

Mr. NORRIS. No; not must work. We could not compel them to work. They could quit, anyway, of course. If they were compelled to work, I admit that would be slavery; it would be involuntary servitude. But I say that when the Mediation Board, or any other tribunal which has been agreed upon to settle a dispute, shall settle it under the law we have passed and reach a conclusion, then it is the patriotic duty of every man involved in the controversy on either side to accept that judgment.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask the Senator then, what possible effect can be given to this amendment if we shall adopt it?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think it will have any effect. I have heretofore said so. It will not have any legal effect anywhere. There may be some psychological effect by its acceptance. People may argue the question pro and con if they want to, as we have been doing for a day and a half, but legally it will have no effect whatever. It is not worth the paper on which it is written as a matter of law.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In lines 3 and 4 of the amendment we find the language—

The uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor.

What does the Senator from Nebraska understand is meant by the expression "complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor"?

Mr. NORRIS. I think I understand it. Perhaps I do not. Whether I understand it or whether the Senator understands it makes no difference. We are not passing a law. But I think there ought to be complete understanding between Government, labor, and capital, especially in times of emergency such as we are now passing through.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. Should the Byrd amendment be adopted, would it be in order for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to offer his amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; as an amendment to the Connally amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Would it be in order for the Senator to offer his amendment as an amendment to the bill, following the Byrd amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would have to be offered, as the Chair understands, as an amendment to the Connally amendment. Should the Byrd amendment be adopted, it would then be in order to offer it as an amendment to the Connally amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he intends to offer his amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do, in the event the Byrd amendment is agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. Then I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our ever blessed God, for all the light which Thou hast shed abroad, we give Thee thanks. Though we see through a glass darkly, we look forward with ardent expectation to the disclosures of a better world. How infinite in compassion and sympathy Thou art, long-suffering and kind and waiting to be gracious and merciful. Borne down by temptation and care, so often we stumble and falter; we would know Thee as the light, the bread and the way of the wisest service. Fill us with Thy spirit that we may achieve the blessed things of life, in courage, in patience, in bountifulness, in perseverance and in every good word and work. We pray for all who labor, who teach, who have compassion upon the poor, who seek the waste places in human experience and are helping by the rule of Christian devotion, those who need succor and encouragement. Richly bless all churches and their ministers and leaders; grant that they may be strengthened by Thee to sow and reap and that there may be gathered abundantly of their labors into the garden of our living Lord. Now Heavenly Father, draw very near the sick and the distressed; enter their hearts that they may know Thy presence and feel the breath of Thy holy benediction and Thine shall be the praise through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1941.

The Honorable the Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The certificate of election, in due form of law, of Hon. KATHARINE EDGAR BYRON, as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. William D. Byron, is on file in this office.

Yours very truly,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BYRON appeared in the Well of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized.

THE LATE ROBERT S. HALL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty this morning to announce to the House the death of a former very valuable Member of this House, the Honorable Robert Samuel Hall, who so ably and effectively represented the Sixth Congressional District of Mississippi in the House for two terms. Judge Hall, who was a valuable officer of the Federal Trade Commission at the time of his death, passed away last night in his home in nearby Arlington, Va. Judge Hall receives practically every honor that could be accorded him by the electorate of that congressional district. He ably served his country as county prosecuting attorney, as district attorney, as circuit judge, and as a Member of the Congress. Judge Hall, as his long and able public service would indicate, was highly respected, loved, and honored.

Robert Samuel Hall, affectionately known as "Judge," was born in Covington County, Miss., on March 10, 1879, the son of Evans and Effie Hall. Like so many other outstanding Mississippians he was educated in the common schools of Mississippi and finished his education by being graduated from Millsaps College—one of the foremost institutions of learning in Mississippi—with a degree of bachelor of laws in 1900. Shortly thereafter he entered the practice of law in his new home at Hattiesburg, Miss. In 1906 he was elected to the State senate where he first entered public service. In 1910 he was elected county prosecuting attorney of Forrest County, Miss., which office he voluntarily gave up to assume the duties of district attorney in 1912, to which office he was elected as a result of the ability and the fidelity with which he discharged and duties of that office. The people of the twelfth judicial district of Mississippi, recognizing the unusual ability displayed by the young district attorney, further honored Mr. Hall by elevating him to the bench as judge of that district. Judge Hall served in this capacity until March 1, 1929, when he voluntarily retired to accept the office of Representative in the American Congress, having been elected by the electorate of the Sixth Congressional District of Mississippi on November 6, 1928. Judge Hall served his district, his State, and his country for two terms in the Congress of the United States. His service was marked with industry and distinction. In that brief time he became chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Many of you here this morning remember with satisfaction his genial disposition and his uniform courtesy to all with whom he came in contact.

Judge Hall was a lovable man. He was a good husband, a devoted parent, and a devoted member of the Presbyterian Church. Judge Hall, in addition to his thousands of friends, leaves his widow—the former Miss Lenore Robinson, of Hattiesburg, Miss.—four stalwart sons, and two lovely daughters to mourn his untimely passing. Now that the battle of life, the vicissitudes of politics, the honors acquired, and the few disappointments in

life are no more and the splendid heritage is left to his family and posterity, may God—the greatest judge of them all—receive and keep him for the final reunion which we are all taught to believe is the just reward of God's own.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I and every other true Mississippian join our distinguished colleague in his expressions of regret over the passing of our distinguished former colleague, Robert S. Hall, one of Mississippi's distinguished sons. To me his passing is a keen, personal loss. We were long personal friends, and during his services in the House we were thrown together almost every day. I can say of him as was said by another that he was a foe without hate and a friend without treachery.

He manifested a spirit that I sometimes wish was more prevalent in this House and in other walks of life. He reminded me of that expression of our old friend, Walter Malone, the distinguished Tennessee poet, in a little verse called Opportunity, in which he said:

Wail not for precious chances passed away,
Weep not for golden ages on the wane;
Each night I burn the records of the day,
At sunrise every soul is born again.

This verse to me expresses the daily life of Robert S. Hall.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND REPORTS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3782) establishing an office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 21, after the word "amended", insert "or otherwise as he may elect."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia tell us the meaning of this amendment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. When the bill passed the House, section 4 provided that a civilian assistant to the Director of Budgets and Reports be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Senate added "or otherwise as he may elect." In other words, this means that this civilian can either come from the civil-service rolls or outside of the civil-service rolls if the Secretary of the Navy shall so elect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all it does?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is all it does; yes.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

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

THE 18 MONTHS' LAY-OFF, W. P. A.

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

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

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will again take up for consideration House Joint Resolution 193, carrying the appropriation for the W. P. A. On January 29 of this year I introduced what is known as H. R. 2789, which strikes out the 18 months' mandatory clause of the W. P. A. law. Tomorrow I expect to attempt by an amendment to include this bill, H. R. 2789, in the provisions of House Joint Resolution 193, striking out, on page 16, lines 4 to 13, inclusive, which is the mandatory clause of the 18 months' lay-off of the W. P. A. This amendment is now on the Clerk's desk. I ask all Members of Congress to give thought to this amendment and assist me in bringing aid to these unfortunate individuals. I apologize to the House for bringing this bill in in this particular manner, but owing to some reason which I am unable to determine, H. R. 2789 has never had a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, and I am therefore forced to ask that it be accepted in the form of an amendment to House Joint Resolution 193.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

INCREASING AMOUNT FOR W. P. A.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when the W. P. A. bill will be read for amendment, I am going to offer an amendment increasing the amount in the bill to the sum of \$1,250,000,000. That amount will enable us to give employment to about half of those who are unemployed, and able to work, but who cannot find work in private industry. Many people think that because of defense activities all of the unemployed who want to work are taken care of. Members from the Middle West and from other sections of the country know that defense activities are confined to a very small area of this country. Also I want Members to know that the men on the W. P. A. are for the most part men over 40 years of age and that over 60 percent are over 45, who cannot get work in private industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter from Major General Rivers.

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

WORK ON THE FARMS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] spoke about unemployment in the cities. That is not bothering us any out in the country. Our farmers are unable to get help to cultivate their crops, to harvest some of their crops, and farm work will increase from now on. We cannot get men because the factories in the cities are taking them away from us with a higher wage than the farmers can pay.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. How much do we pay them?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. In my district I am taking care of the farmers by having men on the W. P. A. leave the W. P. A. under the condition that if they do not they will not be continued on the W. P. A. rolls; also, by having the commissioner of education defer entrance to college in the fall.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If those on W. P. A. in the gentleman's district are being given employment by the farmers, there is no need for an increase. There should be a reduction in the W. P. A. appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an article showing changes made by Reorganization Plans I to V.

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

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

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

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the liberty of inserting in the RECORD excerpts of an article by a member of the technical staff of the Edward Thompson Co., of Brooklyn, which shows the changes made by Reorganization Plans I to V, promulgated under authority of the act of 1939.

Included in the article are two tables which present a consolidated compilation of all basic changes made. One is an alphabetical listing of agencies and functions as they previously existed, a description of the nature of the change, and the disposition after reorganization. The other table shows the post-reorganization structure of the executive departments and independent agencies insofar as they were affected by the plans.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws has incorporated all of the changes in the text of the new edition of the United States Code, which will be available in the near future.

I hope these tables may be of some use to the Members.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars: First, by the inclusion of a letter from John Cashmore, president of Brooklyn College; and second, by the inclusion of a letter from William M. McCarthy, endorsing S. 220 and S. 24.

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

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including a radio address made by me on June 10.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement on Automobiles a Necessity.

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

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial from a newspaper in my district on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

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

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech delivered by Hon. Elbern Parsons.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Mr. P. J. Anderson.

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Governor of the State of Louisiana in reference to the W. P. A.

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

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks and include a communication from the Polish National Alliance pledging their support to President Roosevelt.

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

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial dated June 5 on the subject of give us an air force.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an article by William Randolph Hearst.

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

STRIKES AGAINST NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the Record.]

HARRY BRIDGES AND OTHER ALIENS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House read the papers and really find out that Harry Bridges is supporting these outlaw strikes. He is an alien. I hope the Members will consider the fact that this man Alex Baint is also an alien and still he has been here for 20 years.

This country has come to a terrible pass when these outside aliens, who are not even citizens, can come in and destroy our defense program.

I have a bill before a committee of this House which provides that no alien shall represent organized labor in any bargaining with any business or industry in the United States. I would like to see that bill passed. I ask the support of every Member of this House to help me pass that bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address delivered by our minority leader, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., at Glens Falls, N. Y., on June 6.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PLAN DE RANCHO

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me you probably can understand this:

8 Estrellas que podemos ganar este ano llevando a cabo un buen Plan de Rancho y Casa.

That is the title of a booklet gotten out by the Farm Security Administration. What it means is that you can win 8 stars each year by carrying out a good plan of county farm and home management. Then it provides the conditions under which each star can be obtained. It contains pictures. It has cartoons; little zinc etchings of one kind or another. It will make swell writing material for some of the children. It will lend itself beautifully to other uses that I can name.

I have not complained a great deal about some of the literature that has been gotten out by Government departments, but when you get to printing things in Spanish and circulating these around, I think we are just about ready to call it quits.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an item from the United States News, indicating that the American farmer is not for sale.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech made by the president of the VI Form, Mr. Douglas W. Franchot.

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

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] call your attention to printing that does not seem necessary. Well, there is much of it being done, it is waste, it is extravagant. But they continue to do it. I just want to call your attention to the Treasury statement of June 7 showing that we are now close to the five-billion mark in the red for this year which closes June 30. The actual figure is \$4,990,000,000. We are over and above the \$5,000,000,000 today. Extravagant, wasteful methods of this administration is the fault of these annual deficits.

We are printing more worthless material that is being sent out by the various departments than ever in the history of the world. This administration is responsible for that. It seems strange that we should continue to do it. You are not cutting down the regular appropriations as the President and Mr. Morgenthau said they should be cut. He does not mean it or he would insist that it be done. You are not going to cut them down. I am now working on the Interior Department appropriation bill in conference. It is going to be a great deal larger than it was when it passed the House. So you will find that all appropriation bills are going to be increased rather than decreased. Why? Why? Why do you permit it? Have you no sense of responsibility?

How are you going to meet the situation when we bankrupt the country, when you have a million and a half men under arms and a great Navy? If you are not able to handle it financially, we will all go bust. You will bankrupt the Nation. You have it about bankrupt now. In the name of our liberties and of our country, do not bankrupt it by doing many of the useless and unnecessary things that are being done by the administration. Stop waste. Stop extravagances. Stop unnecessary functions of government. Stop. Stop. Stop before we go broke.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a short statement issued by 24 national organizations, including the Boy Scouts, the Elks, the

Roosevelt Memorial Association, and certain other organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—FIRST REPORT UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 11, 1941 (LEND LEASE ACT) (S. DOC. NO. 66)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

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.

Beginning with the outbreak of the war, British and French orders began to be placed. But dollars could not be immediately turned into airplanes and ships and guns and ammunition.

In those dark days when France was falling, it was clear that this Government, to carry out the will of the people, had to render aid over and above the matériel coming off the assembly line. This Government therefore made available all that it possibly could out of its surplus stocks of munitions. In June of 1940, the British Government received from our surplus stocks rifles, machine guns, field artillery, ammunition, and aircraft in a value of more than \$43,000,000. This was equipment that would have taken months and months to produce and which, with the exception of the aircraft, cost about \$300,000,000 to produce during the World War period. Most of this matériel would not have been usable if we had kept it much longer. This equipment arrived in Britain after the retreat from Dunkirk, where the British had lost great quantities of guns and other military supplies. No one can appraise what effect the delivery of these supplies had upon the successful British resistance in the summer and fall of 1940 when they were fighting against such terrific odds.

Since June 1940, this Government has continued to supply war matériel from its surplus stocks in addition to the matériel produced by private manufacturers. The

50 over-age destroyers which Britain received in exchange for the defense bases were a part of the aid supplied by the Government.

By the turn of the year 1941, the British commitments in this country for defense articles had reached the limit of their future dollar resources. Their striking power required the assurance that their munitions and equipment would steadily and certainly be augmented, not curtailed.

The will of our people, as expressed through the Congress, was to meet this problem, not only by the passage of the Lend Lease Act but by the appropriation of \$7,000,000,000 made on March 27 of this year to carry out this task.

In the 90 days since the Lend Lease Act was passed, and in the 74 days since the funds were appropriated, we have started in motion the vast supply program which is essential to the defeat of the Axis Powers.

In these 74 days more than four and one-fourth billion dollars out of the seven billion dollars have been allocated to the War, Navy, Agriculture, and Treasury Departments and to the Maritime Commission to procure the aid authorized. Contracts have been let for long-range bombers, ships, tanks, and the other sinews of war that will be needed for the defense of the democracies. The balance of less than two and three-fourths billions is being rapidly allocated.

To be effective, the aid rendered by us must be many-sided. Ships are necessary to carry the munitions and the food. We are immediately making available to Britain 2,000,000 gross tons of cargo ships and oil tankers.

But this is not enough. Adequate shipping for every day to come must be reasonably assured. Since the appropriation act was passed, \$550,000,000 has been allocated for the construction of new ships under the Lend Lease Act. Contracts have been let, and the new ways required to build these ships are now nearing completion. Allied ships are being repaired by us. Allied ships are being equipped by us to protect them from mines, and are being armed by us to protect them as much as possible against raiders. Naval vessels of Britain are being repaired by us so that they can return quickly to their naval tasks.

