efforts have borne fruit.

Not only does this bill eliminate the Eudora floodway, but it gives the great Red River backwater area protection equal to the Yazoo River backwater area on the Mississippi side. This means that the Red River backwater area will have far greater protection than ever before. There are other projects in Grant and Rapides Parishes on Red River included in this bill which will be of great benefit to the people. There are still other projects, particularly on Red River, which we have not been able to include in the bill in the House because the reports of the Board of Engineers have not been officially submitted to Congress, but I hope that these reports will be received in time to include them when the bill reaches the Senate.

While I have spoken of the great problem which we have had in the lower Mississippi River region, I wish it understood that I am also interested in the flood-control problems of the entire Nation. I have been happy to cooperate with my colleagues from other sections. Flood control long ago became a national problem, and this committee so views it. At our recent hearings we considered the problem at length from a national-defense standpoint. We held exhaustive hearings on dams and reservoirs for power for the future development of strategic minerals. You will find in the hearings some very worth-while information on this phase.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to express by appreciation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who is the very capable chairman of this committee, and to all the other members of the committee for their cooperation and help, and I sincerely hope that every Member of this House will vote for this very fine flood-control bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate what I said awhile ago when I interrupted the chairman about my sincere appreciation for the splendid manner in which he conducts his committee. It is a pleasure to serve on it for that reason.

I also wish to say that the passage of this bill means a very great deal to the section of the country from which I come, a section where we have 3,000,000 people in an area approximately 40 miles by 50 miles in area. Practically all of those people are subject to danger from floods that come to us without more than sometimes a couple of hours' notice. In this bill there is included the approval by the Congress of what is known as House Document No. 838, which is a new and revised plan of the Corps of Engineers for flood control in the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River Basins. That plan will, we believe, when consummated give us a real program of flood control in our area.

I should also like to say that our county, the county of Los Angeles, has already expended of its own funds in excess of \$100,000,000 for flood-control purposes,

and it certainly intends to continue to carry its end of the load and also to cooperate fully with the Federal program.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe that the gentleman had the honor of introducing the bill which became the act of June 22, 1936, and that, as a distinguished member of the Committee on Flood Control, who is always looking out for the interest of our joint section of the country, he is familiar with the bill H. R. 4348, which I introduced, the purpose of which was to effectuate the act of June 22, 1936.

I understand that section 7 of the bill carries certain funds for the purposes of the act of June 22, 1936. Would the gentleman kindly state what the total authorization will be for the purposes of the Department of Agriculture when this bill is passed?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman for what he said in his question. I may say that the act of June 22, 1936, was the regular flood-control bill of that year. It is true there was another short bill introduced to set up upstream flood-control work by the Department of Agriculture, and that was included in the general act. Naturally, the gentleman and myself are both deeply interested in that upstream flood-control work because in our section water conservation is quite as important as flood control. We want to conserve as much water as we can and throw it underground.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe it was hoped by the Department that H. R. 4348 would be included as a section in this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman that in this bill we have appropriated an additional \$5,000,000 for the upstream work of the Department of Agriculture. The chairman will correct me if I am in error in saying that that means a total appropriation available to the Department of approximately \$19,000,000 up to date.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct, and it is fair to say also that this is primarily a flood-control bill and that the Congress of the United States appropriated approximately \$20,000,000 in the agricultural appropriation bill for soil conservation. I may also say that I feel sure the Department of Agriculture feels that we have done as well as we could for them in this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman be interested in the language contained in H. R. 4348 for future purposes?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am always interested in any language in any bill about flood control or soil conservation, but this language here is pretty carefully studied out. I am always glad to look further into the matter of which the gentleman speaks, but I may say that we heard the Department of Agriculture and consulted with them with respect to this authorization.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe that those are the only things I feel com-

elled to say right now about this bill. I should like to add my word to those of the others who have spoken to the effect that I hope very earnestly that it will pass the House without dissent. I am certain that as we look forward to the future, to the time when, as we all hope and pray, the present international crisis will be over, it is most important that there be prior to that time studied out by us all, in the most careful way possible, various means of seeing to it that unemployment and things of that kind do not result. I believe this bill is a contribution to that end.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill to be the most equitable flood-control legislation that has been presented to the House since the great flood of 1927. The bill is not perfect; it is not all that some of us had worked for; but it is much better than previous flood-control bills. We believe it should be unanimously passed by the House.

On April 21, 1927, a portion of the district of which I have the honor to represent, suffered the most tremendous and devastating flood recorded in history. The flood of that year in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River took a toll of something like 200 lives, rendered approximately 700,000 people homeless for approximately 1 month, and inflicted property damage estimated to be upward of \$200,000,000. Since 1927, we have been wanting flood control within the levee walls of the Mississippi River, but nothing has been done by Congress during all of these years to accomplish this desire on the part of our splendid citizens. It is commonly known that flood control in this section of the Mississippi River is the greatest problem of its kind in all the world. General Tyler, before our Flood Control Committee hearings this year, testified, in part, as follows:

It is well known that flood control in the alluvial valley of the Lower Mississippi River is the greatest problem of its kind in all the world. For over 50 years, or perhaps 100 years, progress on that plan has been continuous until the protection now afforded is good, better than anybody 25 years ago thought it would be.

After the devastating flood of 1927 the only request our citizens made of the United States was that our National Government give us a fair assurance that the calamity of 1927 would not again occur.

On May 15, 1928, the Congress of the United States recognized and accepted national responsibility for flood control on the main stem or channel of the Mississippi River throughout its alluvial valley, and adopted the Jadwin plan, as set forth in House Document No. 90, Seventieth Congress. The Jadwin plan, among other things, provided for a diversion from the main channel of destructive floodwaters in excess of the carrying capacity of the then existing levees, the most important of which diversion was the Boeuf floodway in the critical

middle section of the river lying immediately south of the mouth of the Arkansas River and flowing through southeastern Arkansas into Louisiana designated to carry approximately 100,000,000 cubic second-feet of water, six times the volume of water flowing normally over the Niagara Falls.

The property owners of that area upon the passage of the act, assumed that it was necessary for the floodway to be constructed in order to give the maximum levee benefits possible to the greatest area affected by the floods, and while they did not desire to sell their property and very greatly hoped for adequate flood control, they felt that under the guaranty contained in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States that "private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation," they were entitled to equal levee protection for just compensation for their property. They were willing for the authorities to determine which should be done: First, levee protection; second, compensation for property, caused by the floodway. I think it can be said that the property owners accepted the decision at that time of Congress, that the sacrifice of their property in the Boeuf floodway was necessary in order to protect the remainder of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, and, of course, assumed that they would receive fair and reasonable compensation for their property.

To this end a test suit to collect reasonable compensation for their property was prosecuted through the Supreme Court of the United States under the style of Mrs. Julia Caroline Sponenbarger against United States, and the Court's decision was to the effect that they were not entitled to compensation. Hence, if they are not entitled to compensation, they now take the position that they are entitled to equal levee protection with their neighbors to the north, south, and east of the Mississippi River, such levee protection now being possible according to the testimony and reports of our Army engineers.

In the report of the Army engineers, contained in Document No. 90, several suggestions for the control of the floodwaters of the Mississippi River were made. They have been very efficient in their work and have secured the maximum benefits from several of the methods suggested in House Document No. 90 to reduce the flood hazards of the Mississippi River. Some of the methods are as follows:

- First. Dredging the river annually.
- Second. Side channels.
- Third. Set-back levees.
- Fourth. Straightening river channel.
- Fifth. Clearing between levees.
- Sixth. Forestry work.
- Seventh. A multiplicity of other minor suggestions.

On page 18 of the Commission's report, further to illustrate how successful the efforts of our Army engineers have been in the operation of several methods of flood control, as above mentioned, we find that the Mississippi River has been shortened between the mouth of the White River and the lower end of the Glasscock cut-off approximately 137

miles. This was done by straightening the river channel. It is well established that the Army engineers have very greatly increased the flood-carrying capacity of the Mississippi River through the other methods mentioned above, and as a consequence have very greatly reduced the height of crest-flow lines of all floods confined between front-line levees.

General Tyler further testified before our Flood Control Committee as follows:

In 1928, when the existing project was laid down to include a west-side overland floodway in the middle section, the capacity of the main river leveed channel was estimated at about 1,950,000 cubic feet per second, and the capacity of the floodway at about 1,250,000 cubic feet per second. The capacity of the main river leveed channel at Arkansas City is now about 2,600,000 cubic feet per second. Had these conditions existed in 1928 serious consideration quite probably would have been given to confining the project flood between the main levees, for to do so would not have involved such substantial increases in levee heights as were then estimated.

The report of the Mississippi River Commission contained, among other things, the following statement:

Had the flow conditions of today existed in 1928, consideration also would quite probably have been given then to a west-side floodway of less capacity than the one recommended and adopted.

These accomplishments were recognized in 1936 when Document No. 1, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, was filed with the Congress covering the flood control of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River. This report was dated February 12, 1935, and the abandonment of the Boeuf floodway was recommended by the Chief of Engineers and a modified floodway provided, referred to then as the Eudora floodway. The Eudora floodway was a miniature floodway of the original Boeuf floodway. At that time, owing to the improvements which had been made by the Army engineers regarding the control of flood waters of the lower Mississippi River, it was considered advisable to have a small modified floodway, and that the modified floodway, in view of these improvements, would be ample in every respect to control any flood which could even be visioned in the future by the Army engineers.

Our engineers have continued their very fine work on flood control in this and other sections of the Mississippi River, and now on page 30 of the Report of the Mississippi River Commission, now before our committee, we find the following language:

Under existing conditions of the main river channel there are three physically feasible alternatives to the adopted plan which will afford protection equal to that contemplated by the existing project when it was adopted, and a fourth which will give protection equal to that afforded by levee and flood-wall projects on other rivers.

According to this, there are now five feasible plans presented to the Congress, and which the Flood Control Committee considered. The Engineers outlined those plans and said that either at this time would give adequate flood control, but that the plan to be selected is one of policy for the Congress of the United States, and not one involving a question

of engineering. The Report of the Mississippi River Commission sets out in full the five plans presented to the Flood Control Committee.

Prior to the presentation of the report of the Mississippi River Commission, as a member of the Flood Control Committee, I introduced H. R. 3064 in the House of Representatives, and Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, introduced S. 705 in the Senate. My bill was, and is, as follows:

A bill to amend the project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby amended so as to provide that the project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River existing at the present time in accordance with the provisions of said act is hereby modified, and as thus modified is hereby adopted, as follows:

Pending the completion of the ultimate plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized to make revisions in the grades and sections of the main line Mississippi levees on both the east and west banks and to adjust and equalize the unequal freeboards which now exist, or may hereafter develop. Between the latitude of the Arkansas River and a point at, or south of, Deer Park, La., revision, adjustment, and equalization shall be made so as to obtain net grades of existing front-line levees generally of such height above the computed crest-flow line of the project flood as the Chief of Engineers may deem advisable as affording reasonably safe protection against such project flood.

The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway, as well as the back-protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project, adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned.

The levee on the south side of the Arkansas River shall be enlarged in grade and section so as to afford, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, reasonably safe protection against the project flood of the Mississippi River.

From time to time additional protection against floods shall be given simultaneously to, and equitably distributed between, the Yazoo River backwater area and the Red River backwater area under such plans as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers.

The total authorizations heretofore for the flood-control project of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River shall not be increased by reason of any provision in this act, but any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made or authorized for said project may be expended upon any feature of the said project, notwithstanding any restrictions, limitations, or requirements of existing law.

The bill carries out plan No. 4 of the Mississippi River Commission.

Before the Flood Control Committee this year I exerted every possible effort to secure the approval of the Overton-Norrell bills. Each of these bills, as above stated, provides for the abolition of the floodways, construction of the levees on the Arkansas side to the 1940 grade and section, equal in height and strength to the levees on the opposite side of the river, giving fair and equal protection to both sides of the river.

