

highway as such survey and study shall justify; to the Committee on Roads.

1350. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Violet Rader and 17 other citizens of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of House bill 2475, which proposes protection to the service men of the United States in connection with the sale of alcoholic liquors and the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1351. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of C. W. Whitman and other railroad employees of Newark, Ohio, protesting against the completion of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1352. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of the members of the Methodist Church, Moshoppen, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1353. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Martin Stoutenberg and 11 other citizens, of Osage, Iowa, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1354. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Syrian and Lebanese American Federation of the Eastern States, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national defense and patriotism; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1355. Also, petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the construction of the Berlin and Mosquito Creek Reservoirs; to the Committee on Flood Control.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1941

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

Almighty and everlasting God, who holdest in Thy hand the destinies of all mankind: We beseech Thee to look upon our Nation with Thy special care and fatherliness, quickening in us thoughts that beget true emotions, which, passing into action, shall make our lives serviceable, if not sublime, as, in imitation of Thy blessed Son, we strive to work the work of God while it is day.

Dispel all gloom and fear that may oppress the hearts of any, and, while we ask for the grace of humility for all upon whose shoulders have been placed the responsibilities of Government, we beseech Thee, especially to endue our leaders with strength and the courage that is born of justice, that right may prevail, manifesting itself on the part of everyone in rectitude of personal conduct, and a wholehearted loyalty to our country and the ideals for which it stands.

And now we pray for all who shall foregather here today, and as they strive to advance in singleness of heart Thy purposes for America, be Thou near them to defend them, within them to refresh them, about them to preserve them, before them to lead them, behind them to justify them, and above them to bless them. All of which we ask in our dear Redeemer's Name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, June 9, 1941, was dis-

pensed 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 passed without amendment the bill (S. 774) to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385);

H. R. 4660. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935; and

H. R. 4965. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The Vice President laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 65)

A communication from the President of the United States submitting a proposed amendment to the Budget for 1942 for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, amounting to \$50,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented by Senators and referred as indicated:

#### By Mr. LODGE:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, 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 South Haven, Ashton, Winfield, and Arkansas City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

#### By Mr. ANDREWS:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing Congress to enact promptly House bill 1036, known as the general-welfare bill, providing for a national old-age retirement system, etc.; to the Committee on Finance. (See resolution printed in full

when laid before the Senate on the 5th instant by the Acting President pro tempore, p. 4732, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, urging that all possible aid be promptly rendered to Great Britain, including patrols and the convoying of ships by the United States Navy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (See memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate on the 5th instant by the Acting President pro tempore, p. 4732, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the table:

#### "Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Resolution relating to the preservation of moral conditions in the vicinity of Army and naval camps and plants erected and maintained by the Federal Government in providing for the national defense

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

"SECTION 1. That the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring) respectfully petition the Congress of the United States of America to give early consideration to legislation suppressing and prohibiting all forms of vice, including the sale of intoxicating beverages, on, in, and in the vicinity of all plants owned, leased, or maintained by the United States of America for national defense, including all reservations, camps, bases, training schools, barracks, and other areas used for the quartering, training, or encampment of the armed forces of the Army and Navy of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Be it further resolved, That the secretary of state forthwith prepare suitable copies of this resolution and cause the same to be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairmen of the several committees on Army and naval affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor May 31, 1941."

#### By Mr. CONNALLY:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Commerce:

#### "Senate Resolution 143

"Whereas it appears from present reports that a serious effort is now being made to induce the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps toward completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power treaty; and

"Whereas the Senate of the State of Texas, although actuated by every desire to cooperate with the Government in its plans for our national defense, firmly believes that such a development would not be in the public interest in any manner, but would be hostile to the best interests of the State of Texas and of the United States, as it would disrupt and demoralize the transportation systems of the United States, land and water, and would disastrously affect the economic welfare of the country, and would particularly work a hardship on the Texas ports, and would cause irreparable injury to a large percentage of the public interests and labor of this State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That it go on record as being strongly opposed to this project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, and particularly the Senators and Representatives elected from the State of Texas, be memorialized and requested to use their utmost influence in opposition to said project; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the secretary of

the United States Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. Sam Rayburn; and to each Senator and Representative elected from the State of Texas."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

**"Senate Resolution 148**

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, House Resolution No. 4816, the purpose of which is to give the right of eminent domain to interstate oil pipe lines; and

"Whereas the citizens of the State of Texas are interested in the same right being given to interstate gas pipe lines which afford a market for Texas gas, which is an essential fuel in defense industries: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That the Congress of the United States be requested to amend said House Resolution No. 4816 so that it will include gas pipe lines and give said pipe lines the right of eminent domain in the event said act is finally passed; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate of Texas be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to each Member of Congress from Texas and to the Secretary of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

**"Senate Concurrent Resolution 50**

"Whereas this Nation is now in the midst of a vast preparedness and rearmament program for the protection of our Nation and homes; and

"Whereas there exists a monster dictator in Europe who is trying to destroy all democratic nations; and

"Whereas this Nation has already drafted her young manhood for protection; and

"Whereas the United States has already called upon the people to give their money so that our Nation can have sufficient money to finance this vast program; and

"Whereas money, men, capital, and labor are all needed to better prepare our Nation to meet this great emergency; and

"Whereas our great citizenship is responding with money and men; and

"Whereas, in order to further the national defense, it is essential that there be full cooperation between capital and labor and all branches of our Government; and

"Whereas there are instances where groups of capital and labor, by their failure to cooperate, are seriously impeding and endangering the defense program; and

"Whereas unless capital and labor do respond as they should the same tragic end will happen to this Nation that has already happened to democratic nations of Europe who were unprepared: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sentiment, will, and desire of the Texas Legislature that the Congress of the United States immediately take such steps as may be necessary to properly prepare these United States of America to defend themselves from any aggressor from within or from without; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of Congress from Texas, to each United States Senator from Texas, to the Vice President of the United States, and to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt."*

**ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT**

Mr. BYRD presented a letter from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce

of Roanoke, Va., transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by the national affairs committee of that chamber, which letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
OF ROANOKE, VA., INC.  
April 16, 1941.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At the request of our committee on national affairs I enclose copy of a resolution which the committee adopted at a meeting on April 15, which you observe sets forth the committee's reasons for opposing the development of the St. Lawrence shipway as a defense project.

You will recall that this chamber has on various occasions from November 20, 1932, opposed the development of the St. Lawrence waterway by the Government of the United States.

Our committee will appreciate very much your further consideration of the matter.

Yours sincerely,

B. F. MOOMAW, Secretary.

Resolution passed by the national affairs committee of the Roanoke Chamber of Commerce on April 15, 1941

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Roanoke, Va., after a careful study, on November 20, 1932, adopted a resolution opposing ratification of a pending treaty providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and

Whereas the declaration of policy expressed in said resolution has ever since been adhered to by this chamber with the consistent support of our Representatives in the Congress and the Senate; and

Whereas the executive department of our Government has recently sought to revive this unsound project in the guise of a defense measure; and

Whereas judged solely from the standpoint of national-defense requirements this proposed adventure is devoid of merit because—

(1) The emergency we face requires action now and not 5 years hence, the minimum time which must elapse before the sponsors of this plant promise us it can be placed in operation.

(2) The concentration of shipbuilding facilities on an estuary more vulnerable than the Panama Canal with a depth that will not admit the passage of a capital ship but only destroyers and light flotilla craft which can be built in dozens of existing harbors scattered along our coast line ignores all the lessons to be learned from the present war.

(3) The embarkation of so much of our national wealth and productive capacity as the prosecution of this enterprise would require will definitely embarrass and delay our production of weapons needed now for the defense of democracy to which we are committed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence shipway at this time is detrimental to the successful defense of the United States and that the Senators and Representatives of this State be respectfully requested to oppose the present effort to launch this project as a defense measure.*

**STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES, ETC.**

Mr. BYRD presented resolutions and letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens and organizations in the State of Virginia, and elsewhere in the United States, relating to the control of strikes in defense industries, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROANOKE, VA., May 28, 1941.  
Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise that we, the Navy Mothers Club of Roanoke, Va., which is a club made up of mothers of Navy boys actually in service, our purpose in mind to support the Government in every way possible in the national-defense move and at the same time aid our boys in every way possible, have adopted unanimously an appeal to all workers throughout the Nation to give all support possible and stay away from strikes and lay-offs under all circumstances; and if and when they have difficulties, to take them up before the proper board and work them out in the form of arbitration, but by all means keep on working during the course of such procedure.

For your information we are enclosing a copy of this resolution, which has already been run in several of our Roanoke newspapers. I am glad to advise that the newspaper in this city approved of this move 100 percent and has cooperated with us perfectly.

We trust that this move will benefit the national defense in some small way and will meet with your approval 100 percent; and if so, we would greatly appreciate you passing the message on as you see fit to do, either through local or national publication, or both.

With kindest regards, we remain,  
Yours respectfully,

PEARL A. PROFFIT,  
Commander, Roanoke Local Organization.

**STRIKE DENOUNCED—NAVY MOTHERS TAKE ACTION**

Opposition to all strikes during the present national emergency is voiced in a resolution unanimously adopted by the Roanoke Navy Mothers Club and released by Mrs. Pearl Profit, commander, yesterday. A copy of the resolution, adopted by 53 members, is being sent to the national organization.

The resolution is as follows:

"We, the Navy Mothers Club of Roanoke, wish to go on record as opposed to any strike for whatever cause in any organization producing any vital defense materials in this time of emergency.

"Since the lives of our boys may depend upon their having proper and sufficient equipment to meet any need, and since they are willing to offer their lives if necessary for the welfare of our country, we feel that no worker has the right to put his personal demand for higher wages, shorter hours, or any other personal advantages above the welfare of our country at the present time.

"We feel that a safe country in which the worker can live and rear his family would be of greater value to him than any increase in wages could ever be. We believe that any worker who has a grievance against his employer should be allowed to submit that grievance to a neutral board, but because of his patriotism and his love of his country he should keep on working to produce materials so vitally needed for our defense today.

"Our only hope for preserving our democratic form of government for future generations lies in the willingness of each citizen of our country to do his part in this emergency regardless of whatever sacrifice it may demand, to preserve the welfare and freedom of our beloved Nation."

At a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, Va., held in the courthouse at Lawrenceville, Va., this the 26th day of May 1941, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it appears to this board that the widespread labor disturbances and strikes in

industrial plants charged with the production of defense materials constitute a serious threat to the safety of our Nation; and

"Whereas it appears that some of those directing the affairs of labor are making deliberate and continuous attempts to delay the Nation's program of defense by unreasonable and exorbitant demands of a selfish nature, which, in addition to hampering the production of defense materials, also cause dissension and controversy at a time when complete accord and sacrifice is essential to the Nation's safety; and

"Whereas it appears that such efforts as have been made by Federal authorities to curb these disorders and strikes in defense plants have met with but scant success: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, Va., in regular meeting assembled at Lawrenceville, Va., this the 26th day of May 1941:*

"(1) That this board places itself on record as opposing and condemning labor disturbances and strikes in defense plants as being dangerous to the welfare of the Nation during the present emergency.

"(2) That we hereby express to our Senators and Congressmen and others in authority at the seat of the Government our condemnation of and opposition to such disturbances and strikes.

"(3) That we respectfully request that appropriate action be taken by Congress to immediately provide such laws and penalties as may be necessary to prohibit and prevent such disturbances during the present emergency; and be it further

*"Resolved, That the clerk of this board be authorized and instructed to certify a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; to the Secretary of War; to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Secretary of Labor; to each Representative in Congress from Virginia; and to the representatives of the press."*

Unanimously adopted at regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, Va., in regular meeting at Lawrenceville, Va., this the 26th day of May 1941.

W. E. ELMORE,  
Clerk, Board of Supervisors,  
Brunswick County, Va.

Whereas a national emergency exists, and our great Government finds its existence challenged by forces beyond our borders, and a duty rests upon all good Americans to lend full support to our President in his efforts to prepare this Nation for the defense of our form of government; and

Whereas our young men are being called upon to give of their time and talent in an all-out preparation of the military defense of the Western Hemisphere, and the young men are responding in the typical American spirit, and it has come to the attention of the membership of the American Legion, department of Virginia, that there are strikes and other labor disputes prevalent in some of our defense industries which are delaying the speedy production of materials necessary in the defense of our country; and

Whereas it is the belief of the American Legion that all men in all walks of life should subordinate their personal interest in the interest of the United States of America during this emergency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the fifth district of the American Legion, Department of Virginia, in convention assembled in the city of Danville this 6th day of April 1941, That the Honorable CARTER GLASS, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, Members of the United States Senate from Virginia, and the Virginia delegation of the House of Representatives, be, and they are hereby, petitioned to support legislation as may be necessary to prohibit strikes, lockouts, or other labor disputes that will in any way tend to hinder or delay the speedy pro-*

duction of armaments and other supplies necessary for our all-out effort against aggression; and be it further

*Resolved, That the American Legion is not opposed to organized labor, but it does deplore in no uncertain terms prevailing conditions at this time which tend to deprive our comrades in arms of the necessary materials and supplies for proper training; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the department adjutant, W. Glenn Elliott, be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy hereof to Senator CARTER GLASS, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, and to each Member of the House of Representatives from Virginia and deliver a copy hereof to the press.*

J. B. ALLMAN, Chairman,  
F. W. KAPPES,  
RALEIGH M. FELTON,  
Resolutions Committee.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the convention.

Transmitted from the American Legion, department of Virginia.

W. GLENN ELLIOTT,  
Department Adjutant.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA,  
Richmond, Va., May 15, 1941.  
Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
Senator from Virginia, Senate Office  
Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by a large group of Legionnaires, members of the auxiliary, and their guests, following the seventh district convention held in Charlottesville, May 14:

"A group of members of the American Legion, the American Legion Auxiliary, and their guests from the seventh district and many sections of Virginia, assembled at this banquet in Charlottesville, Va., go on record as requesting that the President of the United States declare a national emergency to exist, so that our national-defense plans shall not be retarded by strikes or any other agency whatsoever."

We trust that this resolution meets with your approval and that we may have your support in our desire to have the President declare a state of national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

W. GLENN ELLIOTT.

At a joint meeting of Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, Department of Virginia, and Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight, of Berryville-Winchester, Va., held on the 28th day of May 1941 in the American Legion Community Building at Berryville, Va., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it appears to these two organizations that the widespread labor disturbances and strikes in industrial plants charged with the production of defense materials constitute a serious threat to the safety of our Nation; and

"Whereas it appears that some of those directing the affairs of labor are making deliberate and continuous attempts to delay the Nation's program of defense by unreasonable and exorbitant demands of a selfish nature, which, in addition to hampering the production of defense materials, also causes dissension and controversy at a time when complete accord and sacrifice is essential to the Nation's safety; and

"Whereas it appears that such efforts as have been made by Federal authorities to curb these disorders and strikes in defense plants have met with but scant success: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, and Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight, in joint*

session assembled at Berryville, Va., this 28th day of May 1941—

"(1) That this post and voiture place themselves on record as opposing and condemning labor disturbances and strikes in defense plants as being dangerous to the welfare of the Nation during the present emergency.

"(2) That we hereby express to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States our condemnation of and opposition to such disturbances and strikes.

"(3) That we respectfully request that appropriate action be taken by the Congress of the United States to immediately provide such laws and penalties as may be necessary to prevent and prohibit such disturbances during the present emergency; be it further

*"Resolved, That the commander and adjutant of Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, and the chef de gare and correspondent of Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, be authorized and instructed to certify a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Labor, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from Virginia, and to representatives of the press."*

Unanimously adopted at a joint meeting of Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, Department of Virginia, and Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight Society, Le Departement de Virginie, in joint session at Berryville, Va., this 28th day of May 1941.

Official:

H. B. HARRIS,  
Commander, Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41,  
the American Legion, Department of Virginia.

HAROLD C. SCHENER,  
Adjutant, Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the  
American Legion, Department of Virginia.

ROBERT D. BEETON,  
Chef de Gare, Shenandoah Valley Voiture,  
No. 1078, Forty and Eight, Virginia.  
JOHN E. ZOMERO,  
Correspondent, Shenandoah Valley Voiture,  
No. 1078, Forty and Eight, Virginia.

DANVILLE, VA., March 3, 1941.  
Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Brosville Council, No. 51, Jr. O. U. A. M., which is composed of businessmen and farmers, is alarmed at the numerous news accounts from many sections of our country indicating that strikes, delays, and stoppages in our vital industries are impeding the progress of our national-defense program at a time when full speed ahead should be the watchword of every patriotic American citizen.

This council does not criticize either capital or labor. However, in view of the recognized fact that wages paid American labor, dividends enjoyed by American industry, and living standards of American people are incomparable throughout the entire world, and in view of the further fact that thousands upon thousands of American youth are willing to serve their country for a nominal compensation, we feel that this is no time to tolerate petty quibbling from either capital or labor.

We believe in the fundamental principles of collective bargaining, but not to the extent of paralyzing our national-defense program while the bargaining is in progress.

In this hour of national emergency we demand that capital and labor together shall ban all strikes, delays, and stoppages in every vital defense industry pending a settlement of any and all grievances by the proper authorities.

In this hour of national emergency we feel that you, our representative, should know that we view this entire situation with in-

creasing alarm and that we expect you to take every necessary step to insure the elimination of all strikes, delays, and stoppages in our national-defense program, both in Virginia and throughout the country at large.

Very truly yours,

BROSVILLE COUNCIL, NO. 51,  
JR. O. U. A. M., BROSVILLE, VA.,  
By F. MARTIN COLLIE,  
Acting Councilor.  
By H. C. ASHWORTH,  
Recording Secretary.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,  
April 15, 1941.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,  
United States Senate Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At the annual meeting of John C. Culin Post, No. 1827, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held at their club rooms here last night, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and I was instructed by the post to transmit a copy of same to you and to inform you that our organization here is 100 percent behind you in your fight to prevent subversive strikes and unpatriotic actions by any person or group of persons which tend to nullify our preparedness program.

We do not fail to realize the seriousness of the present war situation, and we assure you that we are ready to answer the call and do the job as we did in 1918. We are proud to know we have a man of your foresight, honesty, and integrity in the United States Senate to look after the best interest of all classes.

I beg to remain with best wishes  
Sincerely yours,

M. H. CASON,  
Adjutant, John C. Culin Post, 1827,  
Veterans of Foreign Wars.  
Resolution attached hereto.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., April 14, 1941.

Resolution adopted at the annual meeting of John C. Culin Post, No. 1827, V. F. W.

"Whereas there have been and now are being conducted strikes, sit-downs, and all kinds of subversive actions in various industries, factories, and plants and businesses in various parts of the United States, which are seriously hampering the defense and aid-to-other-democracies program of the United States; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Labor, who is under the direction of the President, has failed to put a stop to such strikes, sabotage, and un-American activities, which are disloyal to the men who have been and are being conscripted to train to defend this great country of ours: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, By this post in regular meeting assembled. That we endorse the speech of our great Senator BYRD, delivered before the United States Senate on March 27, 1941, and that we urge him to continue his efforts to put an end to all subversive actions by any group, person, or persons, official or otherwise, in order that we may present a united front with 100 percent of production and 100-percent American loyalty."

Proposed by Ernest R. Duff, P. C.

Seconded by Judge J. Callan Brooks, P. C.  
Attest:

M. H. CASON, Adjutant.

KIWANIS CLUB OF  
VICTORIA-KENBRIDGE, INC.,  
Kenbridge, Va., May 26, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Victoria-Kenbridge Kiwanis Club of Lunenburg County, Va., has directed me as its secretary to send you a resolution entered at its regular meet-

ing, held on Thursday, May 22, which you will find enclosed herewith.

We wish to assure you of our unified interest and cooperation with the program of national defense, and we shall be ready and willing at all times to help in any way possible to make it a complete success.

With kindest personal regards, we remain,  
Sincerely yours,  
Rev. F. A. SAPP, Secretary.

Inasmuch as the right to live as free men has been denied certain nations of the world and has been challenged in certain others, and inasmuch as this right in our Nation is thereby imperiled, it is hereby

"Resolved by the Victoria-Kenbridge Kiwanis Club of Lunenburg County, Va., in regular meeting, assembled this, the 22d day of May 1941, That we wholeheartedly and unreservedly approve the national-defense program;

That we will by all means that we can employ support every effort to carry it out;

That we urge a declaration of policy by the President of the United States, that no one has the right to strike against public safety;

That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to the United States Senators from this State and to the Members of the United States House of Representatives from this district, and to the proper Kiwanis officials.

The Hanover County Board of Agriculture, through a vote by mail over their signatures, have endorsed the following resolution. I herewith transmit it to the Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States, and personally, considering this a responsibility of the Executive, I am sending a copy to President Roosevelt:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defense of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to fully meet its obligation in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and

"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations in essential industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Hanover County Board of Agriculture, do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Hanover County Board of Agriculture through a ballot by mail, March 27, 1941.

Sincerely,  
C. E. MYERS,  
Chairman, Hanover County  
Board of Agriculture.

NORTH RICHMOND POST, NO. 38,  
Richmond, Va., March 22, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
United States Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am quoting below a resolution unanimously adopted by North Richmond Post, No. 38, of the American Legion, Department of Virginia, at their regular meeting on March 15, 1941:

"Be it resolved by North Richmond Post, No. 38, American Legion, of Richmond, Va.,

That while this post is not opposed to collective bargaining, it feels that during the period of emergency caused by the passage of the lease-lend bill to aid the democracies all difficulties between labor and employers should be settled by mediation, without recourse to strikes; and this post urges the President of the United States and the Congress to take such action as may be necessary to accomplish that end; be it further

"Resolved, That copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the post; that a copy be sent to the President of the United States; that a copy be sent to the Senators from Virginia; and that a copy be sent to the Representative in Congress from this district."

Respectfully,  
C. F. WASSER, Adjutant.

THE YOUNG MEN'S CLUB OF DANVILLE,  
Danville, Va., February 26, 1941.  
Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Young Men's Club of Danville, Va., which is composed of business and professional men, is alarmed at the numerous news accounts from many sections of our country indicating that strikes, delays, and stoppages in our vital industries are impeding the progress of our national-defense program at a time when full speed ahead should be the watchword of every patriotic American citizen.

This club does not criticize either capital or labor. However, in view of the recognized fact that wages paid American labor, dividends enjoyed by American industry, and living standards of American people are incomparable throughout the entire world, and in view of the further fact that thousands upon thousands of American youth are willing to serve their country for a nominal compensation, we feel that this is no time to tolerate petty quibbling from either capital or labor.

We believe in the fundamental principles of collective bargaining, but not to the extent of paralyzing our national-defense program while the bargaining is in progress.

In this hour of national emergency we demand that capital and labor together shall ban all strikes, delays, and stoppages in every vital defense industry pending a settlement of any and all grievances by the proper authorities.

In this hour of national emergency we feel that you, our representative, should know that we view the entire situation with increasing alarm and that we expect you to take every necessary step to insure the elimination of all strikes, delays, and stoppages in our national-defense program, both in Virginia and throughout the country at large.

Very truly yours,  
W. H. DODSON, JR.,  
Secretary, Young Men's  
Club of Danville, Va.

MAY, SIMPKINS & YOUNG,  
Richmond, Va., May 28, 1941.  
Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
United States Senator, State of  
Virginia, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The president of the Ruritan Club of Henry District, Hanover County, has asked that I inform you that a resolution was passed by the Ruritan Club of Henry District at its last meeting to the following effect:

"Resolved, That the Ruritan Club of Henry District, Hanover County, go on record as being of the opinion that strikes in defense industries at this time are subversive to the national welfare and are unfair to those called upon to make great sacrifices under the terms of the Selective Service Act; and that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator GLASS,

Senator BYRD, and Representative SATTERFIELD."

I could not get the secretary this morning to certify the resolution, and I am therefore merely advising you of it. Certified copies will be sent to you by the secretary.

We as a club feel, and I personally feel, very strongly that our Government should do something, if possible, to prevent a small minority of workers from agitating unfairly and thereby causing strikes which definitely cripple our defense effort.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD P. SIMPKINS, JR.

BEAVERDAM, VA., April 29, 1941.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
Member of the United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The eighth grade of the Beaverdam High School unanimously passed the following resolutions:

1. That strikes in national-defense industries be eliminated by appropriate legislation.

2. That strikers receiving over \$4 per diem be placed in the Army of the United States with the men who are earning \$21 per month.

3. That Congress take immediate steps to settle the soft-coal strike, authorizing the Government to operate the mines if such is deemed necessary.

Yours very truly,

DEAN HALL,  
Chairman of the Committee on  
Resolutions of the Eighth Grade,  
Beaverdam High School.

At a meeting, April 4, 1941, of the executive committee, Princess Anne County Board of Agriculture, an organization of Princess Anne County farmers, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defenses of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to fully meet its obligations in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and

"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations and other interferences in essential defense industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the executive committee of the Princess Anne County Board of Agriculture, do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the Princess Anne County Board of Agriculture, at a meeting held April 4, 1941.

M. B. FLANAGAN,  
Chairman.  
H. W. OZLIN,  
Secretary.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
AUGUSTA-STAUNTON POST, 2216,  
Staunton, Va., April 21, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BYRD: Our organization, Augusta-Staunton Post, No. 2216, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has observed very keenly the serious situation caused by strikes when defense orders are involved, and the most of them apparently are called for no justifiable reason whatsoever.

We refer you specifically to the Allis-Chalmers strike, the one at Ford Motor Co., the soft-coal strike which has been in progress since April 1 and is now affecting our defense industries, the complete tie-up in some of our vital airplane and steel plants, and at present a strike is threatening in General Motors.

The situation is gnawing at the heart-strings of our defense program. It is weakening the morale of the boys who have been conscripted for 1 year's training, for they dislike to see some slacker walk out on strike who is already receiving from \$10 to \$15 a day, when they are serving their country as best they know how at \$21 per month, and our organization is heartily in favor of the Conscription Act.

By permitting this condition to exist, our Government is playing to the hands of the Axis Powers, and at a recent meeting of Augusta-Staunton Post, No. 2216, a motion was made and unanimously adopted that letters be written to our representatives in the Senate and Congress, urging that necessary legislation be enacted to prevent future recurrences and straighten out the existing strike situation. Time has proven that the condition will not adjust itself, for we have been confronted with this problem now for a period of years.

Your assistance and support in providing measures to relieve this situation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

W. I. WOODDELL, Adjutant.

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERAN:

DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA,

ROBERT E. CRAIGHILL CAMP, No. 11,  
Lynchburg, Va., April 19, 1941.

The Robert E. Craighill Camp Lynchburg, Department of Virginia, United Spanish War Veterans and its auxiliary, in a joint meeting, adopted a resolution in tenor as follows:

(a) That strikes and lock-outs in plants engaged in war work are a menace to the national security and should be prevented.

(b) That the national administration has been lax in its handling of such strikes, and has therefore been derelict in its duty to the public.

(c) That all strikes and lock-outs in war work shall be prevented. But such prevention should not be taken at the expense of the general public, as has almost uniformly been done in settling recent strikes.

(d) That the Senators and Representatives from Virginia be requested to use their utmost endeavors to safeguard the interest of the general public in this matter.

ROBERT E. CRAIGHILL CAMP,  
L. E. WINGFIELD, Adjutant.

BRISTOL LODGE, NO. 232, B. P. O. ELKS,  
Bristol, Tenn., April 17, 1941.

Hon. HARRY BYRD,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of Bristol, Tenn.-Va. Lodge No. 232, B. P. O. Elks, held Wednesday evening, April 16, 1941:

"Whereas it is apparent that a national emergency exists due to strikes in industrial plants vital to national defense and that it is further apparent that delayed settlement of these strikes tends to weaken and destroy national unity and that it is further apparent that something drastic should be done immediately to alleviate the situation: Therefore be it

"Resolved by Bristol, Tenn.-Va., Lodge No. 232, B. P. O. Elks, That it is the opinion of the lodge that the Government of the United States of America should take such prompt and immediate action in the premises as is necessary to alleviate the situation, going so far as to take over the temporary control and management of the industrial plants so affected by said strikes and mustering the

management and workers thereof into the Regular Army of the United States of America; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to our Senators of Tennessee and Virginia, and our Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America from the First District of Tennessee, and the Ninth District of Virginia."

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL] C. F. HENRITZ,  
Secretary, Bristol, Tenn., Lodge No.  
232, B. P. O. Elks.

INTERNATIONAL LIONS CLUB,  
Staunton, Va., April 15, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At the last meeting of the Lions Club of Staunton the motion was made and unanimously carried that we write our Representatives in Congress relative to our position in the present labor situation in this country.

The Lions Club endorsed your recent stand taken in labor disputes and your effort to have the question referred to the agency recently set up by the Federal Government for mediation and the settlement of grievances of labor unions.

We believe that appropriate action should be taken immediately by Congress to prevent any strikes that interfere with any part of the national-defense program. We further believe that the names, addresses, and compensation received by labor leaders and agitators together with their party affiliations should be made public through the press of the entire United States.

We feel that our reaction to the present labor situation is typical of that of the public generally throughout the country.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD L. STAUDERMAN,  
President.

LADIES' AUXILIARY,  
AUGUSTA-STAUNTON POST, NO. 2216,  
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Staunton, Va., April 15, 1941.

Hon HARRY F. BYRD,  
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At a regular meeting of the Ladies Auxiliary to Augusta-Staunton Post, No. 2216, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, a motion was made and unanimously carried that we write our Representatives in Congress relative to our position in the present labor situation in this country.

The auxiliary endorsed your recent stand taken in labor disputes and your effort to have the question referred to the agency recently set up by the Federal Government for mediation for the settlement of grievances of labor unions.

We believe that appropriate action should be taken immediately by Congress to prevent any strikes that interfere with any part of the national-defense program. We further believe that the names, addresses, and compensation received by labor leaders and agitators together with their party affiliations should be made public through the press of the entire United States.

We also feel that our reaction to the present labor situation is typical of that of the general public throughout the country.

Sincerely,

AILEEN BROWN, President.

COMMITTEE TO DEFEND AMERICA  
BY AIDING THE ALLIES,  
Richmond, Va., April 7, 1941.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,  
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: At a meeting of our executive committee held today, I was instructed to

write you and express our endorsement and appreciation of the speech made by you on March 27, on the subject of control of strikes in defense industries.

We believe that we are expressing the views of our committee membership and the thinking element of your constituency in this section, when we say that the desperateness of the shipping situation is not generally appreciated.

We sincerely hope that you will continue your efforts to speed up production of all defense materials and also to urge that whatever steps may be necessary to get essential materials to England, Greece, and Yugoslavia, even though American naval vessels have to be used to insure delivery.

Very truly yours,

OLIVER J. SANDS,  
Chairman.

ROANOKE, VA., March 29, 1941.

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As our official Representative in Washington, we, the undersigned engineers and draftsmen of the Virginia Bridge Co. and loyal citizens of the United States, are alarmed and exasperated at the growing number and extent of strikes affecting sorely needed defense materials.

We are working long hours and are doing everything humanly possible to complete our part of defense contracts in the shortest possible time, but our effort will avail nothing if others who, according to reports, under questionable leadership, are allowed by their actions to in any way stop or retard our united effort to produce all things necessary for our safety and for the defense of our way of life.

We therefore ask that you use your best efforts to secure a fair and appropriate law which will stop these strike delays and enable those who want to work to do so without intimidation or restraint.

We feel strongly that we workers are defenders of our country and should be encouraged and protected in our vital task.

Respectfully yours,

J. Fred Hoefer, Frank H. Wade, Wista H. Scott, Everett L. Webster, Alfred Thomas, D. W. Reed, Jr., W. P. Noptsinger, A. M. Merchant, R. L. Little, T. E. Greene, G. L. Nininger, Stanley Forbes, O. G. Adkins, Leon C. Bailey, J. E. Myers, S. R. McGehee, L. W. Fischel, E. W. Miller, R. F. Murray, Arthur C. Matthews, George W. Shaw, F. S. Lankford, L. H. McGeorge, L. T. Scott, A. B. Doyle, F. W. Nover, R. L. Mastin, Jr., W. R. Burkholder, L. A. Coffey, W. R. Vickers, W. P. Adams, G. L. Smith, Jr., Harry M. Webber, Sr., L. A. Hansen, T. H. Jones, N. S. Burkholder, Charles D. Herring, Chas. J. Hayes, J. C. Webster, R. L. Fisher, Paul B. Culp, Alvan R. Hayden, John W. Merchant, Everett F. Croxson, Herman Scott, Charles F. Wentworth, William K. Overstreet, William E. Newcomb, Enal S. Slusher, H. K. Webster, C. K. Brown, P. L. Thorpe, H. C. Bringman, L. F. Barranger, F. S. Cram, H. H. Cheatham, Henry P. Sadler, Phil A. Palmer, E. A. Montgomery, E. L. Campbell, Harry M. Webber, Jr., Clovis W. Slusher, Jr., R. P. Ross, T. Cabell Jones, John D. Weaver, Lewis K. Martin, William E. Kester, George P. Jones, W. M. Tate, W. M. Green, T. T. Doering, P. C. Bryant, Thomkin B. Pierce, W. W. Crossgrove, J. R. Cogar, Ringold Olivier.

At a meeting April 8, 1941, of the Westmoreland County Board of Agriculture, an organization comprised of 42 farmers in Westmoreland County, each of whom was elected by his neighboring farmers to represent their respective communities on the County Board of Agriculture, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defenses of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to fully meet its obligations in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and  
"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded, and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations in essential industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Westmoreland County Board of Agriculture, do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Westmoreland County Board of Agriculture, at a meeting held on April 8, 1941.

JAMES H. LITTLEFIELD,  
Chairman.

FARMVILLE, VA., April 3, 1941.

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRD: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution which was passed at the board meeting yesterday. The board directed me to call your particular attention to the matter. Of course, I am sure you are already giving this vital question your earnest consideration. You can, therefore, count on the cooperation and support of this very representative group.

Very truly yours,

E. F. STRIPLIN,  
Secretary, Prince Edward C. A. C. A.

At a meeting of the Prince Edward County Board of Agriculture, held in the courthouse at Farmville, Va., on April 2, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defenses of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to meet fully its obligations in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and

"Whereas the farmers of Prince Edward County are cooperating in every possible way in the national-defense program; and

"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded, and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations in essential industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we the members of the Prince Edward County Board of Agriculture do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States and to the local press."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Prince Edward County Board of Agriculture, at a meeting held April 2, 1941.

H. E. BOSWELL, Jr.,  
Chairman.

OLIVER & PADGETT,  
Bedford, Va., April 5, 1941.  
Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: On Thursday, April 3, 1941, the Bedford County Democratic Executive Committee made and adopted a resolution, a copy of which I am enclosing herewith.

To my mind this resolution expresses the attitude of the people of Bedford County, with, of course, a few exceptions, and I trust that Congress will soon act to prevent the strikes which are now occurring.

I feel sure that you will do all that you can to bring about the end sought in the resolution.

Respectfully,

M. E. PADGETT, Jr.,  
Chairman, Bedford County  
Democratic Committee.

Whereas the safety and security of this Nation at this time demand that there be no interruption in the production of those materials so essential to our program of national defense; and

Whereas heretofore and now disputes between labor and capital have resulted, and are resulting, in strikes and shut-downs of plants engaged in producing material for national defense, thus seriously affecting the morale of the public and endangering and retarding the efforts of this Nation to prepare for any danger the future may hold; and

Whereas it appears to this committee that our National Congress has not yet acted with the firmness the situation so obviously demands. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of this committee, in view of the national emergency that exists, the time has now come for the National Congress to enact all proper and necessary legislation, prohibiting and making unlawful strikes and lockouts in plants or industries certified by the Secretary of War or Navy as being engaged in work needful for national defense and requiring all controversies and disputes between capital and labor in such industries to be referred to the National Defense Mediation Board or to such other appropriate authority as may be designated by the Congress, with full power vested in such Board, or other authority, to make final adjudication of all such controversies or disputes; be it further

Resolved, That severe and appropriate penalties be provided by law for the violation of the above-suggested legislation by any person, firm, corporation, union, and/or the officers thereof; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable CARTER GLASS, to the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, to the Honorable CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, and to such other persons and officials as the chairman of this committee, in his discretion, may deem expedient.

APRIL 26, 1941.

HON. SENATOR HARRY BYRD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have read of your demands that Madam Perkins be removed from office. We congratulate you on the move and trust that you will not give up until you have accomplished what you recommended.

Yours very truly,

C. L. Grandin, Jr., 2500 Humboldt Avenue, South Minneapolis, Minn.; Norman Nelson, 115 South Seventh Street, Minneapolis, Minn.; Catherine E. Stubel, Mound, Minn.; E. L. Brown, 2615 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.; John E. Fritsche, 2801 Lake Isle Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.; Gabriel E. Garber, Minneapolis, Minn.; S. E. Whitney,

R. F. D. No. 1, Hopkins, Minn.; P. Malzen, New Ulm, Minn.; W. H. Babcock, Jr., R. F. D. No. 2, Excelsior, Minn.; John S. Getchell, 2101 Humboldt, South Minneapolis, Minn.; P. W. London, 1825 Girard Avenue, South Minneapolis, Minn.; W. J. Nickerson, Wayzata, Minn.

SOUTH BOSTON, VA.,  
April 12, 1941.

*Be it resolved*, That the Junior Chamber of Commerce of South Boston, Va., realizing the gravity of the strike situation in national defense industries and projects in the United States, hereby petitions the Senators of Virginia and Congressmen from this district, to use unstinting efforts to put in effect the necessary machinery to immediately end this deplorable condition; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of Labor Perkins, Senators CARTER GLASS and HARRY F. BYRD, the State Junior Chamber of Commerce, the State Chamber of Commerce, and the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, requesting them to recommend a similar resolution.

Done by order of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, South Boston, Va., in conference April 10, 1941.

FRANK SIZEMORE, President.  
S. M. WALLER, National Councillor.

BRADENTON, FLA., April 25, 1941.  
Senator HARRY BYRD,  
Washington, D. C.:

We agree that best interests of the country would be served by resignation of Labor Secretary Perkins.

R. W. Bentley, editor-manager, Bradenton Herald; Col. Ernest Coulter, Bradenton; Rev. Fred Smith, Palmetto; Dr. Larry Schulstad, Palmetto; Ray Schultz, Bradenton Art League president; Kay Howze, Manatee County Aid Britain Committee; Harvey Schultz, Bradenton; Capt. Leroy Wilcox, Bradenton; Dr. W. D. Sugg, Bradenton; O. J. Detrick, school principal, Manatee; O. C. McLean, councilman, Palmetto; Earl Mason, city clerk, Palmetto; M. D. McLean, grower packer; William Snyder, president, Palmetto Country Club; J. D. Howze.

RENO, NEV., May 3, 1941.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Thomas H. Barry Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of Reno, at their meeting last night endorsed your action in demanding the removal of Secretary of Labor Perkins. The time has come when we must have stanch Americans representing our Government.

DRUMMOND, Adjutant.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1608. A bill for the relief of the Neal Storage Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 413); and

H. R. 3233. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard; without amendment (Rept. No. 414).

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

S. 1602. A bill to amend section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 14), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 418).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3847. A bill to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 415).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 1580. 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; with amendments (Rept. No. 416).

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

S. 1471. A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; without amendment (Rept. No. 417).

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 9, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

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

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 533. An act for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 657. An act for the relief of certain United States commissioners;

S. 681. An act for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggins;

S. 829. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers;

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

S. 931. An act for the relief of Robert B. Ayers;

S. 1022. An act for the relief of Richard Gammon;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle and the Dauterive Hospital;

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 1613. A bill to permit the importation of defense articles by or on behalf of the United States free of import duty or import tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1614. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish-restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 1615. A bill to provide for the disposition of all moneys received from the sale or other disposition of surplus wildlife on refuges established under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, and

for other purposes; to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

S. 1616. 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. BROWN (for Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1617. A bill to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1618. A bill granting a pension to Mary S. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1619. A bill for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1620. A bill for the relief of Lucille Sleet; and

S. 1621. A bill for the relief of George Alfred Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution commanding 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.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 4660. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4965. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from a previous day.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) submitted by Mr. BYRD on May 26, 1941, as follows:

Whereas the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor; and

Whereas numerous strikes are taking place in national defense industries throughout the United States; and

Whereas such strikes are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies: There be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy and they are hereby condemned.

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the consideration of the concurrent resolution be postponed until the next legislative day. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is offering the concurrent resolution as an amendment to the pending bill.

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

The motion was agreed to.

## COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG AT ALBION COLLEGE, MICH.

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him on the occasion of the commencement exercises at Albion College, Albion, Mich., on June 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

## RETIREMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence published in the Washington Evening Star of June 4, 1941, entitled "The Tragedy of Hughes' Retirement," which appears in the Appendix.]

## EDITORIAL FROM MANCHESTER UNION ON THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union of June 9, 1941, entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," which appears in the Appendix.]

## DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1524.

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

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

Mr. BYRNES. 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	Connally	McNary
Aiken	Danaher	Maloney
Andrews	Davis	Murdock
Bailey	Downey	Norris
Ball	Ellender	Nye
Bankhead	George	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Gillette	Overton
Bilbo	Glass	Pepper
Bone	Green	Radcliffe
Brewster	Gurney	Rosier
Bridges	Hayden	Shipstead
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Brown	Hill	Spencer
Bulow	Holman	Stewart
Bunker	Houston	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Kilgore	Tunnell
Capper	La Follette	Tydings
Caraway	Lodge	Vandenberg
Chandler	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chavez	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	White

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Okla-

homa [Mr. LEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

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

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

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. At this time I wish to offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment to Senate bill 1524.

In the Senate Military Affairs Committee it was decided that the twenty-eighth birthday should be the deciding line for each individual registrant. The perfecting amendment is proposed simply as a matter of efficiency in administration. Instead of making the line individual for each registrant as he individually shall reach his twenty-eighth birthday, the perfecting amendment will make it July 1 of each year. So the amendment I offer is as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "who", insert "on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year."

Then on line 7, after the figure "(3)", insert the word "have", strike out the word "attain", and insert "attained."

So the amendment would make the bill read, on page 2, as follows:

The men who on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year, (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3), have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth.

To complete the amendment it is not necessary to have the word "prior" in line 8, or any of line 9. So I move the amendment as I have stated it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senate consider first the printed committee amendments on page 1, and dispose of them before taking up the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The clerk will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first amendment is, on page 1, line 8, after the word "deferment", to strike out the comma and the words "by age group."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On line 10, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out

"those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate, by age group, the deferment of any or all of the men so deferred", and insert "the men who (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) attain the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth prior to their induction for such training and service."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the committee amendment just read.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, before I discuss the amendment, I call attention to the fact that there has returned to the Senate today, after an illness of some 2 months, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. It happens that the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee was born in the great State of Alabama, just 50 miles from the place where I first saw the light of day. He is not only beloved by me but he is beloved by every colleague in the Senate. I know that I voice the sentiments of each of us in expressing our gratification and our joy that the able and indefatigable Senator from Tennessee is back with us again.

Mr. NORRIS. Amen.

Mr. HILL. I note that the senior Senator from Nebraska says, "Amen."

Mr. President, as to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], I hope the amendment will be agreed to. The Senator from South Dakota offered in the Committee on Military Affairs the amendment which is now the committee amendment before the Senate; and all that is done by the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota now offers from the floor is simply to make sure of better administration and a more effective carrying out of the purposes of the committee amendment.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be agreed to.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I have been requested to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether the committee considered the advisability of making retroactive the provision that none shall be inducted into the service after they have attained their twenty-eighth year. A number have been inducted into the service who have passed the age of 28 years.

Do not misunderstand me. I think the amendment is correct as it is, and I am not seeking to oppose it in any way; but I desire to know whether the committee considered that phase of the matter.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the committee considered many different questions such as the one he has raised. We spent 2 days in the consideration of

the bill; and after considering the testimony of General Hershey, the Acting Director of the Selective Service System, and the testimony of other witnesses, and after discussing the bill as a whole and the pros and cons of the different questions, we felt that the bill, with the committee amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, was the best and the fairest thing to do under all the circumstances.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would the Senator mind explaining to the Senate the reason for this distinction?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I am about to do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not questioning the wisdom of the Senate committee, but it seems to me on its face to be unfair to distinguish between a man who happened to be drafted when he was 28 years old and a man of the same age who has not yet been drafted. I shall be glad if the Senator will explain what ground there may be for that distinction.

Mr. HILL. I will reach the Senator's point, but I will try to explain the bill in an orderly fashion, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. As the Senate knows, the Congress passed the Selective Service Act. That act fixed the selective-service age limits from and including the age of 21 to and including the age of 35. The pending bill (S. 1524) as it was originally prepared by the Selective Service Administration, authorized the President to defer, by age groups, any groups between the ages of 21 to 35. I desire to say that the deferment provided is not of a permanent nature. If this proposed legislation becomes law, and the President sees fit to provide for the deferment, it will be on a temporary basis and the men will be deferred only for such time as the President shall see fit to have them deferred. If the necessity should arise whereby he felt the deferment should be terminated and these men should be inducted into the armed forces under selective service, he would have the power under the bill to terminate the deferment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. How long can the President defer—for what period of time?

Mr. HILL. There is no period of time set out in the bill. It is left to the President's discretion. He may defer them until such time as he sees fit.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, under the amendment the President can defer any ages below 28.

Mr. HILL. No. As set out in the committee amendment, as modified by the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, the President can defer all those persons who have attained the age of 28 years on the 1st day of July 1941 or have attained that age on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year. Any

such deferment must include all the men who have attained or who are over the age of 28 on July 1.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is mandatory, under this provision, is it not?

Mr. HILL. It is not mandatory. It is entirely discretionary with the President. He can defer men 28 years of age and over, if he sees fit to do so, but there is nothing that requires him to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, men between 28 and 35 are left in the same category in which they are at the present time—that is, if the President wants to leave them there?

Mr. HILL. Exactly so. Unless the President acts to defer these men, they are left in the same status in which they are today. If he does defer them, the deferment is, as the word "defer" implies, temporary; it is not permanent. Any time the President sees fit, he can terminate the deferment, and the men can be inducted into the armed forces under selective service.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator from Alabama under what theory is it left discretionary between the ages of 28 and 35.

Mr. HILL. There are several reasons for that. We have a sufficient number of men, all we need, so far as we can see at the present time, in the younger age groups; that is, from 21 to 28.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the present law how many do we need? How many can we take under the present law?

Mr. HILL. At the present time, as the distinguished Senator knows, our Army is fixed at 1,400,000 men; but that includes the National Guard, the Reserves, and the Regular Army. To reach the number 1,400,000, it is contemplated that we will get about 646,000 inductees under the selective service.

Mr. LUCAS. Will it be necessary eventually, then, in order to get the million four hundred thousand, to constantly take men between 28 and 35?

Mr. HILL. I should say not. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we not only have the reservoir of men who registered on October 16 last, but we will have another registration on July 1, at which time we will have about 832,000 new registrants, and those 832,000 new registrants will, of course, be added to the pool which we now have from which to select the men.

Mr. LUCAS. The 832,000 new registrants will still be men between 21 and 35?

Mr. HILL. No; the 832,000 will be men who have reached 21 years of age since October, so, of course, this deferment would not affect them in any way until they reached the age of 28, which will be 7 years hence.

Mr. LUCAS. I rise only for information—

Mr. HILL. The questions are very interesting, and I am glad to have the Sena-

tor ask any questions he desires to propound.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the previous law which was passed, the Congress said a certain number of men were necessary for the Army, and before we can get any more men, if we need additional men as the emergency grows, we will have to have further legislation.

Mr. HILL. It was the understanding, at the time we authorized the strength of the Army at 1,400,000, that if the Army wished to increase the number of men further legislation by the Congress would be required. However, I have heard or read somewhere in a paper that it has been interpreted, perhaps, by someone, that when an unlimited emergency is declared, such as has been declared, the Army can be increased without coming back to Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. That raises a very important question.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it does raise a very important question.

Mr. LUCAS. What I am trying to ascertain is why men between 28 and 35 are left in more or less suspense as to what their position is to be during the next year or more. It seems to me that if there is not some mandatory feature in the amendment, the amendment is more or less worthless, because the President has the same power today he would have under the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; the President has not the same power today. As the law now stands, the President has no power to defer anyone from 21 years of age through 35. He cannot defer these men even if he desires to defer them. In other words, as the law now stands, men from 28 through 35 years of age are subject to all the conditions of selective service, just as are the men from 21 to 28.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the committee discuss the question of fixing a certain age limit between 21 and 35, eliminating the other men?

Mr. HILL. Yes; the committee gave some consideration to that. I recall particularly that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] raised that very question. As the Senator from Illinois perhaps recalls, when the selective-service bill was before the Senate for consideration the Senator from Massachusetts offered an amendment making the ages, not 21 to 36, as the Congress did, but from 21 through 25. So we did consider that question in the committee when the bill was before us.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The purpose of the bill is to carry out an idea which has been expressed by the Army, as I understand.

Mr. HILL. By the Selective Service System.

Mr. STEWART. Is it not true that the Army officers themselves desire younger men?

Mr. HILL. They do, both the Army and the Navy. Not only are the younger men much more physically fit for training but we must bear in mind that what we propose to do is to carry these men in a reserve over a period of 10 years, and

what we want is to have the level of effectiveness over the 10-year period as high as possible. The man who is 21 years of age and gets his training during the next 10 years, of course, will keep a much higher level of effectiveness than a man who is, say, 25 years of age.

Mr. STEWART. In the event the bill becomes law, as I understand the Senator, it will be discretionary with the President as to whether he will avail himself of the privileges of the act.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. If conditions should change, and if it should be found necessary or advisable to use men between the ages of 28 and 36, then the President could terminate the deferment.

Mr. STEWART. Assuming that is done, will the group of men between the ages of 21 and 28 still have the benefit of the privileges of the various exemptions?

Mr. HILL. Oh, surely; the bill does not change any exemptions, or anything of the kind. In other words, any man who has any right of exemption or deferment would continue to enjoy that right after the enactment of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator does not think that in the desire to procure a larger number of men than might now be available for the Army between the ages of 21 and 28 there is any likelihood that the exemption laws or deferment laws would be altered in any way so as to make them somewhat stricter?

Mr. HILL. In the 21- to 28-year group I think not, because we have more men than we need. There can be no reason why there should be any change in the requirements for that group.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Alabama was present no doubt when hearings were held on this bill?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Did anything occur in the hearings to indicate that if this bill should become law there would be a likelihood of lowering the age limit from 21 to 18, as has been previously discussed?

Mr. HILL. No. So far as General Hershey's testimony was concerned, and so far as expressions by members of the committee were concerned, I think it was very definitely expected that at this time there certainly would not be any lowering of the age limit below the age of 21 years.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Alabama, then, does not think that by the passage of the pending bill we might precipitate a movement in that direction?

Mr. HILL. No, I think not, because, as I have said, we have such a great reservoir that we have no need for such a change at present.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. The suggestion appeared in the newspapers that the age limit should be made 27 instead of 28.

Mr. HILL. The General's testimony was to the effect that it should be to the 27th year.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, according to the amendment which has been offered to the bill, the age has been moved up practically another year, has it not, to 29? Suppose a boy attained the age of 28 years on the 2d or 3d of July of 1941, would he have the benefit of the deferment?

Mr. HILL. No; he would not have the benefit of the deferment so far as the present year is concerned. If he were not inducted into service until July 1, 1942, then he would have the benefit of the deferment. I will say that the committee gave much thought to that very suggestion. We sought to write into the bill a provision that if a man was 28 years of age he should not be inducted, but, as the Senator can well see, that might result in a great deal of trouble, for the following reason: Let us say a man had been called by the board; he was not 28 years of age, but he would become 28, we will say, within 30 days. The Senator can see that in such a case there would be a great temptation to that man to try to delay his induction, to exercise every right of appeal he might have, then if he failed there to ask that the board reconsider his classification, and then perhaps ask for some temporary postponement of induction on the ground that he was not well or that some member of his family was sick or that he had to take some kind of important examination, or for any other reason that ordinarily might be grounds for temporary postponement of induction. He might be greatly tempted to resort to some means of that kind in order to avoid his induction.