The training program of 7,000 British pilots in our schools in this country is under way. Valuable information is being communicated, and other material assistance is being rendered in a mounting benefit to the democracies.

Millions of pounds of food are being and will be sent. Iron and steel, machine tools, and the other essentials to maintain and increase the production of war materials in Britain are being sent and received in larger quantities day by day.

Since September 1939 the war goods sent to Britain have risen steadily. The over-all total exports to the British Empire have greatly increased in 1941 over 1940. What is more important, the exports of those things which are necessary for fighting have increased far beyond our other exports. In the first 5 months of this year we have sent more than 12

times as many airplanes to Britain as we did in the first 5 months of 1940, and as the rate of aircraft production increases relatively more and more heavy bombers and medium bombers are being sent. At the same time we have sent more than 10 times as many aircraft engines in the first 5 months of 1941 as we did in the first 5 months of 1940. For the first 4 months of this year the dollar value of explosives sent to the British Empire was about 17 times as much as for the first 4 months of 1940. Ninety times as much in dollar value of firearms and ammunition was sent to Britain during the first 4 months of this year as for the first 4 months of 1940.

With our natural resources, our productive capacity, and the genius of our people for mass production, we will help Britain to outstrip the Axis Powers in munitions of war, and we will see to it that these munitions get to the places where they can be effectively used to weaken and defeat the aggressors.

In the report that follows facts and figures are given to the extent advisable without disclosing military secrets to benefit the Axis Powers. These facts describe the past and portray the present status of our aid to those nations so gallantly fighting the aggressors. They do not present the most important fact of all—the strong will of our people to see to it that these forces of aggression shall not rule the world.

We have before us a constant purpose, not of present safety alone but equally of future survival.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 1941.

CONSIDERATION OF VINSON BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader a question if I may. I observe in the newspapers that the so-called Vinson bill will be called up next Monday. I wonder if that is accurate or not?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. At the time the statement was made it was accurate. I make that statement so the newspapers will not think they made statements which were not justified.

The bill will not be called up before the 23d and probably on that day. That is the best information I can give. I have been informed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that he will probably call it up on that day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Members can plan to have that bill before them on June 23?

Mr. McCORMACK. The best answer I can give to the gentleman from Massachusetts at the present time is what I have given. I will keep the House advised constantly so that they may have as much notice as possible as to when the bill will come up. I will inform them of anything more definite if the occasion arises. The best information I have now

is that it will probably be called up on the 23d.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. It will not be called up before that time, will it?

Mr. McCORMACK. A "gentlemen's agreement" has been made. I believe I can speak for the three gentlemen involved. I know neither of them would violate a "gentlemen's agreement."

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. FULMER (when the Committee on Agriculture was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I call up the bill S. 158, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 158, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for years and years farmers have been losing millions and millions of dollars because of crop failures. Because of this, the Government has been losing millions and millions of dollars in having to make emergency loans, grants, relief, and W. P. A. employment payments to thousands of these farmers.

Let me give you a little history in connection with the crop-insurance program.

For quite some time many Members have been interested in having the Federal Government insure farm crops. I believe I introduced the first bill proposing insurance on cotton.

In 1938 the conferees on the agriculture bill agreed to include a provision setting up the Crop Insurance Corporation. At that time it was definitely understood between Senator Pope, of Idaho, and myself that wheat and cotton would be placed under the insurance program. However, cotton was left out at the time of the passage of this act only for the reason that the Secretary of Agriculture stated that he did not have sufficient information and data on cotton that would warrant the inclusion of cotton. The Secretary was authorized to secure complete and definite information on cotton and submit his findings to Congress. Under a resolution, No. 176, submitted by me, the information submitted by the Secretary was placed in House Document No. 277 in the Seventy-sixth Congress. Bills were then introduced in the Senate and in the House by Senator BANK-

HEAD and myself, proposing the placing of cotton under the insurance program. This legislation was passed by both Houses but was vetoed by the President.

During this session of Congress I introduced H. R. 4595, covering cotton and authorizing the Secretary to gather information on corn and submit same to the Congress, having in mind introducing legislation later on placing corn in the program. My bill was reported to the House. In the meanwhile the Senate passed the Bankhead bill, S. 158, and this bill was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, and this is the bill that we are now considering. The bill has a favorable report from the Department and the Budget Director. At this point I want to read you a letter addressed to me by the President, dated April 5, 1941:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 5, 1941.

HON. H. P. FULMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FULMER: In view of the interest which you demonstrated in S. 2635 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), a bill which would have extended to cotton the system of Federal crop insurance now applied to wheat, and your disappointment that I found it necessary to return this bill to Congress without my approval, I am now enclosing a copy of a letter which I have today sent to the Secretary of Agriculture outlining my present views on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

I am also including at this point the letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, signed by the President, referred to in the letter written to me by the President:

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 4, 1940, I returned to Congress without my approval S. 2635 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), a bill which would have extended to cotton the system of Federal crop insurance now applied to wheat. My action was based on (a) the substantial losses incurred by Federal insurance of wheat, (b) the lack of a sound actuarial basis for a self-supporting crop insurance, and (c) the belief that when such basis was established, the producers of all major crops should share in its benefits.

I am now informed that the losses incurred by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation have been considerably less than previously estimated and that your Department feels the actuarial basis of the Corporation has proved to be sound, provided administrative expenses continue to be paid by the Government.

While I have felt that any crop-insurance plan should be self-supporting with premiums sufficient to pay administrative costs as well as indemnities, I recognize that where the Government has entered insurance fields to meet needs which commercial insurance organizations have been reluctant to provide, it has heretofore seemed proper to share or provide the necessary administrative expenses. The Department has successfully reduced the ratio of administrative expenses and has recently submitted legislation to Congress which would permit premiums to be paid in notes of the commodity, which, if enacted, will result in further substantial savings by largely eliminating storage costs.

In view of the proven benefits of crop insurance and the reduction in administrative expenses accomplished and in prospect, it now seems to me that, as reliable actuarial bases are developed, consideration might be

given to the extension of Federal insurance to other crops.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Let me give you some information about the insurance operations for 1939 and 1940:

| | Fiscal year | |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| | 1939 | 1940 |
| Administration: Total expenditures..... | \$4,484,772 | \$5,585,134 |
| | Crop year | |
| | 1939 | 1940 |
| Number of contracts..... | \$165,775 | \$379,420 |
| Premium collections, bushels..... | 6,676,536 | 13,801,957 |
| Indemnity claims: | | |
| Number..... | 55,929 | 112,645 |
| Bushels..... | 10,163,081 | 22,889,533 |
| Excess of indemnities over premiums: | | |
| Bushels..... | 3,486,545 | 9,087,576 |
| Cash equivalent..... | \$2,229,134 | \$4,739,572 |

In 1941 the Crop Insurance Corporation wrote 420,906 contracts. The Corporation received 14,358,000 bushels of wheat for premium payments. You will note in the figures that the number of applications received in 1940 were over twice as many as in 1939, and in 1941 there was also a substantial increase in the number of applications over 1940. According to the figures and the prospective profits for this year because of the good wheat crop, you will note that the total losses for the 3 years of operation of the wheat insurance will amount to less than \$5,000,000. In the meantime, the Insurance Corporation collected around 35,000,000 bushels of wheat as insurance premiums from 966,101 farmers, giving same to about 175,000 farmers who had crop losses during these 3 years. If you will count this wheat at \$1 per bushel, you will find that the Insurance Corporation during the past 3 years has given to these 175,000 farmers who had crop losses \$35,000,000, and at a loss to the Government of less than \$5,000,000.

Naturally, if we had not been in the insurance business, we would have saved the actual losses of around \$5,000,000, but what would have become of thousands of these farmers who had crop failures? Why, many of them would have been forced into tenant farming. In the meantime the Government would have had considerably greater losses than the actual losses referred to under the insurance program. I mean losses from having to give to these farmers emergency loans, grants, relief, and W. P. A. employment payments. Naturally, in working out this insurance program—that is, a fair basis for premium rates—it cannot be done in 3 years; perhaps not in 5 years. It is apparent to me, and should be apparent to you, that this is a mutual affair between farmers. I am hoping, and I believe the time will come when all crop failures will be taken care of from the premiums secured from farmers, and you will find that it can be done at a very reasonable cost to farmers.

Crop insurance, while not offering a total solution for the farm problem of

more than 2,000,000 cotton farmers, should provide an effective means by which the financial difficulties brought about by unavoidable production hazards may be overcome. In view of the many hazards that affect the production of cotton and the large number of farmers who must face these hazards, it is believed that a program of cotton-crop insurance will meet a real need.

Let me give you some real, definite advantages and benefits to farmers under an insurance program: First, farmers are able to develop better farm management; second, insurance is a wonderful assistance in securing crop loans; third, in many instances, because of this type of security, farmers are able to secure lower rates of interest; fourth, indemnity payments have definitely prevented farm foreclosures; fifth, this insurance will eliminate emergency loans, grants, and relief benefits; sixth, will make possible construction, educational, and health programs; and seventh, the operation of the wheat-insurance program has enabled the Farm Credit Administration to sell farms to tenants on a more favorable payment basis when the tenant agrees to secure his payments by carrying crop insurance.

Section 7 of the bill proposes premium payments to be made in three ways: First, in wheat; second, in cash equivalent to the wheat; and third, notes secured by soil-conservation payments.

During the past 3 years, under the operation of the crop insurance, the insurance agency has been accepting payment of premiums in wheat. It is estimated by the Department that by being permitted to take notes the agency will be able to make a saving of from one to one and a half million dollars annually in cost of wheat storage.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I take it that it is contemplated that the program will ultimately be self-sustaining?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely.

Mr. COX. With the experience and background already had with reference to what has been done, the gentleman has the assurance that we will finally work to that end?

Mr. FULMER. May I state in answer to the gentleman's question that it is definitely understood that eventually it will be a self-sustaining proposition. Based on the experience of numerous private companies, the corporation up to this date has made a wonderful showing over and above the showing of those private companies. If in 5 years or 7 years we can work this out and gradually take in the various crops one after the other, in an orderly way, so as to have this program become self-sustaining and save millions annually for that class of people that follow the most hazardous business in the world, I believe it will be an excellent undertaking.

Mr. COX. The statement of the gentleman, especially worthy of note, as I see it, is that the taking of notes instead of the delivery of wheat is expected to reduce the cost of administration to an extent considerably above \$1,000,000.

Mr. FULMER. At least one million, and perhaps one and one-half million.

Mr. Chairman, may I state that this is not a partisan or a political matter. To me it is a common-sense, sound business proposition. Three years operation of the insurance program on wheat has proven the soundness of the program. No doubt some few Members will refer to the few million losses in 1939 and 1940. Let me state that the benefits received by farmers, including these few millions of losses at the expense of the Government, really meant the saving of many more millions to the Government in replacing emergency loans, grants, W. P. A. employment, and relief.

Crop insurance, where farmers have crop losses, will enable farmers to pay their obligations, interest on their mortgages, and taxes. It will enable thousands of farmers to continue to be landowners, thereby saving the Government millions of dollars that would have to be spent in trying to make landowners out of tenant farmers, many of whom have lost their lands because of crop failures.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether this bill is substantially the same bill that the House passed overwhelmingly last year.

Mr. FULMER. It is identically the same bill, proposing to include cotton at this time; and may I state that it is the purpose of the Committee on Agriculture from time to time, when we have definite information, to put in other crops in an orderly manner, one after the other, so we will not break down the program and in order that the program may be successful, without cost to the Government, and at the same time mean millions of dollars to the farmers.

Let me give you a concrete example as to just how crop insurance may prove to be a life saver to a farmer. Here we have two farmers, each of whom produces normally 10 bales of cotton. We would say that this cotton and cottonseed is worth \$600. One of these farmers is insured for three-fourths of the value of his normal crop, or in the amount of \$400. Both of these farmers have a total crop failure. You can readily see that the farmer with the \$400 insurance would be able to pay practically all of his obligations, taxes, and interest on his land mortgage. It should also be very apparent to you that the only way out for the other farmer would be to call on the Government for an emergency loan, the securing of a grant, W. P. A. employment, and perhaps a certain amount of relief. In the meantime, the farmer with the insurance will enter into the next year's farming program with his obligations paid, or practically so, while the farmer without the insurance will wind up at the end of the next year with 2 years' obligations, all of which will mean that eventually this farmer will pass on into the tenant class.

In that private insurance companies, who operate purely for profit, have not been able to be helpful in solving this serious problem, naturally out of our ex-

perience during the past 3 years it should appear to every Member of Congress that the Government has entered into one of the most worth while, businesslike, helpful activities of any activity that it has ever engaged in. Ask yourself this question: Just how long would other groups, business and industry, last without proper protection, insurance, and so forth? Farmers are subject to more hazards in the producing of their crops than any other line of business in this country, and yet they have been operating all of these years without any insurance or protection whatsoever.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

WHEAT AND COTTON INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, the broad question involved in the consideration of this legislation is how far you wish to put the Government into the insurance business and thereby set the Government up in the insurance business in opposition to private insurance agents and agencies.

If the Government is going to insure wheat and cotton, why not the other farm crops of the country, as these two crops represent a small percentage of the national farm income? Otherwise the procedure is a continuation of the New Deal to legislate for the few at the expense of the many. If the Federal Government is to insure all the crops, why should they not insure the barn to hold the crops? If the barn is insured, why not insure the house? If the buildings are to be insured, why not insure a family, which is dearer than all the crops and buildings?

The second question involved is whether we should at this time increase Federal expenditures for nondefense items.

The Ways and Means Committee is searching eagerly to find every possible avenue to raise revenues. The "widow's mite" is in jeopardy. The public debt, now headed for \$90,000,000,000, is twice the combined value of all the farms and farm buildings in the United States, which in 1940 had a value of only \$33,000,000,000. Daily my constituents write and ask me to work to reduce the non-defense expenditures of this Government. Undoubtedly yours are doing likewise, or, if not, they most assuredly will be doing so.

The third question involved in the consideration of this legislation is whether it is a good governmental policy to pass additional legislation that has a tendency to increase the production of wheat and cotton. These two crops are soil-depleting crops and crops that now have most embarrassing surpluses.

Do you realize all the legislation that has been passed for the benefit of a few crops?

Do you realize that the cotton crop alone in 1 year, already has \$125,000,000 in soil-conservation payments, \$96,000,000 parity, \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000 storage, \$40,000,000 export bounty, and, in addition, numerous other so-called subsidies? In fact, the fiber crop was worth only \$595,000,000 last year, so the

so-called subsidy is now annually over half the value of the crop.

Do you realize that wheat has huge parity payments? Do you think a wheat producer should get 15 to 17 cents per bushel premium for growing, or not growing, wheat when we already have a surplus of wheat? Or why should this wheat producer get 17 cents per bushel bounty when the barley and other grain growers do not have a bounty on their product?

The flax grower does not have a bounty, when we are on an import basis as far as flax is concerned.