The Mississippi River Commission reported that this could be done. General Tyler and his corps of assistants testified before the Flood Control Committee that such plan could be done. Engineers and a number of lay witnesses gave the same testimony. Testimony also before the Flood Control Committee was that under the law Mississippi levees now are from 3 to 6 feet higher than the levees on the Arkansas side in various places, and that under the law they have the flood protection of the floodways and fuse-plug area on the Arkansas side, and that the citizens of Mississippi very vigorously oppose the abolition of these existing differences between the east and west sides of the river.

After much testimony and extensive arguments the Flood Control Committee finally recommended the adoption of plan No. 4, which was the provision of the Overton-Norrell bills, with one modification, to wit: That the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River, south of Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan, shall have a 2-foot freeboard over the west side of the river in this area.

The Flood Control Committee rewrote this provision of my bill, and I quote in part from the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4911, which is the omnibus bill of 1941, from line 6 of page 10 to line 6 on page 11, having to do with this section of the Mississippi River, as follows:

The project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended by the act of August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby modified and, as modified, is hereby authorized and adopted, and the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The existing engineering plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is hereby modified so as to provide for the construction of plan 4 as set forth in the report of the Mississippi River Commission, dated March 7, 1941, to the Chief of Engineers, except that the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River south of the Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan shall have a three-foot freeboard over the project flood, and all levees shall be constructed with adequate section and foundation to conform to increase levee heights. The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway as well as the northward extension and the back protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned, and the provisions of said acts relating to the prosecution of work on said floodways and extensions are hereby repealed.

The actions of the Flood Control Committee in reporting this change in the law with reference to the Mississippi River is adequately supported by our Army engineers. I quote their testimony in part as follows:

Whatever may be the ultimate plan for the middle section, it is apparent that advantage should be taken of the opportunity to attain increased protection at small cost by bringing up to some common and higher grade the lesser levee freeboards that now intervene between reaches of maximum stage lowering. Not to do so is to fail to obtain the maximum possible return on a portion of the

present investment, for the maximum possible return on a portion of the present investment for the maximum freeboard is the controlling freeboard, and makes the contiguous higher freeboard of little avail.

Complete confinement of the project flood to the leveed channel of the main river throughout the middle section appears now to be physically practicable.

The Eudora and Boeuf floodways, insofar as they represent definite projects and locations, could be abandoned.

General Tyler has testified that No. 4 would give greater flood protection benefit to a wider territory than any of the other suggested plans. General Tyler and the other engineers, however, take the position that since they have advised Congress with reference to the engineering and financial feasibility of these several plans, and that either is now physically possible from an engineering standpoint, the plan actually to be inaugurated is a question for Congress to determine, as it is purely a matter of policy, and not an engineering question.

For approximately 14 years the citizens of the Boeuf and Eudora floodways have been subjected to the constant and continuous menace of the floodways, fuse-plug area, and differentials in existing levees from 3 to 6 feet in the floodway area. They have lived for approximately 14 years under the shadow of the fuse-plug levee that might at any unexpected time be used by the Government in diverting the destructive waters of the Mississippi River and consequently again, and in a most terrifying form, flood their lands as was done in 1927, when approximately 200 people lost their lives, 700,000 others were made homeless for approximately a month, and something like \$200,000,000 worth of property was destroyed. If the floodway is not necessary, they do not wish to live under the shadow of the act of Congress providing for the floodway. Their property has been constantly damaged by virtue of the provision of our statutes, insurance rates have been increased, loans cannot be secured, and normal development cannot be expected by that section of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi until the floodway is abolished, and they are given equal levee protection.

The adoption of the Overton-Norrell bill, even as amended herein by the committee, and placing in operation plan No. 4, as modified, will have the effect of restoring an empire on the west side of the river in Arkansas and Louisiana to its rightful position. It will remove the constant fear that has been upon them for 14 years, and the hazards and uncertainty under which they have lived, give the west side security, increase values, and permit a healthy, normal development.

They are desirous that these mandatory provisions be enacted by the Congress to divert the presently existing fuseplug levee in southeast Arkansas into a standard levee of 1940 grade and section, giving to all the property owners in the presently existing Boeuf and/or Eudora floodways adequate protection.

I have also been intensely interested in adequate levees on the south bank of the Arkansas River from Little Rock to

Pine Bluff, Ark., for the protection of one of our best agricultural areas and for the protection of other important enterprises.

Fortunately, we have succeeded in obtaining a favorable report and recommendations from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, after the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors had completed a thorough study of the matter over a period of several years. I and others who have been earnestly interested in flood control in this area were pleased to have this highly important recommendation.

Need for these levees is emphasized by the lengthy history of disastrous floods in the locality from Little Rock to Pine Bluff. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors found that "during the 66½-year period of record, flood stage has been equaled or exceeded 46 times in Little Rock." These floods occurred in an area where the property value has been set by Army engineers at \$2,375,310 and the annual farm income is estimated to be \$1,180,079 annually when not interfered with or damaged by floods. The vast extent of damages is not known. Estimates, however, that have been made reveal the desperate need for action by this Congress. Other than the destruction of crops, there has been with each flood tremendous damages to fences, farm houses, barns, and other outbuildings, farm implements and tools, drainage ditches, loss of livestock, damage to existing levees. These represent direct losses. Indirect losses include interruption of business and gainful occupation during and after a flood, interruption of traffic, evacuation and reoccupation of the flooded areas, the pollution of wells used for drinking water, the increased number of breeding places for mosquitoes, and the creator of other conditions adverse to human health and happiness. All of these conditions reveal the need for corrective legislation.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has made this recommendation:

Raising, strengthening, and extending of these levees to give complete protection against floods—at a cost fully warranted by the amount of direct damages prevented, the indirect damage that will be eliminated, the appreciation in the value of lands that can profitably be put to productive use, and the general, though intangible, benefits to a large number of people through the threat of frequent disruption of normal activity. The Board recommends that the levees along the south bank of Arkansas River, between Little Rock and Pine Bluff, Ark., be raised, strengthened, and extended generally in accordance with the plan contained in the report of the district engineer, at an estimated first cost of \$641,000.

The Flood Control Committee has presented the recommendations of the Army engineers in the pending bill to the House for consideration, and I sincerely hope that this feature of the bill is retained.

I appreciate the actions of our distinguished chairman in agreeing to plan No. 4, submitted by our Army engineers and modified by the committee as above stated. I appreciate the actions of the committee in voting the additional flood-

control protection for Arkansas. I very greatly appreciate the fine cooperation I have had from General Tyler, Major Reber, and other engineers from the War Department. They have all been very helpful. Of course, I deeply appreciate the efforts of citizens of Arkansas and Louisiana in coming to Washington and testifying with reference to the matter before our Flood Control Committee, and on behalf of them, I wish to express my appreciation to the membership of the House for the passage of the bill today, and I sincerely hope that it is passed in the Senate and approved by the President.

If it is finally enacted into law, I am advised by our Army engineers that it will constitute a very enormous saving to the Government and at the same time there will be expended in the building of the levees on the Arkansas and Louisiana side the sum of \$31,453,000—the sums of \$17,128,000 for work in Arkansas and \$14,325,000 in Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, last but not least, I desire to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS, who so ably represents Chicot County, for his very fine cooperation and outstanding service with reference to perfecting this plan before our Flood Control Committee. He has rendered every possible service. Also, I shall always be grateful for the outstanding service rendered by Senator OVERTON and Congressmen MILLS and ALLEN, of Louisiana, who never ceased to exert every possible effort for enactment of the proposals included in this measure.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, when the committee was holding hearings I appeared in opposition to any projects on the White River in Missouri and Arkansas which would provide for generation of power. My outstanding objection is that I am informed there is an abundance of surplus power now being generated on the Grand River project in Oklahoma that is available for the area that would be served by the White River projects.

It is true this bill only provides for one project—that at Norfolk—Table Rock and Bull Shoals being eliminated. The Norfolk project gets \$24,000,000, but let it be remembered if in the end the flood-control project is abandoned and it becomes a joint flood-control and power project the ultimate cost will be \$79,000,000 with \$25,000 annually for maintenance.

Until it is shown beyond question that a power project is actually needed in this section of the country I maintain it should not be authorized. The Grand River Dam is owned by the State of Oklahoma, and that State is willing and ready to furnish power at an extremely low rate.

One of the first votes I ever cast in this House was for the Sears amendment, which provided for reservoirs in connection with flood-control projects. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated, although some years after the view of the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Sears, was accepted and reservoirs

were authorized as a result of which floods have been eliminated in many parts of the country.

The Norfolk Reservoir is under way as the report shows, but provisions are made in this bill in the proviso at the bottom of page 3 for pen stocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power. They can be installed for future use in the development of hydroelectric power. This, however, must be approved by the Secretary of War, upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission. It is my purpose to appeal to the Secretary of War, as well as the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission, to make a complete survey to determine whether or not there is sufficient power in this area being generated at the present time to satisfy the needs of this part of Arkansas and Missouri.

As the report clearly indicates, this is an undeveloped section of the country. True, it is supposed to be rich in minerals as well as raw materials. The report further shows that it is a nonindustrial region. We should be extremely careful in providing for the expenditure of such a tremendous amount of money on a hydroelectric project if there will be no demand for the power generated.

Some would lead you to believe that the people of this section of the country are unanimous in favoring this project, but my mail clearly indicates that this is not the case. The conservationists are especially very active in their opposition.

I realize the futility of endeavoring to defeat this provision in the bill, but, nevertheless, no matter if I am alone in my opposition, I am opposed to it until, as I said before, it is clearly demonstrated it is the only way that power can be secured for this area.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me time to call to the attention of the House again the condition that exists in the Mahoning Valley, Ohio. I hope this bill will correct the situation that now exists there.

For the past 15 or 20 years we have been visited by floods in that valley and work has had to stop in the steel plants. We not only suffer in the wintertime but I would also like to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that out in that valley there are 75,000 men working on national defense. Three weeks ago we had a statement in the press and also by the United States Engineers that there was just enough water to run the steel plants 60 days. Can you imagine 75,000 people working on national defense, producing one-tenth of the steel manufactured in the United States, in that valley with only enough water to run 60 days?

In addition to this, in the summertime the flow of that stream falls from 50,000,000 gallons to 30,000,000 gallons and the steel plants alone use 800,000,000 gallons. Under normal conditions there are 40,000,000 gallons of that 50,000,000-gallon stream of untreated sewage and the

people of Warren, Ohio, drink that water. That is one reason the people of this Nation are known as wonder people—they can drink that sewage and still live.

I am now asking that this bill be passed because, as I repeat, just this week and every week we are losing 25,000 tons of steel in that valley, and yet the O. P. M. is asking that we build steel plants or expand them to the extent of one-half billion dollars.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What does this bill do to correct this terrible situation?

Mr. KIRWAN. It authorizes the construction of a dam at a cost of \$7,000,000.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is a very fine thing to do.

Mr. KIRWAN. I may say that I am thankful for this opportunity to tell about the conditions in that valley with respect to the school children and all of the people out there who have to drink this water.

I do not know that I ought to state this on the floor, but it was only 2 weeks ago that the Republic Steel Corporation cut into a sewer known as the Red Creek sewer, and that is all that kept the Republic plant going. If that is the kind of national defense we have got to depend on, God help this country.

For these reasons I am thankful for anything that can be done to pass this measure.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say for the benefit of some of the younger Members of the Congress who have been praising the chairman of the committee so highly, as well as the work of the committee, when the chairman and I came to this Congress—and we came the same year—I do not know whether the Flood Control Committee had then been established or not, but, anyway, at that time it was a very small committee and was fighting for its life. The dignity to which this committee has risen since then is due largely to the work of the chairman.

As I look back over the years since he and I have been here, the gentleman from Mississippi representing flood control for his side of the aisle and I, in my humble way, trying to represent our side, much progress has come to the cause of flood control. The gentleman represented the great Mississippi Valley and I represented the Ohio Valley. I am willing to accord to him the most of the credit, yet together we, with the assistance of many other stalwart friends of this great plan to save the lives and property of those who lived in the great river valleys of the country, are glad to feel our work was not in vain.