Furthermore, in many of these cases there may be a close question as to whether a man should be inducted, and the board may give very serious consideration to that question. If by reason of the fact that the board stopped to consider the question, or by delay being caused in any way, the man became 28 years of age, and therefore was deferred, the board might very well be criticized severely and its good faith in the matter might be challenged. The board might be accused of having delayed the matter so as to keep a given man from being inducted.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, under the bill the President will have the power to defer men if they have reached the age of 28 years by July 1, 1941, but the President will not have the power to do so if they have not reached that age by that date?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct, sir.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. How does it happen that the age of 28 was selected as the flooring rather than 27 or 29? I have the impression from something I have read that the Department recommended a different age than 28. Am I correct about that?

Mr. HILL. General Hershey talked in terms of 27.

Mr. WHITE. That is what I understand.

Mr. HILL. He also talked in terms of using the date October 16, 1940, which was some 8 months ago, rather than July 1, 1941. The committee, after weighing his testimony and all the other testimony, thought the age of 28 was about the correct age.

Mr. WHITE. So the committee rejected the recommendation of the Department in that respect?

Mr. HILL. It rejected it in the respect that it did not take the recommendation of 27 years as of October 16, 1940.

Mr. WHITE. That is, the committee followed its own judgment rather than the recommendation of the War Department?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Am I to understand that the option given to the President is to defer every man subject to service beyond the prescribed age limit?

Mr. HILL. There is no right to say, "I will defer those from 30 to 35, but I will not defer those from 28 to 30." He either defers everyone 28 years of age or over or he does not defer anyone by reason of age.

Mr. ADAMS. If the deferment is made, does the Senator think the President, under this measure, could rescind his deferment?

Mr. HILL. I think, unquestionably, he could rescind the deferment. I think, unquestionably, he could terminate the deferment at any time.

Mr. ADAMS. Then, that leaves the man between 28 and 35 entirely uncertain as to whether he is subject to call?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The Senator is correct, and that would depend upon what the conditions were. Of course, I understand what is in the Senator's mind, but I think in the majority of cases men between 28 and 35 would rather have their deferment with the uncertainty than to be called immediately and inducted into the service.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Colorado can make quite clear what is in his mind. It is my judgment that if the Congress thinks that men beyond 28 years of age should not go into the service, Congress should say so, or if Congress thinks they should, Congress should say so. I am not yet persuaded that the decision should be left to an individual's uncontrolled discretion. It is a matter which the Congress has determined in the first instance. Congress fixed the age limits and the methods by which the men were to be drawn. Now we are drawing a line and saying that up to a certain point the law applies, and beyond that point it is left to the discretion of the President whether it shall apply or whether it shall not apply. It seems to me that if Congress thinks men over the age of 28 should not go into the service, Congress should say so.

Mr. HILL. The reason the committee did not make such a recommendation was that the committee felt that no man could foresee what the needs of the future might be; what there might be in the

way of changed conditions. As the bill is now written, if the President makes deferment, as I am sure he will from what General Hershey said, he will have the right, if conditions were to change, to terminate the deferment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator understand that under the language of the bill, if the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is adopted, the President will have the discretion of deferring persons below the age of 28?

Mr. HILL. No; it is not my understanding that he would have that right at all. He could only defer men 28 years of age and over. He would have no power under this bill or under existing law to defer anyone under 28 years of age, by reason of age.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is a new interpretation of the amendment. The committee did not understand the effect of the Gurney amendment in that light at all.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Colorado voted for the Gurney amendment, and the Senator from Alabama did not. One reason why I did not vote for it in its original form was because I thought it was a matter which ought to be more carefully considered. Under the terms of the bill in its original form the President might have deferred any group, by age, from 21 through 35; but under the Gurney amendment he may defer only those 28 years of age or over; and if he provides for any such deferment, he may not pick out any one age group between 28 and 35. He must defer all those 28 years of age or over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator's interpretation is correct, the Senator from Colorado supported the Gurney amendment under a misapprehension.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator from South Dakota will confirm my interpretation of the amendment. I think the amendment is clear on its face.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In view of the question asked by the Senator from Colorado, is it not a fact that as the language is written, three conditions must concur? First, the men must be liable for the training and service. Second, they must not already have been inducted into the armed forces. Third, they must have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the date of their birth on or before the date in question, July 1 of this year, or of each succeeding year. But the three conditions must concur.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall that the exact language of the Gurney amendment was not before the committee. There was an amendment, but the Senator wanted to perfect it; and it was my understanding when I supported his amendment that

the President would still have discretion to defer those below the age of 28 if he should see fit to do so.

Mr. HILL. That was not my understanding.

Mr. GURNEY rose.

Mr. HILL. I see the Senator from South Dakota is on his feet. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I did not hear the question.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado to state his question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the committee I understood that even though the Senator's amendment should be adopted, the President would still have discretion to defer those below the age of 28.

Mr. GURNEY. No; not the way the provision is written. As I understood—and I am quite sure that was the sense of the committee—he would be authorized to defer only one age group, that between 28 and 35.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I did not so understand the amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I could not hear the Senator's reply to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] when he was inquiring what would happen to the draftee between 28 and 35 who had previously been inducted. Would he gain any new status?

Mr. HILL. He would not gain anything. If he were in the service, he would continue in the service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that fair?

Mr. HILL. The committee thought about that question. As the Senator knows, in connection with all these questions there must be some line of cleavage. The Senator might ask whether it would be fair to draft a man who is 35 years of age, and not draft a man who is 35 years and 1 day of age. There must be a line somewhere. Some of the men in the category referred to by the Senator have gone into the service. Some of them have had months of training. The Government has spent a great deal of money training, preparing, and equipping them. The idea was that they should continue their service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under the terms of the bill, could any discretion be used in their behalf?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. VANDENBERG. They would be in for good?

Mr. HILL. They would be in for at least a year.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What would be the position of the man who is 34 years of age, and who has been called, but has not been actually inducted?

Mr. HILL. If the bill should become law, I should say that he would not be inducted.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, if he has not already been inducted, he would not be inducted.

Mr. HILL. I should say he would not be inducted, provided the President

should proceed immediately to grant deferment, which I am sure he would do. As I have stated, the reason for the bill is that we have a reservoir of younger men so great as to be more than sufficient to meet the present needs of our armed forces; and younger men are much better subjects for training than are older men.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How many men between the ages of 28 and 35 have been inducted?

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to give the Senator the figures in a moment. While we are waiting for the figures, let me give the Senator some other figures which I think are very much in line with the question he has in mind.

Through March, 74.76 percent of all men inducted were between the ages of 21 and 28. Through March, 78.5 percent were men between the ages of 18 and 28. The men between the ages of 18 and 21 are not subject to the draft. There is no compulsion about their service; but a considerable number of them have been volunteering under selective service for 1 year's service. When they have come in of their own free will and accord, and have stated that they would like to have the training, they have been inducted if they have been found physically and otherwise fit. So, 78.5 percent of all the men inducted have been between the ages of 18 and 28; 21.5 percent have been between the ages of 28 and 36; and 10.08 percent have been between the ages of 31 and 36. The figures as to the number between 31 and 36 confirm what has been said by the Selective Service Administration, that in the higher age group we get 10 percent of the men and 90 percent of the headaches, because among the older men not only do we run into all kinds of questions of physical disability, but we run into all kinds of questions of dependency. Naturally, those men are more fixed in our economic and social life; and when they are called into service there is greater dislocation in our economic and social life.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do the Senator's figures indicate how many married men have been inducted?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell the Senator the number of married men who have been inducted, but I can give him certain figures which have a bearing on that question. Of some five and a half million men who have been classified, 3,706,379 were put into class 3; that is, they were classified as having dependents, and therefore deferred. Of those 3,706,379, I presume that a great many have dependent wives.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It has been my observation that in the various draft areas there has been a great variation in the use of discretion in respect to married men. Does the Senator agree to that statement?

Mr. HILL. We talked to General Hershey about that question. He has some 6,500 draft boards throughout the

country, and naturally it is very difficult to make all the 6,500 draft boards think alike and use the same yardstick. General Hershey has men out in the field who are constantly in contact with the draft boards, trying to impress upon them the necessity of uniformity of regulation and trying to give them the right kind of yardstick, so that discrimination may not result from the decisions of the various boards throughout the country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are no figures available as to the number of married men who have been inducted?

Mr. HILL. I can get that information for the Senator, but at this time I have not those figures here on my desk.

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

Mr. HILL. Excuse me; the Senator asked me another question which I am glad to answer now. The question was, How many men who have been inducted up to date were between the ages of 28 and 36? The figures I am about to state are through the month of March. Of the 336,636 men inducted up to date, 56,764 were between the ages of 28 and 36.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if I correctly understand the import of this matter.

Under the original law which the Congress enacted there were registered about sixteen and one-half million registrants, which has been figured out, as the committee stated in its report, as about a million in each year's classification along in the late twenties and thirties.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. Under the provisions of this proposal the President is given power to defer approximately 8,000,000 of these registrants under rules and regulations to be prescribed, or not to defer 8,000,000. He has either to defer 8,000,000 or to let sixteen and one-half million stay in. He has no choice?

Mr. HILL. He has no choice; that is correct. The figures of 8,000,000 and 16,000,000 are approximate figures, though they are generally correct; but I want to convey the thought that the group of 8,000,000 in the higher brackets—that is, from 28 to 36—contains nothing like the number of eligibles as does the group of 8,000,000 between 21 and 28.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I suppose the balance probably would run in the same ratio as the figures the Senator gave a while ago—about 78 and 22?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. I think we have every reason to believe they would run in about the same ratio. In other words, roughly speaking, today we are getting approximately four-fifths of our selectees from the ages of 21 to 28. We are getting only about one-fifth from the ages of 28 to 36.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for one more question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. In the report I notice that the committee says:

Dividing this entire group into classes, it has been estimated by the Selective-Service officials that, in round figures, there were 5,000,000 in each class, viz, 21 to 26, 26 to 30, and 31 to 36.

Which would mean about 1,000,000 in each age group. The committee has changed the original bill, which provided for deferment by age groups.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. What was the reasoning that appealed to the committee which made it incumbent upon the President to defer all these men or not to defer any of them?

Mr. HILL. The committee felt that the Congress should determine those who could be deferred, rather than leave it to the discretion of the President.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator if the committee was advised that the War Department, or those in charge of war activities in that Department, would recommend to the President deferring all men above 28 years of age if this amendment should be adopted?

Mr. HILL. I do not know that there was any direct testimony that the War Department would make such a recommendation. There was direct testimony that the Director of the Selective Service System would make such a recommendation, and there was testimony that both the War Department and the Navy Department favored the passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That they favored the passage of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Therefore I assume that if we should pass the bill there would be issued by the President a general order deferring all men who had reached 28 years of age and who had not been previously inducted into the military service.

Mr. HILL. I feel quite certain that unless something very unforeseen should occur, that would be the situation.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall that the War Department had a representative at the hearing—

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And that he fully and completely concurred in all the statements which were made by General Hershey.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. As I read the bill as amended, we are conferring upon the President a completely new power. Is that conclusion correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is a new power, because, as the law now stands, he has no power to defer any men between the ages of 21 and 36 by reason of age.

Mr. DANAHER. That is my understanding. I thank the Senator. That being the fact, why should we not strike out line 6 on page 1 as a matter of sheer

clarity in draftsmanship, so that the section would read:

The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations—

And so forth. Thus we would state by our amendment that we confer a power upon him.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the Senator wishes to strike out the words:

Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I do not know that those words are necessary or needed; but ordinarily I think that when we are amending an existing law we use those words so as to make sure that if there should be any conflict between the amendment and the existing law, the amendment should prevail. As I view the situation I do not think that clause is very material one way or the other; and yet, on the other hand, I do not see that the words would lead to any harm.

This bill has been rather carefully worked over, both by the Selective Service System experts and by our own legislative drafting experts; and since I can see no good reason for striking out these words, there may be some reason we do not know about why they should stay in there, just as the Senator from Colorado said about the Gurney amendment that if he had understood all this and all that he might not have taken the position he did.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator, as to the first point he makes, that the words were put in at a time when the words the Senator from Iowa pointed out, "by age group," were in the draft submitted to the committee. That is the reason why they were put in.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. DANAHER. But when those words were stricken out, the reason for their existence fell.

As to the second point of the Senator's comment, I say that if there is a reason why those words should be in there, we ought to know what that reason is.

Mr. HILL. As I have said, there might be some prohibition somewhere in the existing law, and that prohibition might in some way be in conflict with the amendment which we now seek to put in the existing law.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his courtesy and patience with me; but he has admitted, as I asked him, that we are conferring upon the President a brand-new power. We are creating an authority which up to this time he has lacked; and I say that the way to amend existing law to confer that power is to say just that.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what the bill does. It says the President is authorized.

Mr. DANAHER. No. There is a line there that gives him a blanket catch-all.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to return to an answer which the able Senator from

Alabama made to a question by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The Senator answered, as I recall, that, in his opinion, the President of the United States will issue, on the recommendation of the Army and the Navy, probably General Hershey, a deferment order affecting men of all ages between 28 and 35.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. That will be one complete class?

Mr. HILL. That will be one complete class.

Mr. LUCAS. And the order will take care of all men within that class?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that this proposed legislation gives the President of the United States the power to rescind that order within, we will say, 30 days after the order is made?

Mr. HILL. Within any time.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, we say to these men, "By an order from the President of the United States, you are not subject to the draft"?

Mr. HILL. We do not say to them, "You are not subject to the draft." We simply say, "For the time being, we are not going to call you." That is what it amounts to.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, they are deferred for the time being?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot understand the real purpose of a deferment order of that kind. What could it accomplish?

Mr. HILL. It could accomplish this: As the law now stands, these men must be inducted; while if we pass this bill, and the President issues a deferment order, the men may never have to serve; they may never be inducted.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true; but these men, at the present time, as I view this proposed legislation, absolutely know where they stand; yet if this bill is passed, all men between the ages of 28 and 35, most of whom are in business, at the present time will not know where they stand. They will not know what to do. They may be deferred for a month under a general order of the President of the United States; they may set up their business and say, "Well, we can go ahead now under this deferment order"; but in 30 days' time or 60 days' time the position of these men is changed materially as a result of the rescindment of the order by the President of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator that, from the testimony before the committee, the War Department and the Navy Department and the Selective Service Administration would not recommend the termination of deferment unless and until there was a need, that is, unless and until we could not get the men we have to have from the age group from 21 to 28, including those from 18 to 21 who now may volunteer; and, as matters now stand, as I have said, we have more than an ample supply.

Mr. LUCAS. When that time comes, when we need more men, we will need more legislation to get the men.

Mr. HILL. We will not need more legislation to get the men if we pass this bill as it is now written.

What the War Department and the Navy Department and the Selective Service Administration seek to do is to defer these men, with every intent and every purpose of their never being inducted unless there should be such a need that we could not meet the need from the younger age groups.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator candidly that, from the discussion, and the debate upon the floor of the Senate, and from what I have read of the hearings involving this particular amendment, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Colorado, that the Congress of the United States ought to say for the moment that all men up to 28 years of age shall be inducted, from 28 to 35 they shall not be inducted, but if such an emergency arises that we need these men, I think the Congress of the United States then ought definitely to say thereafter that we do need them, and enact legislation to that effect. I do not believe we ought to leave these men in a suspended condition, as it seems to me this amendment would leave them. They ought to be in or they ought to be out.

Mr. HILL. The Senator may be right about letting Congress do the deferring; but I do not know that would change their suspended condition, because I think their suspended condition does not depend either upon the President or upon the Congress; their suspended condition depends upon future conditions which will determine what the need may be. In other words, if the need is so great that we cannot get the men we have got to have from the young age groups, then, whether it be the President or the Congress, the deferment will be terminated and the men previously deferred by reason of age will be called and inducted into the service.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that perfectly, but I think the Congress, perhaps, should retain that authority and say when the time comes that these men are needed, and should enact legislation to that effect.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—  
Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand the Senator from Alabama, if there were need for the men there would be no deferment?

Mr. HILL. If there were no need for these men they would be deferred; if there should be need for them because we could not get the men we have got to have, as I have said—

Mr. CHANDLER. There would be no deferment.

Mr. HILL. There would be no deferment.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the emergency should not be acute, the men would not be needed.

Mr. HILL. Then there would be deferment. Unless the need comes about, these men will never be inducted into the service.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to continue for a moment further. If the emergency is not acute, the object of the bill originally was over the run of years to try to get an effectively trained force

of men to defend the United States of America.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. CHANDLER. Over a long period of years young men who are in training now and who will be inducted hereafter, if the amendment is agreed to, will be available and useful for a great many years in the future, but the men who are in the age groups that we intend now to permit the President under this authorization to defer will not be useful for any great length of time. When the emergency is not acute, the object is to get an effective force to defend the people of the United States of America. It is my belief that we would make a serious mistake if we should not give to the President full power and authority to do what is proposed, because if the emergency is acute they will not be deferred; if the emergency is acute he will have to call them, because he has not got enough trained reserves or trained men in the younger-age groups. I understand what the Senator from Illinois means when he says men do not know what to expect; but in time of war, men over the country never know what to expect; they have got to be ready for anything.

Mr. HILL. There is another thing I will say to the Senator from Kentucky. If these men are simply deferred by an Executive order of the President, the Selective Service Administration can go ahead with its inventory, it can go ahead and inventory these men and classify them, so that if they are needed all that information would be ready, and it would not be necessary to incur the delay which would be brought about if they had then to make the inventory.

Mr. CHANDLER. And the President would not have to come back to Congress if he needed the men. It is my judgment that no men between the ages of 28 and 35 deferred will mind being deferred in the manner proposed; but they will be very glad to know they are going to be deferred, and they will also be glad to know that if there is an actual emergency they will be called, because we can say that there is a pretty clear indication that that will happen to them.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is right, and I think men between 28 and 35 will be very much relieved if this bill passes as reported by the committee.

The Senator has well emphasized the point that I tried to make earlier in the discussion, namely, that the effectiveness of the young man can be maintained and continued at a high level over the 10-year period, whereas the effectiveness of the older man cannot be. He begins to wear out; he develops physical disability and loses his efficiency.

Mr. CHANDLER. And those who, in the run of the years, do not want the burden to be any heavier on the American people—and obviously it is going to be heavy—can see at a glance how much less expensive it will be to complete training the young men who will be prepared for 15 or 20 years to meet the country's emergency.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky comes from the greatest horse-producing State in the Union—the greatest

horse-producing area in all the world—and he knows if he were going to buy a race horse, he would buy a young horse that would run many races; he would not invest his money in an old horse that perhaps would run but one race.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Kentucky also comes from a State that gave more volunteers in defense of the country before the selective-service law was passed than any other State in America. I call the Senator's attention to that fact.

Mr. HILL. And I thank the Senator, representing that great State, for the contribution he has made to this debate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to yield to me once more?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Referring to the discussion as to the delegated power given to the President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. We are specifically delegating the power to provide for the deferment of the men in the group specified. Now, say the President issues an order as soon as this bill is enacted deferring these men for 9 months, and 3 months from now such an occasion arises as makes it necessary to use them. These men have been notified that they are deferred; at present they are on a list subject to call under the general law; but now they are notified that they are deferred for 9 months. What authority is there under the proposal which is now before us for the President to rescind his order and to notify these men that they are not deferred?

Mr. HILL. The deferment would be an indefinite deferment, subject to termination by the President. We reserve to him the power to terminate the deferment at any time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment further?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. What if the President does not make the deferment an indefinite one? What if he says, "The deferment is for 9 months"? What right will he have to call the men before that time unless we give him power here to rescind or change the deferment at any time?

Mr. HILL. I think he would have power, under this language as it is now written, to terminate any deferment that he might make. The language very closely follows the language in section 5 (e) of the Selective Service Act; and we note in that language that no such limitation is put upon the length of the deferment. That is, the deferment may be terminated.

A man might be deferred today because he has a dependent. The dependency might terminate. He could then be inducted. He might be deferred temporarily because he was ill at the time, or had some condition that would make it not proper or right to induct him; but when that condition was alleviated or removed he could be inducted.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Is this deferment suggested by Army officials because they believe that the average inductee over 28 finds it more difficult to adapt himself to Army life, less flexible emotionally, or what is the reason?

Mr. HILL. There are several different factors. One is that the inductee over 28 years of age is not as adaptable; he is not physically capable of becoming, ordinarily, as good a soldier as a younger man. The other reason, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has well pointed out and I have tried to point out before in the debate, is that the idea is to train these men so that we shall have a great reserve. If we train a young man, his period of effectiveness remains at a high level much longer than if we train an older man. Another reason is that we do not have as much dislocation in our economic and social life when we take a younger man. The older man is more apt to have become fixed, to have become set, in the economic and social life of the community. Another thing is, from the administrative standpoint, that in the older groups it is necessary to process so many men for comparatively so few inductees.

Mr. BONE. I can understand that when a young man is given training, and goes back into the pool of reserves, his potential usefulness as a soldier would extend over a much longer period of years than in the case of an older man. I suspect that that was a persuasive argument with the committee.

Mr. HILL. Very persuasive.

Mr. BONE. I think it was suggested, perhaps by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], that legislatively we just cast out all men over 28, instead of allowing their deferment to be discretionary, because of some aspects of the problem presented by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who says it leaves him somewhat up in the air. Has the committee considered that angle of the matter—in other words, drawing a red line, and chopping off all induction into the service after the age of 28?

Mr. HILL. The men may be needed in the future.

Mr. BONE. Congress could repair that breach in the law, if there should be one, in 24 hours' time.

Mr. HILL. Yes; Congress could go back and repair it; but let me say to the Senator that whether the President called the men back or whether the Congress called them back after all would not make any difference in their situation; they would be dislocated just as much. Does the Senator see that?

Mr. BONE. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. HILL. Is not that true?

Mr. BONE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. As I say, it is not a question of whether Congress shall defer them or whether the President shall defer them, so far as their situation in the future is concerned. It depends upon the need, upon conditions which may arise over which neither the President nor the Congress has any control.

Mr. BONE. In the mine-run of experience of the officials under the Draft Act, have they found that they were able

to get enough men between the ages of 21 and 27 to meet the needs?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes. I gave those figures early in the debate.

Mr. BONE. I know the Senator did. I came in just as he was giving them.

Mr. HILL. For instance—

Mr. BONE. I do not care to have the Senator go into detail again. The figures will be in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL. I will give the Senator those figures. Up to date we have inducted only some 336,000; and yet, out of the 336,000, we had from 21 to 28 years of age, 1,802,000 eligibles.

Mr. BONE. Have the authorities called only that many men because they were unable to equip a larger number; or what was the reason?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; but the Senator must realize this condition: Our Army was to be at a maximum of 1,400,000. That was the ceiling. We had a large number of men in the National Guard. We had a large number of men in the Regular Army. We had a large number of men in the Reserves who were called in. We have not needed to induct more men than we have been. I will say to the Senator that the figures I have given him are only through the month of March.

Mr. BONE. I understand. What is the total number of men we have under arms now and actually in training?

Mr. HILL. The total number of men under arms, I should say, is between 1,300,000 and 1,400,000.

Mr. President, unless some Senator has some further question to ask, I think I have pretty well gone over the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended by the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. 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	Chavez	La Follette
Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Lodge
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Lucas
Bailey	Connally	McCarran
Ball	Danaher	McFarland
Bankhead	Davis	McKellar
Barbour	Downey	McNary
Bilbo	Ellender	Maloney
Bone	George	Murdock
Brewster	Gillette	Norris
Bridges	Glass	Nye
Brooks	Green	O'Mahoney
Brown	Gurney	Overton
Bulow	Hayden	Pepper
Bunker	Herring	Radcliffe
Butler	Hill	Rosier
Byrd	Holman	Shipstead
Byrnes	Houston	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Chandler	Kilgore	Taft

Thomas, Idaho	Tydings	Wallgren
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wheeler
Tunnell	Van Nuys	White

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following:

That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided (1) to any plant equipped for the manufacture of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith, and (2) to any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials. Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged, whenever the President finds, after investigation, that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or threatened strike or other cause, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators, because I changed two or three words in the printed text of the amendment I propose to offer. I call the attention of Senators to page 2 of the printed amendment, line 15, where the language reads "of a strike or other labor disturbance." I strike out the words "other labor disturbance" and insert the words "threatened strike." My reason for that is that a number of Senators have suggested that "other labor disturbance" is an uncertain term, somewhat nebulous, that it might create a good deal of question among both employers and employees as to just what was meant by the term "labor disturbance." Since the essence of what we are trying to get at is the actual occurrence of a strike or steps leading to a strike, such as a vote to strike on a certain day, which would certainly constitute a threatened strike, I would provide that under the bill the President would have authority to step in and take charge of a plant in order that production might not be hindered or delayed, but that it might be continued.

Mr. President, I think most Senators are familiar with this matter, and I do not care to consume much of the time of the Senate in discussing it. I do desire, however, to suggest that this is not a new question before the Senate. About 8 weeks ago, as I recall it, on April 2, 1941, I made a speech in the Senate

proposing the taking over of any strike-bound plant where the strike was hindering or delaying the production of essential war materials. At that time I announced that I intended to introduce a bill providing for an amendment to the Selective Service Act authorizing the Government to take over strike-bound plants where the strikes were interfering with, impeding, or delaying the production of defense materials.

I had such a bill drafted at that time, and almost wore it out carrying it around in my pocket waiting for what I thought would be an opportune time to offer it as an amendment to some legislative act. I could not offer it as an amendment to an appropriation bill, because it was legislation. So last Thursday I introduced it on the floor of the Senate, and submitted some remarks in connection therewith as well as a tabulation of a great deal of material furnished me by Government authorities, showing the number of man-hours that had been dissipated and wasted in national-defense plants by strikes, and the number of plants producing national-defense munitions and implements of defense throughout the entire country in which there were strikes.

The country is familiar with the fact that in the original Selective Service Act, section 9, and particularly the amendment to that section offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], provided in the case of an employer, that if he declined or refused to manufacture defense articles for the Government at a reasonable compensation, he would have to suffer the probable taking over of his plant by the Government. So the basic idea of my proposed amendment is the same, except that it applies to the employees refusing to continue the production of necessary or essential defense materials, just as the former amendment applied to failure of the employer.

The thesis of this amendment is that the essential and primary necessity of the Government is to continue the manufacture and the production of defense materials. The Government, under this amendment, is not taking the side of labor against the employer; neither is it taking the side of the employer against labor. The processes of mediation and conciliation are in no wise interfered with. The Government agencies which we have set up for the hearing, and for the adjudication, and for the possible settlement of labor controversies as to working conditions and hours of labor and all those questions, are still preserved. All this amendment does is to provide that if we have these agencies for settling these disputes, but if the employees do not avail themselves of them, if they do not submit when the quarrel is adjudicated, but simply go out and say, "We will not work, we will not produce, we will tie up this necessary agency for national defense," that in that kind of critical emergency the Government has the right to step in and take charge of the plant and to operate it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from

Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I gladly yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is just one phase of the matter which disturbs me, and I want to submit it to the Senator for his comment. I am not doing it critically. I am in complete sympathy with what the Senator undertakes to do, and I certainly cordially approve of what the President did yesterday. I am fearful only of this possibility, and I ask the Senator from Texas to discuss it. Would this provision of law serve in any way to encourage strikes on the part of those who might thus want to precipitate the general nationalization of industry? Will the Senator discuss that possibility, and does he think there is anything in it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will be very glad to discuss it. The matter has been raised before. I have received several letters about that matter, mostly from employers. Some employers were fearful that if the power were given to the Government to take over the plants because of strikes, it might encourage some of the employees to foment strikes in the hope that the Government would be more generous with the employees than the employers would be. Of course, that is a hypothetical theory, but as against that let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the amendment proposes the conferring of a power on the President which need not be exercised. It would only be exercised after other measures had failed. But now, suppose other measures do fail? Suppose we have a situation out in California similar to that which we had in Inglewood. All these other processes failed. What would be the answer of the Senator from Michigan to a situation similar to that which existed at Inglewood? It would be just what he said a moment ago, when he said that he approved the action of the President of the United States. That is all this amendment means. This amendment means to make it clear and unequivocal that the President has the authority to do what he did yesterday in California.

What other parties to this controversy are there except the employer and the employees and the Government? If you have a strike, then the strikers take the plant over and they are going to run it to suit themselves. Let us assume that the employer forces a lockout, and he is going to run the plant. There is nobody else who can intervene except the Government of the United States, and I think the Government of the United States can be trusted, when it intervenes and takes possession of a plant to see that the men have fair wages and good working conditions. The employer is protected under this amendment by a provision that he shall be compensated, if necessary, in a court where condemnation proceedings would determine, according to the laws and under the Constitution, what his compensation should be.

To whom else would you give that authority except to the Government of the United States? You gave authority to mediate to the Mediation Board, and the Mediation Board is defied. You gave authority to the Secretary of Labor, through her mediation facilities and she is defied.

If the laboring people and the employers themselves cannot settle their difficulties, if the Mediation Board cannot settle them, if the Secretary of Labor cannot settle them, who else is there in this Government except the Government of the United States itself to settle the difficulties?

Mr. President, the time has come in this Republic for the people to know who is sitting in Washington, and whether the Government itself or factions and groups are to control the destinies of the people and the life of this Republic. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I think the fear he has just called attention to is greatly exaggerated. Does he think that the strikers out in Inglewood today would like to encourage another strike in another plant where they might be working after the experience they have had?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is my observation and my very deep belief, as the responsible C. I. O. leaders themselves have said, that that particular strike is definitely and specifically inspired by Communist influences, and it is simply our "fifth column" on the march, and it is my belief that a great deal of the labor difficulty which organized labor itself now confronts is the difficulty of communism on the march. Communism is interested in the nationalization of industry. Communism, I assume, would figure that it had served itself if it forced the nationalization of industry, and what I am asking the Senator from Texas is whether this amendment thus might inadvertently become a weapon for them to promote their own objectives, and I am wondering if there is any protection possible against that possibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think I can answer the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to tell him how I think it perhaps might be done, so he will fully understand that I am not contending against his objective, but that I am trying to protect it if possible against this one contingency which it seems to me is dangerous. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that when the President directed the Secretary of War to take charge of the North American plant and remain in charge and operate that plant, he said that should continue "only until normal production shall be resumed."

I was wondering whether some such limitation as that in the Senator's amendment might not still leave the amendment fully reaching every objective he seeks, and not offend against this other menace which it seems to me might exist.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his interest. I know he wants to be helpful. Let me say that the amendment, by specific terms, is limited to the emergency. The President may not exercise any of these powers except during this emergency.

Let me further suggest to the Senator—

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I wish to answer the Senator from Michi-

gan. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The Senator from Michigan says it is his view—and I think it is the general view—that many of the extreme strikes which the national leaders are denouncing, are caused by Communists; and his fear is that a few Communists may be willing to have bayonets jabbed into them, as was the case in the strike in Los Angeles, in order to provoke a disturbance so that the Government will take over the plant.

Let us see about that. If the Government steps in and takes charge of the plant, the Government will say who shall work there. The Government does not have to continue to employ Communists, if any of them are in the plant. The Government does not have to continue the employment of radicals, labor disturbers, and troublesome individuals. The Government can do a little weeding, a little combing, a little eliminating, and perhaps a little liquidating, if necessary, to get rid of troublesome individuals. I do not think that the action of the Government in that particular strike will encourage the Communists at all.

Let me say to the Senator from Michigan, as I suggested on last Thursday when I made some remarks on the bill, that during the World War President Wilson set up a three-pronged labor arrangement. One prong was a wage board. President Taft, the father of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, was a member of that Board, which was commonly known as the Taft-Walsh Wage Board. It devoted itself to undertaking to stabilize and fix rates of pay in various sections of the country for a number of classifications of labor. That action tended to prevent sporadic strikes.

President Wilson then set up a mediation board. We now have mediation boards.

President Wilson then set up a "no strike, no lock-out" agreement, to which both employees and employers subscribed. There were to be no strikes and no lock-outs. There were wage boards and mediation boards. If it should become necessary to take over any plants the President, by Executive order, could very appropriately set up some sort of wage board in order to prescribe fair wages in the various areas.

However, the main consideration in this legislation is that production shall not be delayed, hindered, or stopped. The strikers may take over the plant and tie it up, or the employers may declare a lock-out and tie it up. If the Government itself should step in, it would say, "This plant is going to operate. The Government is going to operate it. If employers who know their jobs want to continue to work, all right; but the Government is the boss. If employees want to continue to work, they may continue to work; but the Government of the United States will be their supervisor. If there are those who do not want to work, who have a yen for a vacation, all they have to do is to get their hats, walk out, and keep on walking.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Merely setting up boards to settle wage disputes and matters of that sort would not necessarily reach the crux of this situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There are other kinds of strikes. For instance, we have a strike in the city of St. Louis at the present time in a plant which has some \$18,000,000 worth of contracts for the Navy Department, covering material which the Navy Department says is of the most imperatively necessary kind, and with respect to which time is of the essence of the whole matter. Production is held up by a jurisdictional strike. The plant has been 100-percent unionized for years. There is no dispute whatever as to wages or hours, or collective bargaining, or the fact that the plant is 100-percent unionized. There is not even any dispute between the two great labor organizations, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., because both factions are A. F. of L. affiliates. There is a jurisdictional dispute between the machinists and the carpenters of the A. F. of L. Vitally necessary Government work is being held up.

Unless there is some authority somewhere to see that Government work goes forward, as is proposed in the Senator's amendment, I do not see how setting up wage boards or anything of that kind can meet the situation, because in the case to which I refer, as I have said, there is no dispute as to wages. There is no dispute as to hours of labor, conditions of labor, or collective bargaining. The only dispute is a jurisdictional row between two local unions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I think his remarks are entirely timely and appropriate and go directly to the point. The reason why the Senator from Texas mentioned the wage boards was to show that we are not trying to ignore or fail to recognize the rights of labor or of the employers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with what the Senator from Texas says. I am merely suggesting that there is another field outside what he mentions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to give employees every opportunity to present their grievances and troubles. I wish to afford the same opportunity to employers. But that does not answer the question. When we have a hung jury, we do not get any verdict. That is what happens in the case of strikes. So there is no other answer.

Whose business is it to produce war materials? It is the business of the Government of the United States to see that they are produced. Are we to have a sidewalk conference somewhere and let a picket line determine whether or not we shall produce national-defense articles? The responsibility is that of the Government of the United States. We assume that responsibility in this body. We called the young men of this Republic from their homes and occupations and said to them, "You must join the Army or the Navy." Those young men were not in a position to demand collective bargaining. We said, "We in the Congress will determine those matters. You are going into the Army at \$21 a month."

Other men, whose military training had been deferred in order that they

might do skilled work, were relieved from going into the Army. Some of them held meetings in little groups and said, "We will not work unless you pay us what we say we shall be paid. We will not work unless you do what we say you should do."

Mr. President, is the Government of the United States to have its arm paralyzed by that sort of thing, or will it step in with some authority and emphasis on what it does and say, "This plant is going to operate; if you do not want to work, you can get out, but the plant is going to operate?"

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite see how the Senator's amendment would make anybody go to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would not.

Mr. TAFT. Then I do not see how it would solve the problem.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would not solve everything. The Senator from Texas does not say that it is a cure-all.

Mr. TAFT. If the men do not want to work, they will not work. If they are going back to work in California today, it is not because the Government has taken possession of the plant. It is because apparently they wanted to work all the time, and they were prevented from doing so by picket lines and violence. So it does not seem to me that there is as yet any evidence that taking over the plant was in any way an essential feature of the solution of the strike.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the Senator's solution?

Mr. TAFT. I think that if adequate protection had been given to the employees by the same soldiers, the same men who went back to work yesterday would have gone back to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are now affording them protection with 2,000 soldiers. If that protection is not adequate, we will send some more. I do not see the Senator's point. The Senator's point seems to be that instead of saying that the Government will take over the plant, we should send some soldiers out there.

Mr. TAFT. I do not intend to oppose the bill, because I think the Government already has the necessary power; but I still do not think that the bill affords a solution to the problem. If the men do not want to work, they are no more willing to work for the Government than for the owner of the plant. If they were being prevented by force from working, the soldiers who took possession of the plant could have seen to it that they were protected in their right to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says that the bill would not make them work. Has the Senator any bill or proposal which would make them work whether they wanted to work or not?

Mr. TAFT. The President had full power to send the Army there yesterday.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about making the employees work. The Senator says that the bill is defective because it would not make them work.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's argument is that the proposed legislation is the way

to make the men work, and that they should not be allowed to strike while other men are being paid \$21 a month in the Army. I say that the Senator's amendment would not put anybody to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas did not say it would. If the Senator from Ohio had listened as well as he talks, he would have heard the Senator from Texas say that if a man did not want to work, all he would have to do would be to get his hat and walk out, and keep on walking. Was the Senator present when I said that?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but the Senator's subsequent argument was somewhat inconsistent with that position.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, all right; let us see. If the Senator from Ohio heard the Senator from Texas say that, how can he say that the Senator from Texas has been contending that it would make them go to work? I did not make any such contention as that.

The Senator from Ohio is a statesman. He does not think this bill is any good, but he is for it. He just said he was going to vote for it. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to ask the Senator one other question. He suggested that there was a difference between Government operation and private operation because, as I understood him, the Government could refuse to employ Communists or other agitators.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Whereas, of course, private employers are required by the National Labor Relations Act to employ such people; they cannot turn them down, as I remember the law. In fact, the National Labor Relations Board insists that they do not turn them down, particularly if they are officials of unions. So I am wondering if the Senator feels that under his bill for Government operation, perhaps there is a difference, and that the Government can operate a plant without regard to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly; I think the Government can do so. That is the thought I tried to convey a moment ago.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In just a moment; I do not want to ignore the Senator from Ohio. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Ohio poses that question. I think the Government can do so.

Another thing is that they cannot strike against the Government of the United States. They cannot strike against our Government. A few boys up there with a few implements of peace in their hands can stop all the pickets that come there.

Now I want to say this in answer to the Senator from Ohio—

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did I understand the Senator to say that they cannot strike against the Government of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, they can quit and go about their business; but they cannot put picket lines up there and keep other people from going to work.

Mr. TAFT. But a strike simply means ceasing to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, they can quit, and can go plumb to Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Therefore they can strike against the Government of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; they can strike.

Mr. TAFT. But the Senator just said they could not strike against the Government of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. They cannot tie up the plant. That is what I mean.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In just a moment. I want to make some observations in answer to the Senator from Ohio.

The Senator from Ohio says, "Oh, well, this bill does not amount to anything, but I am not going to oppose it"; and the Senator says, "The only trouble was that those men wanted to work all the time."

Granted that they did—why did they not work? Why did they not work all the time? The Senator said there was no trouble, that they wanted to work all the time, that all they wanted was a chance to work. Why did they not work all the time? Because those who were on strike would not only not work themselves, but they had 3,000 pickets massed in front of the gates, turning over the automobiles of those who wanted to go in to work, keeping out the men who wanted to go back into the plant, strongarming them. That answers the Senator from Ohio.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. I am afraid of the Senator from Oregon, but I will yield in a moment.

That answers the Senator from Ohio. He says they wanted to work all the time, that it is not necessary to pass the bill, but just let them go to work. It took 2,000 soldiers out there to make it possible for those who wanted to work to go to work. Under my bill anyone who wants to strike may strike, I say to the Senator from Ohio; and the Senator from Ohio has no plan that will prevent it. He has here no peonage bill that would make men work, whether they want to or not, except by putting them in the Army. That is all right; we will put some of these men in the Army, if they do not want to work, under the draft. We will remove their preference. The President has already issued the order.

No; they can strike. But this bill goes further than that. It is a constitutional right, we will admit, that if a man does not want to work he may quit. On the other hand, while that is a valuable constitutional right—to quit work if one wants to—there is another valuable constitutional right in this country; that is the right to work if you want to work; and no one else has a constitutional right to say that you shall not work when you want to work, and when there is someone ready to hire you and to employ you. This bill does say to these men, "If you are raising trouble and you want to

quit—quit; but you cannot stand out here at the gates of this plant and tell every other man who wants to work in a national-defense plant that he shall not work, and that you are going to keep him from work by force, violence, and all the arts of persuasion and coercion and intimidation that it is possible for men to exert."

I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I want to submit an amendment aimed to be helpful to the objective of the Senator from Texas. Briefly, it provides that whenever the President has taken over any plant, and so forth, he is authorized to induct into the land or naval forces of the United States any employee of such plant, and so forth. I should like to send this amendment to the desk and offer it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot keep the Senator from sending it to the desk, but I hope the Senator will not press it, because under that amendment we would have to amend the whole Selective Service Act. The President already has issued an order to the draft boards throughout the country that with respect to any man who has gotten deferment by reason of being a skilled laborer; if he is on strike, the deferment shall be withdrawn.

Mr. HOLMAN. Briefly, it provides that he shall go to work in that plant under the direction of the President.

Mr. CONNALLY. Everyone and anyone who is in the plant?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, who was on his feet first; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I approve of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, and I will support it.

In answer to the Senator from Ohio, who asks if a man can strike against the Government of the United States, I desire to say that a man can do so, but he should not strike against the Government of the United States; and in my opinion, when he does strike against the Government of the United States, he has taken his third strike and he is out. It is apparent that, under the order of the President, when the soldiers moved into that plant 2,000 patriotic men of this country went to work; and the patriotic men of this country are working in order to make materials for the boys who are in the military camps and who are receiving \$21 a month.

I say that the Senator from Texas has a good bill which ought to be passed, and it ought to be passed speedily.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

I yield now to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was particularly interested in the President's order to the Army to operate the plant, which, as I understand, means that an Army officer today is in charge of that plant.

Mr. CONNALLY. I so understand it. If he is not I hope he soon may be.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator feel there is any limit to the extent to which the armed forces might be used in the operation of the plant?

Mr. CONNALLY. Why, yes; I do.

Mr. BREWSTER. Where would the line be drawn between the officer who now is in charge and any of the men under his charge who might be engaged in mechanical operations?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will explain the matter to the Senator. Is that all his question?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what I wished to know.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that the president of that company or of any other company does not go in there and run a machine, he does not go in there and sweep the floors. He directs it. He is the head, he is the executive. If I were an Army officer and took charge of one of the plants, the first thing I would do would be to call in all the superintendents and the heads of the departments and say, "You have been running this business, and you know your business, or are supposed to. You go right on. If there is any difficulty, you report the trouble to me. You go right on and do this job as you have been doing it."

Then I would call in the employees and the men in the laboring departments and would tell them the same thing: "I have no quarrel with you. This plant has got to operate. If you want to continue, report to your division foremen and your laboring chiefs, and the higher ups report to me if there is any trouble."

What is the harm in that?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am in entire accord with the Senator, but I want to know where it will stop. Apparently today there is a shortage of several thousand men in the plant; not all the employees are back. We have several thousand mechanics in the Army. Does the Senator feel that under the amendment the President would be authorized at this time to use those Army mechanics in the operation of that plant?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I think under the present authority, under the Draft Act, and under his authority as Commander in Chief of the Army, he can detail, if necessary, men having mechanical experience who are now in the Army; he could, if he desired, detail them to do this work.

Now let say to the Senator from Maine that that was done during the World War. During that war we sent enlisted men of the Army to the Northwest, to Washington and Oregon, to produce fir and other timbers for the manufacture of airplanes; and in France whole regiments of troops were detailed to perform labor in unloading goods at the docks and other places. They were still in the military service, but they were detailed to perform those duties.

Mr. BREWSTER. Could that be done under the existing law or under the amendment of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it could be done under the general control of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. If I am Commander in Chief of the Army, I can tell the men in

the Army to do anything that is not prohibited under Army regulations or by law.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it could be

Mr. BRIDGES. I am in sympathy with the objective sought by the Senator, and I think he has exhibited courage and patriotism in presenting the matter at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am wondering why, however, the result cannot be accomplished by sending the troops to protect American workers in their fundamental right to work and allow the operation of the factory or plant to proceed by private operation and still use the troops for protection in their right to work. Is there not an advantage in this method?

Mr. CONNALLY. In essence there is no distinction at all. What has happened in California amounts in effect to that. Troops are being sent to protect those who want to work. This is the practical reason: If we simply send in troops to protect the employer and say we are going to take his side and say to the employees "go on and work just as you have been working," immediately there would be raised a reaction on the part of many laboring people that we were taking the side of the employer and we were sending in troops to bayonet them or shoot them because they do not go along. That is not a very strong reason, I will say, but it is enough to make a distinction.

Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that if he had listened to the Senator from Texas awhile ago he would have understood that the Government taking over a plant does not mean it is going to disrupt the organization at all. I dare say today that under the Army officer in charge of the plant in California the employees are the same as those who have been working all the time; the superintendents and heads of divisions are the same; they are going right on just as if they were still in the employ of the operator, and they are, in effect, still in the employ, in effect, of the owners of that plant. But the Government simply steps in and takes supervisory charge and control. That is all there is to it.

I am glad the Senator approves my bill, but do not let us hunt up any more ghosts than we can handle. The Senator wants done exactly what has been done at Inglewood; I assume he wants something to be done exactly in conformity with this amendment; and yet he wonders why it could not be done in some other way. If there is a way readily at hand, why go off and comb the bushes for some other way to do it? Why detour when there is a plain road straight ahead?

Mr. BRIDGES. If we want to follow the plain road, the straight road, it would not be what the Senator from Texas has suggested. He is taking a long detour to reach a given point. I prefer the straight road rather than the Senator's detour, but if we cannot get action by the direct route I will take the detour.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am very glad to have him come out for this amendment, because I know his support will carry a good deal of weight.

Mr. President, one other word and I am done. This matter was first discussed by the Senator from Texas on April 2, 1941, in the RECORD, page 2863, where I said:

So, if I had my way about it, I would adopt a provision directing or authorizing the President, through the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, to take over any plant which now has contracts for the production of essential national-defense articles, or arms or munitions, where disputes between the employer and the employees, or other labor disturbances, or strikes are impeding and delaying production.

After making those remarks, I had this amendment prepared, and I have been waiting to present it for what I thought was the psychological time. So on last Thursday in this Chamber, I introduced this amendment in the form of a bill and made some remarks and submitted some recommendations and some statistics with reference to the delay in the production of essential defense articles.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up more of the Senate's time—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask one further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the Senator's judgment, would the adoption of this amendment obviate the necessity for the passage of the general bill which has been proposed enlarging the Presidential power to take over facilities?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator I have not examined that bill; I have not, in fact, read it, but I understand that those who are urging it would not be satisfied with this particular proposal.

I do not speak my own attitude, because I have not any attitude; I do not know at the moment where I stand on it; but let me say to the Senator that persons who are urging the general bill insist that the necessity for it arises because under the present law the Government has no power of requisition as to personal property. It can seize land and condemn it, but they claim—I am not urging the bill; I think it is too broad, to be frank—that in some cases persons who have raw material, such as scrap iron, copper, or nickel, which the Government needs and wants, will not sell it for a fair price; they will not give it up except at an exorbitant price, and the War Department, which is urging this bill, says, "We want the right to go and take that and pay the owner what the fair value is, through the court, if need be." That is their contention, and that being their contention, I assume they would not be satisfied with this bill. But my proposal has no relation to that bill, for I drew my amendment 2 months ago, long before the other bill was ever heard of in this Chamber. I am not offering it as a substitute or an amendment; it is offered wholly independently.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Probably there was some connection between the two, for, it seems to me, the Senator's bill is 95 percent of the justification that would have been urged in behalf of the other bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be. I will say that some enterprising newspaperman when I introduced this bill the other day immediately saw an effort to substitute it for the other bill. My bill, as I have said, was drawn on the second day of April, 1941. The other bill was only introduced a week or two ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. In connection with what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said, I should like to read a dispatch in this afternoon's Washington Star, in which it is said:

The War Department asked Congress today to sidetrack its so-called property seizure bill temporarily to permit speedy passage of legislation to give the President specific statutory authority to deal with defense strikes.

Under Secretary of War Patterson told the House Military Affairs Committee that amendments to the selective-service law, such as proposed by Senator CONNALLY, Democrat of Texas, or Chairman VINSON, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, would "fill the needs as the War Department sees it."

So I presume that they have retreated from their position referred to by the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have not seen the afternoon newspaper, but the Senator from Texas has correctly stated the situation, as I understand it. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas has absolutely nothing to do with the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from North Carolina. Hearings upon that bill will be held in the Senate beginning next Monday and in the House of Representatives beginning today.

There is no justification for the confusion between the two measures. As the Senator from Texas has stated, the questions raised by the bill introduced by the Senator from North Carolina apply, in great measure, to personal property not only to accumulated stocks of aluminum, say, but to privately owned airplanes, on the same theory the Senator from Texas has urged that if the Government of the United States may draft a human being for defense purposes and put him into camp for a year, when it calls upon an American citizen who owns a private plane and offers to buy the plane and he refuses to sell it to his Government, the Government should have power to take over the plane and use it for defense purposes. The same thing is true of a yacht owned by a man who refuses to sell it to his Government at this time, when the Government needs it. That furnishes an illustration—a plane, or an accumulated stock of raw material in the hands of some man who is seeking to speculate and make money out of the necessities of his Government. For that purpose this bill was introduced.

I agree, as I read it, that in drafting the bill unnecessary powers were granted; but whenever the committees of the Congress, in Senate and House,

after hearing what it is desired to accomplish, sit down to consider the matter, they can draft legislation that the Congress certainly will approve and the country will approve, to require the individual citizen who has property that is demanded for the defense of his country to turn over that property and be paid for it, just as a citizen is required to go to camp and serve his country.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment; then I will yield.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Michigan that the amendment which I now offer was prepared by me without any consultation with the War and Navy Departments. Nobody had anything to do with it except the legislative drafting counsel, Mr. Wood, who helped me prepare it and draw it; so it is not in any sense related to the other bill. It has no concern at all with the other bill, because I drew the amendment on the 2d of April 1941, 2 months ago, before I ever heard of the other bill.

What the Senator from South Carolina says about the attitude of those who are pushing the bill I think is accurate.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire. Then I shall have concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question about the language on page 2 of his amendment, where these words appear:

Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged.

What I want to know is this: After a plant is taken over, when the emergency terminates, is the plant turned back?

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that there would be no rule about it. The President announced in the newspapers, as I saw today, that the Inglewood plant will be turned back to the owners just as soon as normal production is resumed. Under this bill, in no event could the taking over last longer than the unlimited emergency. The language has been changed to read, "the unlimited emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27," instead of the one declared in 1939.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator object to a more definite termination being inserted in his amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what "definite" means in that connection; but I certainly think the language is adequate just as it is, because as long as this unlimited emergency continues, as long as it is necessary to get these war materials, I want this power to continue.

Mr. BRIDGES. Suppose, for example, certain words were used whereby the President must return the property to the owners within a certain given length of time after the emergency is over.

Mr. CONNALLY. The power is terminated when the emergency is over. The President then has no power under the amendment.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. The other part of section 9 is terminated by the Selective Service Act on May 15, 1945. Does the Senator think the powers contained in his amendment will also terminate at that date?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, I think undeniably they will. Of course, they will, because this is an amendment to the general act; but this power can be exercised only during the existence of the unlimited emergency.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago the Senator stated that the legislative counsel had drafted this bill. I have high regard for the ability of the legislative counsel, but sometimes they draft measures which it is rather difficult for me to comprehend, and I find that the courts also have some trouble in determining just what is meant.

I should like to give a concrete example with reference to the authority the President is given under section 2, or provision 2, in which he is given the right to take over—

any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials.

In my home city we have a small manufacturing concern which manufactures plow wheels. If the Secretary of War should determine that that factory should, we will say, manufacture tractor wheels as defense articles, instead of plow wheels as it is now doing, I wonder whether or not the President, under the language of this bill, would have power to take over that factory by simply authorizing some agency of Government to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that he must bear in mind all the time that under this amendment the President cannot exercise any of those powers unless there is a strike or a threatened strike.

Mr. LUCAS. That raises the very question.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator ought to do is to get section 9 of the Draft Act, which provides about the draft of employers' plants. That is in greater detail.

Mr. LUCAS. I have not section 9 before me. Perhaps that may be where I fell into error in attempting to analyze this provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Section 9 deals with taking over the plant when the employer will not make defense articles at the request of the Government, and provides for his compensation.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

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

Mr. BROWN. I puzzled for quite a while over the same question that dis-

turbs the Senator from Illinois; that is, whether or not the President might take over a plant which was not engaged in defense production, but was making cosmetics, we will say, or, as the Senator from Illinois says, wheels for plows; but I think that question is answered by a careful study of the final sentence of the amendment. The President could not take over the plant to which the Senator from Illinois refers unless he found that production there was necessary to the national defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Production of what?