The following table shows the United States wheat production from 1920 to 1940:

| Wheat production—United States | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| | Bushels |
| 1920 | 843,277,000 |
| 1921 | 818,964,000 |
| 1922 | 846,469,000 |
| 1923 | 759,482,000 |
| 1924 | 841,617,000 |
| 1925 | 668,700,000 |
| 1926 | 832,213,000 |
| 1927 | 875,059,000 |
| 1928 | 914,373,000 |
| 1929 | 823,217,000 |
| 1930 | 886,470,000 |
| 1931 | 941,674,000 |
| 1932 | 756,927,000 |
| 1933 | 551,683,000 |
| 1934 | 526,393,000 |
| 1935 | 626,344,000 |
| 1936 | 626,766,000 |
| 1937 | 875,676,000 |
| 1938 | 931,702,000 |
| 1939 | 751,435,000 |
| 1940 | 816,698,000 |

Note that the average production is over 100,000,000 bushels more the last 4 years than it was the 4 years before. Where is the crop control?

The following table shows the exports of wheat:

Wheat: United States exports, by 5-year averages, 1900–1938, and for calendar years, 1939 and 1940

| Period ¹ | Quantity | Value |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| 5-year average: | | |
| 1900 to 1904 | Bushels | |
| 1905 to 1909 | 109,466,000 | \$81,206,000 |
| 1910 to 1914 | 56,646,000 | 52,142,000 |
| 1915 to 1918 ¹ | 56,913,000 | 55,063,000 |
| 1919 to 1923 | 173,481,000 | 276,970,000 |
| 1924 to 1928 | 181,981,000 | 341,951,000 |
| 1929 to 1933 | 131,140,000 | 189,392,000 |
| 1934 to 1938 | 64,219,000 | 57,363,000 |
| 1939 | 28,182,000 | 25,833,000 |
| Annual: | | |
| 1939 | 63,214,000 | 36,815,000 |
| 1940 (11 months) | 14,078,000 | 10,972,000 |

¹ Fiscal years 1900 to 1918, inclusive; 1915–18 is a 4-year average; calendar years 1939–40.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Note from the above table we have gradually lost our export wheat market. Also remember, for the last couple of years we have had to pay an export bounty of 25 to 27 cents a bushel to get rid of it.

Did you know that 1 congressional district received more money from A. A. A. in 1 year than 32 different States received?

Did you know that three congressional districts received over \$43,000,000 or more money than all but two of the States in 1939?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Were any of those districts in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. MURRAY. I will say to my distinguished colleague that they were not, but I do not want to get into any argument with any congressional district or any State and therefore I do not use either the number of the district or the State.

Did you know that five congressional districts got 23 percent of the money in 1939?

Did you know that of the four States with a total value of over \$2,000,000,000 in 1935, the first State received \$87,000,000 in 1 year, 1939; the second State over \$59,000,000; the third State over \$41,000,000; and the fourth only \$13,000,000? Since 1933 to 1941, one of these States received \$451,000,000; one, \$288,000,000; one, \$180,000,000; and the last, \$62,000,000.

Did you know the fourth mentioned State was one that did not happen to grow the right crops to get the large payments?

Do you know any reason to continually have legislation for two or three crops that represent only a small part of the national farm income? Or should we have a constructive program for all the farmers of the country?

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE

The other side of this picture is: First, if Federal crop insurance is developed, the proponents say that there would not be the demand for emergency legislation, for droughts, floods, grants, and the other projects so that in fact the United States Treasury is really being insured instead of the crops.

Second, the production of crops can be much more readily financed by the insurance program. This is evident. The farmer gets his policy; he can go to the bank and borrow for his operations as the banker knows just how many bushels of wheat the farmer will have and soon he will no doubt know about how much the farmer will receive a bushel for it, so he can, with complete safety, make the loan.

Third, The Republican platform includes crop insurance. I have not read the Democratic platform since 1932, but I hear the insurance provisions are in that too. Unless one repudiated that part of his party's platform during the campaign, he is honor bound to support the platform according to my way of thinking. Unless of course, if one does think he is bigger than his party, it is usually an erroneous opinion.

Fourth, Many students of this problem believe that this program can be self-sustaining, and that a general benefit will be obtained. This depends wholly on the administration, of course. I personally feel I should vote to go along with the legislation for the above reasons, but I do so with deep misgivings as to how the New Deal will conduct it.

In conclusion I wish to say that the wheat-insurance program has been carried on with a much greater overhead

than would obtain if more crops were included and if this Federal insurance is to continue all farm crops should be included so we could discontinue legislation for the few at the expense of the many.

Do you not really think that anyone that can raise from five to nine thousand acres of wheat a year should be able to attend to his own insurance?

Do you think the public should be asked to carry on this kind of an insurance program?

The present farm program needs plenty of fixing and here is an opportunity to begin if you wish to legislate for the greatest good for the greatest number instead of continuing for the few at the expense of the many. We should include all crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As far as the rank and file of the farmers throughout the country are concerned, the gentleman's last proposal, in my opinion, is very sound. In diversified farming areas, which represent most of agriculture in this country, they should be entitled to insure their crops just the same as a few of the basic farm commodities are insured, and I am therefore glad the gentleman has mentioned that proposition.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am sure that anyone who has spent any time studying agricultural legislation will agree that all crops should be considered. I do not mean in the last few years, but for the last 20 years we have been legislating for the few.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot but come to the conclusion that we must include all types of farmers, regardless of the type of the farming that he is engaged in. We cannot continue to do it simply because he happens to raise this or that crop. I think we must insure the whole farm crop.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we are going to have an insurance program for agriculture which is to be sound and permanent, such a program must be self-sustaining and established on a business basis. At the present time wheat was used as an experiment. We tried wheat out for 2 years. It is impossible to establish tables of experience over a 2-year period. I opposed this cotton program insurance bill last year, as the gentleman knows. The President vetoed the bill. Now he recommends that we insure cotton. I am not sure but what we are making a mistake in taking in other commodities than wheat before we complete the experiment with wheat to see whether it will work out on a sound basis and give us a permanent and a sound insurance program.

Mr. MURRAY. If the gentleman were to make an investigation of the wheat policies, he would find that in many cases only about two men are insured in a county. One can readily see that entails a much greater overhead than if we had the whole farm being in-

sured. It just convinces me that much more that we should either quit going into the insurance business any further or should include all crops on the farm, because the overhead could be cut down then, and in fairness to the wheat program I think it should be brought out that the first year these policies cost the taxpayers \$29 apiece, and that was given to the man that got out the insurance, and that has been reduced this year to \$10 per policy. This is just another thing that confirms me in the conclusion that we should include all farm crops or get out of the insurance business altogether.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the gentleman, I am sure, agrees that we should not include a crop until we do have the necessary statistical information to make it self-sustaining, as near as we can.

Mr. MURRAY. And I say to my distinguished friend that this New Deal can be so lacking in knowledge when they want to be lacking, and can give so many answers when they want to give them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. MURRAY. And I will answer the question in this way. All these stories that they have to have, history behind it all, are not to me as laudable, because I think it is not very difficult to get a case history of a whole farm practically as quickly as you can get it of one crop. Therefore, I say, instead of going into this way we are now—and next year we will have corn—we should, I think, take in the whole farm crop.

Mr. PACE. But the gentleman would not advocate an all-comprehensive, all-crop program?

Mr. MURRAY. I would; yes.

Mr. PACE. At this hour?

Mr. MURRAY. At this hour or at the next hour. That is the basis on which I would operate—for all of the people, and not for just a few.

Mr. PACE. Although the Corporation has not the information as to the average loss and the yields?

Mr. MURRAY. The trouble is that these New Dealers seem to think that we never knew anything about agriculture or soil fertility until about 5 or 6 years ago, when the fact is that we had considerable knowledge of agriculture wrapped up in our agricultural colleges throughout the country for many years, although that information does not seem to have gotten as far as Washington. They would not go through the performances they are at the present time if they had as many answers as they think they have.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The distinguished gentleman must know that if we authorize full coverage for all commodities the administration would not go ahead until they made an investiga-

tion, because they must establish it on a sound basis.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I may be the only Member of this House who is opposed to this bill, but if so that will be quite all right, and I think I can make the case.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a little while ago privately asked me as to whether I would be for this bill if corn were included. The answer is, "No." I am opposed to the Federal Government going into the field of crop insurance, because it is going to be suicidal. It will develop a colossal headache, and we will have proved exactly nothing, except to carry a huge burden upon the Federal Treasury. Let us see what the score is. I have gone into this. We had the Secretary of Agriculture before the subcommittee in connection with the appropriation bill for 1942 for the Department of Agriculture. The figures I am going to give you are documented, and I can give you the pages, if you like, from the record of the printed hearings.

In 1939 the wheat premiums were about 6.7 million bushels and the losses were 10,000,000 bushels. You compute that at 60 cents a bushel and we lost \$2,216,000 on our wheat experiment in insurance in 1939.

They said at that time, "As we find a sounder basis everything will be hunky-dory." In the following year, 1940, they took in over 13,000,000 bushels in premiums on wheat. They paid out 22,000,000 bushels in payments. Expressed in terms of 60 cents a bushel their loss was \$4,431,000. I have reason to believe that the score is going to be no different in the crop year 1941 because they are already anticipating that there will be a loss.

Here are succeeding losses each year. But that is not the whole story. You will find additional losses in the fact that the administrative expense comes out of the Federal Treasury. I will take for my authority the great gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who is a member of the subcommittee. He asked Mr. Smith, head of the Crop Insurance Corporation, what the cost of administration was. You will find this on page 938 of the hearings if you are interested in looking. Mr. Smith said \$5,434,488. It has run over \$5,000,000 a year. Add \$5,000,000 to \$2,000,000 and the loss was \$7,000,000 in 1939. Add \$5,000,000 to four and four-tenths million, and the loss was nine and four-tenths million in 1940. We are going to have that continuing administrative cost as we go along. We are going to carry a big load of red ink in this venture year after year.

I am satisfied in my own mind that we are not going to work out a sound actuarial basis unless the premium is so high that farmers will back off, and then we can cross off these insurance contracts and put it in red ink on the books of the Treasury. We should look ahead a little. This thing is tied to something else.

When you insure a crop do not forget you are developing a vested interest in that crop, and if for some reason we have to change our agricultural economy because of world conditions, then what we have done will stalemate any chance to get out of that situation.

Sixty countries are raising cotton. China produces 3,000,000 bales; India, 5,000,000; Russia, two and three-tenths millions; Egypt, three and twenty-five one-hundredths millions; and Brazil, 3,000,000. They have three and one-fourth million square miles of territory in Brazil. They have millions of acres of new cotton land in Brazil. They have 42,000,000 people. They are going to get ready to whack off some of their coffee trees and go into the cotton business. Once we secure an insured interest in the cotton production of this country and it becomes necessary to change the economy, frankly, I do not know how we will do it. I am alarmed about extending this, and we have not seen the limit. To aggravate the situation and provoke even greater losses insurance will be gradually extended to other basic crops. Let me read from page 948 of the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. This is our friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] speaking. He asked this question:

Now, Mr. Smith, are you working, for instance, on the rice crop?

Here is Mr. Smith's answer, the head of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:

Yes, sir. At the present time we are working on cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and citrus fruits, and studies are being made on each one of those commodities.

So after a while we are going to insure oranges on the trees. We are going to insure lemons, I suppose, and make sure there will be a rice harvest. Some of these may prove sour crops for the Federal Treasury.

I do not know how they are going to arrive at an actuarial basis, based upon accounting mortalities, as the gentleman from Minnesota says, and make this thing work out without a staggering loss. I am alarmed about it and that is why I am opposed to it. I do not know of any other country that does it. As we go along, having no regard particularly for the future, we are going to wind up with a tremendous headache. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. If you are going in for insurance, let us go whole hog.

I am disposed to offer an amendment on page 2, line 9, after the colon, which would read as follows:

With the cotton crop planted for harvest in 1942, the field-corn crop, and the oats crop, flax crop, rye crop, sorghum crop, sugarcane crop, peanut crop, potato crop, sweetpotato crop, barley crop, buckwheat crop, alfalfa crop, artichoke crop, celery crop, rutabaga crop, pear crop, plum crop, almond crop, apricot crop, avocado crop, orange crop, lemon crop, broom-corn crop, cherry crop, soybean crop, hop crop, hay crop, clover crop, onion crop, prune crop, tomato crop, and spinach crop whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a satisfactory actuarial basis has been established for such commodities.

The accent might be on the spinach.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman left out chickory.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman also left out cashews.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman have peanuts in there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have peanuts in there.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable there are not more Members on the floor today to envision how we are going to project this Government into a crop-insurance policy that will continue in proportion as those boys down in the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation continue to push insurance for other crops. Each year we are going to wind up with a headache and a deficit. If there is to be any withdrawing from this program that time is now.

We are not satisfied with the result obtained in the field of wheat. We have had losses in the years in which wheat has been insured. There will be a loss this year, in my judgment, as indicated by the testimony. Why should we add another crop now?

If you are bound and determined to extend crop insurance, why not defer it for a year or two until sounder actuarial data and information is available to the Congress and to the Department of Agriculture. I wish there were more interest, I wish there were more opposition to the pending bill at this particular time. It is a very unfortunate thing that on a matter of policy so grave and with so many implications there is such a great lack of interest at the present time. We are going to move on if we take this step today and indulge in other fields of insurance. After a while, we will simply have to tax it against the Federal Treasury and then wonder where the fund will come from. I do not know whether anyone else in this Congress will vote against the pending bill today, but I shall raise my voice as best I can and vote against it.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The policy is to afford some sense of security to most all other American citizens. For old age there is some assurance of a return on their efforts. Now, what does the gentleman propose to offer in the way of security to that branch of the citizenry that provides all of the food and fiber for the Nation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not propose anything as a substitute. If you are going to carry out logically that theory of assurance, insurance, and guaranty, then why not insure the plumber his job, why not insure the grocer a return on the canned goods he pushes across the counter, why not insure every segment of public life in this country? Let us find them all and somehow or other put them on the insurance rolls and be done with it. I am not yet persuaded that we are going to depart from what they call a sound American viewpoint. If we can get prices up—and I am willing that the farmer have adequate prices from one year to another—then when he does have

adversity he can balance the good years against the bad.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, if we follow that proposal through, what about industry that will go on for a year, or 2 or 3 years having a loss, then pick up the stitch and have a good year or two so that one cancels the other. Obviously if you are going to go the whole hog on this insurance principle, then look out.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman, of course, understands the farmer has no protection under the Social Security Act. He has no benefit from a guaranteed wage under the Wage Act. He has no way to set aside a retirement fund like the millions of Government employees. He has to plant his crop, produce his crop, and when the evening comes and it is destroyed by the elements, he is left destitute and alone.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have a far better answer to that. Instead of having him go through all the rigmarole of planting wheat, hoping for rain, plowing, and cultivating the land, and so forth, let us make direct provision out of the Treasury and be done with it. That would be the answer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, it is always very interesting to listen to our very industrious, loquacious, and learned friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. This is nothing new. The gentleman has opposed this legislation heretofore. In spite of that fact the House has passed this legislation on two previous occasions by very large votes, although later it was vetoed by the President. I understand on reliable authority that the President will sign the pending legislation at this time and I hope, in spite of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, that this House will see fit to repeat what it did on a former occasion and pass this legislation, affording some sense of security and protection to that large class of our citizenship of the Southland who are engaged in the production of cotton.