In the short time I have remaining I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can tell me how the \$45,000,000 that goes to the Ohio Valley is going to be spent. I find nothing in the report to give me this definite information.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As the gentleman is aware, most of the money that has been appropriated for the Ohio Valley for reservoirs has been spent above Pittsburgh. There are many reservoirs that are available, and they are selected in the order of their priority by the Chief of Engineers, but, to answer the gentleman's question specifically, it is my thought that for the further protection of the populous area of Pittsburgh, the Connamango Reservoir, the Berlin Reservoir, in the gentleman's State, and then a reservoir along the Miami River. This gives the information so far as the reservoirs are concerned.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Then the priorities that had previously been established have been followed. I am glad of that.

The Flood Control Committee owed its origin to the fact that there were some flood and water conditions that the Rivers and Harbors Committee could not handle in the most advantageous way. For a long time after the establishment of a Flood Control Committee there was constant confusion between that committee and the Rivers and Harbors Committee over matters of jurisdiction. Gradually these differences were ironed out and the Flood Control Committee came into its own. The great flood in the Mississippi Valley, I think in the year 1927, increased the stature of the Flood Control Committee mightily. That was the time when the President assigned to Mr. Hoover the task to bring relief to the devastated areas of the Mississippi Valley, especially in the Southern States.

Then the great flood of 1936 in Pittsburgh and the great flood of 1937 in the lower Ohio Valley came, and from this terrible calamity and devastation the Flood Control Committee received additional recognition and assumed an additional responsibility. I well remember the time when the chairman and I arranged a meeting with the President of the United States whereby and from which we worked out the plan for passing proper legislation to set up what is known as the Disaster Loan Corporation. This Corporation began to function immediately and did much good in the Ohio Valley section.

About that time also we contacted the President of the United States, and from this contact we were able to work out a proposition whereby legislation was passed providing for the construction of flood walls and flood protection for the various cities and communities along the Ohio River. This law was well drawn and provided for local contribution. I am proud to say that my home city of Ironton, Ohio, was the first community in the United States to qualify for flood-control assistance under that program. I am also proud to say that my home city of Ironton was the first in which any flood-control work under the new program was done. And likewise it was the first city for which a flood-control project has been completed. The community in which I live today is living safely behind flood walls constructed by the Army engineers according to the most modern methods. The people of my city are proud of this fact, and they are glad to

feel relief against the terrible danger and inconvenience and expense of floods such as formerly visited our community.

The fact that my home city was the first to qualify under this law and the first in which the full flood defense has been completed is due largely to the wisdom and efficiency of the city manager and city council and the city officials generally and due to the patriotism of the people in my city who were willing to come forward with a sufficient bond issue to guarantee the city's part of the program.

I am proud to have been one of the pioneers in flood-control legislation in Congress, and I rejoice today with all of you that we are having up for consideration before us a bill which from all indications will pass the House by unanimous vote. There is no appropriation in this bill for any community in my district. All the communities of my district that can qualify have done so. Nevertheless, I have not lost one bit of my zeal for adequate flood protection because those of us who live in the Ohio Valley know better probably than any other people in the Nation what big devastating floods mean to a community. I want every community that can qualify to have the benefits of flood protection [Applause.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, having served on the Flood Control Committee for 4 years, I could not let this opportunity go by without expressing my appreciation for the excellent work the committee has done. This is another illustration of the fine work that can be done and has been done under the direction of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. They always bring in a good bill, they always bring in a good report, and the measure has been presented in an excellent way here today.

I sincerely trust the Committee will pass this bill without opposition from anyone. The Army engineers have recommended these projects, they have been thoroughly studied, the committee has made an excellent report, and we have sections in the United States suffering from the effects of floods. Let us get these authorizations through, and let us try to take care of these various sections at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of this Flood Control Committee I pay tribute to the chairman. It was a revelation to me to learn of the knowledge that our chairman has of the different streams and rivers throughout the country. The work of the committee is very interesting, and as I am representing a district that has suffered for a great many years from floods, no doubt my interest was somewhat enhanced. I represent a district where 200,000 people have suffered from floods for many years, and I know that they will be very happy when they know that this bill has been reported favorably and passed, to realize that we can look forward to a time when the lives lost and the suffering endured because of floods in our district will be

eliminated. I especially pay my respects to the chairman of the committee and thank him for the manner in which the representatives from my district that appeared before the committee were received by him and by the committee.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the able and distinguished chairman of the committee with regard to the dam at Sugar Hill, N. H., it is not necessary for me to take much of the time of the House. It may seem curious to be objecting to a project for a dam in my own region, but I would like to point out that as far as concerns flood control in the upper Connecticut Valley it is not primarily for the benefit of the State of New Hampshire. The benefit is to the lower part of the valley, as described by the gentlemen from Massachusetts, for the protection of cities in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The State of New Hampshire is very glad to cooperate in such a matter, but it does want to have something to say about the location of dams when there is interference by them with local conditions.

It had been my intention to offer an amendment specifically omitting a reservoir at Sugar Hill, N. H., from the list of approved projects.

In the report of the committee, however, on page 8, I find the following language:

With the understanding that none of the funds authorized in this bill shall be used for the construction of the Sugar Hill Dam and Reservoir on the Ammonoosuc River in New Hampshire, the Flood Control Committee recommends the modification of the approved flood-control plan for the Connecticut River in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. The committee by recent resolution has called upon the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and previous reports on the Connecticut River with the view of finding a substitute reservoir which can be built in the place of the Sugar Hill project.

The Bethlehem Junction Reservoir was authorized in the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938. The authorization has not been repealed. The committee understands, however, that both Bethlehem Junction and Sugar Hill would not be constructed. Several substitutes for Sugar Hill have been suggested. As stated, the committee has provided for a review of previous reports and from information furnished to the committee it is believed that a suitable substitute or substitutes can be found for the Sugar Hill project. The committee, therefore, has declined to authorize funds for the Sugar Hill Dam and Reservoir. No part of the \$10,000,000 herein authorized and no part of funds previously authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1936 or any other act is available for the construction of the Sugar Hill Reservoir.

It is my understanding that the intention of the Congress as thus stated by the committee will govern the Board of Engineers and will operate to prevent the use of the Sugar Hill site just as positively as would an amendment to the bill.

If I may, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if he will confirm this statement of the case.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think I have answered the gentleman's inquiry, but I read again from the report, House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session:

This second interim report considers changes in certain figures of the approved general reservoir plan for flood control in the Connecticut River Basin and additional local protective works now found desirable. A final report to be submitted under this and other authorities will cover the Connecticut River as a whole.

If you were to strike out that whole Document No. 724, you strike out the provisions for local protection, and I would say that in view of this being an interim report, in view of our report that there is no authorization for it, Sugar Hill is definitely out of this bill, as the authorization does not provide for Sugar Hill.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I might say that that was the unanimous opinion of the committee—that it is definitely out of the bill.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I am entirely satisfied, and I believe that my constituents will be. I would like to express my appreciation to the able and distinguished chairman of the committee and the members of the committee, and I thank them for the courteous and effective consideration that they have given to the views and wishes of the people of the Ammonoosuc Valley.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Committee having resolved itself into one of mutual admiration, I wish to join in the participation of that, although I do not share in any of the benefits of this remarkable bill. I rise, however, to discuss another phase of floods, that might properly be considered by some other committee. It is not strictly under the jurisdiction of this particular committee. We are speaking, however, of national defense, and that the membership of the House might be interested and know and understand a notice recently published and widely circulated in a typical American village in the State of New York, not in my district, circulated without protest. I shall read it to you and then for what it is worth refer it to some committee that might be interested in this particular form of flood that is sweeping over the country:

COMMUNIST RALLY TONIGHT, SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1941

Special showing of the great Russian Communist moving picture, Mannerheim Line. See the crushing defeat of the Finnish Army by the mighty Communist war machine—just as the greedy bankers and the ignorant American reactionaries will soon be crushed by the Communists of America.

Show your loyalty to our great leader, Joseph Stalin, and the local branch of the Communist Internationale by your presence at the Van Etten Hall tonight.

Come prepared to defend our cause in case of interference by narrow-minded police officials.

I see the majority leader present. I was interested some years ago when he carried on an investigation of these subversive activities. I also remember that the gentleman from New York [Mr.

FISH] was active along the same line. I say to you the time has come when we cannot temporize with this sort of thing, especially when it appears to be a published bill poster such as this, distributed without protest by the community.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have seen what the gentleman has presented to the House. I think that is the most outstanding piece of anti-Americanism I have ever seen. Somebody ought to be called to task, whoever is responsible for that sort of an article.

Mr. REED of New York. It is in the RECORD for those who are in authority to act upon those particular matters.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Flood Control Committee, I wish to say I have enjoyed the interesting work which has characterized the Flood Control Committee this session of Congress.

The chairman of the Flood Control Committee and the members of the committee with whom I have had the pleasure to serve have worked diligently and patiently to give people throughout our Nation who have flood-control problems the opportunity to present any facts pertinent to the various sectors of our Nation. I wish to say right here in my opinion no chairman of any committee in Congress is more energetic, fair, understanding, and efficient than our own able chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON. The Nation and the Congress are fortunate indeed to have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] occupying the post at which he so signally and successfully serves.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, first I desire to congratulate the Flood Control Committee of the House and its chairman, the Honorable WILL WHITTINGTON, for their very splendid work in the handling of this bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], as all of us know, has during his many years in Congress taken a particular interest in flood-control matters, and is the Nation's foremost authority on flood-control problems.

The committee has given very close and thorough consideration to all the projects that have been submitted. It has analyzed the reports of the Corps of Engineers, and I am sure that every project included in the authorization bill is meritorious and should receive the support of Congress.

I realize that during these days of great national stress we are primarily concerned with the manufacture of munitions of war and with doing those things necessary for the protection of this country and for the defeat of that ruthless totalitarian force that seeks to destroy the fundamentals of our civilized society.

We should not, however, overlook the great importance of preventing death and destruction to our property caused by the ravages of floods. Furthermore, almost every flood project contained in this authorization bill has a direct bearing to national defense. This is especially true of the Chattanooga-Rossville, Ga., project, which I shall later discuss in more detail.

The mere fact that floods have not occurred in some communities during the past few years is no reason why protective works for those sections should not be authorized and undertaken at this time. The history of flood protection is replete with instances where either through ignorance or deliberate negligence communities have postponed action until overtaken by disaster. Protective works have too often been built after a great flood rather than before it. The result of delay has been a gross cost of double or treble the actual cost of protection, combined with loss of life and property that can never be replaced.

The Flood Control Committee of the House has wisely included in this authorization bill an authorization for the construction of flood-protective works for Chattanooga and Rossville, Ga. The building of these works has been very vigorously recommended by the Corps of Engineers in House Document No. 479, Seventy-sixth Congress, and by the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which report is contained in House Document No. 91, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Chattanooga is the largest city in the Tennessee River Basin. The city proper, which extends on both sides of the river, has a corporate area of 27.42 square miles, and a population of approximately 150,000. Rossville, Ga., which joins Chattanooga on the south, is located on the headwaters of Chattanooga Creek and has a population of about 5,000. The Tennessee River Basin above Chattanooga has a drainage area of 21,400 square miles, which is an area 10 times the size of the State of Delaware. All of the water from this area flows through the city of Chattanooga. The city is the bottleneck for this drainage district. The flood stage at Chattanooga is 30 feet. During the 64-year period from 1875 to 1938, this stage has been reached or exceeded 71 times. A 57.9-foot flood was suffered by the city in 1867. Since that time there have been frequent floods, the last one being in 1932. If a flood such as the one in 1867 should occur, approximately 8,000 acres of the city would be under water. It is estimated that 50,000 people would be homeless and that property damage would be \$90,000,000. The Corps of Engineers estimates the cost of the project to be \$1 to \$2.27 in proportion to the benefits; that is, for every \$1 invested a return of \$2.27 in protection would be secured. This is a very high proportion, and is much higher than most of the projects included in this bill.

That Chattanooga is awake to its vital need for protection and has sought assistance from the Federal Government in the manner prescribed by Congress was evidenced by the response to a public

hearing held at the call of the War Department and the Department of Agriculture on August 16, 1938. Petitions and briefs were presented by many organizations. Among the signers were the commissioners of the Chattanooga flood-protection district; Mayor Bass, of the city of Chattanooga; Judge Cummings, county judge of Hamilton County; and Mayor Bennett, of the city of Rossville.