Mr. BROWN. Anything; defense articles that are necessary to the national-defense program.

Mr. LUCAS. As I read this amendment, I will say to the Senator from Michigan, it occurred to me that all the qualifying language in that section primarily referred to provision 1, which says:

Any plant equipped for the manufacture of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith.

In other words, under provision 1, articles are already being manufactured for national defense. In that case, when there is a strike, there cannot be any question that under this amendment the Government would have a right to take over the plant. But when we get to provision No. 2 we say that the President is authorized to take over—

any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials.

I now come back to the original illustration that I gave. In my home town there is a little factory manufacturing plow wheels at the present time. Undoubtedly, with just a slight change in the machinery, it could manufacture tractor wheels, which would be defense materials for the Army. The point which worries me, under this language, is how the President of the United States, in the first instance, is to take over that factory. What kind of an investigation can he make under this amendment? In other words, it deals altogether with the question of strikes; it deals with disturbed conditions with respect to labor; and at the particular time that the President of the United States is interested in this factory which is manufacturing nondefense articles there is no strike. There is nothing at all there other than machinery and tools and equipment that can be used for manufacturing defense articles.

I just raise this question because in the discussion of it it disturbed me as to whether or not there is any power at all for the President to finally say in the decree he has to issue that he exercises this power and authority as desirable in the public interest. It seems to me there may be some question about it.

Mr. BROWN. I do not see how the President could take over the plant which is described in subsection 2 under any circumstances, unless he could make the finding, which would be a rather extreme one, that it was necessary to

take the plant over to produce material for the national-defense program.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will permit me right there—

Mr. BROWN. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not trying to take the Senator from the floor, but right on that point, if the Senator will get section 9 of the Selective Service Act, which is what we are amending, he will find that is the section which provides for the President taking over plants when the employers or the owners of the plants refuse to manufacture articles. The bill before us is drawn with the idea that we will apply to strike-bound plants under similar conditions rules that were applied to the refusal of the employer to go along. That is why this language to which the Senator adverted is used. Listen to the language of the Selective Service Act:

Any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the Army or Navy, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof.

That is the original draft act. In drawing my amendment I was merely trying to make the same conditions apply to a strike which would apply to the President's authority in section 9 of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning the Senator's intention at all, and I am with him in the amendment; I intend to vote for it. The only thought that disturbed me was, as I stated before, as to whether or not under the language of provision 2 of the amendment the President really would have any authority to take over a plant such as the one I have heretofore described. The Senator from Texas just read a part of section 9 of the act, but when we go on from where he left off we find its says—

or who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of such orders—

And so forth. In other words, under this act there had to be a defiance of some kind, but under the amendment of the Senator from Texas, provision 2, as I understand it, gives to the Secretary of War the absolute right to take over a plant which is manufacturing any defense materials if, in his judgment, after an investigation, the War Department can use that plant to effectively manufacture articles of defense or other implements of war.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is done in section 9, which reads—

shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment.

What must the employer do?

Who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the

execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition, or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of War.

Why, that would not apply to a plant that was manufacturing the articles the Senator specified, if the Secretary of War should so determine. After the Secretary of War determined it, nobody but the President could exercise the power of taking over.

Mr. BROWN. All that refers to the owner of a plant who refuses to permit it to be used for the production of defense articles.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. When we get down to subdivision 2, to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, we are met with a different situation. We are not talking about the refusal of an owner to permit his plant to be used, we are talking about some condition—a strike being the condition we all have in mind—which prevents the use of the plant.

I say the answer to the question the Senator from Illinois propounds is that there is no conceivable condition where the President could make a finding that the production of the plow wheels, in the illustration used by the Senator, or the illustration I used, a cosmetic plant which might be converted into a chemical plant—there is no conceivable situation where the President could find that the failure to produce due to a strike or other cause threatened the defense program, because we are talking about a plant which might be taken over for the purpose of producing chemicals, or for the purpose, as in the Senator's illustration, of producing plow wheels. So while I thought at first there was some inconsistency in the bill, I came to the general conclusion that no power could be exercised under the last sentence of the Senator's bill which would apply to his subdivision No. 2. The power could only be exercised when the plant got into the production of defense materials. I do not think it amounts to anything.

Mr. LUCAS. I dislike to disagree with the Senator from Michigan, but I think it amounts to a good deal. In other words, if the position of the Senator from Michigan is correct, then provision No. 2 can in no wise apply until the Government has taken over the plant. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. That is my view of it.

Mr. LUCAS. After the Government takes it over, then there must be the conditions which are laid down in provision No. 2 with respect to a strike or other disturbance around that plant which materially affect the manufacture of the defense weapons.

Mr. BROWN. My point is that the fear which the Senator from Illinois raises can never materialize, because the President would never have any authority to take over a plant described in provision No. 2 unless he should find that production in that plant was necessary to the national-defense program. Of course, he could not so find unless they were producing some of the articles which are described in the proclamation.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I am making is that he could absolutely make a find-

ing, and I am questioning whether or not the authority is sufficient in this amendment for him to make a finding. In other words, if in the plant which I have depicted as an example they have machine tools which they can use in making tractor wheels instead of plow wheels, the President of the United States would have the power to authorize the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to take over the plant equipped for the manufacture of tractor wheels by a few little changes in connection with the machinery that is in the plant.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose the Senator's assumption is correct; if the President finds it is necessary to get those car wheels, and the employer is going to be guaranteed a fair compensation for his plant, why should he not take it over?

Mr. LUCAS. He should take it over.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. I think he should take it over. The only question I am raising as to provision No. 2 is whether or not the authority is sufficient for the President of the United States to take over that kind of a factory. In other words, provision No. 2 deals specifically with strikes, it deals specifically with disturbances and other matters around a factory which interfere with the manufacture of defense weapons. But in the first instance about which I am talking, under subdivision (2) here is a factory which is going along in a normal way, there are no strikes, they are manufacturing nondefense articles; but the Secretary of War sees an opportunity to use that plant for the purpose of manufacturing defense articles for this Nation and those other nations which are vital to our defense. So, he says, "I am going to take that factory over." The point I am raising is whether he can take that factory over under the language that is now in section 2.

Mr. CONNALLY. My contention is that he has that power under section 9 which I read awhile ago, strike or no strike. He has power to take it over under section 9, strike or no strike. Under my amendment he could not take it over unless there is a strike.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be correct. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] that there are three different propositions here, as he explained awhile ago, and I have some fears as to the authority of the President to do it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I congratulate the Senator on his painstaking and careful analysis.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In order perhaps to take care of that condition, at least looking forward to that very thing, I am wondering if the Senator would object to the addition of three words to his amendment. On page 2, line 14, after the words "or threatened failure of" would the Senator object to adding the three words "or interference with."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is, so the language would be:

That the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or

threatened failure of or interference with production at such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause.

When one says, "an existing or threatened failure of production," the words "threatened failure" cover almost as much territory as any garment one could devise. I would not object to his proposal. I will say to the Senator from Illinois, but this is a matter that has been canvassed around here, and there is quite general agreement on the matter, and I hesitate to change the text, because the Senator knows how easy it is to stir up a question about such language.

Mr. LUCAS. I will withdraw my suggestion. I thought the addition of those words would improve the Senator's language.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if he would object to the addition of certain language to the amendment which he has offered. My proposal is prompted by the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who read language from a newspaper which was supposed to have been included in the Executive order. After the word "interest", at the end of the Senator's amendment, the language which I offer or suggest is as follows:

*Provided, however, That such power and authority with respect to any such plant shall terminate, and such plant shall be returned to private management, as soon as the President has determined that normal production at such plant has been resumed.*

I know that the suggestion was made to the Senator previously. The amendment is in keeping with the expressed intention of the administration, and I am very hopeful that the Senator will accept the language as a part of his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is always a matter of regret for the Senator from Texas to have to disagree with the expressed desire of the Senator from Connecticut, but I think the language he has suggested is wholly unnecessary, and I think it would be the insertion of a provision or a command of law that might prove embarrassing some time or other.

The whole theory of this thing is that it is temporary, and the President has already publicly stated that this Inglewood plant would be returned as soon as normal production is resumed. But when you put in a statute a command that the President do something you are hampering his discretion, and many times there are considerations that the President knows about that others do not know about.

I am perfectly willing to trust the President to turn these plants back when the emergency ceases. He does not want them any longer than he thinks it is necessary to keep them. The President has not been hasty about this matter. The President has been very patient. He has not invoked this authority hurriedly or without due consideration. I hope the

Senator from Connecticut will not press his proposal.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to advise him, if the Senator will further yield to me, that he seems to misunderstand my amendment. I am perfectly willing to trust the President. I have not any doubt about what the President might do. But we are writing the legislation. We have a responsibility. It is important that the people know how we feel about it. My language will, at least, afford a great deal of comfort to the people of the United States, because we tell them herein that it is our intention that when the President has determined that normal production has been resumed the plant will be returned to private ownership.

The Senator in his amendment provides for taking over plants for the duration of the emergency. The emergency might very well last for 10 years, but I do not think the Senator would insist that it would be the part of wisdom that a large number of important industrial plants in this country be operated by the Federal Government while things were normal in the plants.

All the things the Senator insists upon are covered in the amendment which I have offered. There is no questioning the President of the United States. The language is offered to set down a policy and to allay the fears which have been excited, and will be excited, should it unfortunately become necessary for the Federal Government to take over any other plant under any circumstances. I very sincerely believe my amendment will strengthen the Senator's amendment, if he will take this language, which does not in any way detract from his purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that his amendment is directed at the whole of section 9. His amendment is not so drawn that it would affect the strike provision. The way the amendment is drawn it would go back and affect plants which would not cooperate, and as soon as the Government got them running, the Senator's proposal would have the effect to turn them over again.

Mr. MALONEY. Assuming that is true, if the President determines that normal conditions have been resumed in any plant he has taken over under any circumstances, why should not those plants be returned?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will tell the Senator why. Here is an employer who will not manufacture for the Government, who will not take a contract at a fair compensation. The Government comes in and takes charge of that plant. Does the Senator think that as soon as the Government gets the plant to producing it should be returned? I do not agree with such a proposal at all.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not have the Selective Service Act before me. I think the act provides a penalty for failure to do the things the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. And the penalty is \$50,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not in every case, but the penalty can go up quite high.

Mr. MALONEY. I think that in the attitude he assumes the Senator is going far afield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Connecticut voted for the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; and I spoke for it.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the Senator voted for the \$50,000 penalty provision.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; and I am not complaining against it. I do not want to take it out.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Connecticut wants to go back and amend the prior law, very well, but I do not agree to that, so far as I am concerned. I know that with respect to these plants in which there are strikes, and which are taken over, the President has said that he is going to return them as soon as normal operation is achieved, and I am willing to trust the President to do that.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Texas is not willing to trust the President to do that, because his language provides for the duration of the emergency. The language of the President provides that the plants shall be returned as soon as normal production is resumed. So the Senator from Texas is at variance with the President.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I have been at times, but I am not in this instance. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, if he will read the language, he will find that this amendment is simply a granting of the power to take the plant over. Of course, the power to take it over also includes the power to turn it loose. The President does not have to take the plant and keep it the rest of his life. He has the power under this provision to turn the plant loose at any time, and he has said he is going to turn it loose the moment normal production is resumed. I do not want to hamper him and try and direct him or hogtie him any further than the act does. I have every regard for the Senator from Connecticut, and I know he is prompted by the finest of motives, but I cannot agree with his proposal.

Mr. MALONEY. I respect the Senator's decision to disagree, but I certainly insist that he be clear about it. I am not trying to hogtie the President. I am borrowing the President's own language to perfect the amendment of the Senator from Texas, and I hope he will not misconstrue what I have said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not. That is the reason I am against his proposal. I construe it properly.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Connally amendment and to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Despite the dramatic events of the past week, and especially the past day or two, the problem of avoiding stoppages of defense production caused by labor disputes is not a new one. Many of us have been concerned about it for many months—in fact, almost since the inception of the defense program.

In view of our extremely leisurely procedure to date in attacking this problem, I fail to see the need for the precipitate action which I believe is involved in the amendment proposed by the Senator

from Texas. I should prefer to see some speedy but careful committee work done on the subject within the next few days before action is taken in this body. But since the subject is brought before us by the Connally amendment, I feel impelled to express my views as to the solution of the basic problem involved, which is how to settle labor disputes without stoppage of production.

The Connally amendment would authorize the President to take over and operate plants closed or threatened with closing because of labor disputes. I believe that is placing the legislative cart before the horse.

What we desperately need today is a basic set of procedures for fair settlement of labor disputes without stoppage of production. The Connally amendment would write into the law a drastic penalty—a penalty on employers, whose plants would be taken over by the Government, and on employees, whose strikes would be broken by bayonets. A penalty for what?

The amendment does not say what the penalty is for, but presumably it is being imposed for failure of one or both parties to follow some nebulous or nonexistent policy or procedure in labor disputes which neither the administration nor the Congress has ever stated clearly and definitely.

I do not want to defend the strikers at North American Aviation for their refusal to heed the pleas of their own international leaders to return to work and submit their dispute to the Mediation Board. They should have done so. Yet I can understand why it was easy for the leaders of that local union, in defiance of their international leaders, to convince their followers that they should remain on strike, despite the President's statements.

After all, the men undoubtedly had read newspaper accounts of how one high administration official after another had appeared before congressional committees to oppose waiting periods or cooling-off periods designed to permit Government mediation of disputes before production was stopped. They opposed such proposals on the ground that such legislation would constitute compulsion, and we could not have compulsion on labor unions.

That was a fairly clear position; and I think those union members understood it. Then the Mediation Board came along and told them they should go back to work and provide a waiting period while the Board considered their grievances. When they refused to go along, that request of the Board was backed up by the President's order to the Army to take over the plant, and the union's strike was halted at the point of the bayonet. That is compulsion with a vengeance.

Mr. President, I think that in all fairness we must admit that there were some grounds for the employees being confused as to just what their country expected of them in this emergency. That is not to imply that I do not approve the President's action. I do approve it, heartily, and I believe he did the only thing possible in the circumstances. Furthermore, I call attention to the language in the President's proclamation. His remedy

was much less drastic than that proposed here. His order reads:

Possession and operation hereunder shall be terminated by the President as soon as he determines that the plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

In other words, the plant is not taken over permanently, but merely until such time as the dispute is settled and normal production resumed, when it is to be returned to private operation. I command the President on that statement of policy.

But while this action was necessary in the North American case yesterday, the point I make is that if we develop and clearly state to all employers and employees the policy that we, the Congress and the administration, expect both of them to follow in an effort during this emergency to settle their disputes without halting production, then we shall be attacking the basic problem. We shall be striking at its root; and I believe that once such a policy, such a set of procedures, is fully understood by every individual employer and employee, they will follow those procedures, and it will be the rare exception when the Government will have to resort to such drastic methods as those invoked yesterday in order to assure continuous production of vital defense materials.

I believe that we should only further contribute to the confusion now existing if we should write into law this drastic penalty or remedy for the present unhappy situation, without at the same time providing a saner, more democratic method of solving the problem, which is still that of settling disputes without stopping production.

After all, there can be no strike unless a fairly substantial group of employees feel that they are being treated unfairly, and that they have a grievance, whether that grievance be real or fancied. The action of the Army at Inglewood yesterday has not removed the grievance those employees believed they had. And even if the employees do come back to work, until their grievance is adjusted to their satisfaction or they are convinced that they were and are being treated fairly and were misled by their local leaders, the North American plant will not have the wholehearted cooperation from its employees which is necessary for top-speed production.

So it seems to me that the real problem, that of adjusting the grievance, still remains to be settled at North American; and all yesterday's action accomplished was to assure resumption of some sort of production pending adjustment of that grievance.

Government seizure and operation of a plant should be the very last resort, after all other methods of settlement of the dispute have been exhausted. That policy can be carried out only if Congress clearly defines what the other methods and procedures are. After those procedures have been exhausted, or if one or the other party refuses to follow them, then we are justified in resorting to the more drastic remedy.

But I do not believe it is either sound democracy or sound legislation simply to "crack down" on both employers and

employees with a drastic penalty for failing to do what Congress and the administration have never told them clearly they should do.

The amendment I am offering to the Connally amendment grew out of the so-called cooling-off bill which I introduced last February. A subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee has held hearings on that bill over the past 5 weeks; and as a result of the ideas expressed and constructive proposals made in those hearings I have drafted a new bill.

I had intended to offer it in the subcommittee, and have been assured by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] of prompt consideration. If the subcommittee acts favorably, we believe it might be possible to report a bill for consideration in a week or 10 days. The proposal contained in the Connally amendment could be incorporated into that bill very easily as a final measure to prevent production stoppages in the event the more democratic procedures set forth in the bill are not followed or fail.

I, myself, prefer that method of procedure, and I believe that the President's action of yesterday shows clearly that there is not such tremendous need for haste that such procedure could not be followed. However, since the Senator from Texas has offered his amendment, I feel that in all fairness to both employees and employers we should, if we adopt this drastic remedy for production stoppages, offer them at the same time a more reasonable and sane method of settling their disputes.

The procedures set forth in my amendment are those which one union leader after another testified at our hearings are the ones they have urged and even instructed their locals to follow, and which employers likewise have endorsed. No compulsions and no penalties of any kind, other than that proposed in the Connally amendment, are proposed in my amendment. The Congress would simply set out in clear and definite terms the procedures which it expects both employers and employees to follow in this emergency in the interests of national defense and the security of our country.

I am convinced that in 99 cases out of a hundred, that would be all the compulsion needed, because I am convinced that all but a negligible minority of employees and employers want to do everything possible to expedite our national-defense program. But so far no one has told them plainly and clearly how they may do so. I propose that we tell them now in this amendment.

I have had placed on the desk of every Senator a mimeographed copy of the amendment which I have proposed. It would amend the final sentence of the Connally amendment to read as follows:

Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged, whenever the President finds, after investigation, (1) that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure

of production at such plant as a result of a strike or threatened strike or other cause; (2) that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest; and (3) that either or both of the parties to a labor dispute at such plant have refused to follow the procedure set forth in section 25 of the Defense Industry Conciliation Act of 1941 in an effort to prevent stoppage of production at such plants or that the parties to a labor dispute at such plant have followed the procedure set forth in such section 25 but that a stoppage of production at such plant has occurred or is imminent.

Then I would follow that by title II, which simply would constitute the bill which I have drafted and on which our subcommittee has been working.

Section 21 of that title would simply provide:

This title may be cited as the "Defense Industry Conciliation Act of 1941."

Section 22, which is a declaration of policy, reads:

Sec. 22. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that employers and employees in defense industries who become involved in labor disputes shall exhaust every possible method of settling such disputes without stoppage of work, in order that the Nation's defense program may not be delayed.

Section 23 reads as follows:

Sec. 23. As used in this title, the term "defense industry" means any industry engaged in (1) the production, processing, or transportation of arms, armament, ammunition, implements of war, munitions, clothing, food, fuel, or any other articles or supplies, or parts or ingredients of any such articles or supplies, intended for the use of the United States or any agency thereof in connection with the national defense, or any materials used in connection with such production, processing, or transportation, except in the production of farm products on a farm, and except any industry subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or (2) the construction, reconstruction, repair, or equipping of any building, plant, or facility intended for the use of the United States or any agency thereof, or for the use of any producer or processor or transporter, in connection with the national defense.

Sections 24 and 25 are the heart of the bill. Section 24 (a) provides as follows:

Sec. 24. (a) The administration of this title, except as otherwise provided herein, is vested exclusively in the National Defense Mediation Board established by Executive Order No. 8716 of March 19, 1941 (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

Subsection (b) provides that the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor shall be transferred to the Mediation Board created by the President's order, and that all its personnel and its unexpended appropriations shall be so transferred for the duration of this title—which, incidentally, would expire on July 1, 1943. The subsection reads as follows:

(b) The Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor and all of its functions, personnel, records, property (including office equipment), and unexpended balances of appropriations and allocations are hereby transferred, for the period of effectiveness of this title, from the Department of Labor to the Board; and, upon the expiration of the period of effectiveness of this title, they shall revert to the Department of Labor. Any

transfer of personnel under this subsection shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate after the end of the fiscal year during which the transfer is made to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned and except that the Director of the Conciliation Service shall, upon his transfer to the Board, be given the title of Conciliation Director of the Board.

Subsection (c) of that section would create a Labor Standards Commission. The subsection reads as follows:

(c) There is hereby created the Labor Standards Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), consisting of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms coterminous with the period of effectiveness of this title. Salaries of members of the Commission shall be \$10,000 per annum, and the Commission is authorized to employ such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance as it finds necessary to perform its duties.

Subsection (d) provides as follows:

(d) During the period of effectiveness of this title, the Board shall be the exclusive conciliation and mediation agent of the Federal Government in labor disputes other than those with respect to which the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, are applicable.

The reason why I provide for the transfer of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor to the Mediation Board and for giving the Mediation Board exclusive jurisdiction in all conciliation and mediation efforts of the Federal Government is that before our subcommittee one witness after another told us that one trouble with the present picture and procedure is that there are too many different Government agencies and departments mixing up in this problem. The O. P. M. Labor Division, under Mr. Hillman, sends out a conciliator; the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, under Dr. Steelman, sends out a conciliator; the Mediation Board may intervene; and, then, there is a Maritime Labor Board which may intervene in cases affecting shipbuilding or the maritime industries. Mr. William Leiserson, of the National Labor Relations Board; Mr. William Davis, the vice chairman of the Mediation Board; Mr. Edward McGrady, the former Assistant Secretary of Labor, and who is now labor consultant to the War Department; as well as a number of labor leaders who testified, all said they believed it would help tremendously to eliminate the confusion now existing in this picture to have a single Federal agency handling the conciliation and mediation problem.

Section 25, title II, sets out the procedure which Congress would expect both employers and employees to follow in an effort to settle their disputes without stopping production. It is not very long, and I shall read it:

SEC. 25. Whenever a dispute arises between an employer in a defense industry and his employees with respect to wages, hours, working conditions or the terms or interpretation of an existing or proposed collective-bargaining agreement, it shall be the duty of both parties to the dispute, in the

interests of national defense and security, to proceed as follows:

(a) Whenever a change is sought in wages, hours, working conditions, or other terms of employment in a defense industry, the party desiring the change, whether employees or employer, shall give to the other party 30 days' notice in writing of the change or changes sought. Within 5 days after receipt of such notice, the duly accredited representatives of the employees and the employer shall arrange for a meeting and proceed by direct negotiations between themselves to endeavor to reach an agreement on the proposed change or changes.

(b) Either party to the negotiations may call on the Board for its mediation services if at any time prior to the expiration of the 30 days it appears negotiations are deadlocked, and both parties shall request the Board's services if no agreement is reached by the end of the 30 days. The Board also may intervene in the negotiations on its own motion at any time if it has reason to believe a stoppage of production is imminent. When the services of the Board are invoked by either party or on its own motion, the Board shall immediately put itself in touch with both parties and proceed by mediation to endeavor to bring them to agreement.

(c) If the Board, within a reasonable time, fails to bring about by mediation a settlement of all points in dispute, it shall refer those points still in controversy to the Commission, which shall proceed forthwith to investigate and determine all facts pertaining to the points in controversy so referred and shall recommend to both parties a settlement of these points. The Commission shall publish its findings of fact and its recommendations for settlement in the Federal Register.

(d) The Board may at any time propose to both parties that they submit any points of their dispute with respect to which a settlement has not been reached to arbitration. Employees and employers are urged to agree to such arbitration as a patriotic contribution to national defense.

(e) Both employer and employees, during the carrying out of the procedures set forth in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, shall continue production or the other work in which they are normally engaged. Throughout the carrying out of such procedures the employer shall maintain the wages, hours, and other working conditions and terms current when the dispute arose (except for such changes as may be agreed upon with the employees), and the employees shall refrain from any action tending to decrease or halt production or the other work in which they are normally engaged.

(f) Whenever both parties to a dispute agree to submit points still in dispute to arbitration as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the employer shall agree in writing to make the wage provisions of any settlement reached through such arbitration retroactive to the date when arbitration is agreed upon.

I think we have had enough experience in this Government with conciliation and mediation to know generally what the procedures and steps should be. The first step, of course, is direct negotiation between the employer and employee. If they cannot get together in that way, then they should go to mediation; they should call in the Mediation Board, which may either send a conciliator out to the plant affected or may, if it is a sufficiently important industry, call the disputants in before the Board itself.

The Mediation Board, if it follows the procedure which has worked so well in

the Railway Labor Act, should never be called upon to make findings of fact and make recommendations for settlement, for as soon as it does that the usefulness of the mediation agent is seriously impaired, because one or the other parties to the dispute will feel that it has been given an unfair deal and the parties will not thereafter have the confidence in the Mediation Board which they should have. I believe that right now the Mediation Board created by Executive order is getting itself into a very difficult position, because it is partly mediating and partly acting as a compulsory board of arbitration. It cannot be both at the same time and retain the confidence of both employer and employee.

Under the Railway Labor Act, if the Mediation Board cannot get the parties to agree to a settlement, there is one further step; they certify the dispute to the President, who appoints a special fact-finding commission, which has 30 days to investigate the facts and the dispute before making findings of fact and recommendations for settlement. That is its work. I believe that we need that sort of a fact-finding agency today.

There is under the President the office of Leon Henderson, which is attempting to keep prices from spiraling. About 75 percent of the labor disputes which arise are due to demands for wage increases, and such demands will continue so long as prices continue to increase.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reading the Senator's amendment, if I understand it correctly, it defines what constitutes defense industries. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. It then limits the jurisdiction of the Mediation Board provided for in the bill to disputes in defense industries exclusively. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. Yes. But I believe the definition of defense industries is broad enough to take in everything that is related, directly or indirectly, to national defense.

Mr. MURDOCK. If it does, then, of course, my apprehension about subsection (b) of section 4 might be uncalled for; but, as I understand subsection (b), the entire Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor is taken out of that Department and transferred to the Mediation Board.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Unless the Senator's amendment is comprehensive enough to include all industries, it would seem to me, if there are any industries left out under his definition of what is a defense industry, then, by taking over the entire personnel of the Conciliation Service of the Labor Department all industries that do not come within his definition of defense industry would be left without any mediation service. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BALL. The Senator is correct, but I believe the definition is broad enough so that it would take in virtually any dispute that might arise because I know of

very few that arise in these days that do not affect defense industries, one way or the other. As a matter of fact, the Conciliation Service is transferred to the Mediation Board, which I believe could take jurisdiction if it wanted to, anyway.

Mr. MURDOCK. Before taking my seat, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to make the observation that, in my opinion, the Senator from Minnesota is by his amendment making at least a proper approach to the problem which confronts the Government today. In my opinion, the taking over of plants by the Government of the United States is right in line with the intention of the Communists as to what should happen within the United States of America. I am satisfied that it is done in the name of national defense, but, if too many plants are taken over, if we adopt the policy of taking over plants on too large a scale, we are playing right into the hands of the communistic element in our labor organizations. I hope the Senate this afternoon, before voting on this question, if it shall vote on it, will give thorough and sincere consideration to the approach to this problem that is offered by the Senator from Minnesota. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Utah. I may say that I have had the same feeling about this matter. I was impressed by the picture on the front page of the Washington Post this morning, showing helmeted soldiers with fixed bayonets going up against the picket line. Unless I am very much mistaken, from my observation of the tactics of the Communists and the Nazis, that picture will receive plenty of publicity in both Berlin and Moscow, and it will be used widely by communistic elements in this country to stir up more and more trouble for our defense efforts.

Section 26 of my proposal merely gives the fact-finding commission, the labor standards commission, the power of subpoena.

Section 27 requires every employer in any defense industry who has any collective bargaining agreement or contract with his employees to notify the Mediation Board at least 60 days before the expiration date of such agreements or contracts. That is simply to give the Board a chance to intervene in a dispute before there is a strike or even the threat of a strike and to try to iron out the difficulty without coming right up to the point where production is stopped or threatened to be stopped.

Section 28 authorizes the Board to prescribe rules and regulations.

Section 29 authorizes an appropriation and provides that this title shall become effective on the tenth day after the date of its enactment, and, except for the provision about the reversion of the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor, shall become inoperative after July 1, 1943.

To me it seems strange that the present administration, which admittedly has done so much to advance the cause of organized labor and to assure labor of a fair deal in the adjustment of their disputes, at the first sign of real trouble from labor disputes in the defense program comes forward with a proposal that

the United States Government shall engage in strike-breaking with the Army. It does not "add up" to me; and I do not think we shall be fair either to the employees or to the employers if we enact into law this kind of authority without at least setting up the procedure and establishing the policy which in this emergency we expect both parties to disputes to follow before they resort to a strike, and before the Government is forced to invoke the drastic remedy which the President invoked yesterday.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have drafted language which I think probably will meet the objection heretofore expressed by the able Senator from Texas. I should like to read a new amendment, which I hope he will accept.

After the word "interest", at the conclusion of the Senator's amendment, insert:

*Provided*, That the power and authority exercised under this paragraph with respect to any such plant shall terminate as soon as the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

I ask the Senator from Texas if that language, which is the President's language, and which applies only to this paragraph, is agreeable to him?

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question. Under his language, suppose the President should turn the plant back to the owners, and then the next day another strike should break out. I am in sympathy with the purpose of the Senator as set forth in this language; but he says:

*Provided*, That the power and authority exercised under this paragraph with respect to any such plant shall terminate as soon as the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

Suppose the President determines that that is the case and returns the plant to the owners today, and next week another strike breaks out: Under this language, the power to deal with the plant is exhausted. The President cannot reseize the plant.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think that is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am asking the Senator. It seems to me that is possible under the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I presume many things are possible under the language of the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as I would amend it; but it seems to me it does not prevent the Government from following the same procedure again, and it seems to me the President would not return any taken-over plant until he was completely satisfied that the national-defense program was properly protected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Except for that fear, I should not object to the Senator's amendment. I do not want to provide that the President's power shall be exhausted by one taking over. I want his power to continue, so that if the plant has another strike he may step back in and go ahead with the operation of the plant.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I interrupt to make one inquiry?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. In the amendment of the Senator from Texas is included the power to take possession not only when production ceases but when production is threatened or a strike threatens. I am wondering how the language of the Senator from Connecticut would fit into that provision. As the Senator from Texas said a while ago, his language is wonderfully inclusive. I am inclined to think it is too inclusive, because just who will be able to say when a strike threatens or when production is threatened? That is an anticipatory situation, and, of course, if the President may take possession before production is interfered with, merely because of a threat, I do not know when he will let go.

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

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Colorado a question. Suppose a vote should be taken, and it should be announced that the workers were going to strike on the 20th of June? Would not that be a threatened strike? Ought the Government necessarily to wait until after the strike actually took place? Why could it not step in under those circumstances?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, suppose one labor leader should say, "I am going to agitate, and I am going to see that the workers in this plant strike."

Mr. CONNALLY. That goes to the weight of the evidence, and not to its admissibility.

Mr. ADAMS. In this amendment the Senator has a measure, a standard upon which the President takes possession, which is almost impossible of application. I am wondering if he has not gone too far.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is hard to lay down a rule. I will say to the Senator that, of course, when discretion is granted to anybody or any agency, it is necessary to take certain risks.

Mr. ADAMS. The cessation of production is a definite point. We know when that happens; but when we authorize taking possession when somebody threatens to cease production, that is another matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Suppose, instead of absolutely closing the plant, there is a slow-down; the employees do not produce; they go into the plant and fiddle around and take up a great deal of time and do not produce. Is not that impeding and hindering and slowing down production?

Mr. MALONEY. If I may reply to that particular contention of the Senator from Texas—and I, too, am disturbed by what disturbs the Senator from Colorado—in line 15, on page 2—and I am now replying to the contention of the Senator from Texas—after the word "disturbance", the words "or other cause" seem to cover that particular situation. I quite agree that the words "or threatened" in line 14 go pretty far, much farther than I should want to go, and I think much farther than the Federal Government should go.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator concede that when there is an emergency, and extraordinary power is granted, there ought to be hesitation rather than undue expedition in exercising it? If there is a question, it should be resolved in favor of the Government staying out rather than of the Government going in.

Mr. MALONEY. I think so, and I also think the Senator from Texas is farsighted when he points to the fact that while there might not be a strike, production might be delayed and hampered and slowed up almost to the point where there would be no production. It seems to me, however, that he has covered that particular thing by saying "a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause," following the words "impeded or delayed." So I think the words "or threatened" ought to come out. I think he has more than covered what he had in mind.

However, I am drifting pretty far from the amendment with which I am at the moment so much concerned. I am hopeful that the Senator from Texas will accept my new language, which I am compelled again to say is the language of the President, and which, I am confident, does not do the thing that he fears it might possibly do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is one amendment pending.

Mr. MALONEY. I am asking the Senator to accept this language as a part of his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should want to study it just a little more. I agree with what the Senator has in mind, but I do not want to have the President's power exhausted by taking over a plant one time. He might have to take it over a second time. If I can preserve that power, I shall be glad to accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall not offer the amendment for the time being, because I am hopeful the Senator from Texas will accept it and do away with the need for a vote. I will offer it, if necessary, a little later.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I deplore the precipitate action occasioned by the immediate consideration of the Connally amendment to be followed by a decision on it. It seems to me inadvisable that we should act so hastily. We should proceed with greater deliberation by holding the hearings on this bill (S. 1508) scheduled by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, to which the bill was referred.

For a few days we could observe and learn from the experience of the Government in taking over and operating an industrial plant engaged in manufacturing airplanes. However, the Connally amendment is now before us; and since the President has declared an unlimited emergency, each of us without exception is required to supply, at the discretion of the President, his own property, person, and services where and when they may be of the greatest service to our country.

Therefore, I offer the amendment which I earlier in the day sent to the desk, move its adoption, and request that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Oregon that at this time his amendment would be an amendment in the third degree, and would not be in order. The Senator may offer his amendment after the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] shall have been disposed of.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that it be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks and at the end of the amendment to add the following:

Whenever the President has taken over any plant under any of the foregoing provisions of this section, he shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, induct into the land or naval forces of the United States any employee of such plant who thereafter willfully refuses or fails to perform, or to resume the performance of, his duties as an employee of such plant. Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to members of the force into which he is inducted and may be assigned by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to the performance of such duties, whether or not of a military or naval nature, as such Secretary may designate. For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be an employee of a plant taken over by the President under the foregoing provisions of this section, if—

(1) at any time subsequent to the time such plant was taken over by the President he has been actually employed in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and his employment has not been terminated with the consent of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, or

(2) immediately prior to the time such plant was taken over by the President he was employed by the owner or operator of such plant in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant, or

(3) at the time such plant was taken over by the President he was on strike from the performance of duties which he had previously performed in connection with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to explain briefly why I think the Senate should adopt the Connally amendment and why I believe it should also adopt the Ball amendment to the Connally amendment.

Of course, we are considering one of the most serious and one of the most difficult problems before the people of the United States today. There is no more difficult problem. There are many remedies proposed. The Connally amendment, providing for the seizure of the plants, is one such proposal. Personally, I feel that in dealing with this emergency the Presi-

dent should have all the powers which conceivably can be used profitably to solve the problem. The manner in which this power is used is going to determine whether it will accomplish its object. It may not accomplish its object. But certainly I would not care to deny the President a power which conceivably may be a solution of the problem.

Furthermore, the Government has power to do most all the things provided for. It has power to do practically everything except what the President did yesterday in southern California. The Selective Service Act gives the President power to take over any plant when the Government gives it an order and the owners refuse to take it, or refuse to take it at a reasonable price.

Under the National Defense Act, which we passed last June, the Secretary of the Navy has all the powers the pending proposal gives, and more, but they are confined to the Secretary of the Navy. Under that act the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, whenever he deems any manufacturing plant or facility necessary for the national defense, and whenever he is unable to agree on a price with the owner for the whole plant, to take over and operate such plant or facility, either by Government personnel or by contract with a private firm. He can do it whether there is a strike or is not a strike, so far as the Navy is concerned. I see no reason why the Army should not have the same power the Navy has.

However, it is also perfectly clear to me that the President had no authority to do what he did yesterday. Since I believe it is a good thing, since I am willing to authorize him to do it, I think we should authorize him now so that no question will arise.

In that connection I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the opinion rendered by the Attorney General of the United States in support of the President's power to take over the California plant yesterday. I ask that the opinion be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The President's proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the President's powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.

The Constitution lays upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged Army, to provide for a strengthened Navy, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lease-Lend Act.

For the faithful execution of such laws the President has back of him not only each general law-enforcement power conferred by the various acts of Congress, but the aggregate of all such laws plus that wide discretion as to method vested in him by the Constitution for the purpose of executing the laws.

The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and vests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. These weapons for the protection of the continued existence of the Nation are

placed in his sole command, and the implication is clear that he should not allow them to become paralyzed by a failure to obtain supplies for which Congress has appropriated the money and which it has directed the President to obtain.

The situation at the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike. The President's proclamation recites the persistent defiance of governmental efforts to mediate any legitimate labor differences. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements; they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

There can be no doubt that the duty, constitutionally and inherently, rested upon the President to exert his civil and military as well as his moral authority to keep the defense effort of the United States a going concern.

**Mr. TAFT.** Mr. President, this, in my judgment, is the most extraordinary opinion, outside of the destroyer opinion, which any Attorney General has ever rendered. He says:

The President's proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the President's powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.

What those statutes are I do not know. I suppose if there were any such statutes, the Senator from Texas would not be offering another statute to authorize exactly the same thing. The Attorney General says:

The Constitution lay upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged Army, to provide for a strengthened Navy, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lease-Lend Act.

If we can take a number of loose laws, pile them up, and say that in the aggregate they confer powers which are not contained in any law, then there is not much use in our staying here and making laws. The Attorney General proceeds:

The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and vests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

I think there is a better legal argument for his power, as such Commander, in taking the plant, than there is under the general laws idea, which was first advanced in the Attorney General's opinion.

Having gone into it as completely as I could, I do not believe the President has the power, in time of peace, to requisition a plant to manufacture war materials, and I do not suppose the Senator from Texas would be offering his bill as an amendment to the pending bill if he felt that the President had such power already.

The Attorney General proceeds:

The situation at the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike.

It is a strike. The strikers are not going to be prosecuted for anything I

know of. There is no insurrection. That is just using names. Of course, the President can always use the Army to repel invasion, or suppress an insurrection. But this is no insurrection. These men have simply struck, as many other men are doing throughout the entire United States.

I wish Senators would read the opinion of the Attorney General. I can only say that if that opinion is law, there is not much use in our continuing as legislators.

My difficulty with the Connally amendment is that I am afraid the country would regard it as a cure-all for the strike problem, and I do not think it is a cure-all. I hope it will work. There is no evidence yet that it will work. Its success in California will depend entirely on how affairs in California are administered during the next 3 or 4 days. If as a result of the action taken the men in the plant affected, or substantially all of them, return to work at wages determined by the Mediation Board to be just, and if at the end of 2 weeks the strike is abandoned, then I would say that method is successful, and will accomplish much in solving the problem. On the other hand, if the men refuse to return to work, or if they go back to work only with the Government giving them exactly what they have been demanding all along, then we are going to see this method followed in plant after plant, because the men will feel that the Government was much softer than their employers, that if they can get the Government to take over the plant they will be given exactly what they want. That is the danger in the situation, and I do not think we can tell for some time how successful this system is going to be.

The evening paper is not reassuring. It says:

A second walk-out by C. I. O. union members in the aluminum industry today tied up six plants of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation at Detroit.

Yesterday the plant of the Aluminum Co. of America in Cleveland was tied up by additional strikes. They do not seem to be deterred by the use of troops in California.

Another strike threat came at the huge Consolidated Aircraft Corporation plant at San Diego, when A. F. of L. machinists voted all day on a strike call.

What the Army has done is to push back picket lines. That could have been done without taking over the plant.

The Army pushed picket lines back 1 mile from the plant, but the C. I. O. said its pickets would continue to march with placards in unforbidden areas.

Three thousand five hundred men have returned to work in the two shifts out of a total of 11,500 men who worked in the plant. It is not at all certain that by taking over a plant we can get the men back to work. There is no law which prohibits them to strike against the Government.

**Mr. CONNALLY.** The Senator says there is no way to get men back to work. There is no way of getting them all back to work, but has not what has already been done in California gotten half of them back to work?

**Mr. TAFT.** Yes; but I am trying only

to make the point that I do not think we should stop with the Senator's amendment. I think that is only one method, and it may not be a successful method. I am in favor of giving that power because I think the President ought to have the power to handle the situation.

**Mr. CONNALLY.** The amendment is not a cure-all for every problem. It does not interfere with the processes of mediation and all the processes under the Labor Board. This proposal is simply in addition to all that and supplementary to it. I do not think it is a cure-all, but if we can cure one disease at a time we may get the old boy fixed up after all.

**Mr. TAFT.** There are still several hundred pickets on the picket line, although no pickets are permitted within 1 mile of the plant.

Soldier guards were promised for nearby residential districts, where most of the 11,500 workers live.

The Government is apparently not negotiating with the men.

Colonel Branshaw said he saw "no need for negotiations" with the C. I. O., and telegraphed nearly 9,000 workers an invitation to resume work.

Earlier, he had conferred with C. I. O. leaders, who reported "Colonel Branshaw was not prepared to discuss our demands."

So, in effect, the Government is suspending the right of collective bargaining, at least for the present. I trust that that may not continue and that we may be able to work the problem out.

I only want to call to the Senate's attention the fact that there is no assurance that this is any cure-all for the problem of strikes. Therefore, I think we ought to adopt a constructive measure, such as the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

After all, the seizing of plants is an evading of an issue. If we do not want picket lines we could pass a law saying there shall be no picket lines in the neighborhood of plants. Then those who set up picket lines in the neighborhood of plants would be law violators, would be conducting an insurrection instead of a strike. The Attorney General says that these men are conducting an insurrection, although we have been afraid to enact any law prohibiting the things they have done. They are not doing anything illegal, because Congress has refused to set up any kind of labor code. In fact the Labor Relations Board has encouraged picket lines. The Supreme Court has said picket lines must be allowed. The Supreme Court has said that practically any kind of picketing is peaceful picketing unless the pickets actually slug someone in the head. We have supported the whole system of picketing. If that is not right, then we ought to say what laborers can do in labor disputes. We ought to face the problem directly. We are not going to evade that issue by sending troops in who simply say, "It is illegal to picket around defense plants." If anybody should say that, we ought to say it. We ought to face squarely the problem we have to face.

As a matter of fact the radical leaders on the Pacific coast have been hand in glove with the National Labor Relations Board members. Testimony given before

the committee was to the effect that while they were there, members of the Board conferred with the most radical labor leaders. Harry Bridges has been to a large extent protected, and he is telegraphing support to the strikers on the Pacific coast. The Government itself has largely encouraged the spirit which is behind these strikes, and until we declare a labor policy, until the Government declares a labor policy which determines what can be done in defense strikes, and what men shall be allowed to do under the present emergency conditions, we can hardly criticize these men for proceeding with that which they understand to be legal.

We have today four agencies handling the labor problem. We have Sidney Hillman's division in the O. P. M. We have the National Mediation Board, which is entirely independent of Hillman. We have Madam Perkins and the Conciliation Division under her, with Mr. Steelman, entirely independent of everybody else. And we have the National Labor Relations Board, which is independent of anyone else.

One thing which the Ball amendment does is to make it clear that the National Mediation Board is the centralized labor authority of the National Government, and will speak for the National Government, and it takes the Conciliation Division out of the Department of Labor and puts it under the National Mediation Board for the duration of the emergency.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have just learned, through an Associated Press dispatch from California, that the employees in the North American aviation plant at Los Angeles have voted to go back to work, with some provision providing that they shall not be discriminated against because of their having been on strike.

Mr. TAFT. I am delighted at the result, which shows that this method is going to be more successful. It justifies my support of the proposal.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator, and I want to say that that is the answer of the Senator from Texas to the statement of the Senator from Ohio, made earlier, that the men could not be made to go back to work. They cannot be made to go back to work, but they can be induced to go back to work.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am very glad to hear that the men have gone back to work, but I greatly desire to ascertain whether it is the intention of our Government, upon taking over a plant, to keep it. Is the Government going to turn the plant back to the employers? That is quite as important as is the question of the men going back to work.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the President announced in his original order that the plant would be returned as soon as he determined that the plant would be properly operated in a manner consistent with the national defense.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to read this language to the Senator from North Carolina. This is a proposal which I am making to the Senator from Texas, revised for the third time:

*Provided*, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this section, such plant shall be returned to its owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of national defense.

With the permission of the Senator from Ohio I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if that is agreeable to him, and if he will accept that language.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to divert the Senator from North Carolina from the point he was making.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that the Senator from Texas objected to the original draft of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut on the ground that as then drawn it would seem to exhaust the power of the President, and that in the case of a plant, if he should once take it over and then have to return it, he could not take it over a second time if another strike should break out.

My understanding of the language the Senator from Connecticut has now read is that it does not exhaust the power of the President, but merely provides that the plant taken over shall be surrendered back to the owners when the normal production in national-defense needs are met. I have no objection to that amendment. But I wish it to be shown in the RECORD that the construction we place upon that provision is that it does not impair the powers of the President subsequently to take over that same plant again if new conditions arise which warrant such action. I am perfectly agreeable to surrender the plant.

Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that my purpose is not to socialize industry and have the Government take over industry. My record here does not bear out any such idea as that. My purpose is to continue production as long as the plant is going ahead and being operated and can be operated by its owners. I am perfectly agreeable to turning a plant back to its owners and let them continue to operate it when it is being operated normally. But if conditions afterward arise which indicate that it should be taken over again I want to preserve that power in the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. We can draw the amendment so that that power can be preserved. I am interested in knowing whether the Senator accepts the principle.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am accepting the modification, which is drawn in a way which I do not believe exhausts the power. When once a plant is taken over and conditions become satisfactory, it will be turned back; but that does not exhaust the power of the President again to take it over if new conditions arise which demand such action. I want that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I join in the assumption of the Senator from Texas. That is what I intend. That is what I believe the language does, that is what it means. I thank the Senator for accepting the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield in order that the Senator from Texas may accept a modification of his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield. Let me say that I also think it does not exhaust the power to take over a plant the second time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Whatever doubts there may have been on the subject are now relieved. I accept the modification.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding and joining me, and I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I seriously mean what I said. We all realize that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is an eminent lawyer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification suggested by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment, it is proposed to add the following:

*Provided*, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this section, the plant shall be returned to the owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is so modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say only that, while I think the Connally amendment should be adopted, I hope the Senate will not stop there. Whether or not the Senate agrees to the Ball amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, we ought to adopt a complete, constructive labor program, administered by a single labor head who can speak for the Government and for the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as modified.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays. I realize that I have offered a very lengthy amendment which most Senators have not had the time to study. I think many Senators would feel that they ought to vote against the amendment today, simply because they have not had time to study it, although they might be in favor of the principle involved.

I feel that if we are to invoke such a drastic penalty on employers and employees, the least we should do, in fairness, is to establish for them a policy and a set of democratic procedures which they can use, and which we expect them

to use, in order that it may not be necessary to invoke such a severe penalty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I recognize that he has been working and studying these measures very exhaustively. In all frankness I think that if we are to adopt a wholly new system his bill ought to be considered by some committee and reported to the Senate.

I notice the Senator's amendment sets up a new commission, the Labor Standards Commission, with three members at a salary of \$10,000 a year each, and a great deal of new machinery. I am not prepared to vote on all this, because I do not have any conception of it. I do not think the Senator ought to press his amendment at this time. He ought to wait until his bill can be independently reported by a committee. As I have undertaken to say, my amendment does not interfere with any of the present procedures. It is not a long amendment setting up new procedures for handling labor disputes. Its purpose is simply to meet the one condition of strikes. The Senator would be perfectly free to prosecute his bill to set up any new machinery or agency which the Government may determine upon for the permanent treatment of labor disputes. I am offering my amendment as an emergency measure, simply to meet one situation. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Texas that I agree with him that my bill, offered now in the form of an amendment, should have committee study; but I believe it is no more far-reaching than, and by no means so drastic in its possible effects on our society and our economy as is the much shorter amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. The difference is that we can read the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas in a couple of minutes, and try to figure out what might happen under it. I do not think any of us knows. The seizure and operation of plants is a two-edged sword. It may work in one case, and it may produce the opposite effect in another case.

Let me add that I am assured by the chairman that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor will continue work on the bill, and we shall try to report the bill as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as modified.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as modified.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment. I should like to bring it to the attention of the Senator from Texas and other Senators. On page 2, line 15, after the word "strike", I propose to insert a comma and the words "or lock-out."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from

Wisconsin to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2 of the Connally amendment, in line 15, after the word "strike", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "or lock-out."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think a casual reading of the Connally amendment would lead one to the conclusion that it is aimed solely at labor and at strikes. We all know that there are other causes of labor disputes than merely a desire on the part of labor to strike. I believe that in the national emergency which confronts the Nation in this situation we should be most circumspect in drafting legislation dealing with the delicate problems of labor relations. I believe that the insertion of the language which I propose to insert would go far toward convincing labor that it is not the intent of the Congress to invoke the extraordinary power of plant seizure solely in cases in which labor has resorted to its recognized, legal, and constitutional right to strike. I am hopeful that in view of the Senator's well-known attitude he will find himself in a position to accept my amendment. I should like to ask him whether he feels he can accept it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with that amendment, would the Senator support my proposal?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. It is my intention, if my amendment is adopted, to support the amendment of the Senator from Texas, although, as has been stated by other Senators, I do not feel that this is an answer to the difficult problem with which we are confronted, insofar as labor relations are concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no argument with the Senator on that score. Where does the Senator propose to insert the new language?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the printed copy of the Senator's amendment which I have it would be on page 2, line 15, after the word "strike." I propose to insert a comma and the words "or lock-out."

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the words ought to be inserted a little farther down. The language of my amendment, as now modified, is:

As a result of a strike or threatened strike—

That is where the insertion should come. The amendment would then read:

As a result of a strike or threatened strike, or lock-out, or other cause—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not have before me the modified form of the Senator's amendment. I have only the printed form.

Mr. CONNALLY. The amendment suggested by the Senator should come after the words "threatened strike," in line 15.

Mr. President, I do not think the Senator's amendment is necessary because of other language in the bill. The language "or other cause" is very comprehensive and would cover a lock-out. However, out of deference to the Senator from

Wisconsin, I do not object to the insertion of the words "or lock-out."

I desire to suggest, however, that although I do not think an employer would do so, yet it is possible that some employer who wanted his plant taken over could very easily, by locking out his men, present a situation, or might present a situation, in which the Government would come in and take charge of the plant. I cannot anticipate that such an event necessarily would occur. It was suggested by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Ohio that my amendment might induce the employees to stir up a strike so that the plant would be taken over. On the other hand, the employer might want his plant taken over, and he might bring about a lock-out. However, I feel constrained to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to reserve the right to object. I want to get this thing clear in my mind. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] offered an amendment after the word "strike" on line 15. I want to know if that is the pending amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, after the amendment was printed the Senator from Texas modified his amendment by inserting the words "or threatened strike."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Therefore it would seem logical that my amendment should follow that language, so that it would read, if agreed to:

As a result of a strike or threatened strike or lock-out or other labor disturbance.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President; "or other cause."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. "Or other cause"?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not know that that language had gone in.

Mr. MALONEY. I am wondering if there is a later copy of the amendment than the one I have.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, it has been changed today during the time the amendment has been under consideration.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Connecticut give heed? The amendment now reads:

Will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or threatened strike or lock-out or other cause.

Mr. MALONEY. I presume, Mr. President, that it would be futile for me to ask the Senator from Texas to take out the words "or threatened", in line 14. The reason I have asked him to do so—

Mr. CONNALLY. I have accepted one amendment from the Senator from Connecticut, and the quota today is only one per Senator. One Senator gets one amendment. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas agree to the modification of his amendment suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]?

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is so modified.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. In spite of the admonition from the Senator from Texas that the quota is only one amendment per Senator, I should like to point out to him that the thing he is endeavoring to do is covered under the language "impede or delay." I think we are going extremely far in this legislation, which, as Senators know, is entirely new. To write into the language of the law the words "or threatened," "a threatened delay," "a threatened strike," or "a threatened lock-out," it seems to me goes much farther than we need to go, and I think all the dangers we anticipate and all the fears we have are covered outside of that very unusual language.