As has been pointed out on the floor of this House repeatedly, we believe in insurance in this country. Insurance is a fundamental, recognized principle of our economic life. We insure our automobiles, we insure our homes, we insure our lives for the benefit of our loved ones, we even insure in this modern age under this Democratic administration against old age and the evils thereof.

In spite of the attempt that was made to ridicule this legislation, and ridicule, I admit, is always a very dangerous weapon when effectively used by a skilled foe, the legislation is desirable and it is fundamental. I hope that this House, notwithstanding the facetiousness that has been shown and the ridicule that has been leveled at it, will go ahead and repeat what it did on a former occasion and pass the legislation, giving the President of the United States an opportunity to sign it in the light of the further study that he has seen fit to make.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say to the gentleman, as he has stated, that last session, the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, on two roll calls, this identical bill passed by a vote of more than 2 to 1. This year the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States recommend favorable consideration of it, and the Secretary states that as to other commodities he is not prepared to recommend an insurance program, until further investigation. I gladly support the pending bill as I supported the prior bill, and I repeat the arguments I then made.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for his very able contribution to this discussion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Mississippi says that this identical bill once passed the House. There is not a man in this House who can read this identical bill and have any idea what it means—I say this advisedly—unless he gets the law and superimposes upon the law these amendments. He is a very quiet, analytical man if he can do that satisfactorily inside of 1 or 2 hours.

When the chairman of this committee appeared before the Committee on Rules he was unable to do it. It cannot be done. I have been attempting for better than an hour here to write an amendment to a provision in the bill, and with this "strike out and insert," "the comma," and "the colon," and the language being amended by this bill not being before the Congress, it is a technical physical impossibility. I hope the committee will not bring another bill like this in here.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to my distinguished friend and colleague on the Committee on Rules that he does himself a grave injustice. I personally resent the aspersions he has cast upon his ability as an able Member of this House, as a lawyer, and as a man for whom I have a very high regard. The matter is not so difficult as all that. My friend is very astute, and I am sure he can analyze the situation as he sees fit.

Mr. Chairman, now to get away from personalities for the few remaining moments which I have, let us analyze the situation briefly. What is the purpose of this legislation? The bill is simply an amendment to the crop-insurance bill which was passed by the Congress some 2 years ago. That bill provided for crop insurance on wheat alone. For 2 years that law has been in effect, and the wheat farmers of the country have found it satisfactory. Last year the Congress passed this identical bill, extending the benefits of the Crop Insurance Act so as to include cotton. The bill, had it become law, would have given the farmer insurance on his crop against failure from drought, floods, and the pestilence of the boll weevil. When he planted his crop he could realize that by good husbandry his crop would not be a total loss because

of the visitation of any of these evils which have heretofore beset him.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege at that time, as a member of the Rules Committee, to report House Resolution 271 of the Seventy-sixth Congress which made in order the consideration of this measure. At that time and in behalf of that legislation I addressed the House at some length upon the benefits which it was hoped the bill would extend to the cotton farmers of the Nation. The President saw fit, as has already been pointed out, much to the astonishment of those of us who were friendly to that legislation, to veto that bill, and so it is back today for your reconsideration. And as I have already stated, the President, in the light of the opportunity for further study that he has had to make of the legislation, has signified his intention to approve the bill if the Congress sees fit to pass it again.

It is argued here today that in view of the fact that this legislation is more or less experimental further time should elapse before the benefits of the Crop Insurance Act should be extended to cotton. The Department of Agriculture differs sharply with that position. This legislation for 2 years has been tried out in the wheat-growing areas in 32 States of the Nation. And now the President of the United States, the Department of Agriculture, and the friends of the farmer generally favor the enactment of this bill. Frankly, I confess that no one can say definitely just how this matter will work out in its application to the cotton crop. But in the light of the success which it has met with in the wheat area, and in my zeal to see the cotton farmer improve his lot, I am asking the House today to pass this legislation and at least give us an opportunity to try it out. If it proves unsatisfactory, of course, we who are most interested in cotton will be the first to ask for its repeal. Personally, I am very much in the same attitude about this that the President himself was in the early days of 1933 when he took over as the head of this Government. He said that we were going to try; that we were going to make mistakes; that we would profit by those mistakes; but that we were going to try to do something. Because of the lot of the southern cotton farmer with the loss of his foreign markets, with the continuous innovations of new substitutes for cotton, and with the growing tendency of other parts of the world to become as independent for their raw materials of this country as possible, I am in favor of trying out this experiment for the cotton farmer. Frankly, my friends, if this bill becomes a law and the farmer can have the sense of security that will come therefrom, together with the parity payments and the soil conservation payments which have already been provided by the Congress, I personally feel and rejoice in the fact that the farmers in my section can at least feel that they have not been neglected in these stirring and chaotic times by the American Congress. At least those of us who have the interest of the farmer at heart can get some satisfaction out of knowing that we have done the best that we could under the complicated and complex conditions that exist in the world today.

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will not be 50 votes cast against this bill here today in spite of the derision that has been pointed at it by some of our Republican friends on the left-hand side of the Chamber. The bill should pass, the President should sign it; and the farmer should have an additional sense of security from the floods, the droughts, and the pestilence with which he is harassed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to approach the consideration of this bill with the thought in mind that crop insurance is definitely an experiment. I do not believe anyone can say it is anything more than that. I have never heard anyone urge the enactment of this type of legislation on any other theory. It most certainly is an experiment that is worth making, however. There is no business in the world which has as many hazards confronting it as farming, and there is no business in the world which has as little insurance against its natural and normal hazards as agriculture.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not true that the hazards he has mentioned have made it impossible for the farmers to get insurance and protection that will protect him against disaster and loss, like other forms of business, and if this is not an effort to put him on an equal footing with the businessman, who is able to get insurance so that if disaster, fire, flood, or otherwise, comes along, he can protect himself and get back in business?

Mr. HOPE. I believe the gentleman has stated the proposition very well indeed. I agree with him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the gentleman from Kansas said that this is experimental, is there anybody on this floor who will deny that we lost over \$2,000,000 in 1939 on wheat, that we lost over \$4,000,000 in 1940, and that in addition we spent over \$5,000,000 in administrative expenses in each of those 2 years, over and above the losses? Is there anybody who will deny these figures?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman's figures are correct as far as I know, yet it seems to me that they fall as an argument against crop insurance. We all know that as long as insurance is on one crop only there will be greater hazards some years than others. If the premiums were figured absolutely correct from an actuarial standpoint there would probably never be a year when they would be exactly the same as the losses. Sometimes they will be over, sometimes under.

I believe the fact that we have had losses in the 2 particular years this plan has been in operation, coupled with the fact that these 2 years were years of severe drought in a large part of the Wheat Belt, is simply another proof of

the fact that we ought to have crop insurance if it is practical. I do not believe this experiment as to whether or not crop insurance is practical will be decided or can be decided in 1 year or 2 years or 3 years. I believe in any line of insurance you have to go over a period of several years in order to get the basic figures upon which to determine the risk and the amount of premium to be charged.

When the present crop-insurance system was set up it was applied on wheat originally because there were more basic data on wheat than on any other crop, yet there were not such data as any of us would have liked to have had on wheat. During the last 2 years, however, much more data have been accumulated through the experience of the Crop Insurance Corporation. They know a great deal more about it now, and about the proper rate to charge for premiums, than they could possibly have known at the time this plan was put into operation. They will know more at the end of this year and more at the end of next year than they know now. It is frankly an experiment.

We have had two disastrous years as far as wheat is concerned. I do not agree with the gentleman from Illinois that we are bound to have a loss this year. On the basis of present wheat prospects, the Corporation will likely not have a loss this year, but if it should have a loss that still does not prove anything as far as the soundness of the program is concerned. I believe that is the answer to what the gentleman from Illinois says, that you cannot say that because of your losses in 1 year or 2 years the proposition is a failure. It may be that the rates are too low, but the fact that there were losses for 2 successive years, which were particularly bad years as far as wheat production is concerned, does not even prove that. If the Corporation makes a profit this year and makes a profit next year, that will entirely alter the picture the gentleman from Illinois paints.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman makes an argument against the bill because, as the gentleman has stated, Hartford and Travelers and other private companies which had a great mass of actuarial data never could make it pay, and now the Government has the advantage of that data and still we have to recast the actuarial approach from time to time. So why not limit this experiment at least to one crop instead of moving into other crop fields and into other losses?

Mr. HOPE. I think there is something to what the gentleman has said about not expanding it to too great a degree, although I understood him to say in the course of his remarks that if we are going to have this he wanted it expanded to all crops and all commodities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is definitely correct.

Mr. HOPE. I think what we should do is to approach this matter carefully and cautiously as data are accumulated on other crops than wheat. There is

only one other crop upon which sufficient data have been accumulated to justify us in going into it now, and that is cotton.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was speaking about the hazards that the farmer is required to meet. May I suggest that not all of the hazards come from nature; and, as an illustration, let me cite this: In the spring those of us who grow apples are required to spray. Everyone knows if you are going to get fruit you must keep bees, and just as soon as the spring opens up and spraying begins around comes a Government inspector and says, "You are putting on too much spray; you are going to kill all the bees." Pretty soon along comes the fellow who inspects as to scale and he says, "You have not put on enough spray; you have got to put on some more." This puts the farmer in an awful hole and he does not know what to do. Is there some solution for that problem? I am interested personally.

Mr. HOPE. I know the gentleman is, and I sympathize with him, but I think his complaint is a little beyond the scope of this bill. I agree with him that what he has related describes another hazard which the farmer is up against.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; one that the Government puts on.

Mr. HOPE. There is no argument about that.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not a fact that the losses that have been pointed out represent the cost which the Congress contemplated and for which Congress anticipated money would have to be spent in order to set up the organization and start crop insurance and give it a trial. That was contemplated at the time we passed the original act, was it not?

Mr. HOPE. We all know that when you set up any business organization the overhead is considerably higher in the first year or two, and that, of course, has been the case here. I hope the time will come when crop insurance will be a self-sustaining business proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I do not know whether it will be or not, but I believe we are not justified in saying that it is not sound until we give it a fair trial, and I do not believe we can give it a fair trial by limiting it to one crop, and now that we have sufficient data on cotton, I think we should extend it to the cotton crop and see how it will work out upon the two crops. If we have other crops that may be included later, such as corn, I think it is a fair proposition to include those crops also.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If the gentleman will permit one further question, I will ask the gentleman if he does not think we can justify the money we have spent and will spend when we take into consideration the amount of money this Government has spent for relief in certain sections where they have had floods

and other disasters, such as hailstorms that wiped out entire crops, and would we not be the beneficiaries in the long run from that standpoint alone?

Mr. HOPE. I think, undoubtedly, had crop insurance been in effect during the past few years, the relief burden of the Government in many areas which have suffered drought and other disasters would have been very much less. I do not think there is a bit of doubt about that.

I now want to call attention to one other feature of this bill and that is the one which provides that the Crop Insurance Corporation may take notes rather than wheat or cash in payment of the premium. This will save at least \$1,000,000 a year in storage charges. As you perhaps know, under the plan that has been in operation, premiums were paid in wheat, or if paid in cash, the Government bought wheat and held that wheat in reserve so it could be paid out as indemnities during the following year. This was unnecessary and it has been expensive. More than 2 years ago I urged that that plan be abandoned. In the last Congress I introduced a bill to provide for taking notes instead of collecting the premium in wheat at the time the insurance was written. I am glad to see that this bill contains that provision.

I hope this House will do what it did previously, pass this bill. Certainly if we were justified in passing the bill a year ago, with the data we had then, we are justified to a much greater extent in passing it this year.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. DOWNS. I happen to represent a State where they grow considerable tobacco. Can the gentleman give me any good reason why we should have crop insurance for wheat and cotton and not tobacco?

Mr. HOPE. For one reason, there is not sufficient data.

Mr. DOWNS. I understand that they are going to experiment with cotton. Why not experiment with tobacco?

Mr. HOPE. We have actuarial data on both cotton and wheat to a greater extent than we have on tobacco. As soon as we accumulate enough data to justify it, I think we should consider including tobacco.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the present system of crop insurance where payment of benefits and premiums are both made in kind, as the gentleman has pointed out, we were faced with the storage problem, and tobacco is a perishable commodity that has to be processed before it can be stored. Now, with this new bill, there is a provision for the payment of premiums in notes rather than in kind, and as soon as the Department can get the data upon which to justify the program for tobacco, I for one will be very much interested in seeing the Department adopt a program for tobacco.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am considerably distressed by the figures stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He indicated that in 1939 our premiums were something like \$6,000,000 and the losses were around \$10,000,000, and in 1940 the premiums were \$13,000,000 and the losses \$22,000,000. Then he indicated that the administrative cost was something like \$5,430,000. Will the gentleman explain those losses to us and state whether those figures are correct?

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe those are quite the figures which the gentleman from Illinois gave, but even if they were as bad as that, I do not feel that the fact that the losses were greater than the premiums for a 2-year period is necessarily any argument against the continuance of crop insurance. They merely show that the hazard in some years is greater than in other years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that the present system of Federal crop insurance, now limited to wheat, be extended to cotton. In our cities and towns today there are millions of persons who have social security through unemployment insurance because of our great President and the Congress of the United States. The butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker throughout the land have this income safeguard against periods of unemployment. Yet there are other millions of our people who, because of their occupation—and it is the greatest occupation of all—have been unable to avail themselves of the benefit of this unemployment safeguard. I refer to the bulk of our farm population, the cotton farmers, particularly.

At this time it seems to me not only desirable and expedient but also necessary and imperative that some form of protection, which would serve a comparable purpose to a great extent, should be available to cotton growers. Such a safeguard would be cotton-crop insurance. It would, in effect, be the unemployment insurance of the cotton grower of the South. Already it has served well the wheat growers of our country, benefiting not only them but also their communities, their merchants, their governmental subdivisions, and city labor. It can do the same for the cotton grower, for the southern merchant, for southern communities, their governmental subdivisions, and for city labor.

Everyone is familiar with the principles of unemployment insurance. During periods of employment the city worker contributes a small percentage of his annual earnings to the unemployment compensation fund. Then, when he is no longer employed, he is paid a stated sum for a minimum number of weeks. Thus he has an income when his source of income is shut off. Cotton-crop insurance will do the same thing for the cotton grower. The cotton crop is the cotton farmer's annual income. Without a crop he has no source of in-

come, just as the city worker without employment has no source of income. With cotton-crop insurance, however, the cotton farmer would pay a small percentage of his crop in good years to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Then, in years of cotton-crop failure—when he has no income—he would collect an indemnity. In this respect, his indemnity could be likened to unemployment compensation paid the city worker when he is unemployed and without a source of income.

Thus, what unemployment insurance has done for the city laborer and what wheat-crop insurance has done for the wheat grower, cotton-crop insurance can and will do for the cotton grower. For 3 years crop insurance has been in effect for wheat growers of the country. In good years they contributed a small amount of their crop to the Corporation to protect themselves against crop loss from all unavoidable hazards. So, too, would the cotton farmer under a cotton-crop insurance plan. In good crop years he would pay to the Corporation a small amount of his crop to protect himself against loss from all unavoidable hazards. In crop-failure years, just as the wheat grower has done, the cotton farmer would be paid an indemnity from the premiums he and his fellow cotton growers paid for their crop insurance. This is the way cotton-crop insurance—his unemployment insurance—would work.