Along with the rest of the country, this region has received assistance from the Federal Government in financing the construction of public buildings, sorely needed housing facilities, and other developments. Much private building has been possible because of mortgage loans through the F. H. A. and H. O. L. C. As a result of this, there is a large Federal investment in the community which is secured by public bond issues or by private mortgages; also, the T. V. A. has much property in Chattanooga. Much of this is invested in properties subject to direct damage or total loss due to floods.

It seems unnecessary to set forth at length the value of the Tennessee Valley as a great national asset for war as well as for peace. Due to its natural advantages of topography and location and to the development of its resources, it is bound to play an important part in any comprehensive development of the country for purposes of national defense. This fact is generally recognized. Chattanooga is the principal city of the valley. It is termed properly a crossroads city. Interstate highways and railroads from north and south, east and west intersect there. It is located on air and water routes. Its strategic location and many natural advantages are attested by the fact that it has become a prosperous city in spite of the hazard of flood damage. Its continued development hinges on security against floods.

Attention is called to the fact that on March 15 last this project was endorsed by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress as one of only 18 projects in the entire country found to be "sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status" so that it "should be promptly constructed in the public interest."

Since the beginning of the national-defense effort many of the large manufacturing plants in Chattanooga have taken orders and are manufacturing vital defense materials. A recent survey showed that Chattanooga manufacturers, which are in the flood zone, are manufacturing \$90,000,000 of defense materials. Some of the plants are being enlarged so as to increase their capacity. Floods are no respecters of wars. Our national-defense effort would be impaired if floods should cause damage or destruction at Chattanooga during this period. Calamities are bad enough under normal conditions, but floods would have especially grave results under conditions of extraordinary and intensified activity in our industrial and military areas.

I hope that the Members of the House will look with favor upon this greatly worthwhile project.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, the bill carries authorization of \$11,000,000 for power-generating equipment and full flood-control and power authorizations for the \$45,000,000 Bull Shoals and the \$34,000,000 dams, all on the White River.

This is one of the most important bills, so far as Arkansas and southern Missouri are concerned, that has ever come before this House.

These three dams will—

First. Eliminate all of the most disastrous floods of the lower White and contribute to the control of the lower Mississippi.

Second. Produce 450,000 kilowatts of cheap power. In spite of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says, there is a drastic shortage of power in the area.

Third. Contribute to navigation of the lower White.

Fourth. Return the Ozarks to their former and proper status as the playground of the Mississippi Valley; and in spite of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says, it will increase, and not decrease, the fishing.

Should the war continue long, the Norfolk power will be a vital aid to the national defense.

What a blessing it would have been to the defense of this Nation if we could have had one or more of these great projects in production at this critical hour. Who knows but that the hours ahead may add to our needs in this crisis.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation to the committee for including in the bill a project for flood control on the upper Missouri from Kansas City to Sioux City, brought about, as it is contended by development of the stream for navigation, the building of revetments, dikes, changing of the course, and causing one and a half million acres to be flooded.

My primary object in asking this time is to object to a provision in the bill on page 21, line 23:

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide protection to the Kansas City, Kans. and Mo., is hereby modified to include cut-offs in the vicinity of Liberty Bend substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 722, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

Liberty Bend is about 30 miles east of Kansas City and is a rather sharp bend in the shape of a horseshoe. The town of Liberty in my district is a town of about 4,000 people. It gets its water supply from the banks of the Missouri River. That is, it has some wells in the alluvial soil adjacent to the river. If this bend is cut off it will leave those wells about 3 miles from the channel of the Missouri River. It is the contention of the officials of the town of Liberty that this will lower the water level so that they will have to put in additional pumping equipment.

They also dump their sewage into the river in this bend. It will be necessary

for them to extend their sewage system a very considerable distance.

There is also objection to it from numerous farmers in the community who say if this cut-off is made that the streams now running into the river will be clogged by brush and other things; weeds will grow up in the river bed and cause those streams to overflow, thus causing damage and floods that do not now exist.

Senator TRUMAN, on April 29, obtained approval in the Senate of a resolution to further study this project, that is, the flood-control projects in the Kansas City and area. Liberty Bend is in that area. The Army engineers say that they have no satisfactory data at this time to determine what the effect of this cut-off will be on the water supply and sewage system of Liberty. However, they take the position that there probably will be none, but they definitely refuse to state that there will not be some.

I want to read from a letter from General Schley, dated May 29:

On the basis of the information now available, it appears that the proposed Liberty Bend cut-off will not cause material damage to the water supply or sewage-disposal facilities of the city of Liberty. Further investigation of this subject will, however, be included in a comprehensive study for flood control in the vicinity of the Kansas City which the Department is now making pursuant to several directives from Congress, including the authorization contained in a resolution adopted on April 29, 1941, by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate. That resolution requests the Department to review its report on the Missouri River, which is contained in House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, with a view to determine whether any modifications should be made therein at this time with respect to protection of the Kansas City and adjacent areas from floods on the Missouri and Kansas Rivers and on the tributaries entering that river between approximate river-mile 386 and 356. The Liberty Bend is within this portion of the Missouri River. If the investigation made in connection with these authorized surveys show a justification for remedial measures in the vicinity of the water wells and sewer outlets of the city of Liberty, you may be assured that appropriate recommendations will be submitted to Congress in the report of the Department.

I want to ask, when the time comes, to strike this provision out of the bill until the War Department has completed its further studies pursuant to the resolution approved on April 29 in the Senate.

There are a number of other projects in this vicinity that will be affected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in reference to the matter brought up by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN]. We all remember in Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., the flood of 1903 that paralyzed the whole commercial life of the two cities. Every packing house, all in Kansas City, Kans., were in water from 4 to 35 feet; every railroad at a standstill. It paralyzed the transportation system that centers there, because Kansas City is within 200 miles of the territorial center of the United States.

It is of vast importance that this Liberty Bend project remain in the bill, because it is one of the necessary links that makes Kansas City secure from floods, and it is so determined by the United States Army engineers, by the engineers of the Highway Commissions of Missouri and Kansas; and all of the interests of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., are behind it. This is the first time in many years that these two cities have got together, and we do not want to disrupt the harmony in this one common interest.

It is a matter of vast importance to national defense to prevent a return of floods, such as of 1903 and of 1927. And I want to pay my tribute to our chairman, and add my word of commendation to what has already been said. It is a tribute well deserved. I was a member of this committee early in 1927, after the 1927 flood. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has been the most diligent student of this question I have ever known on the committee, and this is what has made him such a splendid chairman. It is another vindication of the seniority system of the House which provides the opportunity for Members to prepare for useful chairmanships.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is there not some objection to this project as evidenced by Senator TRUMAN's resolution? Senator TRUMAN is a resident of Independence, Kans., which is a part of Kansas City. He introduced a resolution asking for a resurvey.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. There may be some little disadvantage to Liberty about it; but as Napoleon once said, you cannot have an omelet without breaking some eggs.

Mr. DUNCAN. But why should we suffer any damage?

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. This is a vastly important thing to Kansas City. We cannot afford another disruption of communications from coast to coast as happened in 1903 when people could not get out of Kansas City or could not get in on account of the floods of the Missouri-Kaw Rivers, one of the most acute flood situations in the United States. Had the flood of 1927 occurred 10 years before it would have stopped the whole process of national preparation for the war in 1917, because transportation east and west was paralyzed from Cairo to the Gulf.

I am sure if there is any injustice or disadvantage to the little city of Liberty—a fine little town by the way—the Government will take care of it as it is its duty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I should be unappreciative if I failed to join in the statements by other Members of the House commending the manner in which the hearings on this bill were conducted by this great committee and by its great chairman. Furthermore, I should be unappreciative indeed if I failed to acknowl-

edge my personal gratitude and the gratitude of the people of Denver, whom I have the honor to represent, for the careful study by the Army engineers and by the Flood Control Committee of our problem and for the inclusion in this bill of the item providing for flood control of Cherry Creek and its tributaries for the protection of Denver, Colo., and adjacent territory.

This stream is of the same character as that one which the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has just described as menacing Los Angeles, and Cherry Creek also is a flash stream—a mere trickle at noon, a cloudburst upstream in midafternoon, and an enormous flood at night. When constructed, this project will protect Denver from what is now an ever-imminent danger of a ghastly major tragedy.

The item in this bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the Cherry Creek project is as follows:

The comprehensive plan for the improvement of Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized \$2,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The statement in the unanimous report by the Committee on Flood Control (Rept. No. 759, 77th Cong., 1st sess., filed June 9, 1941) is as follows:

CHERRY CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, COLORADO
(H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

The possibility of a major flood on Cherry Creek threatens the city of Denver, Colo., with a major catastrophe. Cherry Creek rises in El Paso County, Colo., flows northerly to join the South Platte River in Denver. The topography of Cherry Creek Basin is such as to cause large floods of great intensity which may descend on Denver with little warning. For the lower 5½ miles of its course Cherry Creek flows through industrial and residential sections of the city. The great flows which would result from major floods on Cherry Creek would submerge a large part of the central portion of Denver, including important business districts, railroad yards, industrial establishments, and extensive residential areas. Denver is the most important industrial center between the Missouri River and the Pacific coast, and any disruption of the normal activities of that city would be detrimental to the whole country. The need for flood control on Cherry Creek has been investigated by the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1937 and a report has been submitted to Congress.

The plan of protection recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for the construction of two reservoirs on Cherry Creek at the Cherry Creek No. 1 site and at the Castlewood site, both above Denver, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$10,500,000.

Construction of the recommended project would protect Denver against any flood reasonably to be expected and would eliminate practically all further damages from Cherry Creek floods in the agricultural valley above that city. In addition, water for irrigation is to be stored in the Castlewood Reservoir. Unquestionably the benefits of the improvement would greatly exceed its cost. The Flood Control Committee reaffirms its previous recommendation that the plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers should be approved by Congress, and because of the need for the contemplated flood protection at Denver \$3,000,000 should be authorized at

this time to provide for the construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and the completion of the detailed plans and other necessary preliminary work for the Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1.

On May 14, 1941, I made the following statement before the Flood Control Committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

FLOOD CONTROL OF CHERRY CREEK FOR THE PROTECTION OF DENVER, COLO., AND ADJACENT TERRITORY TO THE SOUTH

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish again to call your attention to the project for flood control of Cherry Creek and tributaries for the protection of Denver, Colo., and adjacent territory to the south. This "flash stream" flows into the South Platte River, which is a tributary of the Missouri River, in the heart of the business district of the city of Denver, which I have the honor to represent. In the last Congress I introduced a bill to authorize this project, which bill was favorably considered by this committee. In this Congress I have introduced a similar bill, H. R. 3641, which has been referred to your committee, and for which I earnestly entreat your favorable consideration.

The Corps of Engineers' report on this project was transmitted to the House of Representatives with letter dated July 14, 1939, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Honorable Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War.

This report and accompanying papers were, on July 17, 1939, referred to the Committee on Flood Control and are printed as House Document No. 426 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

Denver, the city that is menaced by floods in Cherry Creek, as stated by the Corps of Engineers in their report (p. 9, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

"Denver is the most important industrial and commercial center between the Missouri River and the Pacific coast. It is the center of a large trade area, being about 600 miles distant from other cities of comparable size. Its scenic beauty attracts thousands of tourists each year, and its altitude, low humidity, and large percentage of cloudless days have made it a health resort of national repute. Educational facilities include the University of Denver, the University of Colorado Medical School, and four other institutions of higher learning.

"Denver's manufacturing industry covers a wide diversification of products, including meat and other food products, clothing, wood, metal, stone, concrete, clay, printing, and many others. Stockyards and railroad shops are important factors of industry."

Including the adjacent suburbs (which, nevertheless, are outside the corporate limits of the municipality known as the city and county of Denver), the population, according to the final figures on the 1940 census, is 384,372. Of these, 322,412 are within the corporate limits.