I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Texas with or without the suggested change, because I think I appreciate the seriousness of the national situation, but I want to make a final plea to the Senator from Texas that he delete these two words.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have great receptive faculties for anything the Senator from Connecticut may say; but, seriously, I cannot agree to the amendment. Since the Senator from Connecticut has promised to vote for my amendment whether his amendment is in it or not, I hope he will do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks and at the end of the amendment to add the following:

Whenever the President has taken over any plant under any of the foregoing provisions of this section, he shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, induct into the land or naval forces of the United States any employee of such plant who thereafter willfully refuses or fails to perform, or to resume the performance of, his duties as an employee of such plant. Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to members of the force into which he is inducted and may be assigned by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to the performance of such duties, whether or not of a military or naval nature, as such Secretary may designate. For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be an employee of a plant taken over by the President under the foregoing provisions of this section, if—

(1) at any time subsequent to the time such plant was taken over by the President he has been actually employed in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and his employment

has not been terminated with the consent of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, or

(2) immediately prior to the time such plant was taken over by the President he was employed by the owner or operator of such plant in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant, or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant, or

(3) at the time such plant was taken over by the President he was on strike from the performance of duties which he had previously performed in connection with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as modified.

The amendment to the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as modified.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the Connally amendment, it is proposed to add the following new section:

It is the sense of the Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between the Government, management, and labor; and in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in the national-defense industries throughout the United States which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate army and navy and to render effective aid to other democracies, the Congress hereby declares that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and such strikes are hereby condemned.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is merely a declaration of policy on behalf of Congress that at this critical hour and because of the critical conditions confronting the country Congress believes that strikes in national-defense industries are contrary to sound public policy and should be condemned.

Mr. President, in view of the situation that confronts us, I think the amendment proposes a very temperate declaration of policy on the part of Congress. It says:

It is the sense of the Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between the Government, management, and labor—

Certainly no one can challenge that statement—

and in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in the national-defense industries throughout the United States which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate army and navy and to render effective aid to other democracies—

No one can question that; because today there exist in national-defense industries more strikes than have existed since the emergency started.

The Congress hereby declares that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and such strikes are hereby condemned.

In the event the Senate should adopt this amendment it would be nothing new, because in regard to the sit-down strikes a very similar amendment was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 75 to 3. That amendment declared that:

It is the sense of Congress that the so-called sit-down strike is illegal and contrary to sound public policy.

Mr. President, I think this amendment would greatly strengthen the proposed legislation. I intend to vote for the Connally amendment. I believe we should have a gun behind the door in the situation which now confronts us, although I agree with other Senators that merely taking over plants is not a solution of or an answer to the strike problem.

We read in the newspapers this afternoon that the employees in six aluminum plants have gone on strike today, and that the employees of 46 tool plants in the city of Detroit have gone on strike. I think the Congress of the United States should have the courage, in unequivocal and firm language, to announce the position that strikes in defense industries are contrary to sound public policy and should be condemned.

We now have mediation machinery whereby industry and labor can mediate their differences, if they choose to do so. We have already enacted legislation whereby the Government may take over any plant the management of which does not cooperate, and the pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Texas, provides that the Government and the President may take over plants in which there are strikes. I think, Mr. President, nothing would be more wholesome, in view of the critical condition that now confronts the country, than for the Congress to go on record and say that strikes are contrary to sound public policy and should be condemned.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I believe, without any question, the Connally amendment will be adopted this afternoon, but the big thing confronting the country today is the continuation of our great program for national defense. We are coping without question with some so-called labor leaders who may be communistic, who may be sympathetic to Hitler and to fascism, but, in my opinion, the great majority of American laborers are just as patriotic as is any other group in the United States today.

What will it do to the Connally amendment if we adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia? Is there any question in the minds of Senators today that there are in some instances justification for strikes? Is there any question in the

minds of Senators today that in some instances the industrialists of the country might be at fault? Is there any question in the minds of Senators today that the very root and cause of some strikes have their inception in the greed and unfairness of the industrialist himself?

I deplore, as much as does any other Senator, the fact that we have stoppages in national-defense industries; I deplore the fact that strikes happen, but they do happen, and they probably will continue to happen. We will hope and pray, of course, that they will occur to a lesser extent until this industrial problem is settled and settled right, and that then they should disappear; but it has been pointed out this afternoon on the floor that confronting labor today we have what? We have the National Mediation Board, established by the President; then we have the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor; then we have the Labor Service of O. P. M., under Sidney Hillman; then we have the National Labor Relations Board. Does any group of labor today know where to go to present grievances and ask for justice? It was recently reported that in a strike on the Pacific coast in the shipbuilding industry there was one mediator from the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, another from the National Mediation Board, and there was one group there grabbing onto this mediator and another group grabbing onto another mediator; so that, instead of mediation, instead of conciliation, there was nothing but confusion.

Now we come to the question of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. What would it accomplish? It would accomplish nothing. I believe the Nation, as a whole, the people as a whole, realize that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives are opposed to any stoppages in national-defense industries; but when we adopt an amendment such as this what do we do? Oh, we give a pat on the back to the industrialist and a kick in the face to labor.

I ask you, Mr. President, if we are interested in national unity, why the necessity of doing that? Why should there be any reason this afternoon, in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia providing that the Congress of the United States condemn strikes? Of course, we condemn every strike that is not justified; we condemn every strike that results from the agitation of the pro-Nazi and the Communist; but do we condemn the strike which is justified or which is simply an attempt on the part of honest laborers to get what they feel they are entitled to in the form of wages or labor conditions? I think it is a little unfair to condemn the only weapon that labor has, that weapon being the strike, in case of injustices or unfairness on the part of the industrialists.

If the amendment offered condemned the circumstances and conditions that precipitate strikes, thereby equally condemning the unfair industrialists and unjustified strikes, I would say that

would be fair. But when we condemn the one weapon that organized labor has, which is the strike, regardless of why labor strikes, it seems to me, Mr. President, that that is uncalled for and accomplishes no good purpose.

Let us look at the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. It reads:

It is the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and they are hereby condemned.

In other words, not taking into account why strikes are called or the reason behind them or who is at fault in the matter, we arbitrarily come down with a meat ax and say to labor, "We condemn you for your strike, regardless of what the cause is."

I think that, instead of adopting an amendment of this type today, if we were in a position and would take the time to give sincere and earnest consideration to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] providing an orderly procedure of mediation, telling labor in the United States that here is the one agency, the one body that will control mediation from now on, and to which they can look for redress, provide for a 30-day period of negotiation, and then provide for the investigation which the amendment provides for, and, if mediation is impossible, then for arbitration; that is the type of legislation which should be adopted; that is the proper approach to a permanent solution of this problem. In my opinion, it would be much preferable to an amendment such as the one we are now considering, which condemns, without any facts, without any investigation, the only weapon that labor has, namely, the strike.

Before sitting down, I desire to say that I abhor and deplore, just as much as any other Senator does, any stoppage in the national-defense program; but I also desire to say that I know there is fault on both sides, and I am unwilling today to condemn everything labor might do in the way of protecting its rights and at the same time pat the other side on the back and say, "You are perfect," or "You are not at fault."

I hope, Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will not be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I very much regret that the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] has taken the view of this amendment which he has just stated. He states that a vote for this amendment is a pat on the back for industry and a slap in the face of labor. I do not think that position can be sustained in any view of the matter. I think to undertake to attach such an interpretation as that to this amendment is to evade the entire issue before our country—probably as grave an issue as the country has confronted in the lifetime of any man here—and utterly to belittle that issue.

What is the situation? Our country has found itself gradually becoming more and more involved in a tremendous world situation. Whether we have wished it or not, it has come upon us. At the present moment, I take it, everyone in America understands, whatever his views may be

as to our involvement—whether he be a pacifist or an interventionist—that the country must arm itself. I believe that opinion is universal in our land. We must arm ourselves. Our industries are abandoning their normal activities. Our people are being called upon for sacrifices and self-denials. We are about to pass a great tax bill. We have enacted tremendous appropriation bills, and the President has called upon the industrialists and the workers over and over again.

He, himself—and I take it there is not a better friend of labor in America or on earth than the President of the United States—in his most recent address to the American people called upon the workers to abandon their right to strike under these circumstances. He asked in specific terms that whatever their grievances might be with regard to defense activities they should see to it that the work goes on, and he gave them assurance that they would be treated justly by the Board, which he himself has created, and which no one denies is a fair Board, and, if friendly to anyone, is friendly to the workers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have no question at all that the President feels worse probably than any other person in the United States whenever there is a stoppage in our national-defense industries. If the Senator from Virginia would include in his amendment not only labor but the industrialists, and would let the Congress condemn the circumstances and the conditions which result in a stoppage of industry, whether it is the fault of labor or the fault of the industrialists, I should be glad to join him in supporting the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. The industrialists are not striking. The munition manufacturers are not striking. The condition with which we are dealing is a reality and not a theory. Strikes are taking place all over the country, and it is the workers under the influence of unwise and misguided leadership who are striking—not the employers; and it is the strikes that this resolution condemns—not the workers.

I think the time has come for rather plain speaking in this land. We are either going to have a government that governs, or we are not going to have a government that governs. I rejoiced yesterday when the President stretched forth the arm of our Government and took charge of the plant in California and told the strikes to get out or go to work. I rejoice today that they have seen the light. When our Government governs, we shall have order and production. When our Government does not govern, we shall not have order and we shall not have production. We shall not have peace, either, nor can we have victory.

We are not dealing generally with a vague situation. There may be wrongs on the part of employers. There may be necessities of increased wages. Nobody will debate that now. What we are saying is that under these conditions a strike against the national defense is against public policy; and the wisdom and the

right of the Congress to say that under these circumstances is now challenged.

What have we had in this country since this emergency became intense? Strike after strike. It has gone over the country like a contagion; and it is not stopping, either. One of the Senators says we have had strike after strike throughout the world. I do not think so. There are not any strikes in Germany; none in Japan. I do not think there are any in England. There were strikes in France; and where is France?

Under these circumstances, is the Congress of the United States willing to say not that labor does not have to right to strike—we agree that it does have a right to strike—but that strikes under these circumstances are against public policy and ought to be condemned? For my part, I rejoice in the opportunity to say it, and I have not any question about how the people of North Carolina stand. Ninety-nine and forty-four one hundredths percent of them take the same view. I will leave the small fraction in order not to make an overstatement.

Mr. President, under these circumstances the Congress of the United States can say that it is against the policy of the country or against its welfare for men having the right to strike to insist upon the right to strike. If the Congress cannot condemn strikes which threaten the security and the welfare and the defense of our country, then what power has Congress; what has become of its moral stamina; what has become of its leadership in this land?

When all through our country evil men are appealing to the cupidity of less informed men, leading them to believe that while our country is in this extraordinary situation, when we have good reason to believe that the life of the Republic itself is at stake, they may improve their incomes, have we reached the point where it is possible that the Congress of the United States is incapable of making a record that such strikes and such conduct are against the public policy? Is it conceivable that men like ourselves, trusted with the welfare of the country, should hesitate to condemn such action?

Mr. President, I have another word to say about this matter. I agree that the worker has the right to strike, but I say this to the workers of America: if they insist upon their right to strike against the national defense, they are going to lose their right to strike at all, because the country must save itself. That is the first law of nature.

I will go a long way to maintain the Bill of Rights in America, I intend to go a long way to maintain the Bill of Rights in America, but I would give up the Bill of Rights to save America. I would give up every right I have to save America, just as I would have to give up my life to save my land and its people. I do not desire to, but hear me—if men who have the right to strike insist upon the exercise of that right against the defense and security of the American people, the American people will know what to do; and they will do it, too. We must save ourselves. We must rise to this occasion, or all will be utterly lost, the women and all others.

If I had a word to say to these labor leaders—I do not want any quarrel with them—I would ask them, inasmuch as they love their unions and love the workers and love the labor cause, to join with the President of the United States and call upon the workers of this land to go on with their work, and assert their grievances in the meantime in the tribunal which the President has set up to pass upon those grievances.

We are told that haste and time are the essence of this situation; and I think they are. We have delayed and delayed and delayed, and heaven only knows how much time has been lost, heaven only knows how many ships we might have built, no one knows how many airplanes and how many engines might have been built but for the strikes which have gone on throughout the United States.

We are either going to rise to this occasion or we are not. This morning we were talking about calling the boys. When we called the boys, the boys came. We called the baseball players, and one of them making forty or fifty thousand dollars a year laid down his bat and without saying a word he put on his uniform, and now he is a private in the Army at \$21 a month.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the Selective Service Act, to which the Senator refers, apply just as rigidly to the sons of labor as it does to any other class?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and I am glad the Senator brought up that point. The sons of the workers are going into battle, and the leaders of the workers are telling the workers not to furnish their sons the guns with which to fight.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator consider what has happened in creating the bottleneck in steel and the bottleneck in aluminum any less detrimental to the national-defense program than strikes? Is he willing this afternoon, in his condemnation of strikes, to condemn the men who have told us that we have plenty of steel and that we have plenty of aluminum? That is the point in which I am interested, that when we condemn the sabotage in our national-defense program, we should not limit ourselves to labor, but we should point the finger of condemnation also at the men here in the Office of Production Management who are telling us that we have sufficient steel capacity when they know we have not, and when they tell us we have sufficient aluminum capacity when they know we have not. All I ask for in the treatment of this question is you treat labor as fairly as you treat the other groups. Treat them the same, and then I will join in your amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator totally misapprehends me. If anyone in this country is causing a bottleneck or delay, or if anyone in this country—in politics, or in business, or anywhere else—is interfering with our program of defense, if the Senator will bring the facts to my attention I will

draw the appropriate resolution and very gladly advocate it. I am dealing with an instant situation; I am dealing with facts; I am dealing with this reality of a contagion of strikes.

The Senator speaks about a shortage in steel and a shortage in aluminum. I do not care to go into all that. I read in the paper this afternoon, "Six More Aluminum Plants Hit by New Strikes." That is today's news; that is this afternoon's news, in the 5 o'clock edition of the paper. If there is a bottleneck in aluminum, these strikes are going to make it a great deal worse.

It happens that I know something about aluminum. The Aluminum Co. of America has quite a plant in my State. I think I can say to the Senator—

Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish this point, and I shall gladly yield. There may be a bottleneck in aluminum; I do not know. I have heard nothing whatever so to say. I read a while back that Mr. Stettinius was saying that we had plenty of aluminum. I read in the paper one day that one man says we have enough and another man says we do not have enough. This is the fact: The Aluminum Co. of America had 300,000,000 pounds of surplus aluminum on hand 2½ years ago, and it had created that surplus in order to keep its workers going. Did the United States call for that surplus? At that time the United States had not thought about needing a great number of airplanes. Then suddenly we discover that we need thousands and tens of thousands of airplanes, and that aluminum is the best thing with which to make them, and we give orders in tremendous quantities for foreign and domestic account.

I understand that the Aluminum Co. of America has already expanded its plant, out of its own money, and money which it has borrowed, to the extent of \$200,000,000, and has increased its output from an average of about 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 pounds a year to about 800,000,000 pounds a year. I am speaking from memory, and I will get the correct figures and shall be glad to put them in the Record. The industries of America are cooperating. They want business. They are not striking, but they have been struck.

I think in all kinds of industry in America there are bottlenecks, and they are here, Mr. President, largely because this thing has happened to us and to the whole world with the utmost suddenness. We knew nothing about mechanized warfare, we knew nothing about the value of the airplane in warfare, we knew very little about the meaning of a tank in warfare until a year ago Germany marched across Belgium and then across France. Then we woke up to the fact that there was a country over there that for 5 years had been preparing for mechanized warfare, and we have been trying to do in 1 year what she did in 5.

Mr. President, there are bottlenecks, there are congestions, because the country is trying to move at a tremendous rate; but, Senators, hear me—shall we increase those bottlenecks by encouraging strikes? Shall we fall to condemn

strikes under these circumstances? If so, then you magnify your bottlenecks, for it is certain you cannot have full production without full employment of labor.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted—and I wish my friend to state whatever he wishes to state when I complete my statement—I was saying that we had called upon the American people for sacrifices. Very few of us have made any sacrifices. Many more of us will be making sacrifices next year than are doing so now. The taxes are going to come down upon us and they are going to be very hard upon millions of Americans. But after all that is a financial matter.

We called upon the young men of America to make their sacrifices, and I was just now referring to the famous ball player, Greenberg. I greatly admired the example he set to the young men of our land. He was on the Detroit baseball team, drawing \$40,000 a year to play baseball. His country called him, and he took off his baseball suit and laid down his bat and put on his uniform, and is now a private in the ranks. In my eyes he is a bigger hero now than he ever was when he was knocking out those home runs.

All over this land the boys have been going. I have seen them going down in my part of the country. Their mothers have been bidding them good-bye, and have been bidding them good-bye with tears streaming down their cheeks, and the boys have seen that, too. Those boys are not feeling good about this thing. But the boys are going, and the mothers are not squawking, and they are not striking. They are setting that ancient example of courage that goes back to Deborah in the olden times.

But here we are, Mr. President. We do not have the courage to tell these strikers that they ought to quit that business and produce guns for their country and their sons. We cannot make any sacrifices, oh, no. Our boys can, but we cannot. Oh, no; we will shed the blood of a hundred thousand American boys, but when it comes to shedding a little political blood, we will not do it. Is that not a fine example to set to the country?

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator deprive the worker of the right to strike?

Mr. BAILEY. In the Senator's absence I said I agreed that the workers have the right to strike. There are many things a man has a right to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator would agree that when the worker has a just cause the strike is his only means of enforcing it?

Mr. BAILEY. That is the ultimate test of strength, yes, but not the only means.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator know whether or not these strikers whom we now condemn here on the Senate floor have or have not a just cause?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the Senator that I was just saying that we have created a Board to deal with the situation, and we are not saying that the striker has not a just cause. We are

simply saying to the striker, "Go on with your work and we will see that you get justice." There is no difficulty about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator—

Mr. BAILEY. Let me make this clear to the Senator from Nevada. Here is a workman and here is an employer, and between the two there may be a grievance, and the worker may be right, and the times are normal, and the striker has an absolute right to strike. I doubt if he has any right to keep anyone else from working, but I will pass that by for the present. He has a right to strike. But does the Senator from Nevada fail to see that we are dealing here with a situation in which the defense and the security of the whole American people is at stake, and when that occurs, the moral right to strike does not exist? There may be a legal right, but there is no moral right to strike against the welfare of your Nation and your people.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator, I take it, put a question to me, and I beg leave of him, not wishing to interrupt him at too great a length of time, to make an answer.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator let me sit down while he makes his answer?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not mean to be rude, and I do not intend to take up the time of the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. No; that is all right. Go ahead.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I do see what the Senator has said. I believe the American Congress has had the foresight to see it, in time of peace, when we had the calm of peace about us, we created the machinery with which to solve the difficulties that might arise between the employer and the employee. That was the voice of the American Congress speaking and setting up a means by which the greatest quantum of justice might be wrought out for the American worker. Has that machinery been put into effect? I say it has not, and I say that if it had been put into effect we would not be here taking up the time of the Senate considering the measure now before us.

I make this expression without fear of contradiction, that if the machinery set up by Congress had gone forward, and if it had taken hold of these matters in time, or if that machinery takes hold of the matter even now, this whole situation would be solved, without our intervention by the adoption of a measure such as is pending here now, which to my mind is one of the most unhappy and unfortunate measures that could come before the Congress. I only wish that the machinery which this Congress had created had taken hold of the situation, and had seen to it that fair play was wrought out between the employer and the employee, and then I would not have any hesitancy, but—

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall not go forward now, but shall speak in my own time.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator.

The Senator referred to the machinery which has been set up. I thought I referred to the machinery which had been

set up by the President; that is, the Mediation Board. Presumably that Board is just. Presumably it is intelligent. Presumably it was set up in good faith. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I think we can take it for granted that that Board will do justice. I think the workers of America can take it for granted that that Board will do justice. I have not heard from any source the intimation that that Board would not be fair to labor. That machinery is in existence. It is functioning, and it has functioned successfully in several cases. It has been defied and is now being defied by strikers and labor leaders. I am addressing myself precisely to that situation.

I am saying to the Senate, to the workers, and to the people of North Carolina who sent me here that we do have the means of arbitration of grievances. We do have a Board in which we rightfully have confidence, against which no accusation has so far been brought; and we do have a situation of the direst kind of emergency. I say that the least we can ask of the workers of America at this time is that when they have grievances they will go on with their work, with the assurance that they will receive justice. They are not dealing only with employers. They are dealing with the American people. They will receive more justice in that way than they will by going back upon their country in a time like this.

Mr. President, years ago I was reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I never dreamed that I would be here. I read a speech by the late John Sharp Williams, a most brilliant man, of greatly honored memory. He was making that speech in the period of the World War. He was talking about persons who were grumbling, grousing, and obstructing in that emergency, just as some persons are now grumbling, obstructing, and grousing. He was talking in the light of the sacrifices that the boys of America and the mothers and fathers of America were making.

He told the story of a soldier in Washington's Army at Valley Forge. When his comrades were freezing and starving, and when the Father of his Country was on his knees praying for the help of Providence to save the new land, the new people, and the new cause of freedom, this man was concerned about nothing like that. He cared nothing for the prayers of Washington or the sufferings of his comrades. To use the language of John Sharp Williams, his voice could be heard splitting the ear of midnight, night after night, crying, "Beef! More beef! Beef! More beef!"

I think we are painting that sort of picture in America. Some persons are crying, "Beef! More beef!" while the boys march off to man the ranks, the fighting airplanes and the bombers, and learn the art of tank warfare—while the boys go into camp to learn the most ancient of skills—the skill of a soldier. While the boys go forth to camp and sailors man the ships to defend their country, here at home, under misguided leadership—I will be moderate about it—we can hear all over the land the cry of

"Beef! More beef! Beef! More beef!" with our country in its present situation.

When we come forward with a modest amendment simply calling upon the Congress to say that under these circumstances that sort of thing is against public policy and ought to be condemned, we are told that we are giving labor a slap in the face and business a pat on the back. What we are doing is rising like men entrusted with a great trust, the welfare of our country, and a great leadership, the leadership of our Nation in legislative matters, and saying to the American people that this sort of thing ought to stop. We are trying to help our country.

Mr. President, let me conclude with one word. If we cannot stop these strikes, then we cannot defend our country. Talk about aiding England. We cannot even aid our native land unless we can stop this sort of thing. There are persons who think that this country is on the verge of war. If she is on the verge of war and we cannot stop strikes, then it is the part of wisdom to turn tail and flee like rabbits. A country that cannot deal with its domestic order and rule within itself, a country that cannot have the loyalty of its workers and its labor leaders in a time like this, cannot be fighting anybody's battles, not even its own, for the security of our people demands full and uninterrupted production of all the means of warfare.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how long he expects to speak?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not expect to consume very much time. Does the Senator wish to move a recess?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I understood another amendment was to be offered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I intended to offer an amendment to the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Does the Senator expect to discuss it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I expect to discuss it. I do not expect to take long, but I doubt if we can finish within the usual period this evening.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, earlier in the day my hope was that we might conclude consideration of this measure and then take up the bill of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. From statements made to me within the past few minutes it appears that there is to be considerable debate on this question and on the amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to offer. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada, if he would prefer not to be interrupted, I believe we should recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to offer to the pending amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment will be read for the information of the Senate. The Chair understands that the Senator from Nevada has yielded.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it understood that I may have the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So far as the present occupant of the chair can control the matter, the Senator from Nevada will have the floor; but the present occupant of the chair may not be in the chair when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will take my chances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the last line of the Byrd amendment, after the word "condemned", it is proposed to insert:

And that complete cooperation between government, management, and labor can best be achieved by the whole-hearted acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining and the recognition of the right of employees to designate representatives of their own choosing for purposes of collective bargaining, without interference through unfair or oppressive labor practices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

#### RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Father of light, in whom there is no shadow, with one accord we seek Thy guidance lifting our hearts in praise and gratitude. As Thou dost guard us day and night by Thy mercy, do Thou lead us by Thy unerring counsel and show us anew that wondrous power that makes men free. O Master of this troubled world, who hast the nations in Thy heart, O word and truth of God, unchanged and incarnate, make them the chart and compass over the surging seas of war and hate. We are weak, Thou art mighty; we know but little, Thou art all wisdom; we are selfish, Thou art gracious; do Thou make us magnanimous and altogether worthy of the spirit of the meek and lowly One. We pray that we

may be of the simple heart, of the unpretentious mind and of the uncalculating soul which rises in majesty above injustice and wrongful criticism. Heavenly Father, somewhere behind the battle smoke and the clouds of dusty roadways; somewhere behind the winding mountainsides and along the valleys and the plains; somewhere in shop and office and in the deep precipices of the old earth is the toiling, tragically burdened world, rushing, teeming along the hard-beaten pathways. Almighty God, open our eyes that we may see and help them. In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 9, 1941, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3368. An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 95. An act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska";

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes" approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; and

H. R. 4132. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 378. An act to amend the act of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service";

S. 452. An act for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka);

S. 456. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman;

S. 633. An act to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned by the United States;

S. 708. An act for the relief of Joseph Arreas;

S. 1051. An act relating to the payment of fees and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor;

S. 1052. An act relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims;

S. 1289. An act authorizing the Copper River and Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska, for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes;

S. 1488. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage, an employee of the United States, to service under the Government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the Government of the Punjab, India" (act of June 29, 1940), Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.;

S. 1508. An act to provide for the pay of aviation pilots in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; and

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

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3782. An act establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

The message also 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. 4693. An act to amend the National Housing Act, 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. BANKHEAD, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Labor.
3. Department of the Navy.

4. Department of War.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.
8. Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an excerpt from a newspaper.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Herald Tribune by Mr. C. B. Allen.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a poem published in the Wilmington Suburban News of May 29.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years a number of Members of the Congress have made certain serious charges, wherein they claim that certain bankers are interfering with the White House and the Congress of the United States. Only as recently as a week ago such an occurrence took place. I am not trying to quarrel with anybody, but if these facts are true, we ought to have an investigation and these culprits ought to be brought to justice. This applies to any person who is seeking to undermine this Government, be it by influencing the White House or the Congress; whether such people are international bankers or bankers of any particular faith or religion, their work ought to be destroyed. I have introduced today a resolution asking the Congress to order an investigation and give the Congressmen and other persons in the country, who have made such charges, a chance to produce the evidence as to the facts in this matter. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial from the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two brief newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement from a group of constituents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the New York Times of today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech on the maintenance of morale by M. H. Hedges, of the American Federation of Labor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial by David Lawrence on June 13, 1941.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'HARA addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a short article from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LIEUTENANT COLONEL BRANSHAW

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

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection? There was no objection.

**MR. SNYDER.** Mr. Speaker, just a month ago it was my privilege to be escorted through the North American airplane plant by the president of that institution, Mr. J. H. Kindleberger, and Lt. Col. Charles Branshaw, chief of the western Air Corps production district in charge of inspection on the western coast. It is a fortunate thing for the Nation that a man like Colonel Branshaw was out there to take charge of the situation yesterday when the Army took charge of the plant; also Mr. Kindleberger, the president of the concern. I saw Mr. Kindleberger a year ago with a few gray hairs in his head; a month ago his hair was almost all gray, due to the strenuous job he has been performing for the Nation during the past few years.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

**MR. HOFFMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks twice in the Appendix of the RECORD, once to include a speech, and the second time an article from a newspaper.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**MR. BARDEN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection? There was no objection.

**MR. BARDEN.** Mr. Speaker, during a colloquy yesterday between the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and myself, this remark was made by Mrs. NORTON, and it was her concluding statement. I quote:

I remind the gentleman that before the Labor Committee had any opportunity to act, the bills that should have been referred to it were referred to other committees. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Labor and should resent as much as I do the discrimination against the committee.

Mr. Speaker, that statement consists of 51 words. Following that the gentlewoman added 242 words. I have never considered it quite proper in a colloquy between Members that such additions and such bringing in of new matter in debate by extension of remarks should be permitted or placed in the RECORD. I am not going to ask that those 242 words be stricken from the RECORD, which I probably should do, but I want the RECORD to show that they were never spoken on the floor of the House and were not a part of the colloquy, and I want those words beginning with "I intend to vote against every amendment to this bill" and ending with the words "throughout the country," her statement complete, printed at this point in the RECORD, so that the RECORD will show that the statement referred to was no part of the colloquy but was added later, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection?

**MR. HOFFMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Did the gentlewoman secure permission to revise and extend her remarks?

**MR. BARDEN.** She secured permission to revise and extend her remarks, but I

have never regarded it and I do not believe the average Member regards it as proper or fair debate to add any such statements in the middle of a colloquy between two Members by way of extension of remarks. If it was regarded as proper, without the consent of the other party, it would be unwise, so far as the RECORD is concerned, to yield to anyone.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

I intend to vote against every amendment to this bill. It is an appropriation bill and should not be used as a vehicle to carry amendments which, if considered in a separate bill, would at least receive the consideration of a committee and we would understand their purpose. This is an extraordinary method of considering labor legislation. It is unfair to the great body of American labor, the majority of which can be depended upon to serve our country, and should not be confused with that small segment of labor responsible for agitating against the national-defense program. I have the utmost confidence in the responsible labor leaders and believe they will do a good job in house-cleaning within labor ranks. They will see to it that America is not "sold down the river" by the Communists and Nazis who are creating dissension within the ranks of labor. The amendments offered here today will not help the labor situation. If adopted they will do a great deal of harm. They are unnecessary. The President has already signed the order designating the United States Army to take over the North American Co. at Inglewood, Calif. If and when it becomes necessary to the defense of our country to act we can depend upon the President to do so. New legislation enacted in the heat of emotion and without full and deliberate consideration would, in my opinion, be a crime against the hundreds of thousands of honest, patriotic, loyal workers throughout the country.

#### UNIFIED AIR DEFENSE

**MR. MUNDT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection?

There was no objection.

**MR. MUNDT.** Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House passed an appropriations bill of virtually \$10,000,000,000 to toughen our national defense. A substantial portion of this huge sum was earmarked for the production of additional war planes to protect us in a world in which air power is rapidly becoming the most effective and destructive method of either attack or defense. This House took a great forward step in developing the impregnability of the Western Hemisphere by yesterday's action.

However, planes alone are not enough, and even planes plus the best pilots in the air are not the whole story. In addition, this country must be sure it has the unified and coordinated control of its air, land, and sea forces, which has demonstrated its effectiveness again and again in the three-dimensional fighting of this war. To make such proof available to Congress, or to provide a method of securing such coordination of action, if it is lacking, I introduced House Resolution 228, which is now before the Rules Committee, asking the Speaker to appoint a nine-man committee to determine

whether our present arrangements are satisfactory or whether our defense can be strengthened and modernized by the creation of a separate air branch or the consolidation of air, war, and naval divisions under a single Department of National Defense. This inquiry would provide an intelligent search for facts on one of the most vital problems of our entire national-defense program. Since introducing my resolution I have received much encouragement, both from the Members of Congress and other interested citizens. Today's mail, for example, brought a letter from Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, supporting this resolution. I am today sending a letter to the members of the Rules Committee requesting a hearing on my resolution, and I hope those of you who favor it will express your support to the members of the House Rules Committee.

**THE SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

**MR. MUNDT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee from Mr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

**MR. STEAGALL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4693), to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

#### CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

**MR. RICH.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection?

There was no objection.

**MR. RICH.** Mr. Speaker, lately I have been criticizing the C. I. O. for what I believed was the intent of a great many of them to hinder national defense. On Saturday night I listened to the radio address of Mr. Frankenstein, trying to get the C. I. O. to stop the strike that was in progress in California. I listened to that address with a great deal of interest. I want to commend him for the part he took in trying to stop the strike. I think it was a fine address. A man who would do what he tried to do then is certainly a good American citizen. I want to commend him for that address and the way in which he tried to prohibit these strikes now going on against national defense. Anyone who does that ought to receive some commendation from Members of Congress.

I am against them when they are wrong. I am for them when they are right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

BEN WHITE ET AL.—VETO MESSAGE  
(H. DOC. NO. 259)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith without my approval a bill (H. R. 2054) entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, A. J. McLaren, A. D. Barkleew, Oscar Clayton, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, the estate of C. E. Wells, and the estate of Theodore Bowen."

The bill would authorize a suit for damages to be brought against the United States in the Court of Claims, in behalf of certain individuals against whom a decision was rendered many years ago by the Department of the Interior in respect to an entry made by them on public lands. Apparently, the basis for the legislation is that subsequently the Secretary of the Interior was in this instance overruled by the courts.

The bill under consideration would constitute an undesirable innovation in the law and might well form a dangerous precedent. The Congress has frequently passed and I have often approved bills which recognized a liability on the part of the Government for negligence or trespass on the part of Government officers or employees in the performance of their duties. The ends of justice require that the Government should in many instances recognize liability for tort in situations of this kind.

The bill under consideration, however, involves a situation of an entirely different character. It proposes to subject the Government to liability for damages in the event that a decision of a Government officer, acting in an administrative or quasi-judicial capacity, is subsequently overruled by the courts. Thus, the instant situation is entirely different from that presented by cases in which the Government subjects itself to the same liability as would be imposed on a private individual or corporation.

Public policy requires that Government officers and commissions clothed by the Congress with the authority to pass on rights of individuals may do so without subjecting the Government to liability for damages, if the courts later disagree with their determinations. Otherwise an intolerable financial burden might be imposed on the taxpayers, and the efficient performance of governmental functions impeded.

The foregoing considerations lead me to withhold my approval from this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 1941.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal; and, without objection, the message and the accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

## EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent has already been granted for general debate, confined to the bill, to continue through the day. I further ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally controlled and divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

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 House Joint Resolution 193, with Mr. McCORMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the House joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 193 carries the appropriation for the Work Projects Administration for the fiscal year 1942 and for the administrative expenses of the Treasury Department and General Accounting Office in connection with accounting, disbursing, and auditing the W. P. A. expenditures, and for expenses of the Employees' Compensation Commission for payment of disability compensation to persons injured on the projects. The total amount carried by the joint resolution is \$885,905,000, of which \$875,000,000 is for the W. P. A. and \$10,905,000 is for these other agencies. The appropriation of \$875,000,000 for the W. P. A. is the smallest amount that has been requested of Congress for this purpose since the inauguration of the work-relief program. The peak was reached in 1939, when W. P. A. expended \$2,230,000,000 for work and work relief. During the current fiscal year there was available for W. P. A. \$1,350,650,000 for this program. The present resolution provides for a total amount of \$875,000,000 for the W. P. A. program for the full fiscal year and is \$109,000,000 less than the amount sent up by the Budget originally, the President having sent up on May 20 a revision of his Budget estimates for the work-relief program, estimating the amount for the next fiscal year for W. P. A. at \$875,000,000.

The amount provided in this resolution for W. P. A. is \$475,650,000 less than the amount for the current fiscal year, and in percentages it is 35 percent less in dollar appropriation.

From the standpoint of the number to be employed on W. P. A., it is a reduction

of 758,685 in the average yearly employment, or 44 percent reduction.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. In your total of \$875,000,000 for W. P. A., is it not a fact that \$50,000,000 of that is transferred to the Department of Agriculture for surplus commodities and is not W. P. A. funds?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct. In the bill \$50,000,000 is earmarked for the extension of the stamp plan for surplus food commodities and provision is made to transfer this sum to the Department of Agriculture. The committee feels, and I am sure feels unanimously, that if in the judgment of the House that \$50,000,000 should not be transferred, then it would want the amendment inserted by the committee taken out of the bill. In other words, we do not want the total amount of this bill increased by \$50,000,000, although I say I think the committee feels very strongly that the earmarking of \$50,000,000 for the extension of this stamp plan will do a great deal toward relieving distress among people who need to be relieved; and that while it may decrease the actual number of people to be employed upon W. P. A. a slight amount, yet there will be very large benefits inure to that class of people. As far as I am concerned, I hope it will be the pleasure of the Committee and the House to leave the bill just as we have earmarked it. We have given for relief the full amount of the Budget estimate, making no reductions in it, but we earmarked \$50,000,000 to go to the stamp plan. In order to keep the record clear, speaking for myself personally and individually, I should like to have seen this amount reduced still further.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HARE. Before leaving the \$50,000,000 provision, as I understand, that is to be used to buy commodities for people on relief?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Is not most of that money for administrative work?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Which money?

Mr. IZAC. The \$50,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. It is for an extension of the food-stamp plan for the purchase of commodities. A small proportion of the money will naturally be needed for administrative purposes, but a very large proportion is for the purchase of surplus food products.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I believe the gentleman said that the number of people who will be taken off the rolls by this amount will be 35 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Forty-four percent.

Mr. DONDERO. And the amount in dollars is reduced 35 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. I was trying to correlate the difference, and wondered why they did not come down in the same proportion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is impossible to do that.

Mr. DONDERO. Is that on account of administrative expense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is on account of the administrative expense, supervisory expense, difference in cost per worker on defense projects, and so forth.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Possibly in connection with the \$50,000,000 food-stamp plan the gentleman would want to add that the conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill eliminated the additional \$35,000,000 that was put in that bill by the Senate for that item, thereby making this amendment all the more imperative.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Exactly; and the conferees did that on the theory that it was a relief project and it ought to go in a relief bill.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No one is more in favor of the food-stamp plan than I, but it seems to me a little tough to take it out of the W. P. A. workers.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It simply means that you have so much for relief and work relief and you put it where you think it will accomplish the most good.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I am extremely interested in the elimination of the 18 months' lay-off period in this bill. Has the committee given consideration to the matter of eliminating the 18 months' lay-off?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee did give consideration to the elimination of that requirement. We discussed it very fully.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would give me the figures of the reduction in W. P. A. employment. With the fund reduced to \$875,000,000, what will be the reduction in the number of beneficiaries?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The \$875,000,000, if all given to W. P. A., would have provided for an average employment throughout the fiscal year 1942 of 1,000,000 against an average employment in the fiscal year 1941 of 1,700,000.

Mr. BOLAND. This \$50,000,000 for the food-stamp plan will reduce it that much further, will it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; it will affect 58,685 people and reduce the average employment for 1942 from 1,000,000 to 941,315.

Mr. BOLAND. In other words, if those people have been on the roll at \$52 a month, you are going to put that many

more in the bread line. That is the answer, is it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not like to put it that way. I would rather state that we are going to put them in the care of the State, on some State program where they ought to be. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I do not want one deserving person to suffer, but, after all, there is a very clear line of demarcation as to where the Federal Government ought to end and where the State government ought to begin. I think it is very apparent there are a lot of people on the Federal program who ought to be on the State program. In putting them back into the hands of the State, I would not say we were putting them back in the bread line, but we are putting them back on the responsibility of the local government where they rightly belong. I believe that by earmarking \$50,000,000 of this fund for the food-stamp plan we are spending the money in such way as to reach the people who need to be reached.

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman will permit a further inquiry, I would like to know just how the gentleman would differentiate between the State that is able to take care of these people and the State that is not financially able to take care of them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what the gentleman means by differentiating.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman states he is trying to see that these men shall be transferred from the W. P. A. rolls to State rolls, and the gentleman is intimating that to the extent of \$50,000,000 States should further take care of this relief problem. In the case of States not able to take care of them the people would still be in the bread lines, would they not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what States the gentleman from Pennsylvania is thinking about, but certainly the States of Pennsylvania and Virginia are able to take care of their destitute people. There may be States not able to, States that have not felt the effect of the defense program, but certainly that situation can be taken care of in some way.

Mr. BOLAND. I should like to take the gentleman through the anthracite coal fields in my own district and let him see first hand what great hardships he is going to cause by putting this \$50,000,000 into the food-stamp plan. This amount was recommended by the President and should not be diverted to the food-stamp plan. I do not think it is fair, I do not think it is just.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The food-stamp plan comes under the Department of Agriculture, does it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This will mean, to put the matter very concisely, that the Federal Works Agency for whom this appropriation was intended will lose all control of that \$50,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This comes out of the people who can least afford it and gives it to agriculture.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The relief does not go to agriculture. It is not agricultural relief. It has to do with the purchase of food commodities that are given people who need food, and a class of people who perhaps need it as badly if not worse than people who are on the W. P. A. program. I imagine the gentleman from Missouri is going to have something to say on the subject a little later because he is so familiar with it.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PACE. If agriculture should get a slight benefit from the \$50,000,000, relief gets an enormous benefit from the \$200,000,000 carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for the same item?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BEAM. Now, has the gentleman given any consideration to the number of employables over 45 years of age who cannot qualify in some of the defense industries at the present time, and the number, if any, that will be affected by this lower sum?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman mean by the \$50,000,000 reduction?

Mr. BEAM. Yes; in addition to the curtailment of the original amount?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It will be in proportion. The committee has not given consideration to that particular group. It has considered the whole picture. Undoubtedly this will take certain people off the W. P. A.

Mr. BEAM. Then the gentleman will concede this is a very pertinent question at the present time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly it is a pertinent question.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke as though transferring this money will in some way or other bring a hardship on the people who are in need of employment or who are on relief. It should be borne in mind that every dollar transferred from this fund to the food-stamp plan represents \$1.50 in food to people who are out of employment and possibly those who cannot even be employed; so instead of being a hardship on the people who are having a difficult struggle to get along, it actually amplifies the total amount of food that goes to those people?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is simply this, to state it a little differently: The President suggested \$875,000,000 for W. P. A. The committee has set \$875,000,000, less \$50,000,000, for work projects and \$50,000,000 for the purchase of food for people who may participate in any type of public-assistance funds. I think it is a legislative function and a prerogative that the committee had a right to consider.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I came before the gentleman's committee with this problem: We have continually had cuts in the quotas in the State of Florida. We have a good many defense projects down there. The order has gone down from the Administrator in Washington that these defense projects were immune from cuts. It simply means those cuts must fall on projects where people are in need, for instance, the sewing-room project, particularly. There are a great many women there that I know of who have big families or who are not qualified to do other work, but they can do this work. The cut in quotas falls on them. I asked the committee to consider this problem. I am wondering what consideration it gave to the problem.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee considered that problem along with many other problems. Many of the sewing-room projects should be State problems, not Federal projects. It is a rather wide stretch of the imagination to take some of these sewing-room projects and call them work projects under the theory you are taking a person who is employable in the ordinary sense of the word. They can earn their own living in industry or commerce.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think the administration ought to consider not cutting these projects where they are in need and where they cannot get employment elsewhere.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is it not true that the food-stamp program is a program for the destitute in the city?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; but not exclusively. It will help them, wherever the plan can be instituted.

Mr. LUDLOW. They are the ones who are going to get the benefit of the program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Referring to the language of the bill which provides for the wage scale, I am anxious to ascertain whether or not there is any possibility of increasing the wages of the W. P. A. worker in view of the marked increased cost of living?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, if you increase the wages you decrease the number of people to be employed. You have so many dollars, which will employ so many people. You can increase wages but you will decrease the number of people to be employed. That is the discussion we are having now. The food-stamp plan diverts money and decreases the number of people who can be employed. The committee felt that while it is true there has been an increase in the cost of living, yet this is possibly the best approach to the situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. These national-defense projects give employment to a lot of people. Will the gentleman explain to the House what the opinion of the committee was in reference to breaking down the appropriation? As I understand it, 40 percent of this is based on unemployment, another 40 percent on the basis of population, and 10 percent discretionary.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Ten percent on the defense program.

Mr. STEFAN. And 10 percent on the defense program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. There are some States in which there have been continued droughts where there are no national-defense industries. Where would they benefit by this formula?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly the part of the formula relating to unemployment and the discretionary percentage are aimed to help such situations. The committee in the report on the bill has suggested that W. P. A. in administration of this money for the next fiscal year give this formula close study in order to integrate it with the defense contract letting. Some areas have received large defense orders and some have not. That situation with respect to the distribution of W. P. A. employment needs to be studied carefully.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. As I understand, the committee cut approximately 750,000 people off W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The reduction in average employment is from 1,700,000 for the fiscal year 1941 to 941,315 for the fiscal year 1942, or by 758,685.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Does the committee believe those 750,000 will be absorbed in defense industries? Does the gentleman have any data that would indicate that to be the fact?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Seven hundred thousand of that cut was not only favored by the committee but was made at the suggestion of the W. P. A. and the administration, and they think those people will be absorbed in industry or other private employment.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Has any census been taken that shows the age of the people on W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. The gentleman will find that in the hearings. I believe the average age of the people on W. P. A. is about 43.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The State of California has received a great amount of defense-industry money, but it is to be spent principally on airplanes and shipbuilding—two industries in which the owners of the plants will not employ persons of that age. Therefore, while there is a large increase in the employment generally, the State of California will still be left with a tremendous number of people over 43 who cannot get work in the defense industries, so I believe the cut at this time is most unfortunate be-

cause what we are going to do will break down the morale of thousands of people who ought to be encouraged at this time inasmuch as they cannot get work in industry.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. I believe the amendment is a perfectly logical one. As a matter of fact, it is a relief amendment. In reply to the suggestion that it will put people on the bread lines, I suggest that it will take them out of the bread lines by making it possible for them to acquire bread they could not otherwise purchase.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice that the language of the proposed measure with reference to how preference shall be determined is the same as that contained in the act last year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. With the exception of the addition of the blind. We put the blind in there.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did the committee give any consideration to changing that portion with reference to how preferences shall be determined on the basis of relative need?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee considered that very carefully. It had quite a number of representatives of veterans' organizations before it and some Members of Congress, and it went into the question very carefully. The committee felt that with the rapidly decreasing program such as we have had that the preference section should be left as it is now.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did not the administration really favor changing the language there and wanted to eliminate the words "on the basis of relative need"?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. The administration favored that, and the administration favored taking out all the restrictions we had put in the W. P. A. bills since we started working on them 3 or 4 years ago, but the committee did not feel that it could do that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That language forces the administration to administer the act but makes it almost impossible to follow the intent of Congress or the way the committee wants it. It is an impracticable proposition to determine the preferences on the basis of relative need.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the gentleman's statement. I do not believe it is impracticable. I believe it is about the best formula you could work out on it. You cannot work out any formula that in isolated instances is not going to work some hardship on someone.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did not the administration state to the committee that it was impracticable to administer the act under that wording?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They stated they would like to have the restriction removed, yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They did not go so far as to state it was impossible to administer it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not believe they went that far.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. The gentleman may have covered this in his statement; I have not heard all of it. I know the gentleman will agree with me that there is evidence of growing public disapproval of expenditures in nondefense items. Will the gentleman tell me, if he can, whether or not it is going to be the general policy in connection with these projects to indulge as much as possible in defense or semidefense projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As I recall it, expenditures this fiscal year for defense projects will run about \$400,000,000 from W. P. A. funds and sponsors funds combined. They are carried on, of course, by taking people who are certified to W. P. A. from the relief rolls.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand, this \$50,000,000 diversion to the food-stamp plan necessarily means that a good many people who have been on W. P. A. to get dollars for their employment are not going to get any dollars in the future because of the diversion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. You can employ that many less people on W. P. A.

Mr. OLIVER. So, as a matter of fact, it is very little comfort and very little solace to those people to know that they can get \$1.50 worth of food when they do not have the \$1 to put in to get the \$1.50 worth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But it is a whole lot of solace to the fellow who cannot get on W. P. A. and has not been on W. P. A. to get the \$1.50 worth of food.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Does this not mean that there will be 58,685 men who will not have an opportunity to work if this \$50,000,000 goes to agriculture?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right. It is likewise true that the President's estimate that were sent up here meant that 700,000 persons will not have the opportunity to work on W. P. A. in 1942 that had that opportunity in 1941. The program is pulled down, drawn in, and constricted. The committee felt it was fair as a relief proposition to give some relief to people who could not get on W. P. A. but who were yet just as much interested in trying to eat once or twice a day as the people who did have W. P. A. jobs.

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. O'CONNOR, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to go along with my more or less rambling remarks, but I will yield to the gentlemen who are on their feet asking me to yield.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman tell us about the percentage of decrease in the W. P. A. appropriation under last year?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In dollars, it is 35 percent.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is 35 percent in dollars? I thought it was 40 percent.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Forty-four percent in the number employed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And 35 percent in dollars.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman will yield, I may say, further answering the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] that even a man on W. P. A. can take advantage of the stamp plan and increase what he gets from W. P. A. by 50 percent in food values.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. He cannot increase all he gets in wage from W. P. A. by 50 percent in food value, but if he spends a certain amount of his W. P. A. wage for food, then he gets 50 percent in stamps, in addition, to buy certain other surplus foods.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On this much controverted question about the stamp plan, would not the gentleman agree that the fair statement of the case would be that here are two different approaches to the problem of unemployment and human need, and that the real question is how much of a total, over-all program of both of these plans you are going to have. It does not seem to me that in this bill you can decide how much of a stamp-plan program you are going to have, because, primarily, that is in the other bill, and I would not quarrel with the gentleman about increasing the stamp plan at all, but I do think it is an open question as to whether or not the total, over-all amount is really going to meet the needs.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I imagine that the amount of the cut in the amount for W. P. A. purposes was due to our defense program. Is not that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it was due to the fact that private employment has increased and will increase further, and there are and will be more opportunities for private employment which, of course, is induced by the large expenditures for defense.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to how we are affected in my State. For instance, the only national-defense contract that has been let in Montana is \$25,000 awarded to the Caird Machinery Co., of Helena. We have 10,000 families on relief in Montana, and if the amount that has been allowed in the bill is the final amount allowed by the Congress it will cut down the number that will receive relief under the program to 5,200, and I am just won-

dering what we are going to do with the other 4,800 families that will be in the same position they were in a year ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Answering the gentleman from Montana, I may say that, of course, some of them will have to go on State and community relief, where they belong.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, the W. P. A. is supposed to be set up for the purpose of taking care of those who cannot take care of themselves.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If they are employables—it is supposed to be a works program of people who ordinarily could support themselves except for the fact there are no jobs for them. If you apply that test, you eliminate a great many people on W. P. A. rolls, people who would, in the ordinary course of events, under any sort of improvement in business, be able to support themselves.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know the difficulties under which the gentleman's committee has been working, and he is to be congratulated on the patience and scope of knowledge he has shown in connection with this bill. But we are going to be in the situation where, after this amount is passed, we are going to have want in the United States in many places just about the same as we had before.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that if, with a national income of \$92,000,000,000, which is what we are supposed to have in the next year, the Federal Government still has to support more than 1,000,000 of its people, then there is something radically wrong with our economic system.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may say to the gentleman that that is exactly what we have been trying to point out here for some time. The statesmanship of this country has not solved our own economic conditions. It has not solved the problem of want. We have not a decent pension in this country today for old people who are too old to secure employment in any avenue of trade and too old to work and are in dire poverty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am just a little afraid that in some instances this attempt to spread the program by assigning some of this money to the stamp plan will curtail it, because, certainly, during a certain period of time it has been my understanding that only those could purchase these food stamps who were already on the relief rolls in some way and, of course, the allocating of this amount will mean that the \$50,000,000 will be available to a decreasing number on the W. P. A. rolls, because the other people are not eligible to buy stamps or at least they have not been eligible to do so in my State.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point? If the gentleman does not care to yield now, I shall not press it.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But I would like to say on that point, I think the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is correct and unless the stamp plan is extended to low-income groups that are not on relief, as has been done in one or two communities, that may be the effect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] mentioned veterans' preference and I notice, in the committee report, at page 10, the statement—

The committee also calls attention to the provisions of the law insofar as they affect veterans, so the State and local administrators may use the utmost care in determining that veterans' preferences are scrupulously observed.

Does not this language of the committee indicate the fact that the veterans' preference provision of the law has not been properly administered by the W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, I think in some instances it has not, I will say to the gentleman, but I think in those instances it can be traceable usually to faulty local administration and not to the law. The committee feels that it ought not to make this a veterans' relief bill and does not believe any gentleman here who is zealous in the cause of the veteran would take that position. We have given the veterans the preference, and we have provided also for relative needs; that is, if there is a veteran without dependents who is unemployed and a nonveteran without dependents who is unemployed, the veteran gets the job, but if there is a veteran without dependents who is unemployed and there is a nonveteran with a wife and hungry children who is unemployed, under the relative needs policy that person ought to get the job above the veteran, and I think that is a logical and reasonable position.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We understand that, but, nevertheless, the various State administrators make their own interpretation, and thereby have caused a wave of criticism from the lack of uniformity in extending veterans' preference. No doubt this discrimination is the reason why the committee was impelled to use the language referred to in commenting on veterans' preference.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It wanted to impress the W. P. A. in Washington and through them in the States, that the Congress meant that the veterans are to have the preference, and when they do not do that, then Members of Congress, if their attention is called to it, will call the matter to the attention of the W. P. A.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that the only way that this question can be dealt with is by eliminating the necessity for the veteran being on that roll?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think that would eliminate it, but I do not think that should be or could be done.