The insurance would cover all cotton grown on the farm and would be an "all-risk," which means that if the grower suffers a loss from any unavoidable hazard, such as drought, flood, hail, frost, tornado, storm, excessive or deficient moisture, insect damage, or plant disease, the insurance covers it. The amount of premiums and the amount of indemnities for crop losses can be determined in pounds of lint cotton and payment could be made in either cotton notes or its cash equivalent, at the option of the grower.

Its effect would be more far-reaching than would seem possible at first glance. Complete crop loss, remember, takes from the cotton grower his sole means of income. Lack of money means going into debt—if he can get credit—or going without vital and essential food and tools. The result is that not only does the farmer and his family suffer, but also his community, the merchants, and city labor, because the farmer is unable to purchase what labor manufactures. I know that the record of cotton-crop loss years is studded with unpaid taxes, mounting foreclosures, unpaid interest, and mortgages, increasing relief expenditures. Thus governmental subdivisions are saddled with increasing relief costs, dwindling tax income, and a growing sociological problem.

Experience with crop insurance on wheat has demonstrated that this protection against crop loss will help stabilize farm income and local business, contribute to the health of the individual and the welfare of the community, and help maintain the cotton grower as a necessary part of the Nation's economy. Cotton-crop insurance will go far toward leveling the ups and downs of good years and poor years in agriculture and

strengthening morale in these days of national defense.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I admit at the outset that I do not know very much about the workings of this crop insurance as it applied to wheat last year, and as it is intended to extend it to cotton, but in the main I say I am in favor of anything that will assist the farmer in any way to eliminate this great risk that he is subject to. I hope that eventually we will be able to extend insurance benefit to all of the major crops. I am sure that under the risk to which he is subjected it is impossible for the farmer individually to carry insurance. I tried that some years ago. Before I moved out to my present home I had a large farm and raised a lot of corn and wheat and other grains. I carried insurance for several years, and even during the good times, shortly before the war, in 1914 and 1915, it was impossible for me to carry the premiums. Therefore, after 2 or 3 years I dropped the premiums, and the next year we had the worst hail storm we ever had in that territory. It destroyed the entire crop, excepting a little hay. Of course, we will always find those who constantly say that the farmer is being subsidized to a large extent. I admit that, but on the other hand I do not believe that his subsidy compares with the subsidies that are provided in an indirect or in a different way for industry. This is only a protection to the farmer comparable to the protection that industry has by way of tariffs. Usually, and certainly if we ever resume our friendly trade relations with South America, the farmer will be used for trading stock, because South America does not have anything else to ship to this country except agricultural products.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that this insurance proposition will compensate the farmers of this country for what they will lose in the trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay?

Mr. GEHRMANN. No, I do not believe we can ever have protection enough to compensate the farmer for the loss he is going to be subjected to with competition from foreign nations. That is why I say that anything that goes to the farmer, even though it does not affect my district at all, I am for it. I have supported all of these measures, including parity payments, although they have not helped us at all. I have supported them for 7 years with a lot of patience, believing that eventually we will have recognition for the largest single industry, namely, the dairy industry. I am very happy to know that we have a chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and a number of other Members from the cotton and Southern States who have absolutely pledged their support, and I am sure they mean to go along and do something for the dairy industry this session.

When we got to the point where perhaps the dairy farmer could enjoy some fair prices, along comes our Secretary of

Agriculture and pegs the butter price at 31 cents. Then he said we must produce more cheese and butter, and the farmers in my State—which produces more than half the cheese in the United States—converted many creameries and put in extra cheese vats to make cheese. Our universities and the State department of agriculture spent millions of dollars to improve the quality of cheese, and to educate the people all over the country to eat more cheese. In other words, to become cheese-minded. Now, along comes the Department of Agriculture, and says we have to curtail the consumption of cheese so we can ship more of it to Britain and other places. I think we can produce enough cheese to supply Britain as well as other countries, if Britain would draw on her own colonies and South American countries, and use what they produce over there. I am sure it is not fair to ask our people to curtail the consumption of cheese when we have worked for years and years to build up and acquire the habit of eating cheese.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has spoken about curtailing the consumption of cheese. I just noticed a week or so ago that the administration announced there were 45,000,000 American citizens who were undernourished because they were not eating enough cheese.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is what I said. We have been educating them; telling them that they need dairy products, but now they say we must not eat so much of it. Of course, we go along with one experiment after another, and I am in favor of this, but until we adopt the principle of setting a floor under farm prices, based on cost of production, we will not put the farmer on a self-supporting basis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the House to understand that after 8 years of the New Deal and the more abundant life there are 45,000,000 Americans who are still undernourished?

Mr. GEHRMANN. According to the press, evidently there are; but at the same time they do not want them to eat cheese because some other country probably needs it more than our own people.

Mr. KNUTSON. I can appreciate it happening under the New Deal. We never had 45,000,000 undernourished when the Republicans were in power.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I think it is absolutely not the business of the Department of Agriculture to tell our farmers that they should write us who were opposed to getting into this war by convoy or other means, that we should support convoying, because they claim that if we could convoy and safely deliver agricultural products, our farmers would get a better price for them. I thought they were only rumors, but I sent out

45,000 questionnaires, and I asked everybody that I had on the mailing list if they were in favor of convoys. I had opposed the passage of all measures that might lead us into war, but since they passed, I wanted to know if they wanted me to vote for convoys. I received something over 7,000 answers, and I will say that the percentage in favor of convoying was a little over 2 percent. It was 2.06 percent, but in those replies a great number of farmers, several hundred, asked me who instigated or who caused this rumor. They thought it was a rumor. No one could put his finger on who actually ordered this. I do not know if they meant county agents or the different Farm Security administrators, or whoever they were that evidently spread this idea that they should write to us about being in favor of convoys.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I received at least 15 letters written on the same type of paper, with the same typewriter, coming from my district but mailed from Minneapolis, in which these farmers, who I think were mostly on the A. A. A. committee, urged me to vote for a bill that would use the American Navy for convoy purposes. I wrote to all of those men—in fact, I answered the letters and I asked the question, "Who told you to write this letter to me?" because there is no legislation pending in Congress, as far as I know, urging the use of the Navy for convoy purposes. A great many of my letters that went out to those people have come back, which demonstrates that somebody in high circles is sending out fictitious letters, forged letters, you might say, urging us to vote for some type of bill that is not in existence.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that owing to the many discussions over the radio by different people about convoys it has inspired many people to write to their Congressmen as to how they feel upon the question of convoys?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that I have been receiving a lot of letters not only from Montana but from all over the country, and they run at least 85 percent against convoys and about 95 percent against participation in this war.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mine run more than that. Out of 7,000, the actual percentage figures, computed this morning by my secretary, are 2.06 percent in favor of convoys and about 98 percent against convoys. After I received a number of these letters I called up the Department of Agriculture, but I was not able to get anyone at any time at either the Farm Security or in another regular department of the Department of Agriculture who would assume responsibility or who knew anything about it. I do not know where it came from, but anyway it was

quite prevalent and is being used all over the country to urge the farmers to write to their Congressmen to get them to support convoying or other means in order to deliver the goods to Britain.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. All of the letters I received were to enact legislation to provide convoys so that we can sell our farm products or send our farm products over to Great Britain.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is what they meant. I think it is absolutely unfair, in the first place, for the Department of Agriculture to curb farm prices in order to protect the consumer. It seems to me they ought to look in between somewhere. Maybe it might be some unnecessary middleman who is making an unreasonable profit. Both the consumer and the producer should be treated more fairly by eliminating profiteers usually found among unnecessary middlemen. One thing is certain, and that is while the farmers have been producing at a loss for many years, and it appears now because of this preparedness program they might recoup some losses, they are not willing to enter this war for that purpose. Would that some other groups could feel the same way about this war.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] 10 minutes.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, this debate has certainly taken a wide range; however, it is known to most of us that whenever we discuss a problem here relating to agriculture it is permissive for the debate to take a wide range because agriculture is a Nation-wide subject and vitally affects many different districts in these United States. There have been a lot of things developed in this debate that have been exceedingly gratifying to me. One is the fact that there is so little opposition to the pending measure, and I refer particularly to organized opposition. The only opposition was expressed by our delightful, charming friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who bases his opposition on the thought that he is against all kinds of crop insurance. He did not say, "If you give it to wheat you should give it to cotton." He is just against all kinds of crop insurance. Yet, from the standpoint of economy, he then announces he is going to offer an amendment that will include every kind of a commodity in this bill. This strikes me as too ludicrous to even reply to. In making the closing speech in this debate, with time limited, I necessarily will have to just touch the high points.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I only rise at this time because I do not see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the floor. I had a different understanding of his statement. I may be in error, but my understanding was that the gentleman thought that if we were going to have crop insurance on any crop, we should have it on all crops.

Mr. DOXEY. I think the gentleman is right about that; but until we know what the history of a commodity is and whether or not the background of it

makes the commodity capable of being an insurable proposition along the lines of crop insurance already established, I say it is unreasonable to try to extend it to that commodity, or to think about extending it to all agricultural commodities until the Government has sufficient data and a satisfactory actuarial basis for dealing with such commodities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not arguing about it. I am trying to make that correction.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate that, and I want to be fair as well as clear.

Let me give some background with reference to crop-insurance legislation, and also talk about the merits of this bill. The bill has been discussed so ably by those who preceded me that it is unnecessary for me to go into details.

There is this one additional feature in this bill which is an amendment to the crop-insurance bill, and that is it makes cotton eligible for the insurance program, just as wheat is now eligible for the insurance program. The bill further provides as an amendment to the Federal Crop Insurance Act that the Department of Agriculture, for which appropriation has been made, shall get up actuarial data regarding corn, as corn is the next commodity in line as a reasonable, practical proposition for the extension of the insurance program if and when the facts justify it and Congress passes a law to include corn just as we have extended or are endeavoring to extend it today to cotton. There is this additional feature, as has been explained here today: The farmer can pay his premiums in three ways. He pays them in two ways now— with the commodity in kind or with cash. This bill provides the additional feature, which I think is quite a helpful addition, to wit: He can pay his premium with a commodity note. That note, of course, is payable when due. In that way it cuts down the expenses of the Department in not having to carry the commodity and pay a storage on it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say there is some background behind this legislation. Those of you who have been here as long as I have been know that we have talked crop insurance for many years. It was talked about under the proposed program of the old Farm Board, and, in my opinion, if they had had a little more crop insurance at that time and a little less purchasing program, the program might have turned out better. Nothing was done except talk so far as the crop-insurance program was concerned until in 1937. You know the President at that time called the Congress back in November for a special session of Congress, and the Committees on Agriculture in the House and in the Senate went to work on a general agricultural bill. There was no general agricultural program, because the United States Supreme Court had declared unconstitutional the original Agricultural Adjustment Act.

I am not trying to throw any bouquets, but our committee worked incessantly on that proposition. The House passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act in December 1937. The Senate passed it a few days later. On about December 15, 1937, the Agricultural Adjustment Act went to conference. On the House side every

Member that was in the committee of conference on that bill is in Congress except our distinguished friend, Marvin Jones, who was then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. The rest of us, our distinguished chairman today, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and I, are all here. We were the conferees appointed by this House in 1937.

We went into conference with the Senate conferees. The Senate conferees were composed of some of the gentlemen who are in the Senate today and some who are gone. I do not have time to give you the details, but we worked in that conference day and night, even during the Christmas holiday.

We knew that crop insurance was a good thing. The House passed the bill without crop insurance, but the Senate put an amendment in the bill including insurance for wheat, as an experiment. At that time the Department of Agriculture had more actuarial data regarding wheat than any other commodity. Crop insurance is pioneering. This is all ground work. I wish I had time to tell you of the manner in which the Department of Agriculture has handled this crop-insurance program and to compliment them, for I think they richly deserve it. This proposition has cost the Government some money, but it is money well spent, and how infinitesimal it is compared to the good it has done.

Right here, not by way of digression, but by way of emphasis, let me say that this program will work better or as well on cotton as it has on wheat. The Department not only has factual data and historical data on cotton, but it has plans to put this cotton-crop program into operation. They have studied cotton, and I feel sure they will make a good job of administering it. I believe the benefits will greatly outweigh any liabilities or expenses that may be incurred. When we oppose this bill on the ground of economy, I tell you it is false economy because the agricultural program does not have the benefits and protections thrown around it that other programs have. I do not believe you begrudge this program we are endeavoring to put forward for the benefit of the cotton farmer.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Referring to the losses incurred during these 2 or 3 years, may I say that they are nothing to compare with the millions that were lost in the way of emergency loans, grants, and relief, because of crop failures, that the Government never did get back.

Mr. DOXEY. The gentleman is eminently correct, and I appreciate his observation. Crop insurance has lightened the relief rolls. You men who know cotton know that it is a credit crop proposition; it is run on credit. If a farmer fails, he cannot pay his bills in the fall of the year, and naturally he goes on relief. It has been proven in the wheat section that if the farmer has a loss the Government, having insured his wheat

crop up to 75 percent—and it insures not as to price but as to yield, and they pay either in cash or in kind—he will have something not only to pay his debts with but to live on. In that way it will reduce, or should reduce, some of the expenses our distinguished chairman has mentioned.

To go back to the conferees, we said, "All right; we will put the wheat-insurance program in the bill." Some of us insisted at that time on putting cotton in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, but more data were available as regards wheat. Those of us who have agriculture really at heart know that we have to give and take in order to get anything. It is my privilege always to do anything I can for wheat or any other commodity, dairying or anything else. But each has to take its turn. So we agreed that wheat would go in as an experiment and that then cotton would follow if and when the department that administered the program said that they had the necessary facts regarding cotton and Congress authorized cotton to be included.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the interest he has always shown in matters pertaining to agriculture. My wheat growers have been unfortunate because they have no storage facilities and cannot take out this insurance by reason of that fact. I wonder if the gentleman will tell me, although perhaps it has been explained in the Committee during my absence, what percentage of the wheat farmers of the country took advantage of this insurance. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DOXEY. I can give the gentleman the figures. The number of wheat contracts in the year 1939 was 165,775, and the number of contracts in the year 1940 was 379,420. Just what percentage that is of the entire wheat production I cannot begin to say, but I know there are about 2,000,000 farmers engaged in the production of cotton and more than that engaged in the production of wheat, so the gentleman can see what the percentage is. Necessarily, any program of this nature has to have a beginning and it has to grow.

Mr. HAINES. I want the gentleman to understand that I am very much in sympathy with it.

Mr. DOXEY. I understand, and I appreciate the gentleman's attitude. I hope the gentleman's wheat farmers will take advantage of this program and that they will have facilities for storage, but if we pass this bill and our amendment goes in, the storage item will not be so important, because they can give commodity notes.

Mr. HAINES. If the gentleman will permit an observation, may I say I believe this will be of more benefit to the cotton growers than it is to the wheat growers.

Mr. DOXEY. The gentleman has always been magnanimous, and we appreciate it. I certainly hope this program

will be a success. Cotton needs all the help it can get.