Denver's "sleeping tiger"

Cherry Creek is a typical western "flash stream." Under ordinary circumstances there is on the surface of the channel only a trickle of water. It looks as if perhaps three or four fire hydrants had been turned into it. But, at any time between the last of April and the first of October, after heavy rains or cloudbursts up the valley to the south, this thread of water may suddenly and without warning change into a raging torrent for a few hours and then return soon to its normal state of quiescence. These floods have caused millions of dollars of property damage in Denver and, although the records are not entirely complete, the loss of nearly 100 lives.

Like all western "flash streams," Cherry Creek is treacherous. Its floods come suddenly and without warning. I have often referred to it as Denver's "sleeping tiger."

Floods in "flash streams," coming without warning, afford no opportunity to make emergency preparations for protection

When floods are threatened on the Ohio, the Mississippi, or the Missouri Rivers, the towns and cities menaced have several days, and on the lower Mississippi, at Memphis or Vicksburg or New Orleans, they have many days—sometimes 2 weeks or even longer—to prepare against the coming flood. Furthermore, these cities on the lower part of the big rivers have fairly reliable advance estimates of approximately how great a flood to expect. But, of floods in Cherry Creek, Denver has no warning—unless someone up the valley telephones that a cloudburst is occurring and that high water is coming. There is no time to make any emergency preparations against a flood, and, even if there were time, no possibility of estimating how great the flood will be. Our only safeguard lies in having constructed in advance permanent works which the best engineering investigations determine will be sufficiently large to protect our city against any flood resulting from any storm which meteorological investigations determine is likely to occur.

No city on Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans is as large and as vulnerable to flood damage as is Denver from Cherry Creek

A glance at the map shows that on the main stem of the Ohio River from Louisville, Ky., down to Cairo, Ill., and on the main stem of the Mississippi from St. Louis to New Orleans, there is no city as great in population or in wealth as Denver—and no city which is as vulnerable to floods from those great rivers as Denver is vulnerable to attack by floods from the comparatively insignificant and harmless appearing Cherry Creek.

The "syllabus" of the Army's report on this project is as follows (p. 5, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

"Survey of Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado.

"Cherry Creek is a small tributary of the South Platte River which joins the South Platte within the city of Denver. Floods have occurred frequently in the past and have caused a considerable amount of damage in the upper valley and a great deal of damage within the city of Denver; the most recent flood, that of 1933, having caused a damage of over \$956,000 to this community. The watershed is within the eastern Colorado cloudburst zone and is immediately adjacent to other similar watersheds which have suffered flood-producing storms of magnitude many times greater than any which have occurred on Cherry Creek. The occurrence of such a storm on Cherry Creek would cause a flood several times larger than that necessary to overtop the existing flood-control dam above the city, and would cause a loss, at the present stage of economic development, estimated at \$40,000,000. Additional flood-control storage in this watershed is absolutely necessary. A feasible irrigation development within this basin has been reported on by the Bureau of Reclamation and should be incorporated in any proposed plan of development. The irrigation development can repay a total cost of not to exceed \$429,500. The most feasible plan for all purposes would involve construction of Castlewood and Cherry Creek No. 1 Reservoirs, which would cost \$1,782,250 and \$6,409,938, respectively. The proposed improvement is recommended for immediate construction as a Federal flood-control project."

The results of the exhaustive hearings, examinations, and surveys conducted by the Army engineers, beginning in November 1937 and carried on continuously until the report

(H. Doc. No. 426) was sent to the Congress on July 14, 1939, are so fully and carefully set forth in the report that it would be superfluous to attempt to review them further in this statement. However, I believe it is pertinent by way of emphasis to quote the paragraphs indicating the extent of the catastrophe to Denver which every year impends, and will continue to impend, until this project is authorized and actually completed.

At set forth at pages 21 and 22 of House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the damages which would be wrought by the flood which may occur any year, and which this project will avert, are summarized by the Army engineers as follows:

"Damages from reservoir-design flood

"The hypothetical flood which may occur on Cherry Creek would have a discharge of 230,000 cubic feet per second at Denver, as determined in paragraph 37. This would be approximately 14 times greater than any previous flood of record at this station, and would produce a height approximately 16 feet higher than that of the maximum flood of record. The flood would arrive with little warning and velocities would be sufficient to prevent rescue work. The effect upon Denver would be that of a first-class catastrophe. A summary of the principal damages which would result from this flood is given in the following paragraphs:

"Denver: The flood would submerge a larger part of the central portions of the city. Important business districts, municipal buildings and parks, railroad yards and station, streetcar barn, bridges, and some of the finest residential and recreational areas would be covered. The property, valued at \$23,000,000 affected by the 1933 flood, would all be covered some 16 feet deeper with silt-laden waters carried at high velocities. An incomplete flood damage field survey showed that damages within the area covered would total \$19,913,200.

"When a flood occurs on Cherry Creek large numbers of people gather to watch it from the bridges and the sidewalks adjacent to the stream, which are higher than large areas lying farther away. Numbers of people would probably also be trapped in the area between Cherry Creek and the South Platte, as there would be a heavy flow over the divide between the two streams. It is quite possible that a loss of several hundred lives might occur.

"It was estimated that damages in areas not covered by the field survey would total about \$6,100,000. Other tangible damages not covered include damages to railroads (except Union Terminal), to the Public Service Co., and to municipal facilities, such as bridges, roads, parks, and sewers.

"Intangible damages include a major interruption to business, probably for a period of years; enormous costs of clean-up; relief and emergency assistance to the homeless; loss of business and municipal records; interruption to rail and tramway service; panic depreciation of property values; flooding of Denver General Hospital and Steele Memorial Hospital; and interruption of city sewer system. Denver is a center of commercial and governmental activity over a wide area, and normal activities of all kinds would be dealt a terrific blow. Furthermore, the city has a record of continuous growth, and damages of such an occurrence will be greater in the future.

"Considering all factors, it is believed that the total of tangible and intangible damage which would be caused by an occurrence of such a flood would probably equal \$40,000,000 at the present time, or an average of \$50,000,000 over the economic life of the structures being considered.

"Damages above Kenwood Dam: A large portion of the community of Parker, with a population of 200, including the business district, would be affected by the reservoir-design

flood, and there would undoubtedly be some loss of life. It is estimated that the direct damage from this flood would amount to \$75,000. The only other town in the basin is Franktown, which is situated so that there would be no damage from the hypothetical flood.

"Damage to rural districts: The area above Kenwood Dam is largely an agricultural district, with the exception of the towns of Parker and Franktown. It is estimated that in this area the damage to farm lands would be \$318,600, in the present stage of development.

"The main highway is susceptible to damage along the valley, as are the numerous local unsurfaced roads which cross the stream by means of small wooden or steel bridges. The hypothetical flood would cause some damage to the roads and would probably destroy all the bridges.

"It is estimated that the damage to highways, bridges, and local roads from a hypothetical flood would amount to \$100,000.

"The occurrence of the hypothetical flood would undoubtedly cause some indirect loss to business by interruption of transportation, communication, and trade, and would also cause some lasting depreciation in real-estate value within the affected zone. The community of Parker would be most severely affected. The indirect losses of this character would probably amount to about 20 percent of the other flood losses, or \$98,720.

"The future damages that would result from the occurrence of the reservoir-design flood, between Kenwood Dam and Castlewood Dam site, are summarized as follows:

Parker.....	\$75,000
Rural districts.....	318,600
Highways.....	100,000
Intangible damages.....	98,720
Total.....	592,320"

The district engineer, with headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., Lt. Col. W. M. Hoge, concludes his report as follows (p. 32, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"It is recommended that the proposed improvement be constructed as a Federal flood-control project."

The division engineer, Col. C. L. Sturdevant, says, in his report to the Chief of Engineers (p. 32, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"The flood-damage potentialities in the Cherry Creek Valley, especially in the metropolitan Denver area, and the recent experiences with severe floods in that locality, indicate the desirability of early adoption for this project. It is therefore further recommended that this project be considered of early priority in the selection of flood-control projects for construction."

The report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, by Brig. Gen. M. C. Tyler, senior member of the Board (p. 4, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), concludes, as follows:

"The Board considers that these improvements are well warranted by benefits that would accrue to the project and recommends construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1, on Cherry Creek, Colo., at an estimated first cost of \$10,500,000, with \$3,000 annually for maintenance."

Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, after reviewing previous reports, says, in his letter of transmittal to the Secretary of War (pp. 3 and 4, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views of the Board. Cherry Creek Basin lies in an area where storms of cloudburst intensity occur. Studies indicate that floods many times greater than any that have occurred in the past are a definite possibility. Should such a flood occur under existing conditions, the destruction and dam-

age that would occur in Denver and the valley above would be enormous. There is also the possibility of serious loss of life. The two reservoirs proposed by the district engineer, with the existing Kenwood Reservoir, would provide full protection against any flood reasonably to be anticipated, and, in my opinion, their construction is essential if the security of the city of Denver is to be provided. * * * I recommend construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1 on Cherry Creek, Colo., at an estimated first cost of \$10,500,000, with \$3,000 annually for maintenance."

It is difficult adequately to express the vital importance of this project, not only to the city of Denver, which comprises my congressional district but also to that part of the Cherry Creek Valley south of the city limits of Denver in the Second Congressional District of Colorado. Until this project is authorized and completely constructed, Denver, every year, between April and October, will be in ever imminent danger of a ghastly major tragedy.

In the last Congress this committee embodied the Cherry Creek project in the omnibus flood-control bill, H. R. 9640. In favorably reporting that bill (Rept. No. 2103, 76th Cong., 3d sess., filed May 7, 1940), this committee made the following statement (at pp. 23-24) concerning this Cherry Creek project:

"CHERRY CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, COLORADO
(H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

"Cherry Creek rises in El Paso County, Colo., and flows north to join the South Platte River in the city of Denver. The valley of Cherry Creek for over 20 miles above Denver is a rich farming area and for its lower 5.5 miles Cherry Creek flows through the residential and industrial sections of the city. The need for flood control on Cherry Creek has been investigated by the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1937, and his report has been transmitted to Congress. This report indicates that the Cherry Creek Valley lies in a cloudburst zone and has suffered damaging floods since its earliest settlement. Major floods of Cherry Creek have caused extensive damages at Denver and the flood of 1933 destroyed the old Castlewood irrigation dam above the city. It has been estimated that the maximum probable flood on Cherry Creek would cause damages in Denver of from forty to fifty million dollars, and might cause large loss of life.

"The plan of protection recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for construction of two reservoirs on Cherry Creek, at the Cherry Creek No. 1 and Castlewood sites above Denver, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$10,500,000.

"The recommended reservoirs would protect the city of Denver against any flood reasonably to be anticipated and would largely eliminate flood damage in the valley above the city. In addition, it is proposed to reserve water for irrigation in the proposed Castlewood reservoir. The benefits of the improvement would be greatly in excess of its cost. The Flood Control Committee therefore believes that the project merits approval by Congress and that it is of such an urgent nature that \$3,000,000 should be authorized at this time so that the necessary lands can be secured and detailed plans can be initiated as soon as funds are appropriated by Congress."

March 18, 1940, at the hearings during the Seventy-sixth Congress on H. R. 9640, page 11, Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, made the following statement concerning floods in so-called flash streams in the West and the necessity for flood control of Cherry Creek for the protection of Denver:

General SCHLEY. Those are in the semi-arid sections, where the river channels have very small capacities and where the rains come like cloudbursts. As the cities grow larger and become more important, the destruction by these cloudbursts is very much greater.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON of Mississippi). You have also submitted a report and recommendation for the protection of the city of Denver, Colo., have you not?

General SCHLEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a rather populous area?

General SCHLEY. The possibilities of danger there are very great. It has been simply a matter of great luck that Denver has not had a great catastrophe since it has been a large city. The floods, according to the historic record, have not been anything like as great as they might be.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to add to what has been said my appreciation of the fine bill the chairman and members of the Committee on Flood Control have brought before this House. On the east boundary of my district, the lower part of the Mississippi, extends the Wichita and Red Rivers. I know the people of my district will be very happy to receive the benefit afforded by this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, I desire to speak just a few words in behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] who so ably represents my old district where I was born and reared. The citizens of the various districts throughout the United States who have untiring Representatives on their toes like the gentleman from Arkansas, CLYDE ELLIS, of the Seventh Congressional District of Arkansas are indeed very fortunate.