Mr. HOOK. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this preference goes to the supervisory positions, the administrative positions as well as just the ordinary relief work?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It has nothing to do with the supervisory or administrative positions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I shall take 5 minutes more, and I shall yield briefly to these gentlemen who are on their feet.

Mr. WALTER. Certainly the gentleman does not contend that a veteran will seek a W. P. A. job when he can obtain employment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not want to say that he would, but one would think that anyone would not seek a W. P. A. job when he could find work elsewhere. However, there are many instances where that has happened. I would not want to remove from this law the test that a person before he could ask the Government to furnish him a job out of the taxpayers' money certainly ought to show that he is in need of a job.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman think the veteran seeking a W. P. A. job is conclusive proof that he needs assistance?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I don't think that is conclusive proof on the part of anyone.

Mr. HEALEY. It is a fact that the W. P. A. has and is making a substantial contribution to national defense.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. HEALEY. On many of those projects the hours have been increased up to 48, and many of these men who are on the other projects where they work a much shorter week demonstrated their anxiety to be on the full 48 hours, so that they could earn whatever the difference was in time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. HEALEY. I think that ought to be emphasized to show that all of the W. P. A. workers are not merely people who want to loaf on the job.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not make that contention and I never have.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman knows that his committee has appropriated great sums for both the Army and the Navy. I have this fault to find with the W. P. A. program: Why cannot the Army and the Navy come in here and ask for an appropriation to do this defense work that has to be done, instead of taking these people off the W. P. A. and having them do the work for them in national-defense projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has exactly stated my position in the matter, that the three or four hundred million dollars in this bill will admittedly be used for defense projects and

ought to be expended by the Department in the regular way, with the work let to contracts and people employed as they are employed in everyday affairs, and paid not W. P. A. inadequate wages but regular American wages.

Mr. IZAC. I think the Army and Navy are taking advantage of this situation. We need that \$300,000,000 for the people who are needy and starving to death in this country and not for able-bodied men who can go out and get a job at five or six or seven dollars a day on national-defense projects.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PITTINGER. I am interested in the comment that has just been made by my colleague from Pennsylvania. I think he does not appreciate the circumstance of some of our communities. We do not have Army and Navy defense work up in northern Minnesota. We do not have any war industries up there. The W. P. A. is needed more there now than at any other time if you are going to take care of the unemployment situation. Otherwise you have to take the position that the Government should not furnish any money for relief projects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have used a great deal of time, and I think I will yield the floor at this time because all these matters will be discussed when we take the resolution up under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in toto. I am opposed to it because I do not believe it is possible with such a set-up as we have in the Federal Government and the W. P. A., headed by Howard Hunter and David Lasser, to accomplish anything constructive toward the unemployed who may be left in this country. I do not believe that is the proper way to handle a relief program of any kind.

A year ago the amount of funds that was available to the W. P. A. during the fiscal year 1940 was approximately \$2,200,000,000. In 1941 the amount of funds was reduced to a total of \$1,375,000,000, or a cut of \$825,000,000, approximately 37½ percent. The average number of administrative employees through the year was reduced from approximately 26,000 to an average of about 23,000. At the same time the number of supervisory employees upon projects was increased from 63,000 to 68,000. So that the total number of employees has averaged about the same for those who have supervisory offices as it did in 1940, with 27½ percent less funds with which to operate, and a 37½ percent less load.

Now, maybe that is the way to run a Government institution; never save a dollar; never cut down on foolish and ridiculous administrative expenses. I understand that someone even has the nerve to talk about increasing their administrative expenses when they are wasting money to a ridiculous extent at the present time.

In the fiscal year 1941, at the beginning of the year, they had in their Washington office 1,709 administrative employees with an average salary of \$2,436, one of the very largest of any institution in the Government. The average is considerably below \$2,000, but for W. P. A. it was \$2,436. Now, what kind of progress did they make during the fiscal year 1941 down to the 1st of April? They reduced the number of employees in the office by 53. They increased the average rate of salary to \$2,248 a year, making an average amount of upward of \$400 above what the average is for other governmental outfits.

If this outfit were properly administered, they could assign the labor that they have available to the States where there is need. There is no provision in the bill anywhere which prevents the assignment of such numbers as are needed for employment in any particular State. The number that they have on their rolls at the present time, as nearly as I can tell from the latest date they gave us, was 1,496,000 on May 14. Of this number it is alleged that 239,000 are upon defense projects, subject to legislative exemption. In most no place I can find in the country, going through the whole situation, do I find a relief load from which any substantial number of people available for defense projects could be recruited. Once in a while in a town there is a larger relief load than the amount of workers upon alleged defense projects. On the other hand, there are many, many places where they have these so-called defense projects where the relief load is not equal to the number that are on the roll at the present time.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Relative to the gentleman's statement in connection with defense projects, has he given consideration to the State of Minnesota, especially the larger cities which have received but few defense projects, and also the availability of labor and the number of those on relief at the present time?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I have given consideration to that State, as well as every other State. There are in the State of Minnesota at the present time a total of 39,410 W. P. A. employees. That is as of May 14. There is a total upon alleged defense projects of 4,100. That State has a far larger percentage of people upon W. P. A. rolls than New York State, up-State, which has a population three times as great, and has 27,000 on the W. P. A. roll, or 12,000 below the number that Minnesota has at the present time. New York State is being liberally taken care of, and Minnesota has a quota of practically four times as much for its population as up-State New York.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it not true that the State of New York has generously received defense projects and therefore has received employment possibilities, while the Middle West has received few or no defense projects, and therefore their relief rolls are much greater than those of the eastern territory?

Mr. TABER. That may be so as to some places, but they are being taken care of very liberally along those lines and they are being taken care of in a ratio which, to my mind, indicates extreme liberality.

Frankly, I do not believe there has been much diminution in the number on the W. P. A. rolls in Minnesota. Minnesota employment is 39,000 as against last December of 43,000; while the number of relief cases was 36,000 last December and that dropped off steadily with an increase of employment on W. P. A. through the winter, and when it gets to the 14th of May they begin to cut down the number of relief cases in proportion. I am sure the Midwest has been better treated in connection with the number of people who can actually be employed than the Midwest thinks it has, as compared with the rest of the country.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. In addition to the Government defense projects which the State of New York has received—and, of course, I can see the reason for giving many of these projects to the East—is it not true that the industrial plants of the East have been filled with subcontracts while we in the Middle West have not received our share of these subcontracts?

Mr. TABER. I presume the Midwest has not received as many as some of the Eastern States. On the other hand, I am sure employment in the Midwest is very substantial.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Does not the gentleman feel that as long as we are not getting our share of defense projects and as long as we do not have the industrial plants as compared to the East, we in the Midwest should continue to benefit from a properly administered W. P. A. program while men willing and able to work are unemployed?

Mr. TABER. As long as there is need for it and as long as the money is provided. As a matter of fact, I know the situation in the gentleman's State could be better taken care of by an intelligent method of handling relief, by turning the thing over to the States with a proper amount of money rather than continuing it under Howard Hunter and David Lasser. I know it could be handled for half the money it is now costing.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I was glad to have the comments of the gentleman from New York in his answer to the gentleman from Minnesota but I would ask the gentleman from New York if he will not comment on one other provision of this bill, the 18 months' lay-off. Does the gentleman consider this a beneficial provision or does he feel it will be the cause of considerable suffering?

Mr. TABER. The 18 months' lay-off, in my opinion, is an absolute necessity unless you are going to develop a class of people to whom W. P. A. is life's objective, who never want to get off and never intend to get off. That is the only way anyone can justify striking that provision from the bill. At the present time

better than half of those on W. P. A. could find employment, if they set out to, either on the farms, in the factories, or at domestic work. There is a tremendous shortage of all kinds of labor of that type because so many are on W. P. A. right now.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. According to the figures submitted by the Department, about 50 percent of those on W. P. A. at the present time are 50 years of age and over. Would the gentleman include those of 50 years and over in the 18 months' clause?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would watch the industrial situation and study it as I have, he would come to the conclusion, and he would find, that with the trend now in vogue and the situation we are now confronted with such as it is, a man over 50 years of age can find employment better and easier in a great many instances than the younger fellow. I do not believe that at the present time the fellow over 50 is under the handicap he was 2 or 3 years ago. I think most of the complaints come from people who have not investigated the facts.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My district is one in which there are many steel mills. I know as a matter of fact that none of the large steel mills will employ any person who is over 40 years of age. I know the Pennsylvania Railroad will not employ new employees who are over 35 years of age.

Mr. TABER. When one sees so many cases where large corporations are adopting the policy of employing older men because they are more dependable, more ready, and more willing to work, much more so than some of the immigrants who come here with foreign ideas, who are not naturalized and who are subject to so many adverse influences, one cannot be terribly impressed by these complaints.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the gentleman made the statement that Howard Hunter and David Lasser were running the affairs of the W. P. A. In just what capacity is David Lasser employed? And is he the gentleman who formerly headed the Workers Alliance?

Mr. TABER. He is the same fellow who led the raid on the statehouse at Harrisburg—the same bird.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What is his salary?

Mr. TABER. Forty-four hundred dollars.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What is his title?

Mr. TABER. He is a sort of employment specialist, doing kind of lay-out stuff.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman give me the figures for Massachusetts?

Mr. TABER. For employment?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I mean for W. P. A. aid under this bill.

Mr. TABER. W. P. A. in Massachusetts: The current figure is 59,866. The figure last December was 80,445, and that number stayed about the same until March.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman from New York there are a great many women who can do the lighter work of W. P. A. but who cannot do the heavy work of industry.

Mr. TABER. Yes; there are a lot of them who could do domestic work, housework, and could get such work on a remunerative basis.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are not strong enough to do that either.

Mr. TABER. I am inclined to believe there are many of them who can.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. My distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL] called the gentleman's attention to a condition which exists, I think, generally throughout the Midwest. For example, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that we have this situation in my district and it pertains to some of the other country districts. You have a group of men and women who cannot compete in the industrial field. They may not have the physical ability; they have not the training; at least they have not the physical ability.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean they are not employable from a commercial standpoint?

Mr. O'HARA. From a commercial or industrial standpoint.

Mr. TABER. What could they do; what are they able to do?

Mr. O'HARA. They are able to work these shorter hours and do the work which the W. P. A. does in its program, and if they did not have this work, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that they would be a responsibility upon their communities for relief? Some of these municipalities are small and cannot take care of these people. Will the gentleman not agree that the W. P. A. program does furnish a good field for that type of people who are in need of work?

Mr. TABER. There is a great deal in the W. P. A. for those who are unable to work because of mental or physical handicaps and for those who are unwilling to work because of their disposition, who have been catered to and who have been developed into a frame of mind where they expect the Government to provide them with funds for making motions rather than for working. In my opinion, I do not think it is the right thing for the Government to operate that kind of a program. If we have to handle a situation of that kind, we should make proper allotment to the States if they are not able to carry their own load. I do not think there are so many States that are not able to carry it. We should then let those States take care of it as they find it most fitting. For the Government to have a general program of that character has absolutely and totally demoralized a tremendous number of people.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I want to make myself clear on one point. I, too, am bitterly opposed to any waste or extravagance, whether it be on W. P. A. or any other governmental program. I, too, oppose the employment by our Government of persons with communistic leanings and beliefs and who will not subscribe to a 100-percent Americanism. I, too, believe that our relief program could be better administered if it were decentralized and handled by the States, but until that program can be decentralized, I for one must support a program to aid these men over 40 years of age who are today having difficulty in getting employment, whether it be in industrial plants or other places, and also those people who are incapable of regular employment because of some physical handicap. All of them desire to work, and I believe it is our obligation to take care of them until they can be provided with gainful employment.

Mr. TABER. I have called attention to David Lasser. You all know the kind of a record he has. Now I want to call your attention to the record of Joseph C. Ryszeleski, an investigator employed by the W. P. A. Here are a few questions that were put to the gentleman on an occasion:

Now, Mr. Ryszeleski, you studied law at the University of Pennsylvania?

Yes. And you joined the American Army in the other World War?

Yes. You were in France in the Army?

Yes, sir. And you became involved in some gambling and fighting and were arrested?

Yes; I was court-martialed; yes, sir. You were court-martialed and sentenced to prison for 3 years—

Yes, sir. From which you escaped?

Yes. And then joined the Polish Army?

Yes. And came to Pennsylvania, after the war was over?

Yes. And entered the practice of law?

No; I first received my honorable discharge from the American Army.

My comment: How did he get it?

All right; but after that you came back to Pennsylvania, to Philadelphia, and started in to practicing law?

Yes. And you became Assistant City Solicitor?

Yes. You became counsel to the Polish consul in Philadelphia?

Yes, sir. And you became attorney for some building and loan associations that had a great number of Polish clients?

Yes, sir. Customers. And your old custom of gambling and getting in debt caught up with you?

Well, you did become involved, did you not, Mr. Ryszeleski, in embezzling the funds of these customers of the building and loan association.

Yes, sir. I wouldn't say "customers." It was a building and loan association.

That is right, and you became involved in the embezzlement of about \$5,000 of the estate of a certain Polish man who died and

whose net estate was to be transferred, through the Polish consul, to Polish beneficiaries of his estate? You know you did, don't you, Mr. Ryszeleski?

Now, wait. I was in one case; yes.

In about a half dozen or a dozen cases of that kind, weren't you, Mr. Ryszeleski?

Not in estates.

Oh, not in estates—

No.

But in misapplication of funds?

That is right.

You were indicted in 1934 for embezzlement, weren't you, Mr. Ryszeleski?

Yes, sir.

You were listed for trial on the 4th of April 1935 in the City Hall, in Philadelphia, and entered a plea of not being willing to contest it?

Yes, sir.

And there were certain other bills against you, in February 1934 and September of 1934?

No.

Weren't you indicted for carrying concealed deadly weapons?

No, sir.

Well, on this charge of embezzlement, in the October term of 1934, your sentence was deferred and you were placed on probation? Isn't that right?

That is right, sir.

And then you were disbarred from the bar of Philadelphia or that court of common pleas and a great many other courts there, in a proceeding in 1934, in December, were you not?

Yes, sir.

And 3 years went by, a period when you—3 years went by and you applied for reinstatement, did you not?

Yes, sir.

And that was denied, was it not?

Yes, sir.

And all of those are matters of record in the courts of Philadelphia?

Yes, sir.

Now, you began the work as an investigator for W. P. A. about how long after you were disbarred from the courts in Philadelphia?

About a year.

And you were the principal investigator in working up the evidence for this case?

Yes, sir.

That is the kind of "critters" on whom they spend their money, the money that is appropriated by you for relief. What would you expect of something managed by Howard Hunter and David Lasser?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This is a good time.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman something to say?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I have something to say which I believe will interest the House very much.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yesterday the gentleman made a 1-minute speech. In view of the fact—

Mr. TABER. Yes; and I refuse to yield further because I know what the gentleman is going to say. I will tell it. He is going to say that it is immaterial.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Why does not the gentleman let me say what I want to say?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it is immaterial, and I know that what I told was correct.

The gentleman made a statement that it was only a pebble. My Lord, if inefficiency is only a pebble, W. P. A. is a terrible pebble.

After having gone into a great many of these details, I have now called attention to some of the celebrities in connection with W. P. A. and to the situation with which we are confronted. On May 20, 1941, the W. P. A. in New York State, and I understand in other States, and this appears in a memorandum I put in the record on page 276 of the hearings—

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is making a most interesting contribution to the discussion, and I believe the Committee should be in order so that Members may hear the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I should like the RECORD to show at this point that the attention of the Committee was riveted on the gentleman from New York as he gave these very positive and informative statements. I know of no time when the Committee has been in better order than it is at this time, as it listens to the statement of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

On May 20, 1941, this was sent out by the W. P. A. New York office:

We have received authorization from the State office to accept all male and female cases of persons on relief, whether they have a small budget and receive a small amount of relief weekly, semimonthly, or monthly; where they received hospitalization without any home relief; where they have received medical care without home relief or hospitalization or, where they have received clothing and surplus commodities without home relief, hospitalization, or medical care.

If you have any such persons on your relief rolls, we now can accept them. Our interviewers will call on you with the necessary forms within the next day or two.

This was sent out to all the local welfare commissioners, and I understand the same thing has been done throughout the country, in an effort to bolster up and increase the number of people on W. P. A.

Under that proposition they could take on anyone who had received as much as half a peck of apples from the Surplus Commodities Corporation during the winter, regardless of anything else. It is becoming increasingly apparent that W. P. A. is unable to find enough persons to go on its rolls to satisfy the greed of Howard Hunter and David Lasser for opportunities to spend money.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment; I should like to get all of this information in together, if I may.

A survey was taken by the Scripps-Howard papers about 3 or 4 weeks ago, and this was the result. I am quoting from the Washington Daily News of May 21, 1941:

1. That it is becoming easier for W. P. A. workers to get private jobs.
2. That an acute shortage of skilled workers is bringing demands for more and better co-ordinated industrial-training programs.
3. That there is much room for improvement in efforts, through public-employment services, to place men and women from the relief rolls in private jobs.

Full employment—a condition in which everyone who wants to work and is able to work will have no difficulty in finding a place on a private pay roll—is nowhere in sight. W. P. A. authorities and Government economists insist that expansion of the defense program will not bring that condition about.

But in highly industrial States and cities—of which Ohio and Cleveland are typical—there is a decided and encouraging trend.

A year ago Ohio had 136,562 persons on W. P. A. pay rolls and 53,593 others certified and waiting assignment. It now has 82,789 on the W. P. A. rolls and only 10,295—of whom about 60 percent are women—on the waiting list.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not now; I want to finish this first:

In the same period the State's direct-relief rolls have dropped from 99,657 cases to about 66,000.

In Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) workers on the W. P. A. roll have decreased from 31,868 to 15,363 in the last year; those on the waiting list from 13,962 to 4,421. The city's direct-relief cases have decreased from 21,270 to about 15,000.

However, with business conditions improving and with their direct-relief loads decreasing, such cities will be much better able to take care of their own unemployed employables if Congress decides to reduce the W. P. A. rolls more drastically than the President proposes.

Here is another picture I want to call to your attention before I yield to anyone, and I shall yield in a moment. We have all these alleged defense programs.

There is not one of them that could not be done for one-half the cost if the job were let to private contracts and regular wages paid, and this would tend to relieve unemployment a great deal more than to continue alleged defense projects through W. P. A.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. I agree fully with the gentleman that one of the worst things about W. P. A. is the matter of administration. The cost of administration is entirely too great, and I should like to inquire how the gentleman would feel about an amendment to provide that foremen, timekeepers, and so on, of the administrative staff be taken from the relief rolls. I might add, if the gentleman will permit, that my observation is that as a rule foremen, timekeepers, and so on, are political pets. They are folk who do not need the jobs. For instance, I have in my possession an affidavit to the effect that a maiden of 77 summers, who is wealthy in her own name, for the last few years has been drawing \$200 a month to head a project under the W. P. A., and as is usual with a person 77 years of age, she does not enjoy good health and really puts in no time. It is a political sinecure.

Mr. TABER. That is sabotaging the relief program.

Mr. BENNETT. And that is not an unusual thing. I think the bill should be amended to provide that these folk be taken from the relief roll, because I noticed a statement very recently from the State administrator who claimed that every profession was represented on the

W. P. A. relief rolls, so they ought to be able to get them.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is right.

Just a little while ago the President submitted a new tax bill designed to raise \$3,500,000,000. We have a debt now of over \$47,000,000,000, and military expenditures are running at the rate of nearly \$850,000,000 a month. At this time we ought not to take any chances on appropriating this amount of money for any such purpose as this. If we need to appropriate \$100,000,000 and divide it up among those places where it is needed for relief, we should let it be administered honestly by the localities, and then we would be getting somewhere. But when we go on year after year with a wasteful, ridiculous program in charge of such "birds" as Hunter and David Lasser, and they employ such "birds" as the investigator I read about, I am rather inclined to feel that I have been right all these years in opposing the W. P. A. I do not believe it serves a useful purpose in this country.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the last 8 years have witnessed here in the United States the most remarkable development in social and humanitarian legislation—the most notable progress in governmental philanthropy to be found in a similar period in the history of any nation.

Eight years ago the Nation faced an economic crisis unprecedented in severity and extent. The period of prosperity, which reached its peak in 1920, marked by the highest standards of living the American people had ever known, ended suddenly. Factories closed; furnace fires were drawn; banks failed; farms were sold under the hammer; and labor, which had been employed at high wages, was turned out into the street. Men who had never had difficulty in providing for their families were without work and for the first time American children lacked bread. Young men just reaching maturity ready to take their place in life, found neither work nor opportunity to get a start or become established. Destitution was widespread; the highways were thronged with men seeking employment. Armies of desperate men prepared to march on the Capital, and cities ordered machine guns and tear gas to meet the threat—for here in America men will no longer starve peaceably.

We proposed to meet that situation in two ways: First, through reassurance of business, encouragement of industry, resumption of trade, cooperation with labor, and enhancement of the national income; second, by providing work for the unemployed on Government projects, in the construction of needed public improvements, contributing to national wealth and the public welfare—through the Work Projects Administration. It was a method unprecedented in Federal activity, but as successful as it was unique. Bread lines disappeared; soapbox audiences melted away; in every community construction started, providing opportunities for honest work and

self-respecting support of dependent families. The W. P. A. was successful from the beginning.

It met adequately the needs of the hour. But recognition was slow and opposition was indefatigable. Born of conditions brought about through political and legislative maladministration, criticism followed inevitably. Of all of the agencies created to meet the emergencies of that trying period, none were so bitterly assailed as W. P. A. Here in the House opposition flowered in an ill-advised investigation in which \$100,000 was spent in an effort to find some defect or culpability in its administration, its methods, or its expenditures and its integrity of purpose. Highly paid, high-powered investigators combed the Nation in an all-out drive to find something dishonest, dishonorable, or discreditable, all without avail.

The bill which the committee reports today is highly significant. This report marks the end of the baseless charges which have accompanied every bill to provide funds for W. P. A. in previous sessions. Each year when this bill came up for consideration the opening speeches were punctuated by unbridled charges of corruption, mismanagement, and reprehensible veniality. They charged diversion of funds, misappropriation of public property, partisan prostitution, subversive activities, communistic control, boondoggling, inefficiency, maladministration, and every other possible sin of omission and commission which the fertile imaginations of paid investigators could devise. This year the discredited and repudiated maligners of the W. P. A. have been forced to content themselves with vague references to one unimportant field employee who has no possible connection with any policy-forming branch of the service and against whom no specific charge of dereliction of duty of any kind or character has been made, much less sustained.

Out of all the millions of men who have been employed by W. P. A. in the current year they can find only one man to criticize and submit no basis for even that inferential criticism. I assure them now that if they will file and sustain any charge of culpability against this man—or any other man in the vast army of workers under W. P. A.—he will be promptly and summarily dismissed. And more significant still, out of all the thousands of projects under construction in every State of the Union, the cross-examination of witnesses before the committee, and the debate on the bill here today, has pointedly failed to develop any criticism, protest, or objection of record. The report and the discussion adduced here this morning constitute one of the most sweeping and convincing vindications of the efficacy of W. P. A. and the integrity of its administration that could be presented. The proceedings here today are a gratifying testimonial to the efficiency of democratic government, to the effectiveness of the remarkable program of relief devised by the genius of American statesmanship and the outstanding ability with which it has been so successfully administered.

When the W. P. A. was organized, it was understood that it was a temporary

expedient designed to meet an emergency, and that as the need for it declined and private industry provided employment, there would be a corresponding decrease in the need for W. P. A. and the funds appropriated for its maintenance. That policy has been followed from year to year, and the amount carried by the bill has reflected the business and employment needs of the country. We have appropriated in past sessions as high as two and a quarter billion dollars for this purpose. This year, in keeping with the vastly augmented increase in industrial activity throughout the country and the corresponding decline in unemployment throughout the Nation, the President requests only \$875,000,000. In other words, the W. P. A. has made good. It has been successful. It has achieved its objective. It has carried out every purpose for which it was created.

And, in doing so, it has added immeasurably to the wealth of the United States and the health and happiness and welfare of the American people. It has provided for every community in the land enduring and imperishable facilities which those communities could never have provided for themselves without the Federal aid contributed through the W. P. A. and which will benefit them and their people for generations to come.

They have included the improvement and extension of physical facilities for transportation, education, recreation, public health and sanitation, and welfare.

More adequate highway and street systems; new airports; thousands of new and improved school buildings; hospitals, and other public buildings; additional sewage- and water-treatment facilities; and many other tangible achievements have resulted from W. P. A. construction work. Significant contributions to the scope and quality of public services have resulted from the nonconstruction projects through which instruction, recreational leadership, personnel for planning and research have been made available.

As a result of the operation of highway projects the construction or improvement of 565,000 miles of roads and streets had been completed. Rural sections of the country have been the chief beneficiaries of W. P. A. road work in terms of mileage. Roads constructed or reconstructed by W. P. A. workers in rural areas totaled about 498,000 miles.

In urban areas, much of the project work has been directed toward the reduction of traffic congestion. Altogether, a total of 59,000 miles of urban streets and alleys were built or reconditioned. Sixty-nine thousand bridges and viaducts had been completed along with 880,000 new culverts.

Project operations involving construction and improvement of airports and air-navigation facilities have involved work on 90 percent of the air-line stops.

W. P. A. project workers have strung 3,200 miles of telephone and telegraph line. Through this work the fire-fighting efforts of the Forest Service have been greatly facilitated and communication at Army bases and on other federally owned property has been improved. These totals do not include the 3,000

miles of police, fire alarm, and traffic signal lines which W. P. A. workers have installed or reconditioned.

Four thousand eight hundred new school buildings have been constructed through W. P. A. project operations, 1,800 additions built, and 30,000 buildings renovated or modernized. That great need for construction and modernization of school buildings has existed in the United States for some time was indicated by surveys of the United States Office of Education and of the National Education Association which estimated that several million school children were improperly housed, and classes held in buildings condemned by public officials.

Numerous recreational facilities other than buildings also have been constructed by W. P. A. workers. Among them are 2,100 new or enlarged stadiums and grandstands, 1,700 new or larger parks, 2,800 school and city playgrounds, and 2,800 athletic fields; 143 new hospitals, 85 additons, and the improvement of about 1,700 others. Many of the newly built hospitals were provided for towns or communities which previously had been without hospital facilities of any kind.

One hundred and eighty new or enlarged water-treatment plants were completed; also 981 new or enlarged pumping stations, and 293 reconstructed plants, together with 13,000 miles of new and 3,000 miles of improved aqueducts, water mains, and distribution lines.

The drainage and treatment of mosquito-breeding swamps and improvement of drainage structures by W. P. A. workers has been a strong weapon in the fight against malaria.

Direct medical and health services for persons who could not otherwise afford them have been furnished by W. P. A. workers, most of them unemployed physicians, registered nurses, dentists, and chemists. Usually these services are supplementary to those provided by local health agencies at medical and dental clinics, but often they are extended in regions where such services are otherwise not available. During a 2-week period in January 1940 W. P. A. workers assisted in the examination and treatment of 243,000 children and adults. Some were treated in dental and medical clinics, others in their own homes or in public schools and other institutions. During the same period about 83,000 tests—such as the Schick test for susceptibility to diphtheria—and 17,000 immunizations against diphtheria, typhoid fever, whooping cough, and other infectious diseases were given.

Welfare activities of State and local governmental agencies, other than health services, have also been extended through the cooperation of the W. P. A. On sewing-room projects, operated in all States, W. P. A. workers completed 312,000,000 pieces of clothing and 85,000,000 other articles.

Projects on which lunches are served to undernourished school children result not only in better health but in better grades, better school attendance, and better attitudes on the part of the children. From the beginning of the program through December 1940, 575,000,000 lunches were served; currently about

25,000,000 lunches are served each month in about 18,700 participating schools.

For 20 centuries men have been futilely asking that the age-old question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" It remained for this age, and for our people, and for American statesmanship to finally and adequately answer that question—"Yes; we are our brother's keeper. And we are making ample provision for him and his children."

I cannot close without giving credit to whom credit is especially due. And I am certain I express the appreciation generally of this body when I pause to pay a special tribute to Howard Hunter, now serving as Commissioner of W. P. A. No man ever stepped into a more trying position than did Howard Hunter when tragically and unexpectedly called to administer an office which had taxed the courage and ability of two of the ablest men to be found in the national administration. Harry L. Hopkins, now a member of the President's Cabinet first came to especial note through his able initiation of the work in this new and untried field. Along with Col. F. C. Harrington, who succeeded him he bore the brunt of virulent criticism the like of which has not been heard in Congress, at least in recent years. It is an eloquent commentary that in the hearings on the relief bill just closed, there was less criticism of W. P. A. and less personal reflection on the administrator and his staff than in any previous year of its operation. And in no previous year has the W. P. A. shown a finer record of accomplishment than under Mr. Hunter's administration.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the record show that Mr. Hunter had to return some seven or eight hundred dollars he had spent going to horse races?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it positively does not show any such fact, or any other fact which would justify any such conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for bringing out into the open that old and exploded canard which has been covertly circulated and which is without foundation or justification. If anyone desires authoritative information on the origin of this story and its complete refutation, I refer him to page 265 of the hearings before the committee, April 22, 1940, in which the matter was fully discussed and discredited.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will give the gentleman a few additional minutes to explain the \$50,000,000 that is taken out of this appropriation for surplus commodities. I would like to know what the attitude of the gentleman is on that particular point, because the facts are, as I indicated to the gentleman from Virginia this morning, that this is an additional reduction of W. P. A. rolls, no matter how you look at it. The gentleman is very familiar

with it, and I would like to know what his attitude on that particular point is.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman raise the question, and fully share his interest in provision for the employment for as many eligible workers as possible.

The President sent down an estimate for \$875,000,000 for relief, to be expended as the Congress deemed best. The committee in considering it allocated \$825,000,000 of the \$875,000,000 for jobs. Of course, that will not take care of everybody who is eligible for a job on W. P. A. No appropriation we have ever made has been sufficient to take care of all who were eligible, but the vital thing is that this \$825,000,000 more nearly takes care of all those eligibles to W. P. A. than any previous appropriation for the purpose. It more adequately covers the needs of the day than any appropriation which this committee has recommended or the Congress has made in the past.

The committee then allocated the remaining \$50,000,000 to those in need of relief which could not be otherwise provided. There are many in great need, destitute, in need of actual food—families who know not where the next meal is coming from, who have hungry children around a bare breakfast table. It is for these that the \$50,000,000 is to be used. If we had used this for jobs it would have only paid for \$50,000,000 worth of relief, but when we put it into food stamps it provides \$75,000,000 for relief. In other words, we added 50 percent to the amount so provided for relief, and we provided desperately needed relief for those who could not have been helped if the entire amount of the bill had been devoted to the one class eligible under allocations for jobs alone.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The thing that bothers me is how we are going to get it to the people who need it. It is not going to be expansive because the general rule of eligibility to purchase foods under the stamp plan requires that the person be on W. P. A., or some form of relief.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension. It is not required that a family be on W. P. A. in order to be eligible to receive food.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That has been the requirement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Anyone who is receiving Government relief of any character; who is on W. P. A.; who is on social security; who is on blind relief; who has dependent children; and especially those who are on W. P. A. where food stamps are not available, is entitled to an allotment out of the food provided by this \$50,000,000 as carried by the bill.

It expands immeasurably the number of those who are eligible to receive allotments of food and it provides the most urgently needed relief and makes possible the widest distribution that can be arranged.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. I understand about that, but this \$50,000,000 was taken out of the appropriation for W. P. A. Why did not the Agriculture Committee let that stand on its own foundation? The gentleman knows, and I believe I have had sufficient experience around here myself to know, that the surplus commodities plan has been a great success, one of the biggest things that has ever happened in this country. It could stand on its own foundation today without taking it out of the \$886,000,000 here provided for W. P. A. I do not think it should have been done in that way. The gentleman is a member of the great Committee on Agriculture. They should have stood by the recommendation that the \$50,000,000 stay in that bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, this is a relief bill—the only relief bill. Food stamps constitute relief. Food stamps do not help the farmer. They are a disadvantage to the farmer.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman will admit that it helps the businessman in different localities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is certainly right about that. It helps the businessman but it does not help the farmer. Such appropriations have no place in the agricultural appropriation bill. They belong in the relief bill. Food-stamp purchases are a distinct disadvantage to the farmer, because the relief administration hammers down the price of the food bought and takes it away from the farmer at the lowest price level, with the unfortunate result that such prices fix the return on everything the farmer sells. If they would pay parity prices for it, it would be of some help to agriculture; but they buy at destination prices and freeze the farm market at the price paid by the Government, and the farm organizations condemn the practice. I have letters from the American Federation of the Farm Bureau to that effect, which I shall be glad to include as a part of my remarks. I am certain the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has always been a consistent friend of the farmer, would not want to perpetuate a practice which will deprive the producers of the Nation's food of a fair wage for their labor.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I agree heartily with what he has said in reference to the purchase of these surplus commodities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the position of all friends of agriculture. The farm organizations have come out officially and say that it is not farm relief, it is poor relief. It belongs in the relief bill.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to advise my colleague from Missouri that at the proper time I shall offer an amendment to require that in the expenditure of this \$50,000,000 for surplus commodities they shall pay 85 percent of parity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman, with the exception

that instead of 85 percent of parity they should pay full parity.

Mr. KEEFE. They should pay parity, but with the advantage of soil conservation and these other farm-aid programs it would bring it up to about parity.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I share and endorse the gentleman's statement that the purchase of surplus commodities does not aid the farmer. For my part I should like to see all of this authorization taken out of the agricultural bill and put where it belongs.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. No Member of the House understands the farm problem better than the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi—or champions his cause more effectively. In order to complete the record I shall insert the letter from President O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, once again we are confronted with the problem of providing relief for those who are in need. It is, of course, essential that this relief should be provided. It is, of course, right that the Federal Government should assume its fair share of the burden. It is not essential, and it is not right, however, in my judgment that we should be called upon to make provision for this relief through the same unfair and wasteful system that has been in force during the past 6 years.

I disagree fundamentally with various observations just made to the Committee by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. To me there is no justification for compelling the Congress to continue to provide relief by methods which in the past have proven themselves to be inefficient, to be wasteful, to be corrupt; by methods which have served to deprive the needy of millions upon millions of dollars appropriated for their benefit; by methods which have afforded ruinous competition with legitimate private industry; by methods which have harbored the subversive elements in this country; by methods which in my judgment find their chief justification in terms of practical partisan politics.

At the conclusion of the W. P. A. investigation a year ago, I had high hopes that constructive proposals would be made to this House, revising our whole system of administering relief so as to place it on a basis that would be fair to the needy and fair to the country as a whole. The intention to make such proposals was abandoned at the last moment, in my opinion, because of the fact that last year was an election year. There is no election this year; nevertheless no fundamental change is proposed in the method of administering our relief system. Apparently we must go on and on with the same old system, despite the glaring injustice which it has brought to the Nation as a whole and to the needy unemployed themselves.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the statement I have made on the floor of this House

many times that in my judgment the situation calls for a thoroughgoing revision of our present system of relief, that it calls for decentralization and the substitution of grants-in-aid with proper responsibility, both financial and administrative, in the several States of the Union. Only in this manner, in my opinion, can we bring about a system of relief which is really fair to those in need and fair to the country as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer briefly to a few matters brought out in the hearings in connection with the bill now before us.

As has been indicated, the bill on its face carries a total of \$885,905,000. This compares with a Budget estimate of \$886,000,000 and with an appropriation for the current fiscal year of approximately \$1,368,000,000.

W. P. A., which of course receives the major portion of the appropriation, will receive under the committee recommendation \$875,000,000. This is the same amount as recommended by the Budget, and compares with an appropriation for the current fiscal year of \$1,350,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Briefly. I want to make my statement without too many interruptions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understood the gentleman from Virginia to say that the bill carried \$886,000,000, and I understood that was the Budget recommendation; but I notice, as the gentleman says, that in the bill it states \$875,000,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The total of \$886,000,000 carries with it \$11,000,000 for administrative funds for projects operated by Federal agencies other than W. P. A.

W. P. A., as has been pointed out, under the committee recommendation will receive \$50,000,000 less than recommended by the Budget. I call attention in passing, however, to the fact that there is an unexpended balance amounting to about \$29,000,000 which will be available for those in need over and above the amount specifically carried in the bill, and also that there is a further item of about \$4,224,000 which will be available to those in need not contemplated in the Budget estimate by reason of the fact that the committee has reduced the total available for administrative expenses to that extent without reducing the total carried by the bill as a whole.

If allowed, the sum recommended will provide for the employment of an average of something less than 1,000,000 persons a month during the next fiscal year, as compared with 1,300,000 on the rolls in June 1941 and with an average of about 1,700,000 on the rolls during the current fiscal year. The amount, if allowed, will bring the total appropriated for W. P. A. in a period of 7 fiscal years to the sum of approximately \$10,404,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, as previous speakers have indicated, a number of recommendations have been made looking to abolishing the restrictions which have been thrown around the administration of W. P. A. by Congress in the last 2 or 3 years. One or two modifications have been al-

lowed, but for the most part they have been disallowed in the belief, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has stated, that the restrictions have worked well in the main and that they are more important under present conditions than they have been in the past.

Just a word as to the relative-need clause, which has also been referred to. As the members of the committee know, Congress has provided that W. P. A. employment shall be determined, insofar as practicable, on the basis of relative need, and that where relative need is the same the veterans' preference shall apply. W. P. A. tells us that in administering this provision it has arbitrarily divided all persons into two groups. Group 1 contains those who have no income whatsoever. Group 2 contains those persons who have some income, but an income which is insufficient. Those representing veteran organizations of this country tell us that as a result of this arbitrary method of carrying out the intent of Congress veterans in many instances have been denied the preference that Congress intended they should receive. The committee has emphasized in its report its desire that those preferences shall be scrupulously observed. If this is not sufficient to assure the desired end, then, in my judgment, the legislation should be amended sufficiently to carry out the will of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak also of the types of projects embodied in the W. P. A. program. The record indicates that in the present fiscal year about 70 percent of the program has been devoted to construction projects, 27 percent being devoted to educational, recreational, and research projects, and 3 percent to vocational training. Four hundred and fifty thousand workers, or 26 percent of the total, have been employed on so-called national-defense construction projects. During the coming year it is intended to maintain approximately the same ratio, 70 percent being allocated to construction work, the amount of defense work increasing so as to absorb about one-half of that total.

I have no doubt that there are some national-defense projects which it is entirely proper to carry on under W. P. A. In my judgment, however, there is no justification for a policy which hands over to W. P. A. major elements in the construction work required for national defense.

W. P. A., as we know, has brought ruinous competition to private industry. The testimony a year ago indicated that it had usurped something like 54 percent of the entire public-works construction program in this country. It has been notoriously inefficient. It has been notoriously extravagant. Expert testimony during the W. P. A. investigation indicated an efficiency of not to exceed 40 percent on road and highway work and a cost of something like 250 percent in building construction as compared with similar work done under private contract. It seems to me that in the main, projects within our national-defense program—particularly the large projects—should be limited to projects supervised by the Army and Navy and done under private

contract with the assurance of comparative economy and comparative efficiency.

As we look at the picture as a whole, Mr. Chairman, we find the same old story we have been over in past years. When it comes to fixing the total Federal contribution, there is no specific formula. It is just a hit-or-miss estimate in the light of estimated unemployment, in the light of the index of production, and such other factors as may be brought into the picture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We are told that in the next fiscal year we are going to have a national income of \$92,000,000,000, the largest national income on record. We are told that the Federal Reserve index of production today is 28 percent above what it was a year ago and 31 percent above what it was back in the boom days of 1929. We are told that total employment is about 3,000,000 above what it was a year ago and over 500,000 above what it was in 1929. We know that the defense program is under way and due to reach its peak in the next fiscal year. We know that the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps are expanding; that Mr. Knudsen is providing for the expenditure of billions of dollars; that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is spending hundreds of millions of dollars; and that Congress has appropriated many more millions under such acts as the so-called Lanham acts. Only yesterday the press carried the statement by various Federal officials in Chicago that 4,000,000 additional skilled workers will be needed in defense industries during the next 12 months.

The estimate of the W. P. A. of decreased unemployment against that background during the next 12 months is 1,500,000 persons. In the light of that estimate, it has recommended that there be a reduction of 300,000 below the number on the rolls in June and 700,000 below the average during the present fiscal year.

If we look at the matter of W. P. A. distribution between the several States, we find again the same hit or miss action. It is true that recently W. P. A. has been trying to work under the 40-40-10-10 formula, but there is still wide discretion in the hands of the Administrator. If anybody has any doubt as to the inequalities as between the several States, I suggest that he refer to the table appearing at page 206 of the hearings on this bill.

I suggest also that he look at the table on page 208 of the hearings, which deals with sponsors' contributions, and which shows that since the beginning of W. P. A. we have realized only about \$495,000,000 from these contributions and only about \$65,000,000 of that total in cash.

There is absolutely no uniform standard for the determination of need. The record indicates the widest variation in standards as between the several States.

The W. P. A. investigation brought out a lamentable lack of supervision in reference to such matters as the purchase of supplies, inventories, engineering, spon-

sors' contributions, and expenditures generally. How much that supervision has improved is not apparent. It is certainly far from encouraging, however, to find W. P. A. today in the hands of an Acting Administrator who, as appears from the hearings of the W. P. A. investigating committee a year ago, saw fit to falsify travel vouchers, to broadcast over the air false statements which he must or should have known to be false, and who today assumes full responsibility for appointment to the W. P. A. rolls of David Lasser.

Reference has already been made to David Lasser. As we all know, he was formerly president of the Workers Alliance. As such, he was a member of the national executive board. If you will refer to the W. P. A. investigation hearings you will find that at the time of those hearings, according to the testimony of former Communists, 15 out of 23 members of the national executive board of the Workers Alliance were known or admitted Communists. Twenty-two out of twenty-seven members of the board controlling greater New York; 17 out of 21 members of the board controlling New York City; 22 out of 25 members of the board controlling Harlem; and 80 percent of the State officials in Pennsylvania were said to be also known or admitted Communists.

This is the organization over which David Lasser formerly presided. He also helped lead the march on the capitol in Harrisburg, Pa., as photographs in the committee files will prove. He is today drawing \$4,400 on the Federal W. P. A. pay roll as a labor-relations expert. The record makes it clear that he was sought out and offered his present position by the present head of the W. P. A., Howard O. Hunter, who has just been confirmed in his present position by the Senate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee will recall that Congress has provided in the last year or two that no one shall be placed or retained on the rolls of W. P. A. unless he is willing to sign an affidavit indicating that he is neither a Communist nor a member of the Nazi Bund. The record in this connection indicates that during the past year 317 persons refused to sign this affidavit, being dropped from the rolls as a result, and that in 400 other instances persons who had signed the affidavit were accused of doing so dishonestly. About 50 percent of these 400 were dropped, the charge being substantiated after investigation by W. P. A.

The Committee will also have in mind the numerous types of irregularities developed in the investigation of W. P. A. The report of the counsel for the committee included about 35 different types of irregularities. A senior inspector from the General Accounting Office, with 37 years in the service, stated at the time that he would say without hesitation that W. P. A. was the "rottest organization" with which he had come in contact.

W. P. A. reports for the calendar year 1940, 2,803 complaints investigated, of

which 557 were pay-roll irregularities, 1,051 benefits to private property, 418 thefts and embezzlements, 164 material and equipment irregularities, and 593 other irregularities. The total was greater than that in 1939. It was greater than that in 1938.

For the first 4 months of this calendar year, W. P. A. reports 841 similar irregularities, 185 pay-roll irregularities, 199 benefits to private property, 143 thefts and embezzlements, 47 material and equipment irregularities, and 267 other irregularities.

W. P. A. also reports that these irregularities have been substantiated in the number of 1,940 and that they have resulted in 754 discharges, 32 demotions, 261 suspensions and reprimands, 42 vendors debarred from bidding, and 106 convictions through the Department of Justice. In 944 cases restitution has been demanded in respect to claims amounting to well over \$4,000,000. Only 16 percent of this total has been realized to date in cash or otherwise.

The Committee will recall the major scandals developed in the investigation a year ago, particularly in Louisiana and Tennessee and Indiana and Pennsylvania. A partial report on these scandals, limited to Louisiana, will be found in the hearings on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for the current fiscal year at page 76. A further report was requested in these hearings. This report has not been furnished. It is significant, however, that State Administrator Crutcher, of Louisiana, State Administrator Jennings, of Indiana, and State Administrator Goodman, of Kentucky are still on the job and apparently in good standing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, your committee has reduced the amount available for administrative expenditure by about 20 percent to \$36,466,000. Those on the rolls at the present time number 19,277 classified as administrative personnel, plus 65,850 classified as supervisory personnel, a total of about 85,000 persons to administer this undertaking.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has pointed out, while so-called administrative personnel has decreased, so-called supervisory personnel has increased to almost exactly the same extent. What percentage it is fair to attribute to administrative expenditure depends on your definition of that expenditure. A computation made sometime ago indicated that on the basis of so-called administrative personnel, alone, it amounted to 3.7 percent. On the other hand, including the so-called supervisory personnel, it amounted to about 11.16 percent.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWTHER. Previously, when we have had up the appropriation for W. P. A., there have been amendments offered to increase the amount. If I

recall correctly, they have generally been defeated and the amount has been allocated that the committee brought in, but following that and in the early days of the following Congress, nearly always in January, there has been a very large appropriation to carry them through to the 30th of June, the end of the fiscal year. Is there any anticipation in the minds of the members of the committee that an additional amount will be asked for to carry them to the 30th of June, as has been done in the past?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the gentleman is correct in his observation. I may say in reply that this appropriation is made on the basis of a full 12 months. So far as the committee knows, there is no intention or purpose to ask for more, as has been done in the past.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

M. O'NEAL. It is true, however, that formerly they appropriated for a period of 8 months for W. P. A. and it was specifically stated that the appropriation was to run for just a limited part of a year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That was done on at least one occasion, but I think the observation of the gentleman from New York will stand as a general statement.

Mr. CROWTHER. If the gentleman will permit, I think that is correct. As to one bill, the gentleman from Kentucky is correct, but I think on the other occasions the amount presumably was for the fiscal year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer, in passing, under the heading of "Administrative expenditure," to the well-known Division of Information. If you will look at the request in connection with this bill, you will find an actual increase in both personnel and dollars as compared with the present fiscal year. The request was for 160 persons, as compared with 149 in the present year, at a cost of \$349,510, as compared with \$303,800 in the present fiscal year.

The W. P. A. reports, among other things in this connection, during a period of 16 months, the preparation of 355 press releases, 75 speeches, 11 issues of a weekly bulletin, 478 articles for trade journals, miscellaneous articles for Government manuals, encyclopedias, and radio script, 37 exhibits, and weekly 15-minute transcription programs for 575 radio stations.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on administrative costs?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman believe that three and a fraction percent for administrative costs is a pretty good showing, even in private business?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it is; but I think, as I have already indicated, that if you include the so-called supervisory personnel you get a figure that runs as high as 11.16 percent.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Why should they be included?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think a great many of those who are classified as supervisory personnel should be included in the administrative cost, because they are, in fact, doing administrative work and should be so classified. It has been very convenient, from my observation, to transfer them from one force to another so as to limit so-called administrative expenditure.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The supervisors, as I have observed, then, certainly do not belong under the administrative expenditures of W. P. A.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Some of them, certainly, do not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I care to take any further time. We have been operating under this W. P. A. system now for 6 long years. This appropriation carries the system on for a seventh year. It seems to me that the inefficiency, waste, corruption, damage to private industry, and unfairness to those who have been in need, resulting under W. P. A. must have become apparent in every part of the country.

Today we are confronted by a great national emergency. We need every dollar we can obtain for national-defense purposes. The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, have both emphasized the importance of cutting nondefense expenditure to the bone.

It seems to me a sad commentary that we cannot at this time revise a method of relief which has lent itself to such extravagance and such abuse; that we cannot take the system as a whole and put it on a basis which is sound, on a basis which is fair to those in need, which is fair to the national-defense program, which is fair to the 130,000,000 Americans in this land of ours. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I shall do the best I can to say some of the more important things I want to say in 10 minutes. What is national defense? I believe that national defense means strengthening the Nation. I think it begins with the spirit on the part of the people. I believe that the American people have got to think a little more deeply about what the United States really means and what it has done in the history of the world than we have ever done before, and I direct the attention of the House to a speech which I put into the RECORD today by Marian Hedges, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which I think, gentlemen, you will find inspiring on this point. Unless we have full use of all of the natural resources, all of the industrial resources, and all of the human resources in our Nation, we never can achieve a real balanced national defense, and, furthermore, unless every group in the population feels and knows that they are having an opportunity to do their part, unless they have that experience, the feeling that they are part and parcel of the national effort, we will fail to that extent.

When the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] had the floor this morning, there was a long discussion with many Members participating about the question of whether \$50,000,000 out of this fund should be transferred to the food-stamp plan of the Department of Agriculture or not. I believe that the food-stamp plan is the most constructive method yet devised for dealing with the problem of our so-called agricultural surpluses. I think it is absolutely sound and I would like to see it extended, but the question is not a question as to whether it is a good plan; the question is how many people are there in this Nation who have not work, who cannot get work under the defense program or under the expansion which follows as a result of it, but who should be at work, and who, but for the W. P. A., would not have work. That is the real question. At the present time there are as many people duly certified in need of W. P. A. employment as there are employed. In other words, about 1,300,000 people are employed by the W. P. A. today, and as many more certified as in need of work and yet we find here a proposal is made to us that we should cut 700,000 people off the rolls. Who are those people?

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In a moment. The average age has been stated to be 44 years, and half the people on the W. P. A. program are over 45. I know a lot of them personally, and I know that they are not the same people who could go to work to build airplanes or ships, but are people who can do certain other things. They are people who need work, and they are people who if they are at work the United States will be better off than if they are not at work. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from California. I do not think there is any more sincere man in his interest in respect to the relief program. I am particularly interested in the concluding statement the gentleman just made. He suggests, what is the country going to do with these people who have attained the age of 40 years or over, and what is the situation which presents itself to us today, when they cannot obtain lucrative employment under the expansion due to defense work, and with W. P. A. cut off?

Has the gentleman given any consideration to the best method of approach to this problem for the Nation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very glad the gentleman asked me that question. If it were up to me to decide the policy of the United States at this time I would tell you what it would be. It would be a policy of saying that we were going to see that every person in this Nation who is entitled and willing to work should be at work. It would be a policy of saying that we were going to make the fullest possible use of the labor of every single person. I am not saying, and I do not say, that I would do all of that by expansion of W. P. A.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] this morning said that it was a work program. I agree with him. I probably agree with him so much that

he would probably not agree with me. What I have always believed is that we should have a program, part of which could be run by means of contracts that would be let, but where you would be able to be sure that people otherwise unemployed would get work, and part of which where contracts are not feasible would be run on the general program that W. P. A. is run on now. But I would not go out and arbitrarily cut these rolls, when I know that people will go on direct relief if I did it. I would adopt a policy of saying, "Let the relief rolls cut themselves as people go to work in private industry," because I have yet to meet this much-talked-about individual on W. P. A. who likes to stay there. I would like to meet him, but I never have met him. The people on W. P. A. that I know are people who would give anything in the world if they could get a private job elsewhere. I feel that it is going to be difficult for some of these folks to understand why it is that on yesterday we passed a \$10,000,000,000 military appropriation bill, which I voted for, and yet that we attempt to make a saving of a relatively small amount of money at the expense of 700,000 jobs. I just think that is going to be hard to understand, and I do not think we ought to do it. I believe the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] should prevail, and I earnestly hope that it will.

I want to read a few sentences from an editorial by David Lawrence in the United States News. It is in the issue of June 6. It reads as follows:

In the period just ahead. \* \* \*

Many factories, without defense orders, will close for lack of steel or aluminum or rubber or copper or zinc or other defense materials.