I challenge any man to show that this program is not fundamentally sound, although you may raise some objection on the ground that it may not be economically sound for the first 2 years, when it is necessarily in an experimental stage.

I want you to realize that you cannot solve this agricultural problem with one piece of legislation. It is going to take a number of pieces of legislation, and this is fundamental, but it is just one proposition and, naturally, when our friends from the Corn Belt have the actual data that will justify the Congress in enacting such a law, speaking only for myself, I may say that you will find me just as enthusiastic to include corn in the crop-insurance program as I have been to include wheat, and as I believe you will be to include cotton.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman, and I want to say to my friend from Washington that he has been of invaluable help in this matter, and I am delighted to yield to him. He is a real friend to the farmer.

Mr. LEAVY. I happen to be on the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations with my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and he and I draw different inferences from the same set of facts. He contends that wheat insurance has been a failure, while I take the position it has been a success. And if you will turn to page 931 of the hearings on agricultural appropriations for 1942, you will find that we have collected in 3 years \$23,960,000 and have paid out \$19,240,000, and there is now a reserve of \$4,720,000. These figures are the wheat collections in terms of dollar value. Of course, that includes premiums collected for fall-wheat crop that will be harvested this year, against which there are indemnity possibilities for the current crop year. We have collected wheat in the amount of 33,473,000 bushels, and we have paid out in wheat value 32,969,000 bushels, and we show a profit of 504,000 bushels, or that much more wheat on hand to meet losses than has been paid out. Natural conditions indicate there will be a very small loss and the surplus will likely exceed the total losses to date.

We have done this in the face of two of the most adverse years. Now, if we have made this fine showing with wheat, and we have had but 3 years of experience, and this year promises to be a year showing a surplus, certainly we can do the same thing with cotton.

Mr. DOXEY. I want to say to my distinguished friend from the State of Washington that I was not exactly as familiar with those facts as is my friend, because he is on the Appropriations Subcommittee with our distinguished friend from Illinois, and if I had had the facts and the time I would have answered the gentleman from Illinois in that regard, but I had neither the time nor the facts, and I thank my friend from Washington for his contribution. But whether this cotton-crop insurance is a paying proposition in the beginning or not, I say to you it is a righteous cause, and I believe the House will vote almost unanimously

in favor of the pending measure and help us help the cotton farmer. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 502 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is hereby amended by substituting the word "crop" for the word "wheat crop" and by substituting the words "agricultural commodities" for the word "wheat."

Sec. 2. That section 506 (h) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "for wheat and other agricultural commodities."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all of section 2 and insert:

"Sec. 2. That section 506 (h) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'for wheat and other agricultural commodities' and by inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following words: 'and preparatory to the application of the act to other basic commodities when so provided by law, shall assemble data relative to field corn, for the purpose of establishing a satisfactory actuarial basis for such commodity.'"

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the comma, at the end of line 4, insert "and dairy products."

And in line 6, change "commodity" to "commodities."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose I have in offering this amendment to the committee amendment is this. The committee amendment permits the gathering of further data in regard to several agricultural products. All I ask is to add to those agricultural products dairy products.

The amendment does not insert dairy products as one of the insured products in the bill. It merely gives an opportunity so that in the future, data shall be gathered in regard to dairy products as well as other agricultural products. It strikes me it is a fair proposal that dairy farmers be granted the same opportunity to have the Government gather the data for them and arrive at certain conclusions as for producers of other farm products to have that opportunity, and therefore I trust the members of the committee will accept the amendment in good faith, as affording merely a fair and equitable opportunity for the dairy farmers.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman understands that the only other commodity at this time carried in the bill is corn.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I realize that and I have added dairy products to corn.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I deeply appreciate the great interest that the gentleman has in the dairying industry and I assure him that I am just as much interested in that industry as I am in every other agricultural commodity in this country. Recently we have had hearings on a bill in the committee, that

the dairy folks were interested in, and we are working out legislation which we hope to present to the House later on that will give consideration to the dairying industry. Several amendments like this will be offered, and I know that these gentlemen are conscientious, and that they want to make a showing for the record for their people, but we ought to thoroughly understand that we could not insure the dairying interests because we could not store a great many of their products. May I say that in this bill we had several other commodities but the committee finally agreed that we ought to go along in an orderly manner, taking these crops up from time to time and we cut out all crops at this time except corn. Later on we will follow with other crops and eventually, as previously stated, we hope to include all the crops that would be workable and that could be insured on a sound basis. The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is deeply interested in hay. That is a very important crop and I am hoping that we will be able sometime to take care of hay. I hope we will not load down this bill with amendments and let us go along on a sound program so as to make this program a success. When the Department has proper information and data, we can bring other crops in in an orderly way.

As the gentleman stated a moment ago we do not have the information on other crops and until we have definite information I hope that we will not load this bill with amendments, so that we may have another bill vetoed. Let us take these products up in an orderly manner. I assure the gentleman that I am deeply interested in agriculture in every section of the country and in the people who produce these crops. I hope that the House will pass this constructive legislation in the interest of two-million-odd cotton farmers in the South. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL to the committee amendment: Page 2, at the end of line 4, after the word "corn", insert the words "and hay."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the subject of crop insurance is one which is going to require a great deal of study over the next few years. It is not my purpose to rise here today to ask whether that subject is a proper one or not. My object in submitting this amendment is to draw to the attention of the membership of the House, and I dare say over half of these gentlemen come from dairying districts, the necessity of further studying and gathering of data on hay and fodders. I am saying to you that every time there is a drought in one section or another of the country, it becomes necessary for dairy farmers all over to provide some sort of subsistence

feeding and to obtain hay from other parts of the country.

It is the tendency of exploiters to come from outside into these localities that have this hay shortage and raise the price of subsistence of dairy herds. I offer this amendment for the purpose of asking the Congress to include hay as a subject for study and research because it is absolutely necessary and is a basic commodity in every dairying section of the country.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. When the question of tobacco was before the Committee, which is a much more insurable crop so far as the figures are concerned, the gentleman speaking voted against that amendment, did he not, in Committee?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot recall just what my vote was on that because it was sometime ago and it was not on a record vote.

Mr. CREAL. I recall it very vividly.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In dairy sections of the country hay is a basic commodity, because upon hay and fodders the dairy cattle must subsist and I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that if he had had the experience I have had in living in a dairy section at a time of serious drought, he would realize that more dairymen go out of business than tobacco farmers or anyone else in the country could possibly begin to, because during a drought they sacrifice permanently their sole capital stock, namely, their dairy herds. It is not a question of building up their commodity or their stock in trade in 1 year as the tobacco farmers can. The situation they are faced with is the necessity of building up their dairy herds for a number of years.

I submit for the consideration of this committee that if crop insurance is going to be indulged in and studied and adopted, it is sensible and logical to pick out a number of basic crops. There is no more basic crop in the world than hay from the standpoint of the dairyman. The rural constituents of at least half the Members of the House are absolutely dependent upon hay in their sections, in order to sustain livestock and dairy animals of their country.

Let me make one more point: I hope that the study will proceed from a consideration not of the commodity itself, but of the feasibility of insuring that commodity and the method by which it will be insured. For instance, a surplus commodity brought in from a section where a shortage occurs, such as hay, should have a reasonable price. Otherwise the dairymen of that district cannot survive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to complete my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Hay at \$25 a ton brought in from the outside is exploitation of the dairy farmer. Hay at \$10 a ton, however, is reasonable.

Therefore, I feel that the recommendation should be along the line of providing a guaranty for the dairy farmers in one section where a drought occurs, perhaps to have that hay shipped in at Government expense from areas nearest to it, that possess a surplus. It is my hope that in the study provided by the Hall amendment—and I ask the committee to approve of this now—it will give consideration to the feasibility of some kind of insurance for this vital necessity to the dairy farmer.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. PACE. If the premium is paid in kind and the loss is paid in kind, that would automatically take care of that situation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; if a reasonable price can be agreed upon.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. How are you going to take care of restrictions in shipping hay across State borders?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I submit that is a question for the committee and the Department of Agriculture to think about, and I am sure they can reach a definite decision on it.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. That is a State matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I believe the authorities will work that out, nevertheless.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am thoroughly in accord with the general provisions of our policy of crop insurance. However, we cannot take the whole step at one time. It is logical and necessary to begin the system with one crop, which we have already done, that is, wheat. It seems to me the next major crop to consider is cotton, which is a part of the plan in the bill at the present moment.

We cannot go too fast in this matter, because insurance of all kinds is based upon scientific, mathematical, statistical data and facts. We must have complete and extensive study of those facts before we can go too far in including crops. I think cotton should follow wheat. I understand the intention is to follow with a study of corn in the next logical order. That I heartily approve of. I think any amendment which would include too much would defeat the whole purpose of our program. For that reason I oppose such a proposal, although the proposal suggested may ultimately be desirable. Let us take one step at a time.

It might seem to some that I would not be interested much in cotton-crop insurance. If any explanation is needed, I want to correct any notion Members may have in that regard. Of course, you have not heard me, as the Representative of a cotton-producing State, say very much about crop insurance. One reason is this: It may seem to some that we do not grow much cotton in Arizona, but I assure you that we do grow a great quantity of cotton. Part of it is the long-staple variety, but long or short, crop failure is unknown. We grow cotton in an irrigated

country. Whenever we have water—and now we have an assured supply for a given acreage—we have no such thing as a crop failure. For that reason we are less anxious about insurance for cotton than are some of the other portions of the country where there is not only possibility but probability of partial or complete crop failure. However, there are hazards for the cotton farmers and for that reason I think even my cotton farmers ought to have the protection which this great social institution of insurance will afford them on a voluntary basis. For that reason I am firmly in support of this measure without amendment.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will ask my colleague if he does not think it is better to approach this subject step by step? We first took on wheat. We are now preparing to take on cotton. We are making a study of corn. It is better to take up those commodities one at a time rather than to try to scatter out over the whole field and not make a good job of any investigation.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is exactly it. The history of all types of insurance verifies the statement the gentleman has made. In matters of life and accident insurance and all that sort of thing, mistakes have been made by incorporating too much; going on rumor and hearsay and supposition instead of statistical data.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. As my good friend is interested in statistics, it may be interesting for him to know that his State has had over 11 percent of the value of its farms in subsidies in the last 8 years. Our colleague from New York only had a little over 1 percent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I am not asking for discrimination in any way. I want to assure my colleague from New York that I am not asking for discrimination. I am merely asking for businesslike procedure in the adoption of this new legislation. I am a firm believer in the institution of insurance, that is, I recognize insurance as a desirable economic institution to spread risk. Through it, the burden of loss is scattered over many who are subjected to the same hazard and is thus lighter upon each individual. This is one way to "bear ye one another's burdens."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If there were available a sufficient amount of data, and I am sure there is, on this particular commodity, would the gentleman not feel that it merited study since so many dairy farmers throughout the country are affected?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in sympathy with any study and any movement based on sound data—provided not too much is attempted at once. I think we will have to take the Agricultural Department studies and statistics first, of course, and I understand they are recommending this one step before we take the next step,

Mr. Chairman, I hope this measure will pass without the pending amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Downs to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the word "corn" insert "and tobacco."

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to give the impression to those sponsoring this bill today that I am opposed to crop insurance for cotton farmers, but, despite the action taken on the previous amendments, I am a bit concerned about the tobacco growers in my State.

I am not entirely sold on the idea that crop insurance is good for all crops in this country; however, I do feel that if we are going to have insurance for wheat, if we are going to have insurance for cotton, we should give some thought to the other farmers in this country. In all fairness to the tobacco growers of my State, we should make arrangements for a survey of the tobacco crops of this country to see if it is advisable to extend crop insurance to tobacco.

From my own experience, the raising of tobacco is perhaps more risky than the raising of wheat, corn, or cotton. I know that in my State entire crops of tobacco have been wiped out by a storm. I am not going to take up any more of your time because I believe a sufficient amount of time has already been taken on this bill. I urge that my amendment for a survey of the tobacco crop be given your due and earnest consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Downs] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the first comma in subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and with the cotton crop planted for harvest in 1942."

SEC. 4. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "producers of wheat against loss in yields of wheat" in the first sentence, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "producers of the agricultural commodity against loss in yields of the agricultural commodity."

SEC. 5. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by substituting the words "the agricultural commodity" for the word "wheat" in the third sentence of subsection (a).

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Page 2, line 20, insert "that section 508 of the said act, as amended, is further amended by

striking out the period at the end of the third sentence of subsection (a), inserting a colon and the following: "Provided, That the insurance herein provided shall be limited to 2,000 bushels of wheat and/or 20 bales of cotton to any one producer beginning January 1, 1942."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I do so because it is in keeping with, not only the political platforms, but also in keeping with the agricultural objective of fair-sized farms. Here is a legislative opportunity to begin this procedure. If we are to give a so-called subsidy to anyone, it should be to the family-sized farm and to the men who would be inspired to own and operate their own farms.

Do you realize that from the last available figures we find:

| Size of payment | Total number, United States | Per centage of total | Cumulative per centage of total |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| \$0 to \$20..... | 1,251,687 | 23.850 | 23.850 |
| \$20.01 to \$40..... | 1,185,833 | 22.590 | 46.440 |
| \$40.01 to \$60..... | 842,590 | 16.050 | 62.490 |
| \$60.01 to \$100..... | 890,956 | 16.980 | 79.470 |
| \$100.01 to \$150..... | 458,752 | 8.740 | 88.210 |
| \$150.01 to \$200..... | 254,034 | 4.840 | 93.050 |
| \$200.01 to \$300..... | 183,905 | 3.500 | 96.550 |
| \$300.01 to \$400..... | 79,006 | 1.510 | 98.060 |
| \$400.01 to \$500..... | 38,289 | .730 | 98.790 |
| \$500.01 to \$1,000..... | 48,968 | .930 | 99.720 |
| \$1,000.01 to \$2,000..... | 11,170 | .210 | 99.930 |
| \$2,000.01 to \$3,000..... | 2,131 | .040 | 99.970 |
| \$3,000.01 to \$4,000..... | 708 | .013 | 99.983 |
| \$4,000.01 to \$5,000..... | 353 | .007 | 99.990 |
| \$5,000.01 to \$10,000..... | 411 | .008 | 99.998 |
| Over \$10,000..... | 113 | .002 | 100.000 |
| Total..... | 5,248,796 | 100.000 | |

Do not 10 percent get 40 percent of this money?

After the Ways and Means Committee brings in the new tax bill we are going to do a lot of thinking and maybe some explaining as well. Should we jeopardize the "widow's mite" and reach all around for every conceivable dollar and still promote a Federal insurance program of insuring 5,000 to 9,000-acre wheat farms?

The present agricultural program needs plenty of constructive legislation. Here is your opportunity to legislate for the greatest good for the greatest number, instead of for the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care personally to criticize the present agricultural program. There are enough other people to do that. I will just say that the greatest criticism that can be leveled against the program is the fact that the farm people of this country have not been getting the money. The last available information, which I am sure each and every one here this afternoon will be glad to hear, shows that 23 percent of the farmers get \$20 or less total A. A. A. funds per year; 46 percent of the farmers get \$40 or less per year; 62 percent get \$60 or less per year; 79 percent of the farmers get \$100 or less per year; 88 percent of the farmers get \$150 or less per year; and 93 percent of the farmers get \$200 or less per year.