Around Norfolk and in Baxter County, Ark., where I used to reside, I lost one of my beloved school teachers, one of my classmates, and one of my relatives by reason of floods. Through the efforts of the gentleman from Arkansas, CLYDE ELLIS, his constituents and members of the Committee on Flood Control, the swift waters of the White River, the North Fork, and other deep, cool, clear mountain streams have been harnessed to an advantage.

The rivers and channels of the rivers in Arkansas are deep, while the rivers in my district are usually a mile wide and a foot deep until the floods come and then havoc is wrought for miles. My district, the Seventh Oklahoma District, needs flood control badly, but, unfortunately, Mr. Massingale passed away January 17, 1941, before his plans materialized and before the Army had completed its surveys and reports with respect to our program. I did not take the oath of office until April 14; consequently, during the intervening 3 months our district was without representation. I feel sure, however, that by the next session I will have prevailed upon the Army engineers to the extent that my district will be included in future bills and will ultimately benefit thereby.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say all that I would like to say. I cannot be thankful, like my colleagues here, for any projects in my district, my city, or in my State. There is nothing in the bill that will benefit my section. However, Chicagoans are always pleased to aid other sections of the country, especially if it is for the best interests of the country.

It is gratifying to me to see so many of my friends on the Republican side as well as my friends on the Democratic side—I am an independent you know—approve this activity and the action of the committee. It merely proves what I have said, that the Democratic Party has acted wisely in legislating in the interest of our country. This legislation I know will be of great benefit.

We have no floods but we need water. We have been trying to get a little water to make the Illinois River navigable. I hope when the time comes we will get a little more water for the channel that cost the city of Chicago \$180,000,000 and to which the Government did not donate a single cent. Whenever we ask for a little relief, however, it is not forthcoming. Notwithstanding that fact, I am here endorsing this bill and hope it will aid all the sections that are included in it.

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I shall not unduly take up the time of the House except to direct attention to the cooperative spirit and liberality displayed by the Members representing the great Middle West in support of this measure and other legislation that has proven beneficial to other sections of our country. Within recent years the Middle West compared with other sections of the country has shared very little in the large appropriations that have been made. I recall the time when the bills covering appropriations for the construction of the Panama Canal were under consideration that many Midwestern Members realized the very material benefits which would inure to the East with the enactment of the legislation, and they also honestly appreciated that it would prove of benefit to the whole country and I am pleased to state that a large majority of them voted for the appropriation bills. There was serious opposition to the expenditure which was then considered a tremendous sum, but time has proven that the judgment of the midwestern Members was correct and today we have the operation of the Panama Canal which has been of such great benefit to the water transportation of the United States and all the world.

Mr. Chairman, we will shortly have before us a bill that will not only aid Chicago but the country as well—namely, the St. Lawrence waterways bill—and I hope you gentlemen whose districts have benefited by reason of the enactment of some of the large appropriation bills will express some reciprocity in support of legislation to make that great project possible. I feel the St. Lawrence project in years to come will also prove its value

and those farsighted men who have advocated it for many years, who have been subject to frequent criticism will, as time goes on, be generally acclaimed upon their courage and judgment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, except as otherwise provided by act of Congress.

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this act, except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided,* That the third proviso of section 1 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937 (Public, No. 406, 75th Cong.), and all of section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939 (Public, No. 396, 76th Cong.), are hereby repealed: *Provided further,* That the authorization for any flood-control project heretofore or herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date of approval of this act unless local interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required cooperation will be furnished: *And provided further,* That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations. The Chief of Engineers is also authorized in his discretion to modify the plan for any dam or other work heretofore or hereafter authorized so that such dam or work will be smaller than originally planned with a view to completing a useful improvement within an authorization: *Provided,* That the smaller structure shall be located on the chosen site so that it will be feasible at some future time to enlarge the work in order to permit the full utilization of the site for all purposes of conservation such as flood control, navigation, reclamation, the development of hydroelectric power, and the abatement of pollution.

SEC. 3. That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of national security and the stabilization of employment, and shall be prosecuted as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided,* That penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the develop-

ment of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission:

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$6,000,000 for local protection works and \$10,000,000 for reservoirs for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Connecticut River Basin, and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the works recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 653, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

The Secretary of War is authorized to reimburse the city of Hartford, Conn., the sum of \$252,000 heretofore contributed to the United States by said city for the realignment of the South Meadows section of the flood-protection works in accordance with the plans contained in House Document No. 653, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session: *Provided,* That there shall be deducted from the aforementioned sum any reimbursement which may be made to said city pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1938, approved July 19, 1937.

THAMES RIVER BASIN

The plan for a system of reservoirs and channel improvements in the Thames River Basin, Conn., R. I., and Mass., in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 885, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized \$6,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

PAWTUCKET RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the North Branch of Pawtucket River at Clyde, R. I., and for the Pontiac diversion is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 747, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$1,320,000.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN

The projects adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local flood-protection works in the Hoosic River Basin at North Adams in Massachusetts; at Hoosick Falls, N. Y., and at Bennington, Vt., are hereby modified and extended to include the town of Adams, Mass., in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 182, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, and are authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with said recommendation at an estimated cost of \$2,170,000.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the Winooski River at Waterbury, Vt., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 656, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$880,000.

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local flood-protection works on Otter Creek at Rutland, Vt., is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 171, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and is authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with said recommendation at an estimated cost of \$308,000.

OSWEGO RIVER BASIN

The projects for flood control and other purposes at Canandaigua, Keuka, and Owasco Lakes, and at Hammondsport, Watkins Glen, Montour Falls, Ithaca, and Syracuse, N. Y., are hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 846, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$3,220,000.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local flood-protection works on the Susquehanna River at Sunbury, Pa., is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 366, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, and is authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with said recommendation at an estimated cost of \$1,900,000.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on Rancocas Creek in the vicinity of Mount Holly, N. J., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 128, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$300,000.

MOBILE RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection at Prattville, Ala., on Autauga Creek, a tributary of the Alabama-Coosa River, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 657, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$530,000.

The plan for the Allatoona Reservoir on the Etowah River in the Coos River Basin, Georgia, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 674, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$3,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The project for flood control on the Tombigbee River authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, is hereby modified to provide for additional channel improvements and related works for flood control for the Tombigbee River and tributaries above the mouth of and including the Noxubee River in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of \$150,000.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN (TEXAS)

The plan for improvement of the Lower Colorado River, Texas, for flood control in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 312, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$6,500,000 for the construction of the project.

The plan for San Angelo Reservoir for flood control and other purposes on the North Concho River, Tex., and for local flood-protection works at San Angelo, Tex., in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 315, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$2,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The plan for Hords Creek Reservoir and for enlargement of the existing Lake Brownwood Reservoir for flood control and other purposes on Pecan Bayou and its tributaries in Texas, in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 370, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$1,400,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project, including \$460,000 for the Hords Creek Reservoir.

The project for local flood protection on Brady Creek at Brady, Tex., is hereby author-

ized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 441, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$825,000.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

The plan, for Whitney Reservoir on the Brazos River in Texas, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 390, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$5,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended by the acts of August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby modified and, as modified, is hereby authorized and adopted, and the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The existing engineering plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is hereby modified so as to provide for the construction of plan 4 as set forth in the report of the Mississippi River Commission, dated March 7, 1941, to the Chief of Engineers, except that the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River south of the Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan shall have a 3-foot freeboard over the project flood, and all levees shall be constructed with adequate section and foundation to conform to increased levee heights. The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway, as well as the northward extension and the back protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned, and the provisions of said acts relating to the prosecution of work on said floodways and extension are hereby repealed.

(b) The project for flood control of the Yazoo River shall be as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 15, 1936, as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938, except that the Chief of Engineers may, in his discretion, from time to time, substitute therefor combinations of reservoirs, levees, and channel improvements; and except that the improvements contemplated in plan C of the report of March 7, 1941, of the Mississippi River Commission are authorized, including the extension of the levee on the east bank of the Mississippi River generally along the west bank of the Yazoo River to a connection in the vicinity of Yazoo City with the Yazoo River levee, authorized by the existing project for protection against headwater floods of the Yazoo River system, and the adjustment in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers of the grades of the existing levees in the backwater areas on the east bank of Yazoo River below Yazoo City, all at an estimated additional cost of \$11,982,000: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers shall fix the grade of the extension levees along the Yazoo River, with higher levees in his discretion, so that their construction will give the maximum practical protection without jeopardizing the safety and integrity of the main Mississippi River levees: *And provided further*, That prior to the beginning of construction local authorities shall furnish satisfactory assurances that they will (1) maintain the levees in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 15, 1928, and will (2) not raise the levees in the backwater above the limiting elevations established therefor by the Chief of Engineers.

(c) The construction of a levee and improvements contemplated in the report of March 7, 1941, of the Mississippi River Commission from the main-line levee on the west

bank of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Shaw, La., westward and northward to the vicinity of Newlight, La., for the protection of that part of the Red River backwater known as the Tensas-Cocodrie area at an estimated cost of \$6,976,000 is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers shall fix the grade of said levee, with a higher levee in the discretion, so that its construction will give the maximum practical protection without jeopardizing the safety and integrity of the main Mississippi River levees: *And provided further*, That prior to the beginning of construction local authorities shall furnish satisfactory assurances that they will (1) maintain the levee in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 15, 1928, and will (2) not raise the said levee about the limiting elevations established therefor by the Chief of Engineers.

(d) The Chief of Engineers, with approval of the Secretary of War, shall reimburse local authorities for actual expenditures found by the Chief of Engineers to be reasonable, for providing at the request of the United States, in accordance with local legal procedure or custom, rights-of-way and flowage easements required for future set-backs of main-line Mississippi River levees.

(e) The existing engineering plan for flood control of the St. Francis River is hereby modified so as to permit the substitution for the suspended portions of the original project below Oak Donnick, Ark., of the construction of a ditch in Cross County, Ark., beginning in the vicinity of the outlet end of the existing Oak Donnick to St. Francis Bay floodway and terminating in St. Francis Bay about 2 miles north of Riverfront, including the construction of a highway bridge at State Highway No. 42 made necessary by the ditch construction: *Provided*, That local interests give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (1) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction; (2) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and (3) maintain the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(f) The total authorizations heretofore made for the flood-control project of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River shall not be increased by reason of any provision in this act, except for the additional amounts necessary for the Yazoo and Red River backwater improvements, and any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made or authorized for said project as herein or heretofore modified may be expended upon any feature of the said project, notwithstanding any restrictions, limitations, or requirements of existing law: *Provided*, That funds hereafter expended for maintenance shall not be considered as reducing present remaining balances of authorizations.

The project for flood control on the Homochitto River in Mississippi, authorized by the act of June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), and modified by the act of June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), is hereby further modified to provide for additional channel improvements and related works for flood control on the Homochitto River and tributaries in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers, and for the execution of these plans there is hereby authorized \$50,000.

RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the Ouachita River near Callon, Ark., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 427, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$50,000.

The project for local protection on the Red River in Grant Parish below Colfax, La., authorized by the act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to add and authorize the

following: Levee enlargement, new levee extension, and the construction of appurtenant drainage structures on the left bank of the Red River opposite Alexandria for the protection of Pineville, La., and vicinity, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$159,100, subject to the provisions of section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936.

The project for local flood protection on the Red River in Grant Parish below Colfax, La., authorized by the act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby further amended to include and to authorize the following: Levees and appurtenant drainage works on the left bank of the Red River and along Bayous Darrow and Rigolette, the improvement of the channel of Bayou Rigolette, and the separation of the channels of Bayous Darrow and Rigolette in the Aloha-Rigolette area, Grant and Rapides Parish, La., all at an estimated cost to the United States of \$914,500, subject to the provisions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936.