Many workers with jobs in these factories will be out of jobs.

Many merchants selling goods that are made of materials useful for defense will find it more and more difficult to restock as the shelves are emptied.

Many consumers with dollars to spend will find it harder to obtain the goods they want; will be limited in what they can buy.

It's just that the defense honeymoon is coming to an end.

In other words, just as Great Britain discovered, although the defense program spent a great deal of money, and employed a certain type of people, you will almost certainly get a certain amount of correlative unemployment in other industries which cannot keep, because of large defense programs. That is a proposition that has to be met and met squarely, in view of the existing situation and in view of the fact that we are attempting to draw our Nation into one great unified, determined whole. Every American citizen has his part. Every American citizen must have his place and a chance to play his part.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] stated that if we were going to have a national income of \$92,000,000 and still we would have necessity for the Government to have a work program for certain people, there was something wrong with the economic system. I agree with that, but I still think we will have this necessity and the con-

servative Industrial Conference Board has estimated that in the fiscal year 1942 the best that can be expected is a total unemployment of 5,000,000. That is less than it has been. But, because it is less, because those men are old fellows, getting a little gray around the temples, is no reason to turn our backs on them. In fact, the situation is likely to be much more difficult and much harder than it has been before. I would say that at least until two things are done, until you have constructive changes in the monetary system and until you have a method of distribution of purchasing power much more effective than it is now, you will have, even with a national income of \$92,000,000,000, a certain considerable volume of unemployment. I am not saying that W. P. A. is the way to answer that because, frankly, I do not believe it is. There are better ways to answer it, but until such time as you bring in those other ways, or I bring them in, or we all do it, it is a matter of justice to see that the head of a family shall be able to have an opportunity to make bread and butter for his family by useful work for the benefit of the United States of America today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I had hoped earnestly that the 18 months' provision would be done away with in this bill. I have felt all along that it worked a great deal of injustice. I did not resent the committee imposing it in the first place. I think perhaps there were some good arguments for it in the first place, but today I just do not believe there are. I believe that by and large you will find mighty few people, as I have already said, on W. P. A. who want to stay there. I think it mixes up the program. People who are doing recreational work in some of our overcrowded communities, where because of defense factories, there is great need for that work, and it is most important, come to March or April or January in the middle of the school year and essential work has to be laid off. Usually they do not get back on again in the same place they were before. Very seldom does that happen.

I want to read a little portion of the Dies committee report for this year, because a great deal has been made by some of the gentlemen in opposition here about one David Lasser. I read from the Dies committee report, page 22, where it discusses the Workers Alliance. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], pointed out there were Communists in various positions in the Workers Alliance. That is true. All I want to say is that I think the situation was a lot less bad than it would have been, because you had at least one man who was not a Communist and who fought them from the beginning. Here is what the committee states:

Our committee kept the spotlight of publicity turned upon the Workers Alliance. Finally, its influence was destroyed when it became apparent to all that its control was in the hands of the agents of Moscow. Its non-Communist element withdrew under the

leadership of David Lasser in June of this year, and today the Workers Alliance is a mere shadow of its former self—without influence anywhere and completely discredited.

It is all very well for political purposes to make accusations that cannot hold water. I do not expect people to agree with everything Mr. Lasser ever did, or with his point of view. In my judgment, however, he is not a Communist and, according to his lights he attempts to the best of his ability, in my humble judgment, to serve the patriotic interests of the United States. I will say this—that in the period of the greatest unemployment we have ever had I think it was a tough job for a fellow to stay in there and try to do his best in a situation that admittedly and according to even the speeches that are made purportedly against Mr. Lasser, was a very difficult situation.

I should like to conclude by saying this—and I will speak rather frankly—I have already indicated I have a very deep and profound interest in the stamp plan. I frankly think that the right thing to have done about this matter would have been to have added the \$50,000,000 instead of cutting the W. P. A. I do not want to see the stamp plan taken out of the Department of Agriculture and placed elsewhere, because I think too much of it. I think it is the most effective approach to the problem of so-called agricultural surpluses we have ever had; but just as soon as it is taken out of the Department of Agriculture you are going to find it is going to be shot at just like every program that gets down to meeting the big basic needs of the people is always shot at; and I do not want to see that happen to it. It is not a thing, obviously, that I can go into in the few minutes I have left.

The purpose of W. P. A. as I see it today, is to do two things: To make such contribution as it can with the people on its rolls directly to national defense. I agree it would be better if those national-defense projects could be all regular projects handled in the regular way, but sometimes they cannot be, and we are dependent upon W. P. A. to build most of the airports in the country. As a matter of fact—and I think they should get credit for it; I mean the men who built them ought to get credit, the men who did the work. The other thing W. P. A. should do is to provide useful work for people who cannot get work any place else. We know from the figures that there are today in the neighborhood of about 3,000,000 such people who have already been investigated and found to be in need. I do not think it makes sense to cut them in the way this bill will. I am not blaming the committee because, as the committee has pointed out, it was a recommendation from the Budget. I am just stating what my position is. I believe now is the time we should hold the program where it was and, as we find people get jobs, then cut the program in accordance with the actual experience.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, until I heard the speech of my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I had always supposed that a eulogy was concerned with the dead. As I listened to his eulogistic efforts I could not help but think that probably he was fearful the time had arrived when W. P. A. was to draw the draperies of its couch about it and lie down to its eternal dreams. As I listened to the eulogy I could not help but remember a part of the examination conducted by my distinguished friend from Missouri, which examination is carried on pages 114, 115, and 116 of the hearings. It is a most illuminating effort on the part of a lawyer to put the best face on a sorry situation. I wish you would read this examination.

Instead of using the leading language of my friend from Missouri you might just take the trend of that examination and I believe you will agree with me when you have concluded, that the gentleman from Missouri realized that the charges that had been made against W. P. A. were pretty well founded. Instead of asking the question: "Have you had any charges of misappropriation of funds?" as my friend from Missouri did, he might have asked: "Has the misappropriation of funds continued?", or as he took another one of the conditions, either sins of omission or commission, he might have asked: "When did the use of W. P. A. funds or W. P. A. labor on private property stop?"

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, for the present I prefer not to yield. In due time I hope the opportunity will be available for me to be most courteous to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Or my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], might have asked: "When did W. P. A. cease to be under active communistic control?" Or, again, as this whitewash brush was used, he might have asked: "When did the undue political influence of W. P. A. come to a stop?" Mark you, he is examining the Administrator. He might have said, "When did the partisan use of funds by W. P. A. come to an end?" Then he might have summed up all of this splendid examination of his, this examination which reminds me for all the world of an examination by an old lawyer when he asked the question, "When did you stop beating your wife?" I say the gentleman from Missouri might have brought a splendid climax to this examination of his by asking, "When did mismanagement and maladministration of W. P. A. cease?"

But he did not do that. The very fact that he tried this W. P. A. whitewash method as he did; the very fact that he stoop up here in the well of the House and made this lengthy eulogy about the innocence, the virtue, and the blamelessness of W. P. A., seems to me to indicate some apprehension on his part. There must be some suspicion abroad that where there is so much smoke, which my friend was trying to blow away by that forensic effort of his, there must be some fire.

The fact of the matter is that most of us remember those days when W. P. A. was not as bold, not as brazen in its claim of the cloak of innocence. Many of us remember the splendid work of a distinguished and fearless Democrat, true to the best traditions of the great State of Virginia. Many of us remember the courage and fearlessness with which he took that record of W. P. A. and laid it bare. That record—oh, that record had its shame to it. It had shame which caused most of the adherents of the New Deal—yes; and most of its devout disciples—to blush. But my distinguished friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] took that record; he laid it bare, not only to the critical eyes of partisan Republicans; he laid it bare to the scrutiny and examination of every honest and every reasonable man in America. We remember W. P. A. We remember now that if there is any virtue in it; if it has any claim to innocence, it is due to the fact there was one Democrat courageous enough to lead the fight to try to bring the truth out of that deplorable condition which had so shocked and startled most of the American people that it bordered close to an incident.

W. P. A. stands convicted before the bar of public opinion. It stands so convicted, not by reason of its reform, not by reason of its belated effort at contrition, not by reason of the penitence it is trying to do, but it stands convicted before the bar of public opinion by reason of what its record was before an investigating committee of the House. Therefore my friend from Missouri could say, "You are not mismanaged any more. You are not maladministered any more. You are not permitting undue political influence to continue any more. You are not using the funds in a partisan way any more. You are not having any communistic control any more. You do not use public money on private projects any more. You do not have any misappropriation of funds any more." But I cannot help but wonder what would have happened; I wonder to what length this thing might have gone; I wonder what boldness and brazenness might have been resorted to, had it not been for the gentleman from Virginia who, I know, by reason of his courage, has merited the approbation of all right-thinking American people. I attempt no undue flattery of my distinguished friend over on the other side of the aisle who, as I said before, exemplifies those splendid traditions of the great State of Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, we have had some observations made about David Lasser. I am not going to detain the House with a lengthy statement about the gentleman. The fact of the matter is I am fearful that probably the references that we are making to him magnify him out of all proportion to his real importance. However, in order that the record might be kept straight I will, under the privilege to revise and extend my remarks, try to give the House just as complete, unbiased, unprejudiced a picture as I can of David Lasser. Then after you have read it, I want you to be honest with yourselves, as I know you will be, and determine whether or not you think

his appointment to a \$4,400-a-year job represents the type of management and control that, in your judgment, will bring the best results to this great army of administrators of work relief.

I am not going to frame the indictment; I am not doing to draw the bill of particulars; I am just going to give you the facts and then have you determine whether the present Administrator has discharged to the American people the great responsibility which rests upon his shoulders when he says, "I was the one to appoint this man to this very responsible position that he presently occupies."

In March 1935, at a meeting in Washington, D. C., David Lasser organized the first Workers Alliance which is not to be confused with the present organization.

The present Workers Alliance of America was formed at a meeting in March 1936 in the Department of Labor auditorium in Washington through the amalgamation of the Workers Alliance Mr. Lasser had formed the previous year, together with national unemployment councils and the national unemployment leagues. The national unemployment leagues were organized by one Mr. Arnold Johnson, an avowed Communist. The national unemployment councils were originally organized by Mr. Herbert Benjamin, also an avowed Communist. In the newly organized Workers Alliance 48 of its affiliates were from the national unemployment leagues and 67 from the national unemployment councils.

It may be well at this point to say a few words about Mr. Herbert Benjamin. He was born in Illinois about 1896, the eldest of a family of 14 children. He worked for a short time in a Buffalo steel mill. Shortly after the first World War he became an active Communist. In 1929 he was first sent to jail in Philadelphia. In 1934 he spent another year in jail in the Southwest.

Upon the formation of the Workers Alliance in 1936, Mr. Benjamin made a report to the Third International, Communist Party in Moscow:

On April 7 to 19, 1936, nearly 700 delegates representing all the major unemployment organizations in the United States met in joint convention at Washington and merged their forces into a single unified organization. The merger represented the successful culmination of a campaign conducted for nearly 4 years by the Communist Party of the United States of America and by the National Unemployment Councils which were organized also by the Communist Party since the time of the crisis late in 1929.

As created in 1936 the Workers Alliance was headed by Mr. Lasser as president and Mr. Benjamin was secretary-treasurer. There was also an administrative committee of 5 that met every 2 weeks and an executive council of 23 members that met quarterly.

The Workers Alliance held another convention in Milwaukee, Wis., in June 1937. It organized a so-called hunger strike on Washington in August 1937, and held another convention in Cleveland, Ohio, in September 1938.

The Workers Alliance is essentially composed of persons employed on W. P. A. projects and other unemployed persons. The national organization is a federation

of State and local organizations. The members of these organizations pay dues of various amounts, ranging from 15 to 25 cents per month for unemployed persons and from 35 cents to \$1 per month for employed persons. A part of these monthly dues went into the treasury of the national organization. At its height, according to Mr. Lasser, the organization had about 260,000 members. Of this number, barely 130,000 actually paid dues. Mr. Lasser testified that 20 percent of the members were women, 10 percent were Negroes, and 5 percent were foreigners.

The Workers Alliance was recognized as a collective bargaining agency by the Work Projects Administration for persons employed on its projects. Thus Mr. Aubrey Williams, Deputy Administrator of the W. P. A., wrote to Mr. Lasser on September 3, 1936:

We recognize the workers' right to organize in such form as they wish to organize. Organization is their own affair. We do not recognize you as the only organization for the workers, inasmuch as such action might be construed as promotion by the administration of company unionism. We affirm the workers' right to organize and choose their own representatives, together with the corresponding obligation of administration officials to deal with such representatives in the adjustment of grievances and consideration of recommendations.

In these ways, we recognize you as a collective bargaining agency, and repeat that we do so and have done so formally and officially on several occasions in the past.

The Workers Alliance in 1937 and 1938 took great pride in organizing strikes and other disorders among workers on W. P. A. projects. Thus in an article appearing in *The Nation* for September 10, 1938, entitled "Lasser and the Workers Alliance," by Mr. Selden Rodman, it was proudly boasted:

The 4 years' growth of the unified organization has been marked by three significant developments. The first was the transplantation of labor's sit-down technique to the relief situation. The trial encounter took place in March 1936 at Madison, Wis. When the pickets arrived at the Capitol, Phil La Follette greeted them in person and advised them to turn the heat on the legislators. Ten days later, with the charges of rule by minority coercion growing, he asked them to leave. Early in May of the same year Governor Hoffman of New Jersey informed John Spain of the Workers Alliance that nothing short of invasion and insurrection could make him borrow money or divert State funds for adequate relief. The Workers Alliance took him at his word. "An insurrection is in progress," said Spain. And for 9 days a hundred workers made themselves as comfortable as possible among the oaken desks and brass rails. Three months later, inspired by this example, the Pennsylvania organization marched its tattered infantry into the galleries of the State Senate at Harrisburg and didn't get out until the startled legislators had promised an additional \$45,000 for the coming 6 months.

Thus apparently they took great credit for the attack on the Pennsylvania Legislature in August 1936. Concerning this assault on the State Senate of Pennsylvania, the *New York Times* of August 2, 1936, says:

Just how the 2,000 hunger marchers who made news this week fit into the bizarre picture of the relief squabbles is a matter of

some dispute. The last invasion of Harrisburg by the unemployed was the third to be promoted since the legislature went into session on May 4.

The question of who promoted the march assumed some importance after 500 or 600 of the jobless, armed with sticks and apparently unweakened lungs, howled and beat on the gallery railings for 2 hours to prevent the senate from recessing until long after midnight Tuesday morning.

When it was disclosed that Governor Earle had ordered \$4,000 appropriated from a State fund to provide food for the "invaders" and when Lt. Gov. Thomas Kennedy, also a Democrat, announced at first a policy of non-interference with any demonstrations of approval or criticism of Senate tactics, Republicans openly charged that the Earle administration had sponsored the "march" for political purposes (August 2, 1936).

Final adjournment came 17 hours after the officially set time of noon yesterday. The "hunger marchers," who had occupied the galleries for nearly 3 weeks with the announced intention of forcing a relief appropriation of \$100,000,000, nevertheless shouted "victory" after the \$45,000,000 bill was passed. This is supposed to care for relief needs until January 31.

The unemployed left behind them damage to the senate gallery and rest rooms estimated at about \$7,000 (August 8, 1936).

As an indication of the Communist nature of the Workers Alliance the following paragraph from an article by Mr. Stanley High in the Saturday Evening Post for December 10, 1938, entitled "Who Organized the Unemployed" is of interest. Mr. High describes the 1938 convention of the organization in these words:

In general, however, the Communists in the organization, up to now, have had good going. They no longer even take the trouble to cover their tracks. At the sessions of the September convention a dozen salesmen manned all the entrances and exits to hawk the *Daily Worker*. Bills were distributed, advertising a talk by Earl Browder. Tables were loaded with party literature and the available wall space covered with posters for all the variety of causes, from Spain to China, which are dear to the Communist heart. For the Communists themselves, a Workers Alliance convention is an old-home week. At Cleveland all the known party members for miles around came to revel in the congenial atmosphere and to fraternize with the delegates.

In the autumn of 1938 the Workers Alliance decided to try to raise \$50,000 to defeat Congressmen who were opposed to increased funds for relief. Due to the fact that the Senate committee investigating campaign expenditures carefully pointed out that unless they filed statements with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House they were violating the Corrupt Practices Act, the national organization desisted from raising this fund but it is quite apparent that the local organizations carried on political activities in 1938. Mr. Stanley High points out their activity relative to the defeat of Mr. O'Connor:

The success in this year's primaries to which the Alliance points with the greatest pride is the defeat in the primary, in New York City, of John O'Connor and the registering thereby of one victory in the succession of Mr. Roosevelt's purge defeats. For that contest the Alliance gave its all. Its strategy is said to have been directed behind the scenes

by those able confidants of the President, Tommy Corcoran and Dave Niles. The visible strategists were Sam Wiseman, the Communist veteran, and Moe Howard. Howard grew up in politics on the sidewalks of New York's East Side. He rose eventually to a place as Tammany precinct captain. The depression landed him on the W. P. A., where he gave extracurricular aid to the Workers Alliance. The Alliance eventually employed his political talents on a full-time basis.

The primary campaign which this board directed against Mr. O'Connor was in the best Tammany tradition. It left nothing to chance. The brunt of the leg work was done by a hand-picked company of 200 Alliance shock brigadiers. Their work was facilitated by a list of relief and W. P. A. clients, and with that they made a door-to-door canvass. The 400 W. P. A. workers who lived in the O'Connor district were the objects of particularly persistent attention. On orders from Washington, all W. P. A. projects were shut down promptly at 2 o'clock on primary-election day to give a chance for all its good men to come to the aid of the party. In this district, at least, they did. Mr. O'Connor was beaten by something like 500 votes.

In 1939 the Workers Alliance protested vigorously because of reductions in appropriations for W. P. A. and because Congress provided that the money appropriated by it should be spent throughout the entire fiscal year and not for only a part thereof. In the spring of 1939 the Workers Alliance issued a press release which Mr. Lasser admitted he wrote. This press release stated in part:

We believe that the reactionary congressional group that imposed the \$50,000,000 cut secured a majority only as a result of misrepresentation, outright lies, parliamentary tricks, bluffs, and threats.

The release went on to recommend that the W. P. A. violate the provisions of an act of Congress requiring that the funds appropriated should be used during the whole fiscal year:

In the meantime we will ask the administration to schedule the funds now available to last until June 20, 10 days in advance of the end of the period for which they were voted, and thus avoid the necessity of making further lay-offs.

In the fall of 1937 Mr. Lasser went to Russia on the invitation of the Russian trade-union movement as a representative of the Workers Alliance. Mr. Lasser admitted that approximately half of his expenses on the trip to Russia were paid by the Workers Alliance. He said that he also went to see the members of the Workers Alliance who were members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade engaged in fighting in the Spanish civil war. He admitted that he made various speeches in France and England before trade-union groups.

The following interrogation of Mr. Benjamin by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH in the hearings of the House committee for investigation of the W. P. A. is of distinct interest when it is remembered that the examination took place in the presence of Mr. Lasser:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are, of course, familiar with all the members of the board?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I know them; yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How long have you known Mr. Harold Brockway, from Washington?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I would say about 2½ or 3 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He represented the Washington State Action Committee, did he not, at the same time that you were with the National Unemployment Councils of the United States?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Yes, sir; he represented this independent unemployed organization in the State of Washington.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is Mr. Brockway a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I would be unable to say definitely. I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you not know that he ran for Governor of Washington on a Communist ticket in 1936?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I must say that I have no personal knowledge of that, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How long have you known Mr. Arnold Johnson?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Oh, about 5 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is Mr. Johnson a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I believe he is, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How about Mr. Chester Watson, of Minnesota?

Mr. BENJAMIN. To my best knowledge and belief, he is not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How long have you known Mr. Sam Wiseman, of New York?

Mr. BENJAMIN. About 6 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is he a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I believe he is, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. Just a moment, Mr. Wiggleworth; I would like to ask a question right at this point. Did I not this morning question you on this very matter and at that time you testified that you had no personal knowledge of the political affiliations of any of these members?

Mr. BENJAMIN. It is true, sir; I could not generalize about all of them.

Mr. McMILLAN. I showed you the list of them this morning and asked you to look them over, and that was your testimony?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I stated, sir, that in this case I believe the man is and in case where I had doubts I could not say. I could not generalize on the question. I had no personal knowledge of each one of them. I could only say what I believed to be so.

Mr. McMILLAN. It was my understanding of your testimony this morning that I showed you the list and you said that you had no personal knowledge of any of them, whether they were Communists or members of any other party.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Let me ask you, Mr. Benjamin, there is another Mr. Watson on the board, Mr. Russell Watson, of Pennsylvania. How long have you known him?

Mr. BENJAMIN. About 2 or 3 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He also is a Communist, is he not?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Would you say he did not run as a Communist candidate for magistrate in Philadelphia 2 years ago, in 1937?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I am not aware of that, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How about Mr. Talbot, of Utah?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I know him very slightly, sir, and I could not say.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not know whether he is a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have very little knowledge of Mr. Talbot.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How many years have you been connected with the Communist Party, yourself?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Eighteen years, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If he had run for Governor on the Communist ticket out in Utah in 1936, wouldn't you have known of it?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I do not think I knew Mr. Talbot until the time of our last convention in 1937, and I would not have any occasion to know him, necessarily. I might accidentally have stumbled on information, but I would have no particular occasion to know.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not recall now that he did run for Governor of Utah in 1936?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have no knowledge of that, sir; never heard of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How about the North Carolina member, Hazel Dawson; you have known her for some time?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Only since our last national convention.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is she a Communist or not?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have no knowledge, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not know?

Mr. BENJAMIN. No.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When was this executive board appointed?

Mr. BENJAMIN. At our last national convention, in September 1938.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you have a copy of the proceedings there?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Turn to page 82, and indicate to the committee any names I have not referred to that, from your long association with those of the Communist faith, you know to be also Communists.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I would say, with respect to the members of the board indicated here, other than those I have mentioned or that have been referred to already, I have no knowledge of any except those that I have mentioned.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So far as you know, your position before this committee is that there is no other Communist included in that list, other than those you have spoken of.

Mr. BENJAMIN. To my best knowledge, that would be so. Pardon me, have you called the name of Mr. Noral?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I know Mr. Noral has been a member of the Communist Party (pp. 169-171).

The Communist domination and control of the members of the executive board of the Workers Alliance is evident from this testimony.

Representative MARTIN DIES in his work entitled "The Trojan Horse in America," sums up the political affiliation of the executive board of the Workers Alliance as follows:

Numerous leaders of the Workers Alliance—as it is presently constituted—are avowed members of the Communist Party. With respect to many others, there is ground for belief that they, too, are members of the Communist Party although belonging to that large group of undercover members of whom the official publications of the party sometimes speak. One by one let us note the open party members who are on the small national executive board of the alliance.

Arnold Johnson, a member of the national executive board of the Workers Alliance, urged acceptance of the program of the Communist Party and of the Communist International, and during the current political campaign is Communist candidate for the governorship of Ohio.

Russell Watson, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for magistrate in Philadelphia in the elections of 1937.

Harold P. Brockway, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for Governor in Washington in 1936. He was also on the ballot as a Presidential elector in the same year.

Alex Noral, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for United States Senator from the State of Washington in 1932. Noral was also Communist candidate for Presidential elector for the State of California in 1936.

Wallace Talbot, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for Governor of Utah in 1936.

Emma Tenayuca, a member of the national executive board, was associated with the American League for Peace and Democracy in Texas, and is the State chairman of the Communist Party of Texas.

J. Austin Beasley, a member of the national executive board, is international organizer for the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, a C. I. O. affiliate which the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found unanimously to have an entrenched Communist leadership. Donald Henderson, avowed member of the Communist Party, is head of this union, of which J. Austin Beasley is international organizer.

Sam Wiseman, a member of the national executive board, was candidate on the Communist Party ticket for State Assembly in New York in 1936. Wiseman is also State organizer of the Workers Alliance in New York.

Frankie Duty, a member of the national executive board, has been praised as a Communist leader in the Party Organizer and in the Communist.

M. Dean Weiner, a member of the national executive board, signed the Communist nominating petitions in Pennsylvania in 1940. Mr. Dean Weiner was until recently secretary of the Workers Alliance in the State of Pennsylvania. He was taken from that position and made secretary of the Communist Party of Pennsylvania.

Hilliard Bernstein, a member of the national executive board, was a member of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion in Spain—a fighting unit which Earl Browder declared to be made up predominantly of Communist Party members.

James H. Dolsen admitted on the stand before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that he was an official of the Workers Alliance in Pittsburgh.

In an official press release, the Workers Alliance of Greater New York publicized its endorsement of the Communist Party's candidates for the city council in New York (pp. 100-102).

In June 1940, Mr. Lasser resigned as president of the Workers' Alliance. He alleged that the reason for this was that he finally discovered that the organization was dominated by Communists.

I want to say a word or two about the bill itself. The easiest thing for us to do at the present time is to say that this program of relief should go on and on and on. Let us just recall one thing. When W. P. A. was started, it was started as a work-relief program. It was started to give employment to those unemployed who were employable. It was never intended as a general relief program. It was never intended as a disguised dole. It was intended for one thing, and that was to provide to the great number of Americans who wanted work, and who could be gainfully employed, the opportunity of gaining this employment. I categorically deny the lack of sympathy that is charged to those of us who did not approve of this W. P. A. program in toto. I believe there are a great many here who were critical of the administration of W. P. A. who were as much concerned about the needs of the employable unemployed, and as much concerned about those who required and needed relief, as the loudest apostle and defender of W. P. A. can possibly be.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I suppose when the gentleman states "we" he means the Republican Party. I want to ask him what the Republicans have suggested as a substitute for W. P. A., or what they suggested during the days of unemployment as a substitute.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the gentleman from Massachusetts would rise above the narrowing limitations of partisan politics. I heard him earlier in the day make every effort to impress upon the House a real, deep-seated and heartfelt concern for the unemployed. I felt that under no circumstances would he permit partisan politics, the limitations under which a partisan always looks at a picture, to so limit his views. I am not speaking as a Republican, I am not speaking for the Republican Party. I am sorry my friend from Massachusetts, for whom I have the greatest regard, should inject politics when this great question of human need is before us.

I repeat—and I answer my friend from Massachusetts—that I am not speaking as a Republican. I had hoped he would have a larger breadth of vision than would cause him to circumscribe his views on this question to the narrow gage of partisan politics.

I am speaking on behalf of a great number of American people who still believe there is a spirit of self-reliance in those still unemployed. I am speaking for the great number of citizens who believe paternalism weakens the character and self-reliance if not carefully watched and controlled. I am speaking for that great group who feel that there are men who want work. We should provide them with the opportunity to work. This great force of the Federal Government should be turned to stimulating private enterprise and private industry; to reviving the great dynamic force that has made America what it is. I speak for that group who still believe we do have a sufficient degree of self-reliance to be self-supporting; that we must be alert to prevent enslavement of some of our citizens in shackles of mendicancy by continually conditioning them with bounties from an administrator of W. P. A.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I wish that I might yield further to my friend from Massachusetts. I refuse to yield further to him at this time only because I want to defend him; only because I feel confident that if I were to yield further to him, temptation, that has already manifested itself, would again come to the fore, and again he would take this problem of need and try to smear it with the brush of partisan politics. No; I want to talk about the bill for a minute.

I call the attention of the Committee to one thing that I believe is a most dangerous tendency. You and I have heard a great deal about vested interests. Many of us have been concerned about the vested interests that are abroad. As I heard the Administrator, as I listened

to the pessimistic picture he painted about the possibility of reemployment, I could not help but feel that what the Administrator had, and what he was seeking to get was a vested interest in unemployment. As I say, that is a dangerous situation. Every figure he could marshal, every fact he could get together, every impression he could possibly get hold of, all pointed toward one thing, increasing to colossal size the figures of unemployment and minimizing as much as possible those factors that seem to indicate that reemployment is on the rise.

I think the Administrator fixed the number of unemployed as something like 5,500,000, and still, according to all of the statistics and according to the Secretary of Labor, practically all of the unemployed who can be gainfully employed will be absorbed by this defense program.

It depends on how you look at this thing. If it is your purpose to continue a great army of unemployed, if it is your purpose to increase as much as possible a sense of dependency on a political bureaucracy by our people, then, of course, W. P. A. should be given a free rein. Then Mr. Hunter's pessimism should be permitted to point entirely to what the W. P. A. should do.

On the other hand, if you feel that there is still some sense of independence in the Nation, if you feel that there are those in this land of ours who resent the suggestion of bounties and gifts in order to make them vassals and slaves, then I say you will join with us who feel that some limitation on this program is in order.

I am not asking you to eliminate W. P. A. I am asking you to take this relief problem and turn it back to the States. It is a problem, and there are some who cannot get gainful employment. Let us turn this problem back to the States. Let there be grants-in-aid for the relief program just as there are in the social-security program. Let us take this great army of administrators, these \$10,000-a-year men and these \$9,000-a-year men, and turn the money now paid to them over to the States. Why, when these administrators came before us, if you will read the record, you will find I asked that the record show at its very beginning the galaxy of stars that attended the Administrator as he came to make his justification. There was an army there—assistant administrators and assistants to the assistant administrators. There were so many assistants there that I wondered what they were all supposed to be assisting in. Let us take that group and the money involved and return it to the States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Let us clear up the inefficiency, the maladministration, the misadministration that my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] tried to defend. Let us eliminate those things by sending relief back there. Back among the neighbors is the place where you will be able to administer this relief program properly and intelligently.

I stand on the declaration today that the neighbors are the folks who know most about the needs of people in their communities. I believe it is the neighbors who can probably, with a fairer and more reasonable appreciation, estimate what the needs of those about them may be.

Let the expansion and acceleration of this defense program take as many as possible of the group who are presently on W. P. A. and let them get into the lines of private industry and private enterprise and put this defense program on its feet.

But let us do one thing more. Let us be fundamentally honest in our thinking. Let us acknowledge what W. P. A. has been in the past. The peak of this distress period is over. Let us be fundamentally honest in our thinking and let us say we are going to stand back of every move that is made to encourage and develop the great energies of private enterprise and private industry; that we are going to use the money of the taxpaying group where that money will mean the most; that we are going to set about clearing up and cleaning up our affairs which have had so much about them of disorder; that we are going to take this great problem of relief, as it relates to the unemployed, and be honest and say that probably there are no fields where they can fit in. Then let us go back into our several communities. Instead of boasting of a desire to make a great relief program a political vehicle, let us be real Samaritans and minister to those we find in need according to their needs and according to our ability to minister.

I ask today only a common-sense approach to this problem and with that common-sense approach, a common honesty on the part of this Congress to deal with the problem of work relief.

This appropriation of \$886,000,000 for relief in 1942, of which \$875,000,000 goes to the W. P. A., is welcomed by many since it is a sizable reduction from 1941 appropriations and \$109,000,000 less than the original Budget request. To my way of thinking, however, the expenditure of \$875,000,000 for Federal work relief in the coming fiscal year is unwarranted and unnecessary. It is not justified by the prospects for employment during the next year. The proposal suggests no change whatever in the basic conception and operation of the W. P. A. We are searching for ways to reduce substantially the nondefense expenditures of the Federal Government. The maintenance of an increasingly expensive system of work relief for the rapidly dwindling unemployed is indefensible. Now if ever the Federal relief program should be revised as a Federal-State cooperative program supported by grants-in-aid, along the lines of the social-security program.

In attempting to justify the continuance of the W. P. A. work-relief program without substantial change, Acting Commissioner Howard O. Hunter, of the W. P. A., testifying before the committee, painted a rather discouraging and, I believe, distorted picture of employment and unemployment conditions of the present and future. Industrial production reached a new high in March 1941, and the Federal Reserve index stood at

143, 25 percent above the 1929 high point. The continuance and expansion of the defense program will bring about still greater production and employment.

Mr. Hunter's estimates of the number of unemployed in the coming year are clearly too high and are unwarranted. He estimates that unemployment during the fiscal year 1942 will average between 5,500,000 and 7,500,000, depending upon whose estimates are used. The two most generally accepted unemployment estimates are those of the National Industrial Conference Board and the American Federation of Labor. The N. I. C. B. estimates unemployment in March 1941 to be 6,142,000 and the A. F. of L. estimate for March is 7,552,000. But both estimates are considerably below the January estimates, and in all probability the N. I. C. B. will show not more than 5,000,000 by July and the A. F. of L. estimate will approach 6,000,000 at the same time.

On December 29, 1940, Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins stated the defense program would create enough jobs "to break the back of unemployment before the end of 1941." She explained that the Labor Department estimated that between five and six million new jobs would be filled by December 1941. In part she said:

The labor outlook for 1941 is bright • • • bright as to job opportunities, bright as to increased earnings for workers, and with every indication pointing to continued and hearty cooperation by labor with industrial and all other groups so that our defense program may be speeded up and carried through successfully for the safety of America, its democratic institutions, and all of its citizens.

The completion of work provided for in present defense appropriation acts will require between four and five million workers. About half of these will be needed on construction jobs, in shipyards or in factories engaged in making finished products such as airplanes and engines, tanks, and shells. The other half will be needed primarily to supply contractors with materials.—*New York Times*, December 30, 1940.

Since that time increased appropriations have been granted for defense, and if we can believe Madam Perkins at all, the need for W. P. A. should be completely eliminated. If the New Deal cannot put practically all employables to work during the next fiscal year, then its all-out defense effort will be a failure.

Mr. Hunter also stated before the committee that total employment is now less than in 1929. However, both the N. I. C. B. and the A. F. of L. series of employment figures show that total employment today is in excess of 1929 levels. The figures are as follows:

	1929 average	March 1941
National Industrial Conference Board.....	47,925,000	49,373,000
American Federation of Labor.....	46,192,000	46,875,000

As employment increases, the most capable W. P. A. workers are taken into private industry. That means that as time goes on only the least capable, those verging on the line of unemployability in private industry, remain. How can

these people accomplish anything in the way of constructive work?

The W. P. A. now contends that it is doing a great deal of important defense work and is trying to get as many projects as possible certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as being necessary for national defense. Some of the projects are of value to national defense, but the great majority continue to be of the made-work type, with a great deal of "boondoggling."

One result of this effort to use W. P. A. for defense purposes is to increase greatly the per-man month and year cost of W. P. A. A year ago the per-man Federal cost of W. P. A. was about \$62 a month, or \$744 a year. At that rate the proposed 1,000,000 W. P. A. workers could be taken care of for 1942 with the expenditure of about three-quarters of a billion dollars instead of \$875,000,000. But during the current year W. P. A. wages have been raised so that the per-man Federal cost for 1942 is estimated at \$71 a month, or \$852 a year.

How has this come about, and what justification is there for it? W. P. A. workers ordinarily work 130 hours a month, but those working on the certified national-defense projects work 48 hours a week, or 208 hours a month. And since they work longer hours, their monthly security wage has been increased. At present about 240,000 W. P. A. employees are working the longer hours and receive on the average \$74 a month, while the ordinary employee receives only \$56 a month. Furthermore the nonlabor costs of the defense workers are greater, and it now costs \$108.80 a month, or \$1,233.60 a year for each one of the 240,000 employees on the certified defense projects. The total cost for the other workers is only \$61.50 a month, or \$738 a year.

So we are paying heavily for the W. P. A.'s contribution to national defense, and furthermore, the many inequities of the W. P. A. system are being intensified. Two persons equally capable and equally in need are on W. P. A. One works on a defense project and receives \$74 a month, while the other is on a non-defense project and receives \$56 a month. True enough, the former works more hours, but the latter would like the opportunity for more work. What justice is there in a relief system of that kind?

The person in need who is on direct relief and cannot get on W. P. A., on the other hand, gets on the average only \$25 a month.

It is high time that we put an end to this farcical and inequitable system of so-called work relief. If airports and cantonments are to be built, let us have them built by private industry all the way through. It will be done better and in the long run cheaper. Return the care of all relief people to the States and make them work out an equitable system where relief is based on need.

It is interesting to note that with the reduction of the W. P. A. to the 1,000,000-man level the administrative costs are going up, viewed on a percentage basis. During the present fiscal year the W. P. A. has had \$44,500,000 for administrative expenses, and that has been about 3.2 percent of the total expenditures. For

1942, \$39,690,000 is asked, and that amounts to 4.5 percent of the \$875,000,000 asked for W. P. A.

Two years ago we placed a requirement in the law that the average sponsor's contribution in a State should be not less than 25 percent of the total cost of the W. P. A. projects. That has had a salutary effect in increasing sponsors' contribution and getting the States and localities to pay a fair share of the costs. During the first 9 months of the fiscal year the sponsors have contributed 30.8 percent of the total cost.

Now the W. P. A. wants this restriction removed so that they will have complete discretion. They contend that \$6 per man-month nonlabor cost requirement is adequate safeguard against the local sponsor's saddling more of the cost on the Federal Government. It should be noted in this connection, however, that the \$6 limitation does not in effect apply to the certified national-defense projects and if such projects become more numerous, and that is what W. P. A. wants, no effective safeguard will remain.

The W. P. A. wants the 18-month lay-off provision removed. But it would seem that the reasons for its retention are more valid today than ever. If it be true that there are many persons in need who are eligible for W. P. A. who cannot get on and have to live on direct relief, then why not pass the Federal largesse around. Persons equally in need should have equal opportunity for the \$74 a month now being paid to W. P. A. workers on defense projects.

It seems that the W. P. A. never learns. Two years ago we knocked out the theater project because of the subversive activities which seemed to dominate its conduct. Now the W. P. A. wants to revive the theater projects with local sponsors. Now of all times seems to be clearly inappropriate for such a step. Subversive activities of the Nazis and Communists are not only rampant but exceedingly dangerous to our national safety. And now while the whole effort of the Nation is being devoted to defense should we worry about relief projects for unemployed actors, musicians, and writers? Employment in the armed forces is waiting for all who are unable to find constructive outlets for their efforts and talents.

Because of the dangers from subversive activities it would seem wise to retain not only the barriers against the employment of Nazis, Fascists, and Communists but of aliens as well. If nearly a quarter of a million W. P. A. employees are working on projects which either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy have certified as being necessary to national defense we do not want a lot of foreigners in position to commit acts of sabotage on such projects.

Mr. Chairman, for more than a year our attention has been focused primarily on national defense. Extraordinary expenditures, totaling billions of dollars, have been authorized by the Congress for the purpose of transforming an "on order" uncertainty into an "on hand" assurance. To carry out that program of changing promise into performance the appropriation of additional billions will be required. Almost every commu-

nity in the country reflects in its teeming industrial activity the emphasis which has been laid on putting into high gear the productive capacity of the Nation. Existing plants have been expanded. New factories and facilities are under construction. Further extensive developments are contemplated. Day by day the demand for men to man the machines of production becomes the more insistent as the woeful lack of machines and materials becomes the more painfully apparent. In many fields workers are at a premium, with every indication that even a more acute shortage of labor will confront us in the future. That fact is presently causing much concern to common-sense businessmen and to candid Government leaders. If ever there was a time when a promising picture of employment presented itself to the Nation, that time is now.

But the rearment program has emphasized the dangers which inevitably come from a disregard of sound fiscal policies. I feel confident that many administration leaders—those who contented themselves with the fallacious philosophy that profligacy was the way to prosperity—realize today the peril which their policies have invited. An administration which has disregarded care and caution in the expenditure of public funds is now turning to the people to replenish the storehouse which it carelessly refused to protect. A campaign is being conducted to try to induce individual citizens to help underwrite by their investments the enormous costs for a defense program. That underwriting program would not be such an acute problem today had there been a reasonable regard for sound fiscal policies during the past few years. And what is even more to the point, there appears little, if anything, which would justify the hope that a change of policy—a change from reckless abandon to cautious common sense—will materialize. At the present time the Ways and Means Committee of the House is wrestling with the problem of finding additional sources of revenue. From what we have been able to learn, the new tax bill promises to be a very effective, although equally unpleasant, notice to men and women in all walks of life that economy in government is a virtue and not a vice.

With these facts before me, I confess that I find it difficult to understand the attitude of the administration toward the work-relief program and the costly agencies which it has created to administer that program. It can hardly be argued that the record of the W. P. A. is one which of itself commends favorable consideration for the perpetuation of its policies. The investigation which was conducted by the House some 2 years ago, and which many felt might have been more searching and complete, was sufficiently revealing of the W. P. A. that no claim should be made for its innocence and hardly any for its competency.

Of course, W. P. A., like all other Federal agencies, has seized upon the opportunity afforded by the defense program to entrench itself. Such a course was to be expected. The popularity which has attended the expansion of national defense was not overlooked as the increase

in industrial activity made it plainer day by day that the uselessness of this administrative agency would become a hard, cold fact. Obviously some excuse must be found for the payment of salaries for the army of officials which has fastened itself on the public pay roll as relief directors. What we face here is the difficulty which will always be encountered when an effort is made to discontinue a governmental activity after its usefulness has expired. That which at the beginning is held out as a temporary creation is never willing to admit that its temporary status has come to an end. Bureaucracy always will seek to perpetuate itself, and, as a parasite, fasten itself permanently upon the living organism of a free government.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Would the Chair mind advising the Committee the subject under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider that a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

W. P. A. SITUATION IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in my State of Washington the average monthly employment on the W. P. A. for the fiscal year 1941 is estimated at 22,805 persons, and the estimated average for the fiscal year, if only \$836,000,000 is made available for the entire Nation, will be less than 11,000 persons, a reduction of over 50 percent. This is too drastic a cut and will throw these people out of employment without any means of obtaining jobs or financial assistance of any kind. Many of these men and women are past the age when they can secure employment, most of them are unskilled, and the national-defense program is of no benefit to them. I have received vigorous protests against this action from the county commissioners of Thurston, Cowlitz, and Grays Harbor Counties, among the largest counties in my district and, in fact, from all my 9 counties.

Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to a fact of great importance. I am advised that 60 percent of those who are employed on W. P. A. in the State of Washington are working on projects which have been certified as essential to national defense, airports, cantonments, barracks, and projects classified as being related to national defense, directly or indirectly. I am told that this percentage of 60 percent in the State of Washington is the highest in any State in the Nation and is due to the vast national-defense program in our State, but it is already an established fact that the persons employed on these W. P. A. projects have not been and will not be employed on the national-defense program, either they are too old or they do not possess the technical skill. To throw so many of these worthy citizens into the streets is certainly not good for our national morale at a time when we should

seek to keep our people contented and united and prove to them that democratic processes do function in the interests of their social and economic welfare. I question very seriously the soundness and wisdom of such a short-sighted policy as that, and I question whether it is sound economy. It appears to me to be the very contrary of that, and I do not hesitate to condemn such a policy as undemocratic, un-American, and detrimental to the spirit of our entire national-defense objective.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I therefore urge that you fix the appropriation for W. P. A. for the ensuing fiscal year at \$1,250,000,000, the amount which Mr. Howard O. Hunter, Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration, states is necessary and needed to give this meager employment to the unemployed men and women of our country, who will otherwise have no source of income whatsoever and face starvation, destitution, and want, which would be criminal folly at this critical juncture in our national history.

I desire to call your attention to a statement prepared by the Division of Statistics, W. P. A., relating to the State of Washington, bearing date May 14, 1941, which I am inserting at this point.

The statement is as follows:

Month	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,000,000 for continental United States	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,265,000 for continental United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year 1941
<i>1941</i>			
July	13,500	16,300	23,113
August	11,600	15,800	23,281
September	11,600	15,800	22,287
October	11,600	15,800	22,071
November	11,600	15,800	22,691
December	11,600	16,400	23,877
<i>1942</i>			
January	13,500	17,500	24,604
February	13,500	17,500	25,109
March	12,100	16,800	22,697
April	11,600	16,300	21,000
May	11,100	16,000	18,300
June	10,400	16,000	16,590
Estimated average for fiscal year	11,900	16,300	—
Average for fiscal year 1941			22,085

Estimated need as of May 1, 1941, 24,185.

<sup>1</sup> Based on employment authorization.

<sup>2</sup> Based on tentative employment authorization.

Employment of Work Projects Administration projects<sup>1</sup> in Washington, by congressional districts,<sup>2</sup> Apr. 30, 1940

Congressional district	Number of persons
All districts	20,082
Undistributed by district	2,596
Districts 1, 2, and 6	10,764
District 3	3,064
District 4	1,803
District 5	1,555

<sup>1</sup> Includes Work Projects Administration projects operated by other Federal agencies and financed by allocation of Work Projects Administration funds.

<sup>2</sup> As the county is the smallest governmental subdivision for which Work Projects Administration employment is available, congressional districts are combined where a county is located in more than 1 congressional district.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Congress to an article, Capital Parade. It appears this morning in the Washington Post, written by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner. Among other things they say:

The report is that when urged to act, the President always recurs to the case of his former chief, Woodrow Wilson. President Wilson, he points out, was far better placed when he led the Nation into the first World War. A succession of incidents, in which American lives were taken and American property was lost, had inflamed public opinion over many months. The debate on the armed merchantmen bill had revealed an almost united Congress. There were only 12 in the little band of willful men whose Senate filibuster forced Wilson to arm the merchantmen on his own authority. In the end, when Wilson went to Congress and requested a declaration of war, he could be certain that every dissident voice would be drowned out by the roar of enthusiasm from a truly United States.

Now, get this and see whether or not the President of the United States should let or permit such charges as these to go unanswered. Among other things they go on to say:

The President agrees that these are the alternatives, but still clings to the hope that his problem will be solved for him by the incident he so much desires.

Members of Congress, where was there ever a more serious charge uttered against a public official, to claim that he wanted American lives destroyed and American property destroyed so an incident would be created whereby he could plunge this country into war? That is what this charge is.

The President of the United States should deny this terrible charge. I cannot believe this is true because, my God, my fellow Members of Congress, I cannot conceive of any man, President of the United States, or any Member of this body who would want something to happen to kill your son or my son so that an incident would be created that would cause public opinion to become so inflamed that the people of this country would demand a war declaration from this Congress, or give the President an excuse, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to enter into an undeclared war, as Alsop and Kintner say, in full partnership with Britain.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Was that by Alsop and Kintner?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. That is the third time they have made the charge against the President of the United States, in three different columns, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, that makes it worse. Has there been any denial from any official source of it, so far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. So far as I know, there has been no denial. The final charge was made in this morn-

ing's columns of the Post, but twice before there was the same charge.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I read appears in this morning's Washington Post, issued right under the dome of the Capitol.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am sure the gentleman realizes the President of the United States cannot go around denying these vile charges all the time that might be made in the press by some irresponsible writer.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know the gentleman feels it would not be necessary to make denial but some person in authority should do so—particularly when these writers are assumed to have knowledge of what they are writing. We have a population in the United States consisting of white men, red men, and colored men, if you please, who are in want, old people who are living on \$10 or \$12 or \$18 a month, and in the face of this we are seeking to plunge this country into war, if you please, to relieve want in other countries like China, England, Australia, Czechoslovakia, and every country on earth. We have talked pretty big lately. We want to establish everywhere on earth, if you please, freedom from want, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of fear, a pretty big order, when we have want stalking nearly every step you take right here in our capital city of Washington, and other large cities in the United States.

You can go into any city, into the slums, and see poor people suffering, see children in want, see aged people in want. Yet in our hysteria we see only want that exists 3,000 miles away in some other country. What is national defense? As was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] this afternoon, you can have national defense only when you have your people at home unified and satisfied. We better commence to look at home to see that they are unified by doing the square thing by them. We ought to have a decent old-age-pension plan whereby the aged people of this country, who have built our churches, schoolhouses, railroads, and every other public improvement, may be free from want. Many of them are living in want; the record shows that from 80 to 85 percent of those people over 65 years of age today are either partially or wholly dependent. Is it not about time that we commence to figure out something for ourselves? Again, I can take you into every State in the Union in which there are Indians, and you will find thousands of Indians throughout the United States that have not a foot of ground—a horse or a cow or a sheep or a chicken even with which to make a living. Can we get any money from this Congress for them? No. But every nation on earth that has made any pretense at all of having any kind of form of democracy has its arms into the United States Treasury clear up to the elbows. That is a fact. The gentleman from Oregon, Governor PIERCE, and I appeared before a committee to get some money for the Indians that I am talking about, and did we get it? Oh, no; oh, no.

Yet \$500,000,000 was sent down to South America and millions of dollars sent to China and other countries. We can send it to every other country, but we have nothing for our Indian people at home. When the Dies committee was before this House for a continuation of its life the first time, I tried to amend the resolution to provide that that committee find out the cause of communism in this country. We knew there were Communists. They were running for public office. What causes it? It is want; it is hunger; it is hungry women and children and idle men that cause communism.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Does not the gentleman think it is psychologically the poorest kind of strategy to visit the first spasm of economy upon the poor in the United States? Does not the gentleman think that is the poorest thing that could be done in the interest of unity and morale?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. Let's not take it out of the hides of the poor. In 1937 I heard President Roosevelt, from the Clerk's stand, make the charge that there were one-third of the people of this country underfed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, and I say to you today that if it were not for this defense program the same condition would exist. The statesmanship of this country has never answered the question of unemployment or relieved the poverty. What an indictment it is against the statesmanship of the great United States that unemployment can only be solved by preparing for war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. In this short time I want to say that charity begins at home. We ought to take care of our own needy and helpless people. The W. P. A. has rendered great service. Homes, churches, roads, parks, courthouses, and schools have been built under this program. It is one of the best services the Government has set up and it has gone a long way to help, but it has not been the answer and it will not be the answer when it has been cut down to the figure represented in this bill. We are spending billions and billions of dollars for armies, battleships, bombing planes, and guns. Remember all of those materials have to be used by men and we want our people satisfied and we want them to love their country. Then they will deliver the goods when the time comes. I am for these expenditures and have always voted for them upon the theory that we are defending America, and I want to go a step farther. I think we should do better than we have been in looking after our own people.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. One of the reasons advanced by the proponents of this reduction of W. P. A. is the alleged increase in employment as a result of so-called national defense. I point out, as an example of how this contention is un-

tenable, that so far as employment in the Army camps is concerned, back in February, 369,000 workers were reported as being employed on camp construction, but that employment in that construction had dropped by 145,000 by April, and it has since continued to decline.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. What is going to happen when this war business is over? It is variously estimated that this program will cost \$116,000,000,000, and then what? Where are we when we get through? We are right where we started. Our unemployment will start right over again. We must commence to think of revamping our economy if we are going to survive as a free country.

I fear that in trying to defend what we choose to call democracy in Europe that we may lose the very thing we think we are trying to save in Europe, namely, we may lose our own democracy in this country.

Now, as to Montana. While the economic conditions are fairly good in Montana, there are still approximately 10,000 heads of families who cannot be gainfully employed in private industry. This unemployment is due to the changing conditions which occurred in Montana during the last decade. These can be summarized as follows:

Montana has large coal deposits and these have been extensively operated. However, during the last 10 years electric power and gas consumption have replaced coal consumption and thousands of coal miners have been thrown out of employment. For the most part, these miners have large families and have not been able to seek employment in other localities.

The use of modern machinery has replaced many laborers formerly employed in the mines, the smelters, and on the farms. For example, at the present time the copper mines in Montana are producing the same volume of ore as was produced in 1929 with but 64.64 percent of the workers. The same is true in the smelters in Anaconda, Great Falls, and East Helena. These machines have replaced unskilled laborers for the most part. Farm laborers have been supplanted by tractors, combines, and other machinery which have been put to use within the last 10 or 12 years.

The use of modern machinery on farms has also created the condition whereby many former farmers have been forced to abandon or sell their farms and move to localities generally on the outskirts of the larger towns. The increase in the population of Billings, Missoula, Helena, and Kalispell can be so attributed. Power machinery calls for larger farm units to make crop production cheaper and this is the cause for much farm migration. Many small operators have been forced out of business because of low prices and power-machine competition.

Another factor which has added to the unemployment in Montana is the purchase by the Government of approximately 2,000,000 acres of submarginal land. These purchases separated many families from their homes, many of which have located in the suburban areas of

Montana cities and towns. The proceeds from these sales were naturally not large and, for the most part, were all taken for the liquidation of debts and encumbrances. Many of these former farmers are currently employed on W. P. A. projects and are not skilled in any line of endeavor.