The reason I introduced this amendment is because of the fact we have heard so much about family-sized farms in the last 10 years in this country. We keep on appropriating money that does not go to the family-sized farmer. It goes to lots

of places it should not go. Do you realize that 10 percent of the people who get the checks—and I will not call them farmers—receive 40 percent of this money?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Suppose that in the case of cotton, a farmer produces 30 bales of cotton, and that 30 bales come from a sharecropper. In my State the title to the crop is in the landlord; therefore that fellow who needs insurance under this amendment would not receive any benefit.

Mr. MURRAY. That depends on what our agricultural objective is. If our only objective is to find out how much money we can get out of the United States Treasury to distribute around, that is one objective. If we are going to try to do something for the farm people of the country, that is another objective. If we want this money to go to the farm people, there is no use blaming the Secretary of Agriculture. It is right here in our lap today. We are the people who are passing on this legislation. If we want to keep our insurance in line and help the class of people who own and operate their own farms, and give them some incentive to do so, we will have to direct our legislation toward that end.

Let us consider for a moment the man who has from 3,000 to 9,000 acres of wheat. If you think that after this new tax bill is passed you want to go home and tell them we have done something for the farmers by passing an insurance bill for these 9,000-acre wheat fellows, you might regret that you entered into that kind of a program.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman did not tell us who the 10 percent was that got 40 percent of the money.

Mr. MURRAY. May I say to my distinguished colleague that I try to keep out of as much trouble as I can. I do not want to get into that. Every one of you should study where this money has gone. The facts are available. The average State of the Union has had 10 percent of its assessed valuation. There are two States that have had over 40 percent of the valuation of their farms and buildings. There are other States that have not had 1 percent. There is not any common sense in the method used in distributing this money. That is not the fault of the Department of Agriculture; it is our own fault.

I cannot see how any fair-minded man can oppose this amendment. If anyone opposes this amendment, he has a right to do it, legally, morally, or in any other way, but I just feel that he is not interested in the farmer who lives on the farm and that he is pretty apt to shed crocodile tears as far as the farmer is concerned. I cannot see why anyone could have any objection to this amendment. Two thousand bushels of wheat is surely a large enough crop to make the farm that produced it a family-sized farm, and

20 bales of cotton is enough to be raised on a family-sized farm.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that the payments that go to some farms are away beyond the value of 90 percent of the small farms of this country?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

If anybody can tell me why a cotton farmer who can raise 50 or 100 bales of cotton or a wheat farmer who can raise 9,000 acres of wheat should have the public carry his insurance, I wish they would state it. I personally do not see why he should expect us to give him that kind of protection when he is already getting \$10,000 in soil-conservation checks. Remember he is already getting that now, and you want to give him another protection by insuring him against loss.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to talk of the merits of the amendment, but I do wish to call attention again to the matter of draftsmanship.

They say that patience is a virtue if the fish do not bite. For the last few years we have adopted this awful, ridiculous, nonsensical method of draftsmanship, which is a disgrace to any legislative body. I am sure that no Member of this body will justify this method. It came in as a custom 8 or 10 years ago at a time when everything enacted was an emergency measure, and the purpose was, and so stated, to pass legislation hurriedly without considering what the legislation already was, because it took too much time. As a result, when it was desired to amend a section of an existing law, the committee would get a drafted bill from down the street which stated, for instance, that section 2 would be amended by striking out the comma in the second line after the third sentence of the law as recorded in the statutes, and inserting a semicolon and 4 or 5 lines. Of course, the Members of the House knew nothing about it unless they took the time individually to get the statute and superimpose the proposed amendment on the statute.

In some committees the custom has grown. It did grow for awhile, then it stopped. Few committees of the House will any longer report a bill in this manner.

The bill we have before us today is drawn in that way, and there is not a Member of the House, including a single member of the committee reporting the bill, who can explain the bill so you can understand it without having the statute before him. Take a look at the bill in your hands.

We have a rule, the Ramseyer rule, which requires that in the report there be a statement of the law as it now is, with the additions and subtractions brought about by the amendment, so that after all is said and done the Ramseyer-rule-reported amendment is what should be and I believe will be in the bill.

Take this section 508. If the bill simply stated that section 508 was "amended to read as follows," just as you

will find section 508 in the report, then you know what it is all about.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has offered an amendment to the bill. We all know that under the rules of the House you cannot offer an amendment to anything excepting that which is in the bill the House is considering. You cannot offer an amendment to a statute, as on page 6 of the Revised Statutes, or something else. You can amend in the Committee of the Whole only the language that is in the bill before the House. If we can only do that, it would be impossible to amend this bill. The gentleman, however, after consulting the Parliamentarian, I am sure, has drafted an amendment which will accomplish what the gentleman suggested. I believe there is no question that if a point of order had been made against the amendment, the point of order would have been sustained.

For instance, section 5 of the bill as reported states:

That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by substituting the words "the agricultural commodity" for the word "wheat" in the third sentence of subsection (a).

Tell me what that means. To prepare his amendment the gentleman had to get subsection (a) of the law—the law book—and then he had to figure out the third sentence. The third sentence is nowhere repeated in the bill which is before the House. The third sentence ends with the word "just." There is no such word in the bill before the House. The amendment strikes out the period, and after the word "just," insert a colon and "Provided." Then the amendment follows.

I am calling attention to this practice.

I know my protests are distasteful to some people, but I hope this great Committee on Agriculture will not bring to the House a bill drawn in this form again.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to express agreement with the view of the gentleman from Michigan that this is a very lax and improper way to draft legislation in that we never know just what it is we are doing without reference to a great many statutes. I have thought so for a long time, but I have gone a little further than the gentleman from Michigan in that I have offered a resolution to change the rules of the House to require that when an amendment to a statute is offered, the amendment shall be set forth in extenso.

I simply want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, who is also a member of the Rules Committee, I hope he will cooperate with me in bringing that resolution out of committee.

Mr. MICHENER. I surely will.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman understands that we have under consideration now a Senate bill, drawn in the Senate and passed by that body and sent over here.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know we have a lot of them drawn like this in the House, too.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the last two speakers have dealt primarily with the rules relating to the drafting of legislation and amendments. I want to get back to the measure we have under discussion, and particularly to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

It seems to me that if crop insurance is a good thing for one, it is a good thing for all, regardless of whether it is the small farmer or the large farmer. Furthermore, we ought to take into consideration the fact that a great part of our production—and particularly is this true of cotton, and I am sure it is of wheat, although I am not so familiar with the growing of wheat—but a great part of our cotton is grown by the little fellow who does not have title to the land, who does not have absolute title to the cotton that is grown, but has an interest in it by reason of having contributed his labor. Suppose that man is working as a sharecropper on a large farm. Perhaps there are 10 or 15 or 20 of these sharecroppers, and each one of them makes 15 bales. It is not the 15 bales that would be taken as a standard, but it is the amount grown on that entire farm, which would mean that not a single one of those sharecroppers would be able to get this insurance.

There has been a great deal of talk about getting up data and information relating to this program before we proceed upon it. I certainly think it would be very interesting to see what the data would reveal as to the application of this particular amendment. Personally, I believe that crop insurance is a good thing for all of our crops. This Congress has spoken upon that subject and has said that such should be our policy, and it has been the policy of this Congress to extend crop insurance just as fast as it could reasonably be done—wheat first, now in its third year, and then cotton, with a study of corn, and following that tobacco, and so on, until the basic crops are all included under a crop-insurance program. I think this is simply good business. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] a few minutes ago, in questioning the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], brought out some of the facts relating to the conduct of the wheat-insurance program during the last 2 years or the last 3 years, including the present year. We cannot tell yet just what the result of this year's activities will be, because we do not know finally what the crop production will be, but I saw in the paper just a few days ago an announcement that we had an unusually large and good wheat crop this year.

I talked with one of the officials down in the Crop Insurance Division of the Department of Agriculture, and while he could not tell me definitely, of course, what the results would be, it was stated that it was believed the gains of this year would go a very long way toward wiping out the losses of the 2 past years,

But even if we lost every single dollar that we have paid out on this program, I still say it would be good business and good economy. I just happened to look over the figures of two counties down in my district where there was a rather heavy drought in 1939. If this program had been in effect at that time, there would have been terrific losses in those two counties. In Lauderdale County, Ala., there would have been payment of 1,377 bales over the amount of premiums that would have been paid, and in Colbert County, immediately across the river, there would have been payment of 1,434 bales over and above the premiums, making a total of 2,811 bales in those two counties.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. I just want to ask the gentleman this question: If it had been limited to only small farmers and not the big farmers, the big farmers would pay the premium that would help the small farmer all over the country?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. DOXEY. And, therefore, when you help the big farmer, as they are trying to talk about here, you help the little farmer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it must be spread out to be made effective, but I want to go further and say that at the time I referred to above cotton was selling for approximately 8 cents a pound, and the number of bales of cotton I have just referred to would have amounted to \$112,440, a terrible loss when you consider that factor alone, but I call your attention to the fact that within 3 months' time in those same two counties there was spent in emergency relief funds to take care of those farmers who had sustained losses as a result of that drought \$93,685. A large additional amount was spent in the following months to rehabilitate those farmers. The total far exceeded what the losses would have been under a cotton-insurance program. The history of our emergency farm relief cost throughout the country over the period of 1926 to 1936 is that we spent more than \$600,000,000. This bill would go a long way toward relieving us from a great deal of that expenditure. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY) there were—ayes 35, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That sections 508 (b), (c), and (d) and 516 (a) of said Act, as amended, are further amended by substituting the words "the agricultural commodity" for the word "wheat" wherever it appears.

SEC. 7. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In connection with insurance upon yields of cotton, to include provision for additional premium and indemnity in terms of lint cotton to cover loss of cottonseed, such additional premium and indemnity to be determined on the basis of the average relationship between returns from cottonseed and re-

turns from lint cotton for the same period of years as that used for computing yields and premium rates."

SEC. 8. That section 516 (a) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the figures "\$6,000,000" and substituting in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I see by the bill that you are striking out the figures "\$6,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,000,000." We have been in the habit of doing that in practically every appropriation bill that has come along. I have been working on the Interior subcommittee for the last few days, and we strike out \$1,000,000 and put in \$2,000,000, we strike out \$500,000 and put in \$2,500,000 and we strike out \$50,000 and put in \$500,000, we strike out a million and a half and put in five million. That seems to be the history of this administration ever since I have known it for 8 long years. The President of the United States criticized the Hoover administration for going into the red in the 4 years of the Hoover administration, but after getting the receipts from the things that were retrievable by this administration, in the 4 years of Hoover's administration he went in the red probably a billion and a half dollars in 4 years. This administration will go in the red over \$5,000,000,000 this year. It has been in the red an average of three and a half billion dollars for each year since it started in March 1933—8 long, red years. We are now considering the relief bill, and in that relief bill, right in the face of appropriating for war for 1941 and 1942 to the tune of \$37,200,000,000, you are asking for a big sum of money for relief. You have not put the people of this country to work and at the rate you are going you will not put them to work. You want to keep them on relief.

Now you want to do the same thing in this agricultural bill. You are heading this Nation for bankruptcy. You are heading this Nation for one of the greatest wrecks that it has ever encountered. I asked one of the high Members of this Congress this morning in committee, "Where are you going to get the money?" and he replied, "We are going to print it, like Hitler does." Think of that from a high official of this Congress. On a conference report last week, when we had other high Government officials present, I asked them the same question, "Where are you going to get the money?" and one of the greatest financiers in Congress said, "We are going to print the money."

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; if the gentleman can tell us where we are going to get the money.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Do not you print all your money now?

Mr. RICH. Yes; but we have always tried to back it up with something; we have always tried to make it sound, but now it is becoming just like the money that old Kaiser Wilhelm printed years ago, after we had gone through the World War, after we had tried to make the world safe for democracy, and you could buy a bushel of that German money for a nickel,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that the Member of Congress you referred to was laughing when he answered the question, "Where are you going to get the money?"

Mr. RICH. The gentleman was present when the statement was made that we would print this money like Hitler is printing it. Oh, this is no laughing matter. These are facts that we want to know. You have been laughing at the Nation, and you have been fooling this country, you have been humbugging them for 8 years—for 8 long years—and yet you say it is a laughing matter. To me it is one of the most serious, one of the most solemn, one of the most important things that we can give our time to; and yet you say it is a laughing matter. I do not term it that, and I think we are long past the time when this Nation and the Members of this Congress should consider this a laughing matter. You come in and want to change this from \$6,000,000 to \$12,000,000 in this bill. Is it a laughing matter? It is not going to be when your children and your grandchildren and your great-grandchildren are compelled to pay for the folly of this administration. It is high time that you did something about it.

A wreck is ahead unless you get serious, stop laughing, do things that are sound, spend sparingly, economize, be prudent in your appropriations. The taxpayers will soon revolt; but I am afraid it will be too late, we will be bankrupt. And who is responsible? The answer is one and only one, and it is Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Congress. They are responsible. I am not. Why? Because I have opposed your extravagances. I want sound business judgment in the administration of affairs. No more reckless and unaccountable administration. Will you help give it to us? I hope you stop laughing and get serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words. It seems to me that some of the members of this Committee are failing to distinguish between providing the means whereby the farmers of this country can be self-supporting and may stay off the relief rolls and the simple expenditure of money that will never be returned. I think that failure to distinguish between making an investment in the ability of our people to earn a living and simply contributing money is a rather common thing in this country. When we considered a bill recently to loan money to farmers with which to buy farms, we found many Members speaking of what the Government was giving to the farmers. Yet we have actually had the experience throughout the years proving that more than 100 percent of the maturities were paid up to date. In spite of this, many Members, who did not know any better, got up and talked about what we were giving the farmers. We were not giving the farmer a thin dime when we loaned him money with which to buy a farm when experience shows that we

get back every dollar, plus interest. We are not giving the farmer something when we provide a means whereby he may insure his crops by paying a number of bushels of wheat or a number of pounds of cotton sufficient to provide the reserve necessary to pay the losses all over the country the next year. All we are doing is saying that the United States Government, being the only agency in the United States that can spread these losses widely enough, will make available to the farmers of this country the ability to spread their losses; that is, to actually share their losses with each other. The Government is not paying those losses. The farmers of the United States are paying those losses in premiums of wheat or cotton that they pay in order to get this insurance.

The additional \$6,000,000 about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is so exercised is money to carry on the administrative expenses of this program. If you carry on the administration of the program and let the farmer himself carry the losses, if you will put up \$6,000,000 for administrative expenses, you will save 60 times this amount in the relief bill, about which the gentleman is so worried. I know from personal experience living among these people. I have seen their crops wiped out. I have seen the grasshoppers come. I have seen the floods and the droughts come. I have seen these farmers make not one thing, and at the end of the year what happens to them? You know and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] knows what happens to them. They then become an expense to the United States Government far over and above the little administrative expense that is involved in this bill. It then becomes a real and substantial burden to this Government. Then the Government must pay for the relief itself in addition to the administration.