The plan for the Narrows Reservoir for flood control and other purposes on the Little Missouri River, Ark., and for local flood protection on the main river below Murfreesboro and on the Terre Noire and Ozan Creeks, substantially in accordance with recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 837, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$3,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$24,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the White River Basin in Missouri and Arkansas, including the projects for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 917, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and the modifications in the Norfolk Reservoir project recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

The projects for local flood protection on the White River, on the east side between Augusta and Clarendon, Ark., and at the town of De Valls Bluff, Ark., are hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 98, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$2,847,500.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, for the Arkansas River Basin is hereby modified to include the reservoirs in the Grand (Neosho) River Basin in Oklahoma and Missouri and in the Verdigris River Basin in Kansas, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Nos. 107 and 440 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$29,000,000 for the prosecution of said comprehensive plan.

The project for local flood protection on the Salt Fork of the Arkansas River in the vicinity of Cherokee, Okla., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 480, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$800,000.

The project for local flood protection along the south bank of the Arkansas River between Little Rock and Pine Bluff, Ark., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 718, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$641,000, with such modifications as may be advisable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

The project for local flood protection along the north bank of the Arkansas River in the Crawford County Levee District, Arkansas, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 720, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$284,000.

The project for local flood protection on both sides of the Arkansas River in the immediate vicinity of Tulsa and West Tulsa, Okla., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$513,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$45,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Ohio River Basin, modified to include the Allegheny Reservoir project in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 300, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

TENNESSEE RIVER BASIN

The projects for local flood protection on the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga., are hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 479 Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$13,500,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, for the Dry Run Reservoir near Decorah, Iowa, is hereby modified to authorize the Chief of Engineers to modify the project so as to provide protection by diversion of floodwaters in accordance with revised plans now on file in his office, at an estimated Federal cost of \$460,000.

SEBEWAING RIVER

The project for local flood protection on the Sebewaing River in the vicinity of Sebewaing, Mich., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 286, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$250,000.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Missouri River Basin, including the project for the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River, Nebr., recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 842, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and such other supplemental flood-control works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

The comprehensive plan for the improvement of Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$3,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The project for local flood protection on the Platte River in the vicinity of Schuyler, Nebr., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 250, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$63,000.

The project for local flood protection on the Missouri River and Indian Creek at Council Bluffs, Iowa, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance

with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 577, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$18,000.

The project for the improvement of Fall River and tributaries, South Dakota, for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 655, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$1,050,000.

The project for flood protection in the vicinity of Sioux City, Iowa, and along both banks of the Missouri River between Sioux City and Kansas City for flood control in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 821, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved and there is hereby authorized \$1,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment thereof.

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide flood protection of the Kansas City, Kans. and Mo., is hereby modified to include cut-offs in the vicinity of Liberty Bend substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 722, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500,000 for the prosecution of the projects approved in the acts of June 22, 1936, and June 28, 1938, for flood control in the Santa Ana River Basin and for the protection of Orange County in California.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN AND BALLONA CREEK

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the basins of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Ballona Creek as set forth in House Document No. 838, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved, and in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized \$25,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of that plan.

SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

The projects for the control of floods and other purposes in the Sacramento River, Calif. adopted by the acts approved March 1, 1917, May 15, 1928, and August 26, 1937, are hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 205, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of \$10,500,000, and also modified to provide for channel clearing, rectification, snagging, and bank protection on the Sacramento River and tributaries in Tehama County, and from Red Bluff southerly, at an additional estimated cost of \$150,000.

The project for the Fresno County stream group for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 845, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$510,000.

UMPQUA RIVER BASIN

The project for improvement of the Umpqua River in Oregon for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 684, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$176,000.

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$11,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Willamette River Basin in Oregon.

The project for improvement of the Pudding River in Oregon for flood control is here-

by authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 185, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$62,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the Touchet River at Dayton, Wash., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 662, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$146,000.

The project for levees, channel enlargement, and channel rectification on Walla Walla River in the vicinity of Milton and Freewater, Oreg., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 719, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and the project for the protection of the city of Walla Walla, Wash., authorized by the act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 719, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$754,000.

The project for levees on the Cowlitz River, Washington, for local flood protection at Castle Rock, Washington, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 721, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of \$31,000.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control, including floods aggravated by or due to tidal effect at the following-named localities, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of such localities; the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as hereby authorized on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law or by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Commerce of the Senate: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Byram River and tributaries, Connecticut.
Blind Brook and tributaries, New York.
Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers and their tributaries, New York.
Bronx River and tributaries, New York.
Hutchinson River and tributaries, New York.

Saw Mill River and tributaries, New York.
Garden Creek, Mathews County, Va.
Indian River, Upper St. Johns River and Marsh, and North Fork, St. Lucie River, and their tributaries, Florida.

Rio Grande and tributaries, New Mexico.
Mimbres River and tributaries, New Mexico.

Pearl River, Miss.
Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, from the Orleans-Jefferson Parish line westward and northward to the vicinity of Frenier.
Black River, Catahoula and Concordia Parishes, La.

Dogy and Clear Creeks, tributaries of the Arkansas River, Oklahoma.

Salt Creek of the Arkansas River and tributaries, Osage County, Oklahoma.

Red River of the North Drainage Basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

Inlets and outlets to Lake Hendricks, South Dakota and Minnesota.

North Fork and South Fork of the Shoshone River and their tributaries, Wyoming.

Emery River and tributaries, Tennessee.

Redstone Creek and tributaries, Pennsylvania.

West Fork River and tributaries, West Virginia, with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a system of multiple-use reservoirs.

Milwaukee River and tributaries, Wisconsin. Little Black River and tributaries, Michigan.

Sturgeon and Otter Rivers, and their tributaries, Michigan.

Cuyahoga River and tributaries, Ohio.

Tig Sur River and Carmel River, and their tributaries, Monterey County, Calif.

Laguna Canyon, Calif.

All streams in San Diego County, California, flowing into the Pacific Ocean.

Coyote River and tributaries, California.

San Francisquito Creek, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, California.

Alhambra Creek and tributaries, California. Matadero Creek, Santa Clara County, California.

Petaluma Creek and tributaries, Sonoma County, California.

Guadalupe River and tributaries, California.

Silvies River and tributaries, Oregon.

Columbia River and tributaries, Washington, from the downstream point of Vancouver Lake to upstream point of Bachelor Island.

Salmon Creek, in the vicinity of Juneau, Alaska.

Yaguez, Estero, Portuguez, Bucana, Lapa, Guamani, Chico, Maunabo, Quebrada Arena, and Susua Rivers, and tributaries, Puerto Rico.

Creque Gut and Fair Plain Gut and their tributaries, Island of Saint Croix, and of Turpentine Run, and Crown Mountain water courses and their tributaries, Island of Saint Thomas, V. I.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed \$1,000,000 for any one fiscal year to be expended in rescue work or in the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood.

SEC. 6. That the provisions of the following acts of Congress relating to river and harbor improvements are hereby made applicable to works of flood control heretofore or hereafter authorized: August 8, 1917, section 9 (40 Stat. 267); July 18, 1918, sections 5 and 6 (40 Stat. 911); and August 30, 1935, section 7 (49 Stat. 1048).

SEC. 7. Section 5 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), is amended by striking out the words "in carrying out the purposes of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in carrying out the purposes of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), as amended and supplemented"; and by adding at the end of said section the following sentence: "The provisions of this section shall be applicable to any funds heretofore appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement for measures of run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention upon watersheds."

SEC. 8. That the sum of \$260,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the improvements herein, the sum of \$10,000,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended in equal amounts by the Departments of War and Agriculture for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act and any

other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by said Departments, and the additional sum of \$5,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture in carrying on works of improvement of the character specified in section 7 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. All appropriations necessary for operation and maintenance of flood-control works authorized by law to be operated and maintained by the United States are hereby authorized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, and that amendments to any section of the bill may be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 27, in line 12, strike out the word "creek" and insert the words "and Dunlap Creeks."

On page 27, between lines 16 and 17, insert "Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana."

On page 27, after line 25, insert a new line as follows: "All streams in San Diego and Imperial Counties, Calif., flowing into the Salton Sea."

On page 28, between lines 5 and 6, insert "Novato Creek and its tributaries, Marin County, Calif."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this contains three preliminary surveys according to a bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE], which the Chief of Engineers approves. This includes all of the surveys which have been requested of the committee and this is a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN: Page 21, strike out all of lines 23 and 24 and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 22.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, all of you were here when I discussed this amendment a moment ago. Since that time the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] has discussed the flood situation there. It so happens that my district joins Kansas City on the north. It is true that there was a flood there 37 or 38 years ago, but since that time there have been worse floods on the upper Missouri than there have been at Kansas City.

The area to which I refer in this amendment lies more than 20 miles east of Kansas City. I understand the only reason for including it in the project with respect to the Kansas City is that it will cheapen the work. If this project is carried out, it will be necessary to remove a

bridge across the Missouri River. There will have to be another built.

The channel will be moved approximately 3 miles, and the Missouri River bridge now across that river is in the middle of the top of this bend. It will have to be taken out and removed to the new channel. It is estimated by the engineer of the town of Liberty that it will cost them \$100,000 to change their water system and their sewage system if this project is carried out. I have no objection in the world to it if they will compensate the people of that community for the damage they do to them.

It has been my experience when the War Department starts carrying out these projects, they do not pay any attention to the people along the banks. They do not compensate the people for the actual damage. They carry out the project in accordance with the act of Congress. So, if they move the river, there will be a dispute as to whether or not the town is damaged.

A study is being made by the War Department, and I did not assume, in view of the correspondence between myself and General Schley, dated May 29, which I read to you a moment ago, that this project would be included. It is under study again, in accordance with Senator Truman's resolution adopted on April 29. As I said, in view of that fact, I did not assume it would be included in the bill. I am asking that it be taken out until that study has been completed. They may come back here with some other type of recommendation which will relieve that community of this burden.

There is another situation a little farther to the west that is causing considerable dispute in respect to this particular project. I believe it is known as the Blue Valley project.

The Blue River runs into the Missouri River there and the flood problems are of considerable importance. They are asking for an investigation of that. It all enters into this one project, and I doubt very much that this Congress is going to appropriate any great sums of money at this session of Congress, in view of the enormous demands for money from other sources.

When you see the tax bill that comes in to you next week you will be a little more careful about your votes on appropriations than you have been in the past, and I doubt that you will vote on any projects that are absolutely not essential when you see the provisions of that tax bill and how it hits the people of this country.

I am simply asking in fairness to the people of this community, 20 miles away from Kansas City, that it be left out until the War Department has completed its further study to see what can be done for the protection of people who are away from Kansas City. We sympathize with them. As I say, I represent the district adjoining Kansas City, and part of my district suffers some of this flood. But I do not believe the people down there ought to pay the difference, and I understand it is a considerable amount, in the cost of taking care of the flood-control situation in Kansas City without this project being included. It can be done.

It is simply a little bit easier and maybe a little cheaper if this cut-off is made. It is fair by the people who know the Missouri River, and we who live on it do know it. It is one of the worst rivers in the country. It cuts and slices and takes away farms overnight. The streams that are running into it and come into this bank will be filled up as the old channel from which the river is taken fills up. It will grow up with willows, and every time the river comes up there will be a foot or two of silt put in there. Then these streams that are running into it will begin to spread out over the land through which they are now running. Certainly the War Department is not going to take care of those farmers who suffer flood damage after the channel has been put in. There is no way of getting them to do it. So I am just asking for plain, ordinary justice for these people in this small community.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Flood Control would not want to do any area any injustice. This item was included in the bill, first, because it was favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers. It was included in the bill, secondly, because it was advocated by the municipal officials of the city of Kansas City, Mo., and other citizens representing the public, and thirdly, because there was no real opposition before the committee.

In an effort to be as fair as it could be, the committee after this item had been included understood that some thought that there might be some danger to Blue Valley, to Liberty Bend, to the sanitary sewage, and to wells. The Chief of Engineers and his staff were recalled before the committee and his representative stated that this project would really be of benefit to the Blue Valley, substantially that, and that it would not injure the sanitary system in the vicinity of Liberty in any way.