Montana suffered severe droughts during 1934 and 1936 and since that time crops have not been too abundant. These conditions drove families from many farms and many migrated to the irrigated sections of western Montana. Also migrating to western Montana were families from the Dust Bowl in the Great Plains area. These migrants came to western Montana financially poor, and while they are being rehabilitated on lands which were formerly covered with timber, the process of stump pulling and cultivation was extremely slow, and it will be some time before they are fully rehabilitated, if at all.

This migration increased the population in western Montana counties approximately 25 percent, and thus increased governmental costs at least that amount, without any compensating revenue return whatsoever.

Many counties in western Montana depend almost entirely upon the lumber industry, and this industry has never recovered from the depression. Unemployment has also been added to by the fact that seasonal work in the forest, such as maintaining trails, building roads, and fighting fires, has been taken over by members of the C. C. C.

Although the employment condition is fairly good, Montana has a large population of older men and women in the industrial centers. These people are miners who are above 45 and cannot be employed in the mines because of the extreme hard work and hazardous conditions. The working life of a copper miner is short; thus, many widows have been left to be taken care of by relief agencies.

In agricultural sections these aged people can be accounted for by the following fact: The plains area in Montana was largely settled between 1910 and 1920. During that period it was possible to grow good crops of grain in Montana in the agricultural sections. These people were adventurers and probably were not the best of farm operators, and failed to meet the changing conditions occasioned by lack of moisture during the twenties and thirties of the century. Ages have been increased during this period, which causes an average age of 45 of those employed on the W. P. A.

We are reasonably sure that where private employment is available, all W. P. A. workers are anxious and willing to avail themselves of this employment. Reports coming to this office from Jay G. Diamond, agricultural statistician, advise us that farm labor is well balanced, especially where W. P. A. is operating at all extensively. We are aware that there is a great deal more employment in Montana than there has been since 1928. However, a large percentage of W. P. A. workers are not capable of doing this work. To cite an example, the railroad companies are doing a great deal of new

work and maintenance, but the requirements are very strict and no one may be employed except those between the ages of 18 and 35, and only those who can pass a physical examination. There is a shortage of skilled workers in industrial centers, but here again only those well qualified will be accepted. We still have an overabundance of unskilled and semi-skilled workers unemployed in Montana.

Montana has no national-defense contracts except the small contract of \$25,000 awarded the Caird Machinery Co. at Helena. All increases in employment occasioned by national defense have been indirect and only as applied to strategic minerals.

In summarizing the situation, we believe that the work-relief program in Montana must be continued to take care of the aforementioned 10,000 heads of families who cannot be employed. We are sure that at this time Montana has reached a peak of private employment, and unemployment will raise as seasonal employment is discontinued.

#### Montana

Month	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,000,000 for continental United States	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,265,000 for continental United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year 1941
1941	\$875,000,000	\$1,150,000,000	\$1,250,000,000
July	6,800	8,000	8,128
August	5,800	8,000	8,578
September	5,800	8,000	8,225
October	5,800	8,000	8,246
November	5,800	8,000	8,978
December	5,800	8,300	10,111
1942			
January	6,700	8,500	11,291
February	6,700	8,500	12,164
March	6,000	8,200	10,831
April	5,800	8,000	19,800
May	5,600	7,900	19,000
June	5,200	7,900	8,160
Estimated average for fiscal year	6,000	8,100	
Average for fiscal year 1941			8,459

Estimated need as of May 1, 1941, 12,043.

<sup>1</sup> Based on employment authorization.

<sup>2</sup> Based on tentative employment authorization.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, it has become almost a custom, whenever W. P. A. appropriation bills come before the House, for some of the men who take the floor on the subject to convert the debate into a regular field day for maligning the W. P. A. Charges of waste and maladministration, based on relatively small and isolated occurrences, fly thick and fast and serve to distract attention from the subject in its broad perspective. For that reason, I believe this time to be particularly appropriate for reading a splendid editorial which appeared in the Boston Post of last Sunday on the subject of the dividends which have accrued to the Nation from the W. P. A. program.

The tangible accomplishments of the W. P. A. and its substantial contribution

to the real wealth of the Nation have been singularly neglected by the press of the Nation. This is perhaps understandable because the fruits of the program have been a gradual growth rather than a spectacular development. Projects which have simultaneously dotted every village, town, and city in the land have individually been undramatic. But, in an aggregate, they represent an amazing contribution to the health, safety, and comfort of the people of the entire Nation as well as to the defense of the Nation. The Boston Post is to be highly commended for its penetrating article which dispels the mists of witticism and calumny which have too long served to obscure the genuine accomplishments of the W. P. A. program. I want to take this opportunity to read this enlightening editorial on the subject.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME HAS A WAY

Years ago when Charles Dudley Warner concocted his immortal saying, "Politics makes strange bedfellows," he did not envision America's all-out defense effort.

If he had, he would have used a word more embracing than politics alone. For it is totally inadequate for what we are witnessing—the economic royalists hobnobbing with the liberals, the intellectuals appealing to the industrial tycoons to speed up productions and the social-conscious zealots who would make America over, discovering that the George Babbitts are not such bad fellows after all.

Yes, there is more to this defense effort than idle factories springing to life, idle men throwing back their shoulders as they get on permanent pay rolls again, soldiers and sailors filling the cities over the week end, more planes in the skies, more parades in the streets, civilians training on the village green, and the women folks learning to be air-raid wardens.

Beneath the surface, changes in attitude are sweeping America like a hurricane. The fellow travelers are now thumping the platforms in behalf of democracy. The authors who probed the lives of great Americans for faults, are now singing, God Bless America. Even a famous United States poet who some years back was marching in front of our statehouse condemning Governor Fuller, President Lowell of Harvard, and Judge Grant for their Sacco-Vanzetti decision, is now hoping the American people will have hearts of oak like the English if war comes to us.

A lot of folks are finding a lot of things they did not like, and were not bashful about saying so, were not so terrible after all. The liberals and the intellectuals are not the only ones who are recanting and jumping the fence. New light is also falling on the conservatives.

The proof of that is the growing realization that the money expended on W. P. A. projects was not wasted after all. Of all the Government's efforts to keep people from starving, to keep them from being evicted from their homes, and in the final analysis to keep them from actually revolting against privation, the W. P. A. was the most vilified.

Against that endeavor was hurled not only charges of rank, outrageous waste—and there was waste—but the hatred extended to a campaign of cheap humor against the people engaged in the work. Men with hardly strength to swing a putter on a golf course grew apoplectic every time they passed a project and saw some workers not swinging picks. Women who had chauffeurs to open the doors of their automobiles for them thrilled tea parties with the latest joke about shovel-leaning.

But what has happened? Thanks to the W. P. A., our defense effort is about a year ahead of time. Take the matter of airports. We need them badly even now. We need big ones, better ones. We need them everywhere around the Nation. Yet at the moment there are 545 airports in the country which we would not have had except for the W. P. A. For in 5 years' time that number of airports were either built or improved by people on Government funds.

We also need highways. We need them long and far in all parts of the Nation. For, if we are invaded we must have them for our mechanized armies. We must have them, too, for trucks to deliver our defense goods. In 5 years we have accumulated a number we might not have had. The number is so great that the W. P. A. figures it this way—180 miles of roadway were built for every county in the country.

The figures of the work accomplished by the alleged "shovel leaners" during half a decade, work which is vital as guns and gunboats to national defense, is staggering. More than 100,000 bridges and viaducts were improved or built. Improvements were made along more than 10,000 miles of our important river banks. The total playgrounds, parks, and pools built or rehabilitated by this same group was nearly 20,000 around the Nation.

Meanwhile, back to work in our factories, shipyards, stores, shops, are going men not softened by years of sitting around. They are going back at least physically fit and with their self-respect still retained. They are going back to help the same America in a crisis that helped them in a crisis. And people who laughed are soberly considering they did quite a job.

Time of stress and danger also makes strange bedfellows. But it is all uniting America into a harmonizing, impregnable front against any foe. And that's the greatest goal of national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. My friend does not subscribe to the philosophy that all of this money appropriated by Congress has been wasted?

Mr. HEALEY. I have just taken occasion to read this editorial which lists the beneficial projects and the amazing amount of work that has been accomplished by W. P. A. funds.

Mr. HAINES. And all of this has added to the wealth of the Nation?

Mr. HEALEY. All of this has added to the wealth of the Nation. All this public work has contributed to the welfare of America.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Does not the gentleman regret the fact that Members of Congress themselves in a great many instances have not been educated to many of the benefits of W. P. A.? For instance, in this particular editorial which the gentleman read there was nothing which dealt with the food-lunch program that thousands of school children are benefiting from.

Mr. HEALEY. There are other features about which equally commendable editorials could be written.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to get this straight from the minority as well as the majority. Does not this cut represent a revised Budget estimate? Is not this cut recommended by the President? I think the Congress and the American people should know whether that is so or not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me give a chronological history to my friend from New York. In the President's Budget message on the 8th of January he recommended \$995,000,000 for W. P. A. In the Budget message which came from the President of the United States and which was read from this rostrum only 3 or 4 weeks ago he recommended a cut of \$109,000,000, or a reduction to \$886,000,000. The amount that is appropriated here, within \$95,000, is the amount that was recommended by the President of the United States.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No matter what anybody says, that is the history of the situation and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is eminently correct.

Mr. Chairman, I sort of like this hour of the afternoon. This is the vesper hour. All the turbulences of the mind and spirit have been dissipated, and I think there is that spiritual glow and serenity that makes it possible to enjoy an informal fellowship. While the Chamber is slightly devoid of the full membership of the House at this hour of the afternoon, I think if I were privileged to select my time, I would rather talk now than at any other time of the day.

What I want to talk about a little is this matter of David Lasser. Presumably the casual visitor sitting in the gallery listening to the emphasis on one individual in the whole W. P. A. set-up, which embraces more than a million people, must necessarily wonder why so much importance is attached to a single individual. Yet I think it is a matter that is of far more importance than meets the eye.

Mr. Lasser is on the pay roll for \$4,400. His job is to go around in 15 or 16 States and investigate the conditions under which people are taken from W. P. A. and reinstated in private industry. It is entirely conceivable that in the performance of these functions a man whose heart and mind is not exactly right and who may be lacking in that essential devotion to this country could do a tremendous amount of damage. Make no mistake about that.

The other thing before the committee is the whole question of policy relative to subversion in the United States of America at the present time. I sat here all day yesterday listening to this Chamber ring with discussion about party lines and the Communist front as this dignified and deliberative body devoted itself to the question of the North American Aviation strike; but I want to return for a moment to Mr.

Lasser and explain certain things with reference to him and several others, and to point out some matters the Congress is going to have to get clear in order to deal with this matter.

Mr. Lasser appeared and testified before the investigative committee of the Committee on Appropriations in April 1939. I was over there at times. He is a very handy gentleman. He is very fluent. He is educated, and he is extremely able. As I understand it, he is a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and is an engineer by profession. I saw the gentleman parry questions and handle the answers, and I know he is a man of rare capabilities. When that kind of capability is coupled with a subversive heart—if it is a subversive heart—then you have a truly dangerous person in the American economy.

As I said, Mr. Lasser is employed at the present time at \$4,400 a year. When he came before the committee in April 1939 he was president of the Workers Alliance. His testimony, together with that of Mr. Herbert Benjamin, secretary of the Workers Alliance, covered 150 pages in the record, and it is worth reading and rereading from time to time in order to pick up the stitches of American sentiment and see whether or not there is some un-American, radical, and subversive danger that is growing upon the horizon. At that time Mr. Lasser testified, as shown by page 42 of the hearings, testified himself that at the instance of the Workers Alliance he made a trip to Russia to be in attendance at the twentieth anniversary celebration of the Russian Revolution. He indicated that that was only incidental to his trip to Spain and to Great Britain, but a person does not go to Russia to sit in on the twentieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution unless there is something more than a casual interest in his heart. He is the same Mr. Lasser who got out a press release on the 13th of April 1937, and I believe Members of Congress will be very much interested in one portion of the context, because this is the statement that Mr. Lasser wrote into that press release:

We believe that the reactionary congressional group that imposed the \$50,000,000 cut secured a majority only as the result of misrepresentation, outright lies, parliamentary tricks, bluffs, and threats.

That was the language Mr. Lasser wrote into that press release on the 13th of April 1937, and then by a kind of tenuous and specious logic undertook to justify every one of those allegations hurled against the integrity of Congress. That is the gentleman who is drawing \$4,400 a year. He goes around in 15 or 16 States. He investigates conditions in private employment in the transition of W. P. A. workers to private industry, and he holds a genuinely responsible job. According to the record, he was hired at the instance of Mr. Hunter, the Director of W. P. A., himself.

It is rather singular that Mr. Lasser was associated so long with Herbert Benjamin, the secretary of the Workers Alliance, and, oddly enough, could escape contamination. Or if he did not escape

that, somehow there has now been a reconstruction of the spirit and a reformation of his political approach to national problems.

With respect to Mr. Benjamin, let me tell you what that gentleman testified—and you will find this on pages 135 and 136 of this record. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] asked this question of Mr. Benjamin:

Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Here was Benjamin's reply:

Yes, sir. I would say in connection with all this that my membership in the Communist Party, of course, is no state secret. My political affiliation and views have been a matter of public record for a good many years and are known to the membership of my organization, but insofar as expressions can be and are my personal opinions, they do not necessarily represent the point of view of the organization of which I am an officer.

But you see, he said, "Yes, sir; I am a member or have membership in the Communist Party." Mr. Lasser was identified with the Workers Alliance in 1935. Mr. Benjamin came into that organization in 1936. They worked in tandem, president and secretary, for more than 3 years, maybe 3½ years, before Mr. Lasser got out on the ground that Mr. Benjamin was delivering the Workers Alliance to the Communist Party.

Now, I am wondering somewhat whether or not Mr. Lasser has changed his viewpoint; and, of course, there is nothing in the law of the land to make him; but there is involved a question of policy for Congress to determine: Whether or not we shall keep somebody on the pay roll who is subversive in heart even though the lips may deny it and who is holding a responsible Government position whereby he can let this indoctrination manifest itself wherever his duty may lead him. The reason I am interested not only from the standpoint of Mr. Lasser but others is that there is a responsibility here for the Congress.

I told this Congress a few years ago when they were complaining about the certain activities of the National Labor Relations Board that there was a lawyer whose name was Nathan Witt who really ran the National Labor Relations Board. That is very important, because the first thing that happened when Mr. Leiserson took over down there was get rid of Nathan Witt. The reason Mr. Witt was so important was because he was the executive secretary. You could not run a thing from any regional office through the National Labor Relations Board unless Mr. Witt got a look at it. When the testimony was finally taken from the files of that Board before the Smith committee it would have made a far more resolute gentleman than Mr. Witt leave the service of the Government. He had no choice except to sever his connection.

Where is Mr. Witt today? This is rather an interesting query and a very pertinent query. I am going to tell you what the gentleman is doing and I am going to read to you from the May 27, 1941, issue of the Daily Worker. There can be no quibbling or controversy as to the policies of this newspaper. Everybody in the United States knows them. I want to tell you what Mr. Witt is doing at the

present time. He is engaged in the law business up in New York and he has taken for himself a case very recently in connection with Harry Bridges. Mr. Witt has filed a petition very recently with the Federal Communications Commission. He thinks that Mr. Bridges is being crucified and is not getting a fair deal. So Mr. Witt is now in charge of a committee in New York that is filing a complaint with the Federal Communications Commission in order to open up the radio channels to Mr. Harry Bridges, well-known alien and west coast glamour boy. Here is what Mr. Witt said, and this is reasonably fresh because it is only 2 weeks old:

As a result the newspapers are free to print all sorts of malicious misstatements. Further the radio news broadcasts are largely written by the press services, so that what does go out over the air is no improvement on the newspapers themselves.

Mr. Witt, who had industry within the cup of his hand for many years, is today heading an organization in New York for the purpose of giving Harry Bridges a chance to capture the ear of the American public in order to stay here longer and resist the procedure that is pending against him at the present time in California.

You will remember we criticized and complained severely about Mr. Witt and the responsibility that he exercised. Those criticisms and complaints fell on deaf ears until he was in a fair way to ruining a great segment of the industry of the country. Mr. Witt today has taken off the mask after he severed his relationship with the Government of the United States and identifies himself with a committee to assist Harry Bridges, the alien Australian, who has provoked so much disturbance in the land.

Here is another thing in connection with this Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, as it is officially styled, that is seeking to get Mr. Bridges' story to the American public. There is another gentleman whose name is Robert Morse Lovett who serves on that committee.

We had the Interior appropriation up here I think about the time I left for a little jaunt into the great prairie country where I live. This appropriation bill contained an appropriation for the Virgin Islands. Mr. Robert Morse Lovett, who serves on the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, is the Government secretary of the Virgin Islands. He is a Government employee. I just went over to the Appropriations Committee and checked the justification, and he is on the pay roll for \$5,600 per year of the taxpayers' money. Nobody is going to laugh that off, because I like to document my facts a little as I go along.

Here in the Daily Worker of May 27, 1941, they list the name of Robert Morse Lovett, Government Secretary, Virgin Islands, as a member of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges. Mr. Chairman, we have been fussing with this thing for a long time. Why do we have that sort of thing in the Government? I am wondering whether we must not after all go back and take a course in semantics and in the fine discriminations and refinements of word definition for this very

good reason: Are we running into a blind alley? Is communism subversion, or is it not? If it is not, why all the shooting, why all the noise, why all the smoke and fury if it is not? If it is, why are these boys on the pay roll? Why not do something about it now, not only including Mr. Lasser but Mr. Lovett and many others as well?

I will tell you how Mr. Lasser got around it. This printed hearing from which I shall read is a great document.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bound copy of the W. P. A. investigation I will read from, and I quote from page 178. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] proposed this question of Mr. Lasser:

Do you consider the Communist Party a subversive organization?

That is a very fair question. It is going to have to be decided because it is legalized. It gets its name on the ballot in a great many States. Here was Mr. Lasser's answer:

My impression from reading the material that Mr. Benjamin has furnished is that it is not.

Note that. Mr. Lasser says the Communist Party is not subversive. Well, I do not know whether Mr. Lasser can prove that statement or not. There is no need to read the rest of the context.

It seems strange to me he could work in close cooperation and harmony with Mr. Benjamin who stated he was and had been a Communist uninterrupted for 18 years and still Mr. Lasser finds a very responsible job as an investigator and a semipolicy maker, as I see it—although that is denied—in the whole field of the transition of W. P. A. workers to private industry.

Now, just by way of summary, down in the Virgin Islands we have Robert Morse Lovett on the pay roll of the Government, and this body appropriated for him 2 weeks ago \$5,600 a year. This man is serving on the Harry Bridges citizens committee. We have a man who was executive secretary of the National Labor Relations Board practicing law today in New York and appealing to the Federal Communications Committee to get a hearing for Harry Bridges. What are we going to do about it? The Attorney General stated on the front page of the papers this morning that the difficulty out in California was aggravated largely because of the activities of the Communist line and Communist front. But what has this Congress done about it? Has it come to grips? Has it found a square definition of the whole problem that is agitating the people of the country? Has it invoked any kind of definite program or action to meet the situation? We have had a million disclosures and revelations of one kind and another. They make fine reading on the front page of the newspapers. We have had dissident resolutions and legislation of one kind or another, but still the thing goes on. It is bad enough to have it on the outside of the official rolls of Government, but it is infinitely worse when it is

on the inside of Government. I would like to meet the situation if I can.

I do not know what is going to be done, and maybe nobody else will do it, but I am going to offer an amendment to this bill when the time comes, unless somebody else does, to deny use of any part of this appropriation to pay a salary to our friend, Mr. Lasser. This is a very humble effort, I know. It is rather singular that you have to tack a little rider on a tremendous appropriation bill in order to meet a given situation, but I believe there is involved here a great question of policy that transcends the individual fortunes of Mr. Lasser, and that is why I propose to do it, and for no other reason than to direct the attention of the Congress and the country to it and to the fact that the time for vigorous action is at hand.

Finally, the Bridges trial is going on now. We came to grips with it once. I never will forget all the great constitutional logic that was spun out on this floor as to whether it was a bill of attainder or an *ex post facto* act. I am going to throw my effort into that hopper, too, because this afternoon I am going to drop this bill in the hopper:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That on and after the tenth day following the enactment hereof, it shall be unlawful for Harry Bridges, defendant, in the deportation proceedings pending on June 10, 1941, before the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States Department of Justice, to be and/or remain in the United States or any other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

There is no attainder to that, and no *ex post facto*. That is going to make it unlawful for Harry Bridges to be anywhere within the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction. If we are going to deal with this thing, we may just as well deal with it now, and take the gloves off. While this is only a drop in the bucket, at least I want to back up what observations I made here this afternoon by some kind of concrete action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] such time as he may desire.

STATEMENT ON W. P. A. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES—AMENDMENT WILL BE OFFERED TO RESTORE BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends a total limitation on administrative expenses of \$35,466,000. This constitutes a cut of \$4,224,000 from the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and a cut of over \$9,000,000 from the limitation in this year's act. The limitation this year is in itself a reduction of \$9,000,000 from the amount used last year.

COMMITTEE REDUCTION TOO MUCH

If the committee's recommendation is approved, it will mean a reduction of over 5,000 employees from the 21,450 employed as an average this year. The administrative limitation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget would permit an average administrative employment of approximately 18,350 persons for the next fiscal year. This is certainly not an excessive number when the work they are required to perform is taken into

consideration. The W. P. A. is operating over 23,000 work projects in more than 3,000 counties throughout the country. It is responsible not only for seeing that all of the work is properly and efficiently executed but also for carefully reviewing the need status of all of the W. P. A. workers, checking to determine whether they violate any of the provisions in the act with respect to membership in the Nazi Bund or Communist Party, assigning each worker to his proper project in accordance with his capabilities, preparing pay rolls, and carrying out many other functions imposed on it by Congress.

Members of Congress will have an increased number of complaints if the W. P. A. does not have sufficient help to iron out the many differences, disputes, and complaints. Members of Congress will be confronted with many problems that they cannot satisfactorily cope with.

MAJORITY OF DISTRICT OFFICES TO CLOSE

Although the reduction in the total appropriation for the W. P. A. will cause some decrease in the administrative work, the decrease will be very small in comparison to the total reduction in the appropriation, since the basic administrative functions are the same. If the limitation recommended by the committee is not changed, the W. P. A. is going to be forced to close a majority of its district offices and consolidate most of the work in the smaller States into regional offices. Action of this type will unquestionably mean that the officials handling matters will be far removed from local problems and will be less able to give prompt and understanding consideration to local problems. In addition to these consolidations, the program will have to be abandoned in many areas in the country because there will not be sufficient administrative personnel to supervise the work. It is poor economy for us to vote nearly a billion dollars to an agency and then to so limit its administrative cost that it cannot do an adequate job in seeing that the money is properly spent. I know it is the desire of this House that the W. P. A. projects be efficiently supervised and that the W. P. A. carry out all the provisions in the appropriation act in the most thorough way possible. To do this they must have a reasonable amount of administrative funds. The limitation on administrative funds in the act should be restored to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; that is a total of \$39,690,000, with a limitation of \$32,240,000 for salaries, \$600,000 for communications, \$3,600,000 for travel, and \$400,000 for printing and binding.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in his farewell address George Washington with prophetic vision declared that the time would likely arise in this country when groups of men would seek to undermine what they could not overthrow in our governmental system.

That time has come. Subversive elements are scattered all over our land

endeavoring to undermine our institutions and our ideals, with the ultimate object of overthrowing our system of government.

We have imported most of our troubles and most of our problems. It is my belief that the overwhelming majority of real American workers are intensely patriotic. The recent troubles in our program of production for national defense have been due in practically every instance to the activities of un-American workers whose destructive schemes are planned by dictatorial direction from abroad.

Agents of these subversive elements have worked their way into key positions in many localities where defense industries are in operation, and they have become so potent with their nefarious machinations that they no longer heed the counsel of the leader of either of the two great labor organizations of this country. We have read in the press of the recommendations to return to work in the defense plants which have been made by Mr. Green and Mr. Murray, but in many places certain communistic agitators have assumed the guiding role and have made such recommendations of no avail.

No longer ago than this morning we read in the local papers the statement of the Attorney General of the United States that in most cases these strikes against our defense production have been fomented by Communists. That this statement placing the responsibility on subversive groups is true, is attested by the fact that already, since the President has strengthened our confidence and courage by giving the North American Aviation Co. in California the protection of the Army, more than 70 percent of the workers have returned promptly to their labors.

Such strikes are the initial technique of these communistic schemers. They are frequently based upon mere flimsy subterfuges to cloak the real intent of weakening our country by preventing the production of the things needed for our defense. They are just the starting point on the way to the goal at which these agitators hope to arrive. In my judgment, such strikes are not in accord with the desires of the great majority of the workers. They are not based upon the fundamental right to strike. They are based upon the dastardly schemes of these communistic leaders who have wormed themselves into key positions. If true American workers had the right to a secret ballot, I do not believe that they would be casting their votes to disrupt industry and interfere with the production so vitally needed to defend the blessings of liberty they enjoy.

For years the great labor organization which has been longest in existence in the United States has been one of the dominant forces standing firmly against unrestricted immigration, in order that we might not allow within our borders the very class of people who are primarily responsible for the unfortunate conditions that now impede our progress. The subversive agitators who seek to lead labor astray are un-American at heart and un-American in principle. They are trying to undermine what they know

they cannot at once overthrow. There is no place in our American system for these hostile groups. Their activities have so aroused public opinion that the recognized rights of honest American labor have become imperiled, and it behooves all patriotic workers in their own defense to take note of this situation. Anyone who raises his voice against the continuance of these communistic outbreaks is speaking in the interest of the American people and of real American labor.

We have been assured by various executive departments that no further legislation is necessary to correct the unfortunate conditions which exist, yet these subversive strikes have continued, and the Congress is being censured, in spite of the fact that such assurance has been given us. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the measure making appropriations for the War Department which was before us for consideration on yesterday, this branch of the Congress wrote into the bill some provisions designed to give relief from the deplorable state of affairs in our defense production. The executive departments are now giving more active and vigorous attention to this situation, and I am sure are receiving therefor the commendation of those who have the honor to serve in these legislative halls.

Where are these strikes in the United States? In the United States News, which came to our desks yesterday, I find this statement:

Fifty-three strikes involving more than 57,100 employees held up work on defense projects for part or all of last week. The totals are the largest recorded for any week since the beginning of the defense program.

And where are these strikes? They are shown to be in the following States—and I am not reciting this from any sectional standpoint, because I realize that these subversive troublemakers naturally go to the industrial sections where they expect to find a more fertile field for their destructive efforts—there are seven in Missouri, three in Illinois, five in Pennsylvania, three in Connecticut, five in California, six in New York, four in New Jersey, five in Ohio, four in Michigan, three in Washington, and one in each of the following States: Rhode Island, Indiana, Wisconsin, Maine, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

It is naturally gratifying to me to note that we are not having any of these communistic strikes in the State which I have the honor to represent in part, or in the States in that particular section, or out in the great body of the Midwest. As I have stated, that is likely due largely to the fact that they are not sections of great industrial concentration and have been more free from the insidious influence of hostile agitators. But I must confess that I have wondered sometimes if it would not have been a little bit wiser to have assigned more of the defense production to these areas where no such strikes are occurring. We do have considerable defense work in those States, but it has been carried on in a fine American spirit and uninterrupted by spurious propaganda of foreign agents.

Of course, we know that these agitators either come from abroad or get their instructions from some dictatorial regime, and we know also that they are concealing their final desire for the overthrow of this Government by finding excuses to foment strikes that curtail the output of much needed matériel. Just pause and contemplate what this stoppage of work has meant not only to our own country but to England and to the democracies that are fighting for principles of freedom we Americans cherish. There might have been supplied enough of munitions and equipment in some places to have turned the tide of battle. There would have been 40 more bombers available from 1 plant alone. And there are plenty of good and capable Americans who were ready and longing to provide the needed matériel, but in many instances they were hampered and restrained by the technicalities and subterfuges of subversive agents who had acquired places of control within their ranks. Loyal American workers want to have their labor devoted to the protection of our beloved land without interference, and it behooves all in positions of authority to free them from the hostile influences that seek to deny them this opportunity.

Think how many lands of free people have lost their liberty through just such a course as we have been witnessing in this country. Take France, for instance; poor, deluded France. Through the insidious endeavors of these subversive elements, they have now come under the domination of the Nazi yoke.

It is a peculiar thing, injected for persuasion to false conclusions, that from the very beginning these communistic and other subversive groups have termed the efforts of Great Britain and France an imperialistic war. I wonder what France, under the subjection of Germany, thinks today of that accusation. Why, it has been but 2 or 3 years since the Members of this Congress received letters threatening them with defeat if they did not vote in a certain way on certain measures, and those letters were signed by the president of the Communist Party and by its secretary, Earl Browder. And the accompanying document they sent was berating England and France for conducting an imperialistic war. Never one word comes from them to indicate that Germany has been conducting an imperialistic war, in spite of the fact that a dozen conquered countries now feel the pressure of the Nazi heel. And, strange as it may seem, I have heard that same word "imperialism" used in a similar way on the floor of this House.

It is time for American citizens to wake up and it is time for American labor to wake up and protect the interests of this country. If we follow the same system that humiliated and subdued France and other nations of free people, American labor and the American people may eventually find themselves in the same deplorable state as France and all these other conquered lands: serfs and slaves with no social gains, no rights, no protection, no liberty. And whatever legislation may be necessary to stop the

nefarious work of these communistic and other hostile agitators and to allow American labor, unfettered by spurious propaganda and agents from abroad, to have its rightful place and do its proper work in our defense production, I shall gladly support.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the question of France?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; I will yield briefly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to make an observation in connection with the fall of France, and it is that repressive legislation against labor was passed before France went into war under the guise of France's so-called national defense; that the same people who were responsible for the enactment of that legislation against labor in France were the same people who plunged France into war; and this is indeed remarkable for, despite the fact that Hitler has conquered France, these same people still own the same mines, the same banks, the same factories, and own the same monopolies that they owned before France went into war and before France lost. The reason for it was that they were interested in smashing labor and not in the defense of their country.

Mr. LANHAM. I must decline to yield further, because I need the time; but I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from New York that labor certainly has not been repressed in this country of ours. It has had more legislation enacted for its benefit than in any country under the sun.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. And what I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, is an opportunity for American labor to be permitted to work in an American way. American labor has stood opposed to the immigration of these rascals from abroad who are here trying to disrupt our defense program, and I do not want to see American labor or any American citizen reduced to serfdom and slavery through the domination of dictators across the seas, whatever their particular and peculiar brand of hostility to democracy and freedom may be.

We have not yet been called upon for much in the way of sacrifice. The greatest sacrifice has been made by these fine American boys who have gone to the various camps. You know and I know that many of them have given up for the period of their training lucrative positions in the various trades and professions to serve Uncle Sam for \$21 a month. Are we to allow communistic and other subversive agitators to prevent American labor from having the chance to work in order that these boys in the camps who do their jobs without complaint in spite of their sacrifices may have the equipment with which to defend themselves and this great free country in which we live?

Mr. Chairman, America is at the crossroads today. The situation is critical, and we must think and act as Americans worthy of the name and the heritage. It is imperative that our program for national defense go forward.

A year ago I quoted on this floor words of an eminent American poet that seem peculiarly appropriate today. In bidding our ship of state sail gloriously on, he said:

Humanity with all its fears,  
With all the hopes of future years,  
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

Upon the fate of this country, upon the preparation that this country makes for its own defense and for such production as it can spare for the democracies struggling for the preservation of institutions and ideals and principles in which we believe, does hang indeed the fate of humanity. Upon you and upon me and upon the American people rests a great responsibility and, in appreciation of the blessings of liberty which have become our boon in this land of the free, let us be worthy followers and successors of the patriots who made possible this glorious American Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Dakota. [Mr. ROBERTSON.]

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, throughout my entire life-time I have always stood as a sponsor of the philosophy of living within income, a philosophy which, unfortunately, has not prevailed during the past few years as far as governmental expenditures are concerned. At the present time, we are called upon in this national emergency not only to appropriate for domestic needs but, in addition, make available other huge appropriations for our preparedness effort.

In many of these so-called defense appropriations, we have appropriated for items which do not come under the classification of defense. We have had urged upon us the necessity of drastically reducing appropriations for nondefense items, but the fact remains that such reductions have not been made to any substantial degree. The administration has resisted every effort to cut down the spending by the vast bureaucracy it has created. Here is where economy should be practiced first of all. In view of the fact that the administration has not seen fit to reduce its expenditures for operation of the general government, I rise to support this appropriation for continuation of the Work Projects Administration during the coming fiscal year.

I realize that there are many sections of the United States which are greatly benefiting by the billions of dollars we have appropriated for defense. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that the relief load in those sections can be materially reduced. I am sure you all recognize, however, that there are many sections of the Nation which are not and cannot be the beneficiaries of this huge defense expenditure, therefore, the relief problem within these non-defense-production areas has not been materially changed.

I represent a State in the Plains area in which the defense contracts awarded can probably be counted on the fingers of one hand. As with other States in this Midwest agricultural area, we must look to the Federal Government for a continuation of the relief programs inaugurated in past years. The incomes

and purchasing power of our people who have been on relief in the agricultural States will not be materially increased because the unemployment problem still remains a problem in those areas.

I recognize on the part of my colleagues, particularly those from industrial regions, a growing concern in regard to these continuous huge appropriations for relief. I share with them the hope that the day will come when such appropriations will not be necessary. At the same time, I recognize that that day is not here simply because defense expenditures have greatly reduced the relief and unemployment problems of our industrial centers. I would like to suggest to you that a contributing factor to the need for continued relief appropriations throughout the Plains States can be traced directly to the unwise land policy adopted by the Federal Government back in the days when this region was new.

That policy was to open these areas for settlement without due regard to the soil and climatic characteristics of the area. Farm practices which have been successful further east and along the Atlantic seaboard were encouraged. For a considerable number of years when the land was fertile and rainfall ample, these farm practices proved adaptable to this new region, but with the gradual depletion of the soil and a growing deficiency in the annual rainfall it soon developed that this region was not well adapted to intensive cultivation with the result that hundreds of farm families had to leave their homes. Much of this area is now undergoing a transition—from grain farming back to livestock and grazing and also a considerable development in irrigation. That adjustment to new conditions cannot be made overnight nor can the problem be considered as a purely local one. It is a national problem involving many States. Until that adjustment has been made, we cannot neglect to give reasonable consideration to the relief needs of the people in these areas.

The President, himself, realized that not all sections of the Nation could participate in the expenditures made for national defense. I quote from his Budget message:

An additional factor militating against as great a reduction in unemployment as might appear possible is that there are many of the presently unemployed who have little chance to be absorbed by the defense effort. Certain regions of the country are not affected by defense activities, and many types of workers are not in demand.

The big factor in the unemployment and relief situation in North Dakota, which the public does not generally appreciate, is this: In practically all of the towns of the State, we have what may be termed a "stranded population." These people, for the most part, are persons formerly engaged in agricultural pursuits but who have had to leave the land because of depression and poor crops. They have gone to the smaller towns to make their homes under rather desperate conditions. There was no place else for them to go, and in these towns there is little possibility of their ever getting jobs of any kind. In fact, in most of them there simply are no jobs.

I am not so concerned about reduction of the W. P. A. appropriation at this particular time or during the summer months when our agricultural industries will absorb many of the unemployed if the crop comes through. What I am concerned about is the conditions that will prevail next winter. There is little in sight at this time to indicate that there will be any great reduction in the relief and unemployment rolls in North Dakota next winter. During the winter months there is a general suspension of all seasonal work, such as highway construction and agricultural activities. On the other hand, the needs of the people during the winter months are greatly increased—they must have fuel and warmer clothing. Where the heads of families cannot be employed by W. P. A., it means that the relief load is thrown back upon the county or the municipality, which are already in such straitened financial circumstances that they cannot be of much assistance.

Despite the increased unemployment and relief needs during the winter months, the proposed reduction in W. P. A. funds will mean that the heads of the 3,000 needy families must be taken off the relief rolls with the approach of winter.

At the present time, there are quite a few people leaving the State for those sections of the country where there is defense-industry employment. Such migration, however, can only partially relieve the situation, because the greater part of the W. P. A. load is made up of persons who are unable to do this. Forty-three percent of all persons employed by W. P. A. in North Dakota are more than 40 years old, and more than 17 percent are more than 45 years old. People in this age group are obviously reluctant to leave the State in search for employment elsewhere—employment for which, in many cases, they have not the skill or background to qualify. Their only hope is to get back to the land as soon as conditions warrant a reasonable prospect of staying there.

Summarizing the situation, our State W. P. A. director, Thomas H. Moodie, has this to say—and I quote:

It is my conclusion that unless we are able to maintain W. P. A. employment on about the same basis as it was carried on during the fiscal year of 1940-41, there will be inevitable suffering and hardship among a great group of people in North Dakota.

In conclusion, it seems to me, then, that it is time to restudy the efforts of W. P. A. Surely these areas that are so substantially benefited by the spending of defense funds have no rightful claim for the same ratio for continuation of W. P. A. relief, and it should accordingly be reduced. But in sections such as the Great Plains States where there is no possible benefit to be derived from the defense spending, it seems to me only reasonable that the same ratio of W. P. A. relief that has prevailed in the last year should continue again for the coming year. And, therefore, if it cannot be done within the limits of this bill as it prevails, I urgently support the adoption of pending amendments that will make this possible.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, on the 3d day of April the Secretary of Agriculture asked the farmers of this country, certain groups, to increase their production. At about the same time they went on and announced certain prices in relation to the Chicago market. My colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] introduced a resolution, as he could see what would happen to this price structure unless we had producer, consumer, and distributor committee to advise on this matter. Up to this time nothing has been done about that resolution.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I have been informed that as soon as the majority leader can find time this week, the resolution will be given a place. The Rules Committee has already voted it out.

Mr. MURRAY. I am very glad to know that. Last Friday the Secretary of Agriculture called upon the people of this country to reduce their consumption of cheese. In connection with this W. P. A. appropriation bill, we will either have to increase the W. P. A. appropriation or else have to adopt some more carefully thought out agricultural programs than the ones that are being suggested at this time.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PITTINGER. This will be rather hard on the cheese makers of Wisconsin because I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin will admit the best cheese in the world is made in Wisconsin, is it not?

Mr. MURRAY. I admit that. I wish to say that as far as Wisconsin is concerned, I have a telegram that came today showing that the farmers of the State of Wisconsin have done exactly as the Secretary asked them to do. This telegram says:

MADISON, WIS., June 10, 1941.

REED F. MURRAY:

Indicated Wisconsin milk production first 6 months of 1941 about 9 percent above last year. Last month about 11 percent higher than same month of 1940.

WALTER H. EBLING.

Wisconsin has most assuredly done her part on this dairy-production request. Anyone who knows anything about the dairy business knows you cannot simply turn on an electric light and make the cow give more milk. It takes a little time to get the cow to cooperate with you and perform her duties. Now, we have the Secretary of Agriculture going out and telling the people of this country we should cut down on our cheese consumption.

Mr. Chairman, the recent announcement by the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, in which he asks the American public to reduce their consumption of cheese is unnecessary, unwarranted, and unfair to this industry.

First. It is unnecessary because, if an increase in the American cheese production is deemed desirable it can be accomplished by the Government providing cooperative creameries with a few cheese vats and equipment so that these creameries will have a flexible plant. If the present administration can furnish millions of dollars to business interests to expand their plants, why cannot they provide these cooperative creameries with equipment to increase the cheese production if it is a national necessity? As only 6.6 pounds out of every 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States is made into cheese and over 42.1 pounds out of every 100 pounds goes into butter, a small diversion from butter to cheese production would double the amount of cheese available.

Second. This request is unwarranted because, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, there are about 35,000,000 pounds of surplus Cheddar cheese in New Zealand, 15,299,000 pounds in Canada, and 44,180,000 pounds of various foreign type cheeses in storage in Argentina. There are no available figures for Australia. The United States has a total annual production of about 600,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese, and in Wisconsin in 1940, 314,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese were produced. Warehouses in New Zealand are bulging with dairy products, but they say they expect them to be as long as England can get dairy products free from the United States.

Third. The request is unfair as it will undo the splendid work the cheese industry has done in the past 50 years in creating a demand for this incomparable product. The per capita cheese production has been increased from 3.5 pounds per capita to 5.3 pounds per capita during the past few years. The State of Wisconsin and the cheese industry have spent enormous sums in an effort to advertise this great product, universally known as poor man's meat. How much time, how much effort, and how much money will the American cheese farmer have to spend to recover this domestic market if the American people follow Secretary Wickard's advice and reduce their consumption?

The New Deal reduced the tariff on cheese in the first Canadian treaty by 2 cents per pound. The price dropped from 17 to 12½ cents per pound between January 1 and July 1, 1936. The imports in 1936 were 14 times as great as the 1935 imports. The tariff was again reduced 1 cent per pound in the second Canadian treaty in 1938, and the price dropped from 12.7 cents per pound in December 1938 to 11.8 cents per pound in January 1939, or 1 cent, about the amount of the reduction in the tariff. The 1939 imports were over three times as much as the 1938 imports. Cheese has averaged 13.4 cents per pound the 8 years of the New Deal, and butter has averaged 27.6 cents per pound during this time. The 8 years before the New Deal cheese averaged 18.1 cents per pound, and butter averaged 38.1 cents per pound during this same time.

The official price jugglers of the present administration pegged the price of

butter at 31 cents per pound on April 3, when it was 33 cents per pound the day they pegged it, and the parity price was 37.1 cents the same day. The price of 92-score butter averaged 31.5 cents per pound at Chicago under the Hoover administration, and now the New Deal wants to peg a 2-year price of only 31 cents per pound. The New Deal price jugglers have been running and ruining the butter market for several years. They just cannot conceive that the old law of supply and demand can really work again in America. They evidently feel that this dairy market is to be continually and forever manipulated in the interests of the consumer group. There is no evidence of any effort to help the producer get a fair price for his butter and cheese. For 2 weeks I have heard that the price jugglers of the New Deal were very concerned about the recent advance in prices of dairy products. At the same time I was informed that they were going to try to break dairy prices. I knew that we purchased 233,772 pounds of butter in 1940 at 17.2 cents per pound from Argentina, at the time that domestic butter was on our surplus list, but I could not believe that the administration would intentionally try to ruin the dairy market or harm any group of our society after so many protestations of humanitarianism and social gains. Is the removal of butter from the surplus marketing list an effort in this direction? Is this new request to disorganize and disrupt the cheese industry a move toward this? Could this be a method of getting cheese farmers more kindly disposed toward war? If 45,000,000 Americans are now undernourished, will not this number be increased if the domestic consumption of dairy products is to be decreased?

I cannot help but hope that the Agricultural Department's request that the domestic consumption of dairy products be reduced will meet with failure as fully as have its efforts in selling the war to the farmers of America. [Applause.]

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman on the power of his representation of his district, in calling the attention of the Congress to these situations which exist in the country and which exist in his district in the State of Wisconsin. I am wondering if the gentleman would be able to get some of that influence down here in Washington to those who would curb the use of cheese in this country. It is my understanding that it is excellent food for our soldiers and sailors who are in the service. What would be the gentleman's observation in that regard?

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman and I will say that within the last week one of my good colleagues on the other side complained because I was working too hard and said that was not the way to do. He said the main thing to do is to watch around and grab something for your district. He said that is really the best way for a Congressman to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURRAY. I have never criticized Wallace. I do not criticize the present Secretary of Agriculture, but I do say to my colleague from Minnesota that the time has come when the real farm people of this country surely need somebody in Washington who thinks about the producer once in a while and is not continually giving the viewpoint of the consumer of agricultural products.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, no one can gainsay the claim that the unemployment situation throughout the country has been considerably benefited by the great volume of jobs offered in countless industries through the projection of the national-defense program. No one with an ounce of common sense would endeavor to state to this body that inroads into the vast number of unemployed have not been made during the past year.

This is especially so, I think, among those unemployed who are fortunate in having in reserve a skilled trade; and it is so in countless instances in the cases of those unskilled but being under 40 years of age and able and vigorous are therefore given an opportunity to work in our national-defense production plants and factories.

But in considering this relief appropriation bill we must not be so greatly encouraged by these auspicious figures of unemployment reduction that we foolishly come to believe that we are over the hill, the problem is solved, the sun is in the sky, and all is well with those unfortunate who have been struggling for an existence during the past decade. With all the billions of dollars that are being spent in national-defense production there are still several millions of unemployed in this country who must continue to depend upon us for their well-being until such time as they are able to adjust themselves properly into our economic life.

These millions should not be suddenly cut off from such meager protection as they now enjoy through sudden, unreasonable, drastic cuts in appropriation. Rather should the matter be considered carefully, and only such reduction in appropriations be made as are consistent with the relative reductions which are gradually occurring in unemployment.

There are certain groups of these unemployed throughout the Nation who, being over 40 years of age, find it impossible, no matter how hard they try, to secure work in most of our industries today. The man over 40 is an "old man" these days, and youth has first call, whether it be in our armed forces or in the great industrial plants of the country. What is to become of these men and women over 40? Many have had their boys taken from them for the armed service, and are therefore totally dependent upon themselves for support, and in many instances have additional small mouths dependent upon them. If they

are suddenly cast out from the relief rolls, where they have sought refuge, where are they to turn? It is inconceivable that any one of them would remain an instant on W. P. A. rolls at the mere pittance they receive from that source were they offered or could they secure a job in private industry.

It is for these unfortunates that we must carefully consider these reductions in appropriations. And it is for these that we must consider if it is not the time right now to eliminate from the provisions of this bill the enforced 30-day lay-off period after 18 months' consecutive service. If we allow that provision to remain in the bill we are legislating a month or more of distress and privation for those who are forced unwillingly to accept the beneficence of the Government for want of an opportunity to find employment in private industry. We should immediately discontinue this awkward and unfair penalty.

The Appropriations Committee has seen fit to cut by an additional 10 percent the administrative appropriation, which had already been reduced 10 percent by the Budget Bureau. This is eminently unwise; an incomplete, insufficient administrative personnel can but result in an inefficient W. P. A. organization from top to bottom. At the present time, without any reduction similar to those proposed, less than 3½ percent of the entire W. P. A. personnel is in administrative. Any businessman readily recognizes that this is indeed an extremely low percentage.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that when the bill is opened for amendment tomorrow the Members of the House will join in advocating and supporting a reinstatement of those slashes which are carried in this measure and will see to it that a fair, just, and worthy relief bill is passed.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, in his special message to Congress asking ratification of the St. Lawrence project agreement with Canada, President Roosevelt said:

I am advised that we can build the St. Lawrence project in 4 years. Under emergency pressure it may be completed in less time. I should like to agree with the people who say that the country's danger will be over sooner than that. But the course of world events gives no such assurance, and we have no right to take chances with the national safety.

Under the agreement—article II—Canada agrees "to complete not later than December 31, 1948, the essential Canadian links" in the seaway.

It is further provided in article II that the two Governments "may by exchange of notes, arrange to defer or expedite their completion as circumstances may agree."

Insofar as the United States share of the work is concerned, it is set forth in article III that the United States agrees to complete the works allocated to it "not later than the date of completion of the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway."

Thus the agreement as it stands obligates Canada to complete its share of the work by December 31, 1948, and the United States to complete its share not later than that date.

Furthermore the work may be delayed or expedited by agreement stated in an exchange of notes.

Therefore it is obvious the work could not be completed in 4 years except Canada agreed to expedite its share of the work. There is no statement from Canada indicating she would agree to modification of the present obligation of the agreement.

The President did not indicate there had been any discussion with Canada regarding her obligation under the agreement when he said, "I am advised we can build the St. Lawrence project in 4 years. Under emergency pressure it may be completed in less time."

There are only two courses under which the work could be completed in the time specified by the President—

Either Canada would agree to expedite its share of the work, or the United States would undertake to do all the work on each side of the boundary line, at its own expense.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]. He and I have in common the fact that we represent dairy farmers. I like his rugged espousal of the cause of the common man and woman of this country. Since it is a sort of a lazy afternoon, drawing toward its close, and time is not of the essence, I would like to talk a little further about the espousal of the causes of the common men and women. You know, whenever men and women have grouped themselves together in order to formulate rules and laws to govern themselves, strangely enough, they have fallen into two classes. That has been invariably the rule. They fall either into class No. 1, those who mistrust and are contemptuous of the people and who wish to withdraw all the powers they can from the people and place them in the hands of the few whom they think, because they are largest stakeholders in property, have almost a divine right to rule and govern others. Or they fall into the other class, No. 2, who cherish and trust the people, who believe the people are the wisest repository of power. I believe it is the second class that has made this country great. Hamilton, of course, belonged to the first class. The Declaration of Independence, however, was taken from Jefferson's words.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is the foundation stone of American democracy.

I maintain that whenever a public figure has been held in esteem by the American people it is because he has espoused the cause of the people.

It is not a matter of party. We have men—I see them here today—who are

rugged protagonists of the rights of the people. I am glad to see them—from the Middle West, the great Northwest, and from the Western States. And so it has been since the very beginning of this country, the truly great have trusted the people, have guarded their interests, and have identified themselves with the people. Lincoln believed in this philosophy. Remember, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." There was Teddy Roosevelt. Remember, his big stick was the weapon with which he beat back the invasion of the rights of the people by the great trusts and combinations of his day. There was President Wilson. Remember his words:

The great Government we love has too often been made use of for private and selfish purposes and those who used it had forgotten the people.

So I am glad to state here that I believe a majority of this Congress belong to that class that has the interest of the people at heart, who trust them, who cherish them, and love them. We need to have that class represented here. They are weak, they have no lobbyists, they have no pressure groups; and certainly it is a great thing to dedicate yourself to the cause of the weak, because the strong do not need such great support; they take care of themselves pretty well, as you and I have learned during our experience here in Washington. I now approach the problem of unemployment bearing in mind the two different classifications that men in public life have fallen into from the beginning of time, and I want to approach it from the viewpoint of the second class.

Unemployment was a great problem here before we got into this present emergency. Sometimes I think there are those among us who welcomed the emergency because it enabled them to dodge the problem of unemployment. I introduced legislation or amendments predicated upon the proposition that we should appropriate the sum of \$3,000,000—it was an astronomical figure—in order to take care of all the unemployed who were eligible for work and who were able to work, but who could not find work in private industry. I stand upon that as a principle and I have not deviated from it. There were men in this Congress who threw their hands up in horror at the thought of spending \$3,000,000,000, and so the amendment was lost. Year after year I put in an amendment increasing the amount that would enable those who were without work, who could not find work in private industry, to find employment on W. P. A. I did so because I thought the words of Jefferson—"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—were empty phrases unless a man had an opportunity to work and provide for himself, his wife, and his children, and give them at least housing, shelter, food, and clothing. What life is worth living unless a man has that opportunity?

My amendments were predicated upon that proposition, yet they were shouted down because of the amount involved. I say we were too cowardly; we were afraid to meet the problem of unemployment. We put our foot in the water and

then withdrew it because it was too cold. We did it half-heartedly, and that is almost as bad as not doing it at all. Yet today we find that meeting a problem of defense we have either appropriated or authorized \$47,000,000,000 without so much as raising an eyebrow. There was a time when we had the opportunity of solving the unemployment problem for \$3,000,000,000, solving it, wrestling with the problem of making democracy work, and we should have been vitally interested in it. The cry was we could not afford it, and yet, without a thought of affording it, we have appropriated and authorized \$47,000,000,000, all to defend our democracy, I know, but, nevertheless, to destroy rather than build.

Private industry, due to the stimulus of all this great defense activity, has absorbed from W. P. A. rolls and given employment to millions of people. It has not completely solved the problem, but it has brought us so close to it that if we meet the issue squarely in this bill we can solve it. We should not run away from it now. It is not so insurmountable now as it was a few years ago. We should meet it and settle it. There are at the present time 2,500,000 people out of work who are not taken up by defense programs. Many of them do not live in areas where defense contracts are being carried out.

Sixty percent of them are over 40 years of age. Fifty percent are over 45 years of age. Now, you and I know that private industry is not going to absorb them. You know that the insurance companies that are predicated upon hard facts do not allow in many instances, or else charge higher rates, to industries which employ men over 40 years of age. I am going to offer an amendment which I will ask all of you to consider and to support.