I can appreciate how the gentleman feels. This is an amendment, not a new law. It is an amendment of existing law. One of the first projects authorized by Congress was at Kansas City, Mo. That project was authorized on June 22, 1936. The Chief of Engineers, because of the difficulty in obtaining rights-of-way, found that they could go down below the city of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., and construct this cut-off down there and save the Government, on this one project alone, \$100,000, and the Government would pay for the construction of the bridge.

I would say in deference to the gentleman from Missouri that no material opposition was uttered before our committee with respect to this project. I would also say, in view of his statement, which I understand to be absolutely correct, that a Member of the Senate has asked the Committee on Commerce to

pass a resolution, and the resolution has been passed, and that in all fairness, although this project is recommended by the Chief of Engineers, it is an amendment of existing law.

I believe the gentleman can rest well assured that the project will not be constructed until the Chief of Engineers has complied with the resolution of the Committee on Commerce, which has been authorized and passed. If that committee is convinced that there is any injustice to the local water supply or the sanitary system or the land in that bend down there, the project will not be constructed, and there will be an opportunity to amend it later on.

I would say that in view of the fact that the local people out there, not at Liberty Bend but in Kansas City, came here before the committee and said it was necessary to protect airfields and national-defense projects, and since this statement was supplemented by the statement of the Chief of Engineers that this project is worthy and will save the Government at least \$100,000, as far as the House of Representatives is concerned, the gentleman's amendment should be voted down. If it should appear when this bill goes to the Senate that this provision should be eliminated on further study, that body will have the privilege of so doing.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DUNCAN. Was the information from the War Department before them, this letter of May 29?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did not know anything about a letter of May 29 before today. The Chief of Engineers advised us that he was making a study, just as he stated in the letter of said date he wrote the gentleman, of the Missouri Basin, including the Blue Valley and including this area around Liberty, and that report would be submitted to the Congress just as soon as it could be completed. In view of that statement and that this is an authorization, and, as the gentleman stated, because we are engaged in a national-defense program, we are not making an immediate appropriation and there will be ample time before the Congress is called upon to make the appropriation for Congress to consider a modification of this project if it develops that it will do any injustice.

Mr. DUNCAN. It is already in the bill now. It is an authorization. If the appropriation is made, it will still be in it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Certainly. I repeat, this is an authorization bill. The appropriation has to be made. But I maintain that inasmuch as there was no real opposition before the Committee on Flood Control the provision should not be changed now.

Mr. DUNCAN. May I, in fairness, ask the gentleman this question: In view of the letter from General Schley on May 29 stating that the matter was under study and that further investigation was being made, did not the people interested have the right to assume that it would not be included until the War Department had completed that study?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall answer the gentleman by saying that the hearings before the Committee on Flood Control had been completed and the committee had agreed to report the bill. The hearings were being printed. That letter is nothing more nor less than the information we had.

I trust the gentleman's amendment will not be agreed to. If it is desired to eliminate that provision, it can be eliminated in another body.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 234, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 244), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4972, a bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil

Service, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include, in connection with an extension of my remarks made in the discussion of the flood-control bill, short excerpts from the bill and the committee report, and also to include a statement which I made before the committee.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the flood-control bill and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the flood-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARITIME LABOR BOARD

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4107, to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

(1) Line 5, strike out "five" and insert "four."

(2) After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 1004 of such act is amended by striking out the words 'the Board to encourage' in the opening lines of said section."

(3) After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 3. Sections 1006, 1008, and 1009, and the last sentence of section 1010 of such act are hereby repealed: *Provided, however,* That the Maritime Labor Board may continue to act as mediator in any disputes wherein its mediation services have been requested and the mediation of which the Board has actively undertaken prior to the date of the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. No one can have any idea what those amendments mean—to strike and insert certain things that are not before the House. It will

LXXXVII—344

take time for anyone to get the law and superimpose the amendments upon the law. I have repeatedly called attention to this reckless, nonsensical, asinine method of procedure, and unless the gentleman can explain the matter very fully in a very few words, I shall object.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the amendment substantially does this. It continues the life of the Maritime Labor Board for 1 year instead of 2. The life of that Board terminates on Monday next. The language that is stricken out "the Board to encourage" in section 1004, leaves it so as to read that it shall be the duty of the maritime employers, their officers, agents, and their employees, and the duly appointed representatives of their employees to exert their reasonable effort, and so forth, and continues the same duties that were existent in the original law, except that it strikes out the words that it is the duty of the Board to encourage. The other amendment in striking out the section tacitly terminates the work of the Board except in collecting its data, and in submitting that to Congress, and in terminating such mediations as the Board has already undertaken.

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the judge or the Administrator who is supposed to pass on or interpret the law to which the gentleman refers will not have the advantage of having the distinguished and able gentleman from Virginia at his arm, to tell him what the law means. And may I hope that the next time the gentleman brings a bill before the House, he will bring in a bill that one of ordinary intelligence can tell what it means by reading it. With that I withdraw the reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Newport News Daily Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLMENT OF A BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill H. R. 4973.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] had 35 minutes to address the House today. He does not desire to use that time, but asks unanimous consent that the time be transferred until Monday under like conditions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBMARINE "O-9"

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to report another very sad accident that occurred in the Navy today. The submarine O-9, a wartime boat, built 23 years ago, after being reconditioned at the Portsmouth (N. H.) Navy Yard, went on a trial test today and at 9:36 a. m., submerged offshore in 375 feet of water and has not, up to this time, returned to the surface.

The O-9 carries a crew of 34 officers and men. Plans are already under way by the Navy Department to carry on the rescue work. Practically all the equipment used in the rescue of the men on the *Squalus* and in the salvaging of that submarine is now on the scene, most of it having been kept in Portsmouth and Boston since that sad accident occurred about 2 years ago. The naval divers at the time of the *Squalus* incident carried on the greatest rescue act in maritime history, in 240 feet of water. Naval divers left Washington at noon today by plane and are now at Portsmouth.

The location of the submarine O-9 at this moment is not yet determined. The naval authorities assume that 375 feet of water covers the boat. Everything is being done to bring about proper equipment and the carrying on of the rescue work which will be so necessary if the submarine is located.

I wanted to say that at the time the *Squalus* went down in 240 feet of water, 59 men were on board, of which 33 were alive, the other 26 having died in the flooded compartments. All of the men who were alive were rescued through the diving bell. I want the Members to feel sure the Navy Department is going to exercise every bit of human ingenuity to bring about the rescue of the men on the O-9 as they did during the sinking of the *Squalus*. We have the greatest confidence in the organization—officers and men who make up the personnel—and you may all feel sure that the Navy Department will leave nothing undone to save the lives of the men who are on that submarine.

[Here the gavel fell.]

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 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 Atkinson;

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.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

674. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Stillaguamish River, Wash., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted June 6, 1939, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted May 24, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 286), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

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. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 241. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a temporary assistant reading clerk of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5052. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4693. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 243. Resolution providing consideration of S. 1524, a bill authorizing deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 811). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 244. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4972, a bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 812). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 5110. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5111. A bill authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5112. A bill to authorize the commissioning in the Regular Army of Reserve officers who are married; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 5113. A bill to appropriate funds for the completion of San Jacinto Monument Building and the installation of an adequate lighting system therein on San Jacinto Battlefield near Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5114. A bill to prohibit subversive individuals from representing employees for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 5115. A bill to provide for the inspection and certification of plants and plant products offered for export to meet sanitary requirements of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 5116. A bill authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5117. A bill to promote safety in the development of air commerce by regulating the lighting of airports and other landing areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 5118. A bill making eligible for citizenship any alien heretofore admitted to the United States for permanent residence under special act of Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 5119. A bill to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PADDOCK:

H. R. 5120. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of the remaining portion of the Grosse Point Lighthouse Reservation by deed to the city of Evanston, Ill.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 5121. A bill to extend the franking privilege of the United States mails to individuals serving in the land and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 5122. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, between the Boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 5126. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oklahoma of certain lands in full satisfaction of the claim against the United States under the provisions of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution commending the work of the San Jacinto Museum of History Association and authorizing an appropriation for the completion of San Jacinto Monument Building on San Jacinto Battlefield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution creating a Committee to Investigate the Feasibility of Transferring Certain Bureaus and Agencies of the Government from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 245. Resolution suggesting the need for developing a plan for furnishing food and supplies to the stricken and hungry peoples of Belgium and other countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution relative to raising of additional revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 5123. A bill granting a pension to John William Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 5124. A bill for the relief of John R. Agurkis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 5125. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pansy Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1480. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of sundry residents of Galt, Sacramento County; Acampo, San Joaquin County; St. Helena, Napa County; and Sanitarium, Napa County, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852, bills to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1481. By Mr. HART: Memorial of 21 residents of the State of New Jersey, protesting against enactment of House bill 3852, known as the District of Columbia Barbers' Opening and Closing Hours Act of 1941; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1482. Also, petition of the Department of New Jersey, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, endorsing the proclamation by the President, that an unlimited national emergency confronts this country, and making suggestions for the national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1483. By Mr. KERR: Petition of the Limer Post, No. 25, of the North Carolina Department of the American Legion in regular meeting assembled at Warrenton, N. C., on June 5, 1941, relative to strikes in defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of John Nix & Co., New York City, favoring passage of House bill 4760; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1485. Also, petition of the United Marine Division, Local 333, International Longshoremen's Association, New York City, urging passage of the longevity bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1486. Also, petition of the Polish Army Veterans Association of America, New York City, favoring a resolution to supply food for small democracies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1487. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution of the Federation of Belgian Societies of North America, adopted at the convention at Rock Island, Ill., with reference to foreign policy and national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1488. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the proposals of the Treasury Department now pending before Congress in respect to the raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1489. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Motor Car Dealers Association of San Francisco, Inc., recommending that the excise tax on new automobiles be increased up to, but not to exceed, 7 percent of the manufacturer's wholesale price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1490. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the proposals of the Treasury Department of the United States now pending before the Congress in respect to raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1491. Also, petition of residents of Boston, protesting against the enactment of House bill 3852; to the Committee on Labor.

1492. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of the Hairpin and Cosmetic Workers' Union, No. 22180, Shelbyville, Ill., expressing their approval of the Illinois State Planning Commission project No. 33, to construct a dam for the purpose of flood control in the Kaskaskia River Basin; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1493. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, relating to the proposals of the Treasury Department of the United States now pending before the Congress in respect to the raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exceptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1494. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, Alabama, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1495. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Local No. 9, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 3849, relative to the regulation of private forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1496. Also, petition of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the fullest possible moral and health protection for our soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1497. Also, petition of the National Association for the Calling of a United States Constitutional Convention, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to delays and stoppages of work in industries; to the Committee on Labor.

1498. Also, petition of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to safety from criminals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1941

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

O Loving Father, tender Shepherd of the souls of men, who slumberest not nor sleepest, who art often nearest when we feel Thou has forsaken us: At this solemn moment, as we lift up our hearts, so heavy with the burdens of today, yet knowing not what the morrow may bring forth,

we beseech Thee to remove the clouds that veil our sight, that we may discern some gleams of purpose working behind this tangled human world, to the quieting of the strange and throbbing yearnings of our souls.

Again the silent messenger has come and has taken from us one we felt could not be spared at this fateful hour of our country's destiny; and yet Thou knowest best. We thank Thee for his great and noble soul, the fineness of his character, the loyalty and devotion to his every duty, the tenderness of his affection, and the transfiguring quality of chivalry which graced his high and holy sense of manhood.

Do Thou comfort now and through the days that lie ahead the beloved companion of his life, the children who rise up to call him blessed, and all others who are near and dear.

And as we stand here in this National Shrine, where he hath wrought so nobly, may some portion of his spirit fall upon us, for we know that his life has not set in a night of pain and gloom, but amid the splendors of Thine everlasting day. We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Him who hath brought life and immortality to light, Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4107. An act to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 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; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. HARE, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KEEFE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

H. R. 3537. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4911. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, FOR REFERENCE OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn until Thursday next; that during the period of the adjournment bills coming over from the House of Representatives may be referred to the appropriate committees; that the committees