I ask you to read first of all the report of the committee that has been studying this proposition. If you will read the first few pages of that report you will find the greatest argument for my amendment that I have ever seen. It far more eloquently argues in favor of my amendment than I can. I want you to read the report of the committee. It sets up facts but sidesteps the logical conclusion which is that we ought to appropriate the sum of \$1,250,000,000 in order to take care of 1,300,000 people who will not be absorbed by these defense programs.

Mr. PITTINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTINGER. I wonder if the Members of the House realize that if \$50,000,000 of this bill for food stamps is taken the number of people who will be stricken from the W. P. A. rolls will be about 45 percent of the present number on the rolls?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because we had a lot of logrolling on the W. P. A. bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a gentleman who was interested in agriculture was also considering

the W. P. A. bill in committee. He saw an opportunity to get for agriculture \$50,000,000 out of W. P. A. We want to assist agriculture, we want to assist the food-stamp plan, but he puts this proviso in the W. P. A. bill to take out \$50,000,000 and put it over in the Department of Agriculture for the food-stamp plan—a little bit of logrolling to take from those who can least afford it \$50,000,000.

Mr. PITTINGER. I would not call that logrolling. I would call it grab and take.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is what it is—grab and take.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think it is only fair to say that the Department of Agriculture did not ask at any time that this \$50,000,000 be taken from relief funds for the food-stamp plan.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Of course, that is true. The Department of Agriculture would not be a party to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And I favor the food-stamp plan. It has done a marvelous job. But we should not take it out of the hides of the poor unemployed people of the country.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. May I say that, of course, the Department of Agriculture did not ask for it. I am willing to give the Department of Agriculture what is necessary to put through that food-stamp plan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand it, at the other end of this Capitol another body has added \$35,000,000 for the food-stamp plan in another bill. If we want to be fair about it, and if we are interested in the food-stamp plan, we still have an opportunity to put it in another bill.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. You take this money out of the W. P. A., and you will put 58,000 men out of work who will not be able to buy under the food-stamp plan, and, what is more, they will not be eligible for it, because they are not the recipients of any relief.

Mr. PITTINGER. I am in favor of the food-stamp plan, but I am not in favor of getting the money by this method. My home county is the first county in which it was tried out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress I had the idea that there was a real chance of a fighting minority, with the aid of some of our Democratic brethren, being able to cut down some of these vast Government appropriations which run into the billions of dollars. A lot of wind has been taken out of my sails. I have seen these appropriations go through with the utmost speed, despite the fact that we have vigorously fought practically every one of them. I have no idea that we are going to be successful, even if we were so disposed—and I am not saying that I am so disposed—in

cutting down this appropriation of \$886,000,000. We are dealing with a vast sum of money, but unquestionably this money will be appropriated.

Sometimes I am reminded by our experiences in trying to reduce these appropriations of what Matthew Arnold said about the poet Shelley:

A beautiful, ineffectual angel, beating in the void his luminous wings in vain.

I do not mean to imply that there is anything beautiful about any Member on the Republican side, and certainly nothing angelic, specifically excepting the five gentlewomen who grace our benches; but I think you will get the general idea that we come here and we fight vigorously but in vain for economy in the spending of the hard-earned money of the taxpayers. Consequently, our chief purpose now should be to address ourselves to the matter of conducting the Work Projects Administration so as to obtain the maximum benefit therefrom for the people it is devised to aid and for the country at large.

Let us, first of all, consider the fundamental ground for bringing it into being back in 1935. Confessedly, we were in the depths of a great depression; something had to be done. So, entirely as an emergency measure, relief was taken out of the hands of the local communities and taken over by the Federal Government. But let us see now what the situation is in reference to employment.

I read from the monthly digest of the United States Department of Labor for the month of May 1941 that in the month of April 1941 the total of nonagricultural employment reached an all-time peak of 37,617,000, which was 147,000 above the previous high of September 1929.

That same situation is borne out in the report of the committee on this bill. On page 7 we read that in March 1941 the nonagricultural employment was 37,218,000, which was 1,541,000 more than such employment in March 1929.

The natural question that would enter the mind of a man from another planet is that if we have a higher employment peak in the months of March and April of 1941 than we had in the corresponding months of 1929, then why the continuance of W. P. A.?

I think the basic reason is that in 1929 we still adhered to the thesis enunciated by Grover Cleveland when he said that the Government should be supported by the people and that the Government should not support the people. Back in those days when a man did not have a job he got out and really tried to find one, and he did not go home until he had some sort of a job or had made a job for himself.

In these days we say that a man is unemployable because he comes to the W. P. A. office and says, "I cannot get a job." The W. P. A. office then looks him over and says, "All right; that is too bad. We will put you on the rolls and try to find a place for you."

In other words, we have a system that is pernicious in its very foundation in that it places a premium on indolence, it stifles ambition and initiative, and

exacts a penalty for adherence to those traditional American concepts that a man should carve for himself by his own hands and by his own labor and ingenuity a place for himself in the community, and that there is no substitute for personal thrift and industry.

I admire greatly the exposition made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], in his opening remarks this afternoon when he advocated that the proper place for our relief problem should be in the local communities, with the Government helping those States where help is needed. What a myriad of problems that would solve. Would we have the taint of communism if relief were administered by the local authorities? Would Mr. Lasser and this Mr. Levett, of whom we have heard so much this afternoon, be given very much rope in those situations where the localities themselves were spending their own money?

I maintain that it would go far toward solving the entire situation if the Government of the United States would say to the States and the municipalities, "This is your problem. We are giving it back to you. We stand on the sidelines ready to help."

Coming down to the wording of this bill, we read, in line 8 on page 1, that it is for the purpose of continuing to provide work for employable needy persons on useful public projects—and I emphasize the word "useful." It has been brought out in the debate this afternoon that approximately \$300,000,000 of this \$886,000,000 has been, or will be, earmarked for defense projects. Let us look at a few of the projects that are coming up and see just what sort of defense they are building for us.

This is a dandy. I read from an authorization that was issued by the Federal Works Agency under date of January 24, 1941:

Compile specific data of the 1880 census. Work includes transcribing, verifying, indexing, and filing data on all families in the 1880 census in which there were children of 10 years or younger; compiling a master index for a limited representative area from the 1900, 1910, 1920, and 1930 censuses by transcribing information from these censuses to a single master card for each individual; making a study of relative fertility by age, race, locality, and other factors.

And so forth. What do you think that great defense measure is costing the people of the United States? Fifty thousand dollars? Wrong. Five hundred thousand dollars? Wrong again. It is costing the tidy little sum of \$1,680,321.

Here is another beauty:

To salvage, sort, index, microfilm, and preserve records of discontinued Federal relief programs for New York City, including C. W. A., F. E. R. A., and Works Progress Administration records.

That is sponsored by The National Archives. It is a project that no doubt has Messrs. Hitler, Goering, and others trembling in their boots. That is a great defense endeavor, and what do you think it is costing the people of the United States? Just the mere sum of \$700,356.

These frivolous and worthless projects are not localized to my home city of New York and they are not localized to your respective communities. It is all over the country. Here is one that just came out in the April W. P. A. release, Bulletin No. 16:

A history of the Kansas National Guard, now in training at Camp Robinson (Ark.), is being prepared by the Writers Project under the sponsorship of Adj't. Gen. M. R. McLean.

I could go on ad infinitum citing similar useless and nonproductive W. P. A. projects from all over the country. The record is honeycombed with them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I could go on and on here pointing out the graft and the water that has been as much a part of W. P. A. as the name itself. I am not saying that the many worthy people on W. P. A. in my district and in your districts should be cut off. No; they have to be taken care of. But let us give them useful work. Let us see that every dollar is spent for their welfare and their benefit, for which it is intended. Let us try to rehabilitate them so that they can get jobs. Let us try to help them to become again self-respecting and self-supporting American citizens. This self-respect can come only with independence, the right to earn their own livelihoods, and the right to devote their energy and talents to useful and constructive work.

Let us do this realistically. Let us consider the whole problem of relief in its true light; not as a barnacle permanently affixed to our economic structure, but as an emergency measure. Let us take steps to extract the roots of the emergency at the earliest possible time. Let us, in brief, treat this legislation as it should be treated, and not make of it a political football.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] who preceded me a few moments ago, is rather confused between what are known as the old white-collar projects and the national-defense projects. By no stretch of the imagination can the projects that the gentleman referred to be classified as defense projects. The gentleman will find some day that one of the most valuable projects of the Work Projects Administration has been taking the records of the old censuses and making a card index so that unfortunate people throughout the country who have reached the age where they are now entitled to old-age assistance can secure proof of their correct age. This is one of the oldest W. P. A. projects that we have. There come to my desk dozens of requests every week from people in my State who have been unable to prove to the satisfaction of the State social security commission their age, because at the time they were born vital statistics were unknown throughout this country.

There is no record of my birth in the State of Missouri. Vital statistics were not kept at that time and it has only been in recent years, through the efforts of the Federal Government, the Bureau of Public Health, that vital statistics are now kept throughout the Nation. The national-defense projects for which this money is going to be earmarked will be projects in camps, posts, navy yards, and so forth, making roads, repairing property, and matters of that character rather than such projects as the gentleman referred to.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a moment.

Of course, we are exercised in the large cities over this situation, or at least I am. The gentleman stated that he wants to see every worthy person kept on W. P. A. I may tell him that under the provisions of this bill as brought to the floor, you are going to have 758,658 fewer people on W. P. A., starting July 1, than you have had during the present fiscal year. That is the reduction in the number of individuals as a result of the reduction in the amount of this appropriation. The appropriation as brought in here carries \$886,000,000, and one of the things I just cannot get into my head is why, when the full committee was considering this bill yesterday, it voted to earmark \$50,000,000 of relief funds to carry out the provisions of the stamp plan. This has never been done before. Fifty million dollars was carried in the relief bill as a separate item for the stamp plan last year, but in this instance you take \$50,000,000 more away from W. P. A. and transfer it to the Department of Agriculture.

We want the stamp plan in the large cities, but we also want a sufficient appropriation for W. P. A.

The Surplus Commodities Corporation that administers the stamp plan gets 30 percent of the annual customs receipts. This is automatic. It is a recurring appropriation that does not have to be made each year, and it amounts to approximately \$100,000,000. Now, what happened this year? When the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill was before the House it included an item of \$100,000,000 additional, above the customs receipts, for the Surplus Commodities Corporation. As the bill was passed by the Senate it carried \$135,000,000 for the Surplus Commodities Corporation, or \$35,000,000 over and above what we passed in the House. This measure is in conference, and it has been sleeping in conference for weeks. I do not know why. Why do they not bring it in here? We are getting close to July 1. They have another item in the bill that is causing some little concern, I presume, and that is the amendment of the Senate appropriating \$450,000,000 for parity payments.

I cannot understand how a man or woman representing the farmers of this country can stand on the floor here and say that when the Government of the United States buys millions and millions of dollars' worth of surplus commodities

it is harming the farmer rather than benefiting him. When you reduce the supply or when you reduce the surplus, surely the price to the general consuming public should increase. This appears to me to be common sense. Therefore I cannot get it into my head how a man representing the farmers can get up here and say it is of no benefit to the farmers. As I understood it, that is what we set up the organization for in the first instance. That is the reason I voted for it. I might say I have voted for every piece of farm legislation that has been before this House in 15 years with the exception of one, and that was the McNary-Haugen bill.

Under the rules which govern conferees, in the end the Surplus Commodities Corporation will get an amount somewhere between the \$100,000,000 carried in the bill as it passed the House and the \$135,000,000 as carried in the bill as it passed the Senate, and on top of this, if the provision I refer to, taking \$50,000,000 from the Work Projects Administration is transferred to the Agriculture Department, then they will have that much additional.

The point I am trying to make is, that under the guise of taking care of administrative expenditures for the stamp plan you make a further reduction of \$50,000,000 in the appropriation for W. P. A., which will automatically cause a further reduction in the number of men and women who can be employed on W. P. A. from July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1942.

If you want to take care of the administrative expenditures for the stamp plan in this bill, then the proper way to do it is by appropriating the \$50,000,000 for that purpose and not by earmarking \$50,000,000 of the W. P. A. appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have been listening with much interest to the gentleman's discourse and I agree with some of the things he has said. When I first rose to interpose a question, it had to do with matters concerning that portion of the appropriation that will be devoted to defense projects. Now I fear the gentleman has gained the impression from my remarks that preceded his that I was objecting to using any part of it for defense projects.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; the gentleman does not have to go any further. I know he does not oppose defense projects. I may say that I did not make any suggestion of that kind, and if the gentleman will read my remarks he will find I made no such suggestion. What I did say, and what I say now, is that the slips which the gentleman read here referring to projects that he specified as defense projects are not defense projects. That is what I said to the gentleman. They are what have always been termed "W. P. A. white-collar projects" where they employ men and women who cannot handle a pick and shovel.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I agree with the gentleman, but does the gentleman not think that these vast sums of money, in one case \$1,600,000 and in another case \$1,700,000, could be used to

better avail with defense projects than for these boondoggling projects?

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, we had projects of this kind long before we had the defense program. They are really valuable. I know something about the W. P. A. and I know something about unemployment. Right now we have hundreds of thousands of men working on defense plants, constructing them. I said on defense plants, and not in defense plants, and when those men get through building those defense plants, and they are ready for operation, those particular men who built them are not of the type who will run them, but mechanics will go inside those plants which have been constructed and use the machinery that they put in and operate those machines and manufacture the airplanes, the tanks, and the arms and munitions we need for defense purposes. The class of people, when they complete those buildings where they are going to manufacture what we need for national-defense purposes, are going to find themselves out of a job. Where are they going to get a job?

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. The fact of the matter is that instead of the appropriation bill being for \$885,000,000 for purposes of relief it is for a sum \$50,000,000 less than that. Is that correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; by taking the \$50,000,000 and applying it to the stamp plan, and transferring it to the Agricultural Department—taking it away from the W. P. A. entirely. You are taking \$50,000,000 away from the sum appropriated for W. P. A., thus reducing the number that can be employed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, there are many other items in this bill that I do not agree with. I have opposed them before, and I shall oppose them again. The 18-month furlough provision was put in there by the committee, opposed by the W. P. A., and I think I read where it is opposed by the President. It has created nothing but hardship.

Coming as I do from a large city, of course, I am rather exercised over the situation that is going to confront us as a result of this reduction in appropriation. We have by no means in St. Louis reached a period where such tremendous reduction is justified. True, national defense expenditures have placed many people to work. Production has increased, but statistics show that despite this enormous increase in production, goods are produced with less labor, due to the installation of improved machinery.

Let it be remembered that the Federal Government alone is not carrying on a social-security program, nor the aid to the unemployed. The legislature of my State only last week appropriated \$63,347,625 in what is known as the social-security appropriation bill, including \$9,000,000 for direct relief to which the Government does not add one cent.

True, the greater amount of this goes for old-age pensions which are matched by the Government. Likewise, \$7,000,000 is for aid to dependent children matched by the Federal Government. As I say, the \$9,000,000 for direct relief is a burden upon the State alone.

I now draw attention to one of the provisions of the current E. R. A. Act regarding sponsorship of Work Projects Administration projects. Section 1 (d) of this act requires projects sponsors to bear at least 25 percent of the total cost of all non-Federal projects approved after January 1, 1940. This provision, while not applying to each individual project as such, does apply to the average of all projects actively operated by each State.

An examination of the records and reports of the Work Projects Administration reveals that they have executed this mandate of the Congress with exacting care. However, this has caused unnecessary difficulties in dealing with situations of certain kinds, and in other situations works injustice on certain locations, types of projects, or classes of unemployed persons.

In many situations the types of projects desired and needed require local sponsors' participation over and above the available W. P. A. participation to a considerably greater extent than 25 percent of the total cost. In many such cases project sponsors are in a financial position to participate to this greater extent. Although the provision of the act was not intended to place an upward limit on sponsors' contributions, it is only natural for some sponsors to feel that no further contribution should be required when they have provided only the specified 25 percent. The provision thus comes to be regarded as a maximum limit, as well as a minimum, and difficulties are created in connection with the establishment of the higher types of projects which are much to be desired.

In contrast with situations of the nature just mentioned, there are those where the sponsors' financial ability is greatly limited. The inability of a local government to provide 25-percent sponsorship costs may frequently be directly related to distressed employment conditions. Low-wage-earner income and poor business conditions result in deficient tax returns. Consequently, despite the greater relative need for Federal employment assistance in the community, projects from this locality are apt to be disapproved in favor of those communities where the 25-percent contribution is forthcoming due to larger tax collections from a more favorably employed populace.

During recent months, I am informed, many urban centers which have until recently been bearing the larger share of the sponsors' contribution load for their State have been the recipients of large defense orders. These orders have produced sizable increases in private employment in these communities, and at the same time have decreased the need for providing employment on Work Projects Administration projects. This has tended to throw a larger proportion of sponsors' contribution effort onto those municipalities which have not received defense con-

tract awards. I can visualize this dislocation becoming even worse as our defense effort expands.

There are many types of useful projects, such as soil conservation and the like, as well as white-collar work, which can be successfully executed with sponsors' contributions at rates lower than 25 percent. In localities where such projects are needed there may often be relatively little need for projects of the nature requiring a higher rate of sponsors' contributions. The legislative provision makes it necessary in such cases, however, to curtail the operation of the less expensive projects to a point where they will not outweigh the more expensive kinds in the average, thus limiting the very kind of work which may be most needed.

I direct your attention to a congressional provision with which I am in complete accord, and which I believe will alone provide all the control necessary for the proper balance of the sponsors' contributions, since these must cover all required items not available from the W. P. A., consisting largely of nonlabor items. This provision is the limitation of \$6 per worker per month that may be spent from Federal funds for nonlabor purposes. Here the approach is specific in its implication that for the most part the Federal funds appropriated to alleviate unemployment must be spent for labor costs. This limitation provides a safeguard against excessive Federal expenditures for nonlabor items and yet is sufficient to permit the operation of inexpensive improvement projects with low nonlabor costs where such improvements are needed in those communities that can ill afford to assume a full 25 percent of the total cost. On the other hand, sponsors who desire and can afford projects requiring large nonlabor expenditures, can secure them through proportionately larger contributions without feeling that they are thereby supporting the projects of other poorer communities.

To go further than this requirement governing Federal nonlabor expenditures is tantamount in my mind to saying to these communities that if you are well enough off to assume a portion of the burden of unemployment, we will assist you; but if you cannot help yourself to the extent we require of more fortunate communities, then the Federal Government can do nothing for you.

I earnestly recommend that the Congress rescind the 25-percent sponsor contribution requirement from the act appropriating funds for the Work Projects Administration for the coming fiscal year.

When the proper time comes it is my purpose to move to strike out that provision.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. The sponsor's contribution the gentleman will recall is a flexible matter now. It is a 25-percent average. The State W. P. A. administrator will make it lower than 25 percent to satisfy particular conditions in particular communities.

Mr. COCHRAN. But on the basis of what the administrator says himself, I think we will be in a better position if you take the provision out. You will get just as good results.

Mr. LUDLOW. I merely wanted to say to the gentleman that it is not a hard and fast 25-percent rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I presume I am supposed to make this bill perfectly clear to the membership here in 5 minutes, something others have been unable to do in half an hour. I'll do my best and will not ask for more time. All some Members have to do is to hold up five fingers and 5 additional minutes to speak is given. I have not yet mastered the technique of this finger movement.

I am going to limit this to 5 minutes. First of all, I want to say to you that the administration of relief in North Dakota has been honest. It has been good. It has been thorough. There is nothing wrong with it at all. There is no instance of mismanagement or dishonesty in the whole State of North Dakota. While we are supposed to be one of the radical States of the Union, we have no trouble with Communists, not in the least. We just let them speak, let them say anything they wanted to; let them run on the ticket, and in a State that casts about 300,000 votes they get on an average of about 6,000 votes.

The situation in North Dakota has been so well presented to me in a letter from the administrator, Thomas H. Moodie, that when I ask permission to extend my remarks I will also ask permission in the House to insert that letter as a matter of record.

We have in North Dakota a certain group of people that you do not have anywhere else, who are members of the unemployed organization today. You do not have them in the East. Those are farmers who have been foreclosed and they have moved with their families to town. It does not make any difference what happens, whether you have defense operations or whether you have harvest in North Dakota, which it seems we shall have this year, those men are from 45 to 65 years of age and there is not very much they can do after the harvest season is over. Foreclosures have taken away the only profession they knew anything about. As a result of these foreclosures, which have been wholesale and not individual examples, we are met with the proposition of trying to undo what this Government itself has done. Conditions and the lack of congressional action have wholly unprepared those people to take care of themselves. These tables in the Moodie report will indicate that the amounts you are appropriating this year are not enough for North Dakota, nor enough in any farm State in the West. This House, at times, takes peculiar action. We refused one time to pass a billion-dollar-relief bill and in 3 months we came back and were glad to vote for a

four-billion-dollar-relief bill. So this thing is not going to get away with just one sitting of Congress. I anticipate we will be in session right along and as soon as people get hungry enough, at least when enough people get hungry enough, they will get something to eat.

I wish I had as clear a conception of the situation on relief as the junior Member from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER]. His ideas of relief seem to be about as clear as mud. He seems to think it is somebody's fault if he has not a job. When farmers by the wholesale fail through no fault of their own, it cannot be charged that it is the fault of the individual farmer. We have to meet that situation as it comes up, but I want to assure this Congress that there is not anyone in North Dakota, Republican or Democrat, who has anything but praise for the administration of the Federal works program that has been carried on in North Dakota. The administrators here in Washington are most considerate and patient. I am not asking too much to ask you to carefully read the report of the administrator, Mr. Moodie, and you will see from that report and from the telegram from the Governor, who is a Democrat, you will see that there is not enough money to take care of the situation in North Dakota, no matter what happens, because you have that population that has been deprived of their only profession, who will be public charges just as long as time lasts or until they are rehabilitated on farms. Let me say if it had not been for this defense program of ours, instead of having two million out of employment today, you would have fifteen million. Just as soon as this war program ends, unemployment will mount in numbers to more than it ever was. We had better get acquainted with the relief problem now while there is a breathing spell. This bill, after fifty million has been turned over to the Department of Agriculture, is at least one hundred million short of what will be actually needed. If we must save money, is there no place to make a saving except to withdraw work from the poor, the needy, and the hungry? [Applause.]

LETTER AND STATEMENT FROM THOMAS H. MOODIE, STATE ADMINISTRATOR OF WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION IN NORTH DAKOTA

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,  
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,  
Bismarck, N. Dak., June 6, 1941.

THE HONORABLE USHER L. BURDICK,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I am submitting to you a general report on conditions in North Dakota, the probable effect of the new appropriations bill in this State, and other matters pertinent to this whole situation, which I believe will be of interest to you at this time.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. MOODIE,  
State Administrator.

W. P. A. AND THE FUTURE IN NORTH DAKOTA

As of this date, June 5, several conditions complicate the W. P. A. picture as to future needs in North Dakota, which are most difficult to estimate.

The general crop prospect as of today is one of the best in the history of the State. There

has been sufficient moisture. Small grain crops are well rooted, and the condition of pastures has never been better at this time of the year. One thing is definitely determined now: The feed crop, which is always the most important first consideration in the crop situation, is already assured and will be bountiful in all sections of the State. Two weeks ago there was for a short time a threat of damage in limited areas because of hot winds, but this has been entirely overcome within the past 2 weeks.

The farm-labor situation is causing some anxiety, but up to this time there has been no shortage of farm labor, and few requests have been received by W. P. A. for assistance in providing men for this type of work. If the crop comes through on the present basis, there is a very good prospect that practically all of the W. P. A. projects in North Dakota may have to be shut down during the harvest season to meet this demand for harvest labor. This, of course, can be done without any great inconvenience except in the case of a few of the larger projects, such as the Buford-Trenton Irrigation Project at Williston and the National Defense projects. The North Dakota State Employment Service does not view the prospective labor situation with any great anxiety since it feels that cooperation between the Federal agencies and the public will result in taking care of the harvest labor needs in pretty good shape.

My understanding is that the present W. P. A. appropriations bill provides for an estimated monthly employment, for the continental United States, on an average of 1,000,000 persons. Assuming that the quota will be distributed on the same basis as in the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, it is quite apparent that there will be a heavy cut in W. P. A. jobs available for North Dakota. I have made a compilation of just what this will be and I am herewith submitting it to you.

Month	Estimated employment on basis of 1,000,000 jobs per month for the United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year of 1941
July	1941-42	1940-41
August	8,200	9,204
September	7,600	9,173
October	7,600	9,516
November	7,600	10,553
December	7,600	10,773
January	8,700	11,694
February	8,700	12,267
March	8,300	13,847
April	7,400	12,794
May	6,800	12,500
June	6,500	10,500
		9,460

Statistical compilations by the Public Welfare Board, through its county organizations, and the Division of Employment of the W. P. A., indicate that at the present time there are in need of employment in North Dakota at least 15,089 persons. The need for employment in North Dakota, of course, is largely governed by seasonal conditions. During the crop planting, tending, and harvesting season, there is a good deal of work on the farms for W. P. A. clients. For instance, the seeding season makes jobs for quite a few men. There is a lag between the time the general seeding is finished and the beginning of harvest, of approximately 30 days, when the people who go to the farms are again for the most part unemployed. How much employment will be necessary during the harvest season is, of course, a factor governed entirely by the size of crops, time of maturity, and methods used in harvesting the same. The harvest season, of course, represents the peak of available jobs in North Dakota. When this is ended, with the exception of those sections of the State where sugar beets

and other root crops are grown, there is a heavy decrease of jobs available on farms.

The big factor in the unemployment situation in North Dakota, which the public does not generally appreciate, is this: In practically all of the towns of the State we have what may be termed a "stranded population." These people for the most part are persons formerly engaged in agricultural pursuits who have left the land, either because of discouragement or because, in a limited number of cases, they were dispossessed for their delinquent obligations. These people have gone to the smaller towns in a rather desperate condition. There was no place else for them to go, and in these towns there is little possibility of their ever getting jobs of any kind. In fact, in most of them there simply are no jobs. Defense industries are not providing any employment in North Dakota at this time outside of that being given on the W. P. A. defense projects.

A typical example of the conditions that exist in some of the smaller North Dakota communities is the village of Strasburg, in Emmons County, where our information indicates that last year more than 90 percent of the people of the town depended entirely upon W. P. A. employment.

While there is under way in North Dakota quite a "back to the land" movement, the fact is that, while well intentioned, it lacks implementation and a sense of direction assuring its effectiveness.

There is nothing in sight at this time that would indicate there will be any great reduction in the number of unemployed in North Dakota next winter. Experience in this program has indicated that there is a complete change in the general employment situation about October 1 of each year. About that time there is a general suspension of all the seasonal work conducted during the summer by the State highway department and private concerns, and general preparations are being made for North Dakota's long winter. The needs of the people during the winter months are greatly increased. They must have fuel, warmer clothing, and the fact that children in the relief families are going to school increases the average family expense for schoolbooks and other things. All these things contribute to the general anxiety of the unemployed relief workers. Where they cannot be employed by W. P. A., their needs must be met by the welfare board, which is pitifully circumscribed for funds, and faces, if anything, a much greater problem than W. P. A. does in discharging its obligations to the distressed and needy.

Quite a few people are leaving the State at this time for those centers of the country where there is defense-industry employment. However, the greater part of the W. P. A. load is made up of persons who are unable to do this. When it is remembered that 43 percent of all persons employed by W. P. A. in this State are more than 40 years old, and more than 17 percent are more than 45 years old, it can be readily realized why so many W. P. A. workers are reluctant to leave the State and search for private employment elsewhere, especially when they have lived many years here and still have the hope of getting back to the land. This hope, perhaps, is not now based on anything concrete, but is one of those things that spring eternally in the North Dakota breast. Our people love the land, and they would make a great many sacrifices, most of them, to stay here if they could be given any assurance whatever that they could be gotten back on the land with a reasonable prospect for success.

It is my conclusion that unless we are able to maintain W. P. A. employment on about the same basis as it was carried on during the fiscal year of 1940-41, there will be inevitable suffering and hardship among a great group of people in North Dakota.

We have appreciated the consideration given this State by the central office in Washington and by the regional office in St. Paul.

However, both are necessarily limited in what they can do for us by the funds made available in W. P. A. appropriations. We have the hope here, based upon current newspaper reports, that the defense industries will take up enough of the slack of unemployment so that we in North Dakota can be assured of something like the quota we ought to have. You are perhaps better able to judge of this situation in Washington than we are here. One thing is certain: The proposed reduction in W. P. A. quotas in North Dakota as carried in the proposal of 1,000,000 jobs cannot but work a serious hardship not only to the unemployed people but to the State itself, and cannot but bring additional poignant responsibilities to all those who are connected in any way with any phase of the general relief program.

THOMAS H. MOODIE,  
State Administrator.

TELEGRAM FROM THE GOVERNOR OF NORTH  
DAKOTA

BISMARCK, N. DAK., June 9, 1941.  
USHER L. BURDICK,  
Member of House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

I urge that you support amendment to correct W. P. A. appropriation bill which will remove requirement 25 percent sponsor's contribution for W. P. A. projects. I also urge that you support action to put the administrative budget of W. P. A. back to the figure recommended by Bureau of Budget. I understand that it is proposed to cut administrative funds approximately four and one-half million dollars. This would curtail services needed and appreciated in State from State W. P. A.

JOHN MOSES, Governor.

TELEGRAM FROM E. A. WILLSON, EXECUTIVE  
SECRETARY OF THE STATE WELFARE BOARD OF  
NORTH DAKOTA

BISMARCK, N. DAK., June 9, 1941.  
Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge your support amendment to W. P. A. appropriation act to eliminate the requirement that sponsors of work projects contribute 25 percent of total costs of projects. Many North Dakota political subdivisions unable to sponsor projects needed to provide employment for unemployed persons if required to contribute 25 percent of costs. Also respectfully urge your support for administrative budget recommended by Budget Board to insure continuation of efficient administration of W. P. A.

E. A. WILLSON.

MR. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

MR. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will talk for 2 minutes. Incidentally, I come from a country where they say all the "Okies" went to California; however, I wish to state that the cream of the crop still resides in Oklahoma. I represent the small businessman, the little farmer, and the little laborer. I want to say that in our section we have not received one benefit at all from the defense program, except the satisfaction of knowing that our country is going to be defended. We are proud of the sacrifices we have made for defense. We have received no other monetary benefits.

Right now I want to compliment each and every one of the 350 Members who voted yesterday for the \$10,000,000 defense program. I want to say I feel sorry for the one man who did not.

MR. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. WICKERSHAM. I am very sorry. I have been here 2 months, and I have only 2 minutes to talk.

Our country has had 10 years of drought. We do not have any defense projects in the whole territory 300 miles long and 150 miles wide. My people, who are on the W. P. A., are poor people. I am not necessarily defending the State administration of the W. P. A. in Oklahoma. I have not had one bit of cooperation out of them, insofar as non-relief appointments are concerned. But, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] said, there is not a more honest bunch anywhere than the W. P. A. officers in Oklahoma; and the W. P. A. officials and laborers have rendered valuable service to the district. At this time I want to commend the work done on the schools, the sewing-room program, the road and bridge work, the hot-lunch program, and anything connected with the defense work by the W. P. A. I believe at this time the W. P. A. should continue the defense work and build some military highways, train some mechanics, welders, electricians, and so forth, and that we should allow the sewing rooms to make clothing for the defense projects and continue to work full time on the defense program.

Most of the men and women on the W. P. A. in the Seventh District of Oklahoma are there not of their own wishes and accord but by reason of being forced off of their little farms by droughts, foreclosures, low prices, and large-scale farming. What we need, most of all, is a program that will return the little farmers to the family sized farms where they may be permitted to raise their chickens, hogs, cattle, milk, butter, eggs, gardens, cotton, wheat, feed, and so forth; but until this legislation is granted these laborers we must not take away from them their only means of livelihood.

At this time I desire to point out to you Members of the House the inequality of the W. P. A. wage scale in Oklahoma, especially in my district, and I urge you, in the name of fairness and decency, that it should be remedied and our laborers paid a rate equal to that of other workers in other States.

With reference to laborers working on defense programs who strike, I wish to state again that I am 100 percent for 100-percent American unions, but that I am against these foreign-born, un-American racketeers who foster discontent among our laborers, holding up defense industries when our young men are sacrificing their positions to serve this country at \$21 per month. My constituents, consisting of businessmen, laborers, farmers, W. P. A. workers, the aged, the widows and orphans, the ministers, the teachers, the clerks, the doctors who minister to the sick, and all other red-blooded Americans who constitute my district do not strike.

Furthermore, I believe it would be wise for this body to strike from this bill the provisions which would compel laborers to have to lay off after each 18 months' service.

And, furthermore, I believe there should be some adjustment in the provision requiring sponsors to furnish 25 percent of the cost, especially since many

cities and counties in my district are heavily in debt, and especially since our section is not receiving defense projects. May I point out that the cost of living to my people is going up and that a hardship is likewise worked upon the old aged whose income is limited.

Gentlemen, there are no picket lines in my district, and—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTINGER].

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, but I think this bill is one of the really important bills that have come before this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the district I represent is known as the iron-ore section. The popular answer to my protest against reduction in W. P. A. expenditures is that everybody is working—the iron mines are there and they are going to ship 80,000,-000 tons of ore. Let me tell you what the real circumstances are on information I am sure is correct. In World War No. 1 something like 20,000 people were employed getting ore out of those mines. At this time 5,000 people are doing what 20,000 people did then, and we have an unemployment situation there that is just as acute as it was when this national-defense program started. Under the national-defense program practically no new jobs have been created in that territory and the W. P. A. finds itself carrying just as heavy a load as it carried at that time.

I believe the Casey amendment ought to be adopted. I have figures from the State administrator, Mr. S. L. Stolte, and also from Mr. A. P. Gilbertson, the district manager, which show so far as my particular district is concerned, that out of about 6,000 people employed on W. P. A. over 2,000 will be laid off under the present proposed appropriation, and you have got to add to these 2,000 whatever number will be affected by the \$50,-000,000 that is to be taken for food stamps.

In the State of Minnesota as of May 1 there were 40,000 employables on W. P. A.; and W. P. A.—based on an appropriation of \$975,000,000, even if all of it is used for W. P. A.—can take care of but 27,000. What does this mean? It means that in all these communities—St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth, the Iron Range, and other sections—the people who are laid off will be forced back on relief and the relief load will become all the greater. The Casey amendment ought to be adopted.

This furlough, after 18 months on W. P. A. ought to be done away with. The 25-percent sponsors' contribution should also be discontinued. We are making a mistake when we try to cut down on unemployment relief at this time.

I have a protest from a number of small contractors, who say that W. P. A. continuance will injure them. They have been opposed to W. P. A. for a long time; but I want to say to them and to other folks that regardless of the virtues of W. P. A. or regardless of its vices which we have heard so much about this afternoon, this is the method of relief the

administration has determined we should have, this W. P. A. method. And we take this method or we take nothing. As a Member of Congress I consider it my duty to the unemployed to try and make this bill a better bill and to work matters out so that until private industry or national-defense industry can take up the slack, the people who want to work, who need work but cannot find it, will have the help of the Government. The administration is not going to let the small contractors do the thing they would like to do.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTINGER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it not true that some of the cities in the State of Minnesota have practically reached their bonded-debt limitation because of the tremendous relief loads of the past few years?

Mr. PITTINGER. That is especially true in the larger cities.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. And would the gentleman agree with me that the administrator, S. L. Stolte, in the State of Minnesota, as well as some of his assistants, have attempted to do an honorable and a clean and efficient piece of work in administering W. P. A.?

Mr. PITTINGER. I have heard no criticism of Mr. S. L. Stolte, the State administrator. I think he is doing a good job. I know from personal investigation that Mr. A. T. Gilbertson, the district manager in my district, is carrying on his work in a very fine way.

Let me add that we are considering only an appropriation of \$875,000,000. Mr. Stolte tells me that, based on this figure, the number who can be employed in Minnesota will be reduced from the May quota of approximately 40,000 to 26,000. Now, with \$50,000,000 of this amount to be used to buy food stamps, the number to be taken off the W. P. A. roll will be still further increased. In my particular district, it means that where about 6,000 are now on W. P. A. rolls, between 2,000 and 3,000 will be laid off. Congress should not adopt this procedure. While we are spending money to send supplies to the people in Europe, and elsewhere, the least we can do is to deal decently with the people of the United States. We cannot do so with this reduced appropriation. In the district I represent, in addition to W. P. A. workers, there is a relief list of large proportions. In my county alone, St. Louis County, Mr. A. J. Erchul, executive secretary of the County Welfare Board, advises me that 5,249 persons were on direct relief as of May 1, 1941. I have already indicated that all workers taken off W. P. A. will have to go back on relief rolls. The administration has a direct duty under these circumstances to increase the appropriations for W. P. A.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, today we hear on all sides the plea for national unity. We are told that unless we are united in our effort to help England and

her allies, democracy will become extinct throughout the world.

This stress on national unity, unity of purpose to establish peace and contentment throughout the world is a real and vital issue, not only of today, but every day if civilization and the better things in life are to be preserved.

We do not take issue on giving England material aid with the exception of our manpower. We place our resources, without restriction, at the disposal of England in her war to preserve democracy.

But while we are making our resources available to foreign nations we must be mindful of the needs of the men, women, and children of our own Nation. To me this is just as vital, if not more vital in establishing unity of purpose, than any other action that can be taken by our Government.

The resources of the United States belong to the American people first. If we cannot preserve our own unity, why attempt to preserve the unity of other nations?

Democracy means economic security and opportunity to make a living if the rights guaranteed under our Constitution are to be preserved. If England occupies the first line of defense of this Nation, as we have so often been told, then even before today the first line of defense of our own democracy is the establishment of the vitality of our own people on a firm foundation.

From the vitality of our own people come all plans of defense and the vital bodies and minds to man the guns to ward off aggression. The right to live must be established at home, as well as abroad, if we are to be preserved as a Nation. We cannot hope to preserve democracy abroad if we do not preserve democracy at home; and economic security at home is the foundation of democracy. If we stand by England with our resources, surely, we must be true to ourselves and afford the same resources to our own people.

The idea of taking care of a foreign nation and not equally taking care of our own Nation will cause the world to question our sincerity or to smile at our stupidity.

While we have and will appropriate billions of dollars to aid other nations, let us not lose sight of our own domestic problems.

With our great preparedness program getting under full steam the administration is hopeful that there will be a decrease in the number of unemployed. This may be true in the great industrialized areas of the country, but in my district in Pennsylvania—the anthracite-mining area—it is not true. The defense program in my district, to date, has resulted in many of our people migrating to the industrialized areas, thereby separating families and causing a great deal of confusion. But the relief rolls continue just the same and with little or no decrease.

Therefore, while this condition exists, I am for the relief of our people.

I have for the past year and a half brought to the attention of our officials in the various Government departments

details on the great number of idle factories and vacant floor space in my district that could be utilized for some of our defense projects. We have had these facilities listed for over a year, but it all seems to be of no avail. And yet, in the four great anthracite-coal-producing counties of Pennsylvania, namely, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Schuylkill, and Northumberland—the latter two being in my district—the W. P. A. expenditures and general assistance—relief—has averaged approximately \$40,000,000 per year for 1938, 1939, and 1940, or an approximate total expenditure for the past 3 years of \$120,000,000. A break-down of this amount follows:

	1938	1939	1940
Work Projects Administration expenditures	\$44,398,863	\$26,480,557	\$14,018,114
General assistance (relief)	7,316,122	14,068,006	12,515,916
Total	51,714,985	40,548,563	26,534,030

These are facts from which we cannot escape, and since my district is dependent almost entirely on the production of anthracite coal, the program of preparedness has not benefited us to any appreciable degree. We have plenty of available unemployed that could be an asset and help in our national defense, if only given the opportunity.

At the present time there are 8,300 families comprising 19,800 persons who are receiving aid from the board of assistance in Schuylkill County. This includes general assistance, or unemployment relief, old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and blind pension. Of the 8,300 cases, 3,436 comprising 8,767 persons are general-assistance cases.

It is estimated that at the present time there are approximately 5,000 workers on W. P. A., who at an average wage of \$42.50 per month are responsible for about 20,000 persons. During the 12 months ended April 30, 1941, the Schuylkill County board of assistance has disbursed \$2,775,226.76 to families in Schuylkill County. This sum is broken down by type of assistance as follows:

Old-age assistance	\$504,393.60
Blind pension	96,078.20
Aid to dependent children	651,165.75
General assistance	1,523,589.21

With an average of 5,000 cases on W. P. A. during the past year it is estimated that W. P. A. paid \$2,664,000. This would make a total figure for the principal relief agencies of \$5,439,226.76.

In Northumberland County during the month of March 1941, the average number of persons dependent upon public assistance was 22,846 or 18 percent of the population of the county. The total expenditures by the Northumberland County board of assistance for the same month were \$193,479.90. It is estimated that during the current month 11,025 persons were supported by the employment of 3,125 persons on W. P. A.

From the afore-mentioned figures it can be seen that there are almost 43,000 persons dependent upon some form of relief in my district of Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties in Pennsylvania.

Certainly an unemployed people is not in the best interests of national unity. This condition is aggravated in my district by discriminatory wage cuts by the Work Projects Administration which resulted in September of 1939 in the W. P. A. laborer being given a cut of 27 percent, or from \$60 a month to \$42.50.

Despite the high cost of living in my district—which cost is rapidly rising—and the increase of wages throughout the country in general, the W. P. A. cut in my district has never been restored.

An unjustified cut in the W. P. A. worker's wages of \$16, or 27 percent a month, is certainly not conducive to national unity. Such a cut in wages is absolutely unfair and discriminatory. Such wages are starvation wages.

Let me reiterate that while we are appropriating billions to aid other nations, let us be mindful of the needs of our own citizens, men and women who through no fault of their own are still among the Nation's five to nine million unemployed.

March estimates of unemployment and preliminary figures for April as published by three private organizations are as follows:

	March	April
Congress of Industrial Organizations	9,062,000	8,350,000
National Industrial Conference Board	6,117,000	5,412,000
American Federation of Labor	7,540,000	6,923,000

I have persistently tried to have the wages of the W. P. A. workers at least restored to their former levels, and in this respect have already addressed the House on several occasions, as well as offering legislation for this purpose to establish a prevailing rate of wage.

When amendments are being considered to the bill now under consideration I propose to offer an amendment to establish a basic wage rate for the W. P. A. worker. It is the duty of every Member of this House to at least restore the basic wage previously paid the W. P. A. laborer, so that our unemployed—Americans like you and I—are at least given a sustenance wage until men and women are back to normal employment.

This cannot be denied if we are to have domestic peace and contentment. We cannot deny this to our fellow Americans if we are sincere in trying to establish national unity.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the distinction falls to me of being the last speaker before the House this afternoon, and for this reason I will not undertake to present more than one or two observations that I feel are worth making.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill, and although, frankly, I was adverse to doing so last year, I did finally vote for it. Since then, having seen billions of dollars appropriated for the defense of the Nation which I assume are absolutely necessary, and also after having seen some \$7,000,000,000 appro-

priated for the defense of a foreign nation, I feel it is high time and proper that we scrape up a few dollars here today for the urgent relief of our Nation's needy.

It is not my purpose to discuss the administration of relief as provided in this bill, because I do not pretend to be a judge of the proper administration of relief. I have gone on record many times as favoring as near as possible the handling of relief by local officials and by persons who are cognizant of local problems; but, as one of the gentlemen who spoke before me mentioned, if we do not take this we will not get anything. For this reason I believe it is absolutely necessary to accept this bill in its entirety. Earlier in the afternoon I asked the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] if he felt that a certain proportion of these millions of dollars should be used for the defense projects of the Nation, and he answered that there were plans afoot to utilize at least \$300,000,000 for this purpose. I heartily agree with him in this matter, and I am glad to see this amount being used for that purpose.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I cannot forget that, despite the fact billions of dollars are being poured into the national-defense program, there are sections of the country which are not getting what they ought to out of the defense program. I am not satisfied by any means with the defense orders that have been given to my particular locality. I feel more of the deserving firms and contractors within my district could have been more adequately considered. This leaves in my section a condition of unemployment which can only be remedied by the appropriation of millions of dollars at this time for W. P. A. As I have tried to emphasize, I cannot be reconciled to the Federal administration of relief because it represents an impersonal approach to the problem, but since we have no alternative we must accept this. The administration of even that form of relief, at least so far as my particular locality is concerned, is certainly better than no relief at all. There is a vast group of citizens which will be included in this program and cannot be included in defense work. Lest untold sufferings and hardship be brought upon the unfortunate and needy at home, I urge the House to pass this work-relief appropriation now, not only as a necessity but as insurance against trouble and misery among our own fellow Americans who should by all means have our first consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. RAMSPECK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 193, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, had come to no resolution thereon.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD two statements by Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]?

There was no objection.

## PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce for the benefit of the Members the program for the remainder of the week. Tomorrow will be Calendar Wednesday, and the Committee on Agriculture will have the first call. That committee will call up the crop-insurance bill. Then there is a wildlife bill introduced by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] that will be called up. Those are the only bills to be called up by the Committee on Agriculture.

If there is time left, the Committee on Foreign Affairs will have the call, and I am informed that that committee will call up S. 1544, the inter-American highway bill, and H. R. 4973, a bill which relates to the control of travel to and from the United States.

The W. P. A. bill will come up again on Thursday. If the consideration of that bill is concluded early in the afternoon, it is my intention to call up a bill reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs relating to the temporary promotion of warrant officers, petty officers, and officers called back to service. The calling up of this bill depends upon whether or not the opportunity exists on Thursday. If not, I doubt whether the bill will be called up this week.

On Friday the District appropriation bill will come up for consideration, instead of on Thursday, because the pending bill will be considered on Thursday.

I just wanted to make this announcement for the benefit of the Members of the House.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein a table of statistics relating to the W. P. A. in the State of Washington.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

on Monday next, June 16, 1941, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein two short tables on the W. P. A.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the administration of poor relief in the Virginias, and to include therein an article on that subject by Charles McCamie, of Wheeling, W. Va.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein certain documents to which I referred.

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

There was no objection.

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. RABAUT submitted a conference report and statement on 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.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter under date of May 19 from Mr. S. L. Stolte, Administrator of the Work Projects Administration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by J. Adam Bede. I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the article exceeds 2 pages in length. It is a little over 2 pages. I now renew my request.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an account of a patriotic meeting in my district in Pittsburg County, which

I have the honor to represent. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCRUGHAM, for 3 weeks, on account of military training, Army antiaircraft artillery school.

## SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 378. An act to amend the act of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 452. An act for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 456. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 633. An act to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 708. An act for the relief of Joseph Arreas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1051. An act relating to the payment of fees and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1052. An act relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1289. An act authorizing the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska, for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.

S. 1488. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage, an employee of the United States, to service under the government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the government of the Punjab, India" (act of June 29, 1940, Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1508. An act to provide for the pay of aviation pilots in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana), a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. Mr. Littell will appear.

##### COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will continue public hearings on the subject of royalty payments and the freezing of funds, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will start hearings in room 1304, New House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Proponents will be heard during the first week of hearings.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

626. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1942 amounting to \$393,000 (H. Doc. No. 254);

to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

627. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1941, aggregating \$100,075,000 (H. Doc. No. 255); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

628. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to \$5,600,000, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 256); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

629. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries and administrative expenses for the Electric Home and Farm Authority for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to \$600,000 (H. Doc. No. 257); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

630. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942, for the District of Columbia, involving an increase of \$525,000 (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

631. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft bill for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former special disbursing agent, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Claims.

#### 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. O'CONNOR: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Supplement to part 2 to accompany H. R. 4854. A bill facilitating and simplifying the administration of the Federal reclamation laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RABAUT: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4276. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 760). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

##### By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 5014. A bill to provide for the development of electrical power from coal in southern Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

##### By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 5015. A bill to provide for the registration of labor organizations having members engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and to impose duties upon such labor organizations and the members thereof and to impose liability for unlawful acts upon such organizations and the members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

##### By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 5016. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the

Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

##### By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5017. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of all streams in San Diego and Imperial Counties in the State of California, which flow into the Salton Sea for flood-control and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

##### By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 5018. A bill making it unlawful for Harry Bridges to be and/or remain in the United States or any other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

##### By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 231. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate charges against the Jewish race; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

##### By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5019. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Hogan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

##### By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 5020. A bill granting a pension to Mary Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

##### By Mr. McGEEHEE:

H. R. 5021. A bill for the relief of Capt. Alex Papana; to the Committee on Claims.

##### By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 5022. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Houghlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 5023. A bill to authorize cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of James Leo Shannon; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 5024. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

##### By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Winston Cann; to the Committee on Claims.

##### By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of Louis Puccinelli Bali Bond Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

#### FETITIONS, ETC.

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

1356. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of Walter Edwards, of Pottsville, Pa., and other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 3852, which would authorize the District of Columbia Board of Barber Examiners to establish opening and closing hours and a day on which barber shops shall remain closed after an investigation as to the preference of a majority of the licensed barbers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1357. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N. Y., memorializing Congress to oppose any change in the existing law for the preservation of the cane-sugar refining industry in the State of New York that would add additional burden on the American consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1358. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 21 citizens of Brum, Pa., urging the reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 for the protection of young men of 1941 and for the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1359. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Rev. Wallace B. Johnson and other residents of Youngsville, Pa., opposing convoys or moves

toward war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1360. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of certain citizens of Marinette, Wis., requesting support of House bill 2475, to protect the health and morale of the youth called to training under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1361. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition signed by Nellie M. Osmun and 21 other residents, of Long Beach, Calif., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1362. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the Townsend Club of Platte, S. Dak., asking that House bill 1036 be brought before the House of Representatives for consideration and vote; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1363. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of the Basin Miners' Union, No. 23, John Wallin, financial secretary, urging an investigation of labor policies of industries engaged in defense work before curtailing the freedom of labor, an investigation of money being spent by manufacturers on antilabor propaganda and that the results of these investigations be made public; to the Committee on Labor.

1364. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Wisconsin State Junior Chamber of Commerce convention, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to standing behind the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1365. Also, petition of the National Society United States Daughters of 1812, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

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

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

O Eternal God, who hast taught us in Thy Holy Word that Thou art an ever-present, loving Father from whom no secret place is hidden, and to whom every thought, word, and action is known: As we meet together to bear anew the responsibility of making decisions in the name of our Nation, help us to realize Thy Presence and, through renewed consecration to Thee, to find comfort and happiness therein. By Thine indwelling Spirit, O Lord, make us truthful in all our words, holy in all our thoughts, honest in every deed, that our whole life may reveal Thy Presence, and the people of America, knowing that we are led of Thee, may be knit together in unity of purpose. May they manifest great zeal in righteousness and in fervor of spirit, that they may serve Thee in all things until Thy most sure promises have been fulfilled and all nations have brought their glory and honor into Thy Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 10, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

S. 1438. An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present to Eire on behalf of the people of the United States a statue of Commodore John Barry.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House.

### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRNES. 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	Burton	Gerry
Aiken	Butler	Gillette
Andrews	Byrd	Glass
Bailey	Byrnes	Green
Ball	Capper	Gurney
Bankhead	Caraway	Hayden
Barbour	Chandler	Herring
Bilbo	Chavez	Hill
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Holman
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Houston
Bridges	Connally	Johnson, Calif.
Brooks	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Brown	Davis	Kilgore
Bulow	Downey	La Follette
Bunker	George	Lodge

Lucas	Overton	Thomas, Idaho
McCarran	Pepper	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	Radcliffe	Tobey
McKellar	Rosier	Tunnell
McNary	Shipstead	Tydings
Maloney	Smathers	Vandenberg
Murdock	Smith	Van Nuys
Norris	Spence	Wallgren
Nye	Stewart	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Taft	White

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

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

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

### FIRST REPORT UNDER LEND-LEASE ACT (S. DOC. NO. 66)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

### To the Congress of the United States:

Section 5 (b) of Public Law No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved by me on March 11, 1941, provides in part as follows:

The President, from time to time but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this act except such information as he deems incompatible with the public interest to disclose.

In compliance with this provision, I am submitting this report.

We have supplied, and we will supply, planes, guns, ammunition, and other defense articles in ever-increasing quantities to Britain, China, and other democracies resisting aggression.

Wars are not won by guns alone, but wars are not won without guns. We all know this full well now. Beginning with the outbreak of the war, the American public began to realize that it was in our own national interest and security to help Britain, China, and the other democratic nations.