I think we all want to save money for this Government. If you want to save money for the Government, give these farmers an opportunity to contribute their own cotton—not Government cotton but their own cotton—to a collective pool, whereby each one may be assured at the end of the year that he will have some income with which to feed and clothe his family, with which to avoid the necessity of going on relief or hunting a W. P. A. job. With a very small expenditure for the administration of this kind of program you will save many multiplied millions of dollars on that very relief bill that stares you in the face today. Give these farmers a chance to help themselves. We are not coming in here asking you to pay these losses. The farmers of the United States are not seeking relief. The farmers of the United States are seeking justice, seeking a parity livelihood, seeking an opportunity to make with their toil the same kind of a living that the other people of the United States are making; seeking in this instance an opportunity to know that when they contribute in advance from their own property a fair and equitable premium, that at the end of the year they will be able to remain off the relief rolls and to save the Government expense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

I always delight in hearing my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] talk, because he is good at figures. He is a good, sound, businessman. He offers constructive criticism and sticks very close to facts, sometimes. I believe in life insurance. I carry life insurance. I believe it does a great deal of good in addition to the good it does those who carry it. Other people make a good living out of it, big dividends, and big salaries. I believe in fire insurance. I carry it all the time on everything. Yet other people applying that fire insurance, to merely administer it, receive big dividends and high salaries. Crop insurance, when rightly administered, is just as practical, is just as sound, as either fire insurance or life insurance. There is no more reason for saying that all are sound or all are unsound.

Now, the gentleman seems to think that this money is to be appropriated for the man who has a failure of crop, to give him a direct appropriation. The object is to make it absolutely self-sustaining, but, of course, when you begin a program there is no money in the Treasury with which to make administration. This is the administrative end, and we should wait and see, before hurling arguments against this, whether or not there is any loss or whether or not we will also be able to take care of the administrative end.

I am going along with the Committee. I voted to put tobacco in. Tobacco is one of the most practical crops of all to be insured. I have seen tobacco crops that on Saturday could be sold for \$100 an acre, which on the following Monday morning could not be sold for \$5 an acre by reason of winds or hail or other things. All other crops when damaged can be salvaged in part, and a part of the loss saved. I thought tobacco ought to be in. I hope some day it will be. Since the Committee has acted, I will go along with it, and will vote against every other amendment that is offered until that other day comes. I see nothing whatsoever wrong with this. The farmers of 48 States cannot organize an insurance company, but there are failures of crops. Sometimes there is a failure in one part of a State and a good crop in the other part, just as the man who has a fire loss has paid insurance a long time. He suffers a loss and others who do not have any loss take care of his loss. The crop people will do the same thing. It is on a perfectly sound, economical basis. As sound a thinker and as good a businessman as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is, I am a bit surprised that he would criticize this program as being unsound and tell us, "Why, these men cannot pay a premium," when they have good years in one part and a loss somewhere else. What they pay in one section of the country will make up for the other section, just the same as a big fire is a loss on the spot, but there are other areas that pay in that do not have fires.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. You are asking for administrative money double what it was.

The payments to be made to farmers will not be double what they were, will they?

Mr. CREAL. We are including another crop in this bill and, of course, it requires more for administration.

Mr. RICH. Therefore you will not need that amount to be doubled for overhead expenses. That is what I believe is wrong.

Mr. CREAL. When you include other crops the administrative expenses will be greater.

Mr. RICH. In that case you do not require double the amount for the administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been the hardest man, and he is a Republican, on Herbert Hoover of any man in the House of Representatives. He is always talking about what it will take to pull people out of the hole, according to figures. It reminds me of the fellow who had a mule and no need for it for awhile because he had an extra one and another man said he would take it for that time and feed it for its work. That fall the man brought him back and the mule was skin and bone and dragged along with his head down. The fellow had to pay out a great deal more to bring the mule back than if he had kept him home doing nothing. It was almost an entire loss instead of the mule earning his feeding.

We should sometimes remember it is your debt. When you voted for Herbert Hoover and tried to perpetuate him 4 more years, then condemned others for pulling the people out after they sunk, you are not accomplishing anything constructive, nor getting very far by criticism of those who have had to restore the badly kept house the President found.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I should apologize perhaps for further trespassing upon the patience and indulgence of the House, but you know there are certain plausibilities which one cannot permit to go by without some protest.

Can you imagine, for instance, a life-insurance company which gets all of its administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury? The Crop Insurance Corporation does, because we sat over here last year and gave it over \$5,000,000, and a year before over \$5,000,000 for administrative expenses. In proportion as this insurance field is extended, the administrative expenses will grow.

With further reference to the observations of my good friend from Kentucky, have you ever seen a fire-insurance company which can come down to the Federal Treasury with its hat in hand and seek to repair its losses or get its administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury? There has been no hint or intimation at any time that the set-up is going to change, and whether the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation makes

money or loses money it is going to continue to get its administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury. That matter ought to be emphasized.

The second thing to emphasize is that if there were any fire-insurance company or any life-insurance company that operated on the basis that they have operated the Crop Insurance Corporation in the field a week the insurance commissioner of every State of the United States would lock its doors in a hurry as it would wind up in a state of insolvency.

I gave you the figures this afternoon and nobody has arisen on this floor and controverted these figures. We took in 6,700,000 bushels in premiums in wheat in 1933 and paid out 10,000,000. Just translate that into terms of 60 cents a bushel. They lost a little over \$2,000,000 and, if we should translate those losses into terms of parity prices the loss is going to be larger. And do not forget, somebody will be back here some time in the future and insist that whenever we get to the point where there is no profit in paying premiums and getting indemnities in kind they will want to put it on a parity basis and take it out in the form of cash.

That is the first year of crop insurance, in which we lost over \$2,000,000. The documented information that was given to us is here. Here is the account of Mr. Smith, president of the Corporation, as he gave it for the next year. They took in about 14,000,000 bushels of premiums and they paid out 23,000,000 bushels of premiums, in round figures. So we lost 9,000,000 bushels of wheat. Translate it at any figure you please and you will get a loss of somewhere between four and six million dollars. So we lost over two million in 1939, we lost over four and a half million dollars by the least calculation in 1940, and it is indicated on the basis of crop conditions we will lose money in 1941.

Why in the name of all that is sacred should the Congress of the United States project the Government into the field of cotton insurance until a sound actuarial basis has been worked out? Having failed to place wheat insurance on a sound basis why should we now undertake cotton insurance? On the basis of the above, I propose to vote against this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That said act, as amended, is further amended by redesignating section 518 as section 519, and by addition thereto of the following new section:

"Sec. 518. 'Agricultural commodity,' as used in this act, means wheat or cotton, or both, as the context may indicate."

SEC. 10. That section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting the following sentences immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Nothing in this section shall prevent the Corporation from accepting, for the payment of premiums, notes payable in the commodity insured, or the cash equivalent, upon such security as may be determined pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and from purchasing the quantity of the commodity represented by any of such notes not paid at maturity."

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: On page 4, line 1, after the word "purchasing", insert "at the prevailing market price of."

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is that when the farmer makes a settlement, if he does, and is foreclosed, he will get the market price for the commodity which is the security for the note given. I believe everybody wants that to be done, and I can see no reason why the Committee should not agree to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS) there were—ayes 36, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 95, noes 42.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 256, noes 100, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—256

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Allen, Ill. | Boggs | Burgin |
| Allen, La. | Boland | Byron |
| Arnold | Bonner | Cannon, Fla. |
| Barden | Boren | Capozzoli |
| Barnes | Bradley, Pa. | Carlson |
| Barry | Brooks | Cartwright |
| Bates, Ky. | Brown, Ga. | Casey, Mass. |
| Beam | Bryson | Chapman |
| Beckworth | Buck | Clark |
| Beiter | Buckler, Minn. | Claypool |
| Bell | Bulwinkle | Cochran |
| Bennett | Burch | Coffee, Nebr. |
| Bloom | Burdick | Coffee, Wash. |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Cole, Md. | Hill, Wash. | Peterson, Fla. |
| Colmer | Hope | Peterson, Ga. |
| Connery | Hull | Pfeifer |
| Cooley | Hunter | Joseph L. |
| Cooper | Imhoff | Pittenger |
| Copeland | Izac | Plauché |
| Courtney | Jackson | Poage |
| Cox | Jacobsen | Priest |
| Cravens | Jarman | Ramspeck |
| Creal | Jensen | Rankin, Miss. |
| Crosser | Johnson, Ill. | Rankin, Mont. |
| Crowther | Johnson, | Reece, Tenn. |
| Cullen | Johnson, Okla. | Richards |
| Cunningham | Luther A. | Rivers |
| Curtis | Johnson, W. Va. | Rizley |
| D'Alesandro | Kee | Robertson, |
| Davis, Ohio | Keefe | N. Dak. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kelley, Pa. | Robertson, Va. |
| Day | Kennedy, | Robinson, Utah |
| Dickstein | Martin J. | Rogers, Okla. |
| Dingell | Kennedy, | Russell |
| Domengeaux | Michael J. | Sabath |
| Doughton | Keogh | Sanders |
| Downs | Kerr | Sasscer |
| Doxey | Kilday | Satterfield |
| Drewry | Kinzer | Scanlon |
| Duncan | Kirwan | Schultz |
| Dworshak | Koberg | Schulte |
| Eberharter | Knutson | Secrest |
| Edmiston | Kocalkowski | Shanley |
| Elliott, Mass. | Kramer | Sheppard |
| Elliott, Calif. | Landis | Sikes |
| Ellis | Lanham | Smith, Conn. |
| Englebright | Larrabee | Smith, Pa. |
| Faddis | Lea | Smith, Va. |
| Fenton | Leavy | Smith, Wash. |
| Fitzpatrick | LeCompte | Smith, W. Va. |
| Flaherty | Ludlow | Snyder |
| Flannagan | Lynch | South |
| Flannery | McCormack | Sparkman |
| Fogarty | McGehee | Spence |
| Forand | McKeough | Steagall |
| Ford, Miss. | McLaughlin | Stefan |
| Ford, Thomas F. | McMillan | Sullivan |
| Fulmer | Maas | Summers, Tex. |
| Gale | Maclora | Sutphin |
| Gathings | Mahon | Sweeney |
| Gavagan | Marcantonio | Talle |
| Gearhart | Martin, Iowa | Taylor |
| Gehrmann | May | Tenerowicz |
| Geyer, Calif. | Merritt | Terry |
| Gibson | Meyer, Md. | Thom |
| Gilchrist | Mills, Ark. | Thomas, Tex. |
| Gille | Mills, La. | Thomason |
| Gore | Monroney | Tolan |
| Gossett | Moser | Traynor |
| Granger | Mundt | Vincent, Ky. |
| Grant, Ala. | Murdock | Vinson, Ga. |
| Green | Murray | Walter |
| Gregory | Myers, Pa. | Ward |
| Gwynne | Nelson | Weaver |
| Haines | Nichols | Weiss |
| Halleck | Norrell | Welch |
| Hare | Norton | West |
| Harrington | O'Brien, Mich. | Wheat |
| Harris, Ark. | O'Connor | Whichel |
| Harris, Va. | O'Hara | Whittington |
| Hart | O'Leary | Wickersham |
| Healey | O'Neal | Williams |
| Hébert | O'Toole | Wilson |
| Heffernan | Pace | Worley |
| Hendricks | Fatman | Wright |
| Hill, Colo. | Patrick | Young |
| | Patton | Zimmerman |

NAYS—100

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Gamble | Martin, Mass. |
| Andrews | Gerlach | Michener |
| Angell | Graham | Mott |
| Arends | Grant, Ind. | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Baldwin | Guyer, Kans. | Oliver |
| Bates, Mass. | Hall, | Osmers |
| Baumhart | Edwin Arthur | Paddock |
| Bender | Hall, | Pfeiffer, |
| Bishop | Leonard W. | William T. |
| Blackney | Hancock | Plumley |
| Boehne | Harness | Powers |
| Bolton | Hartley | Reed, Ill. |
| Bradley, Mich. | Heldinger | Reed, N. Y. |
| Brown, Ohio | Hess | Rees, Kans. |
| Butler | Hoffman | Rich |
| Canfield | Holbrook | Robson, Ky. |
| Carter | Holmes | Rockett |
| Chipperfield | Howell | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Clevenger | Jarrett | Rogers, Mass. |
| Cole, N. Y. | Jenkins, Ohio | Rolph |
| Crawford | Johns | Rutherford |
| Dewey | Johnson, Calif. | Sauthoff |
| Dirksen | Johnson, Ind. | Scott |
| Ditter | Jones | Short |
| Dondero | Jonkman | Smith, Maine |
| Douglas | Kean | Smith, Ohio |
| Eaton | Kunkel | Springer |
| Elston | Lambertson | Stearns, N. H. |
| Engel | Lewis | Stevenson |
| Fellows | McGregor | Taber |

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|------------------|
| Thomas, N. J. | Vreeland | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Tibbott | Wasielewski | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Tinkham | Wigglesworth | Youngdahl |
| Van Zandt | Winter | |
| Vorys, Ohio | Wolcott | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ford, Leland M.

NOT VOTING—74

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Andersen, | Gifford | Pierce |
| H. Carl | Harter | Ploeser |
| Anderson, | Hinshaw | Rabaut |
| N. Mex. | Hobbs | Ramsay |
| Andresen, | Hook | Randolph |
| August H. | Houston | Romjue |
| Bland | Jenks, N. H. | Sacks |
| Bolles | Jennings | Schaefer, Ill. |
| Boykin | Johnson, | Scrugham |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Lyndon B. | Shafer, Mich. |
| Byrne | Kefauver | Shannon |
| Camp | Kelly, Ill. | Sheridan |
| Cannon, Mo. | Kilburn | Simpson |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kopplemann | Somers, N. Y. |
| Celler | Lesinski | Starnes, Ala. |
| Chenoweth | McArdle | Stratton |
| Clason | McGranery | Sumner, Ill. |
| Cluett | McIntyre | Tarver |
| Collins | McLean | Thill |
| Costello | Maclejewski | Treadway |
| Culkin | Magnuson | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Delaney | Mansfield | Wadsworth |
| Dies | Mason | Wene |
| Disney | Mitchell | White |
| Fish | O'Day | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Fitzgerald | Pearson | Woodrum, Va. |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Randolph for, with Mr. Treadway against.
 Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
 Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Jennings against.
 Mr. Starnes of Alabama for, with Mr. Leland M. Ford against.
 Mr. Pearson for, with Mr. Cluett against.
 Mr. Fitzgerald for, with Mr. McLean against.
 Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Gifford against.
 Mr. Pierce for, with Mr. Simpson against.
 Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Clason against.

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
 Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Ploeser.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Bolles.
 Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Thill.
 Mr. Tarver with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Hinshaw.
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Mason.
 Mrs. O'Day with Mr. August H. Andresen.
 Mr. Harter with Mr. Chenoweth.
 Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Costello with Miss Sumner of Illinois.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
 Mr. Collins with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
 Mr. Wene with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Byrne with Mr. Ramsay.
 Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Hook.
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Dies.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. White.
 Mr. Houston with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Maclejewski.
 Mr. Scrugham with Mr. McArdle.
 Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Sacks.
 Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. STARNES. I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4595) was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

WILDLIFE RESTORATION

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 587) to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii to explain the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the Pittman-Robertson Act, approved by Congress in 1937, to the Territories and possessions, in part, at least, with a limitation as to the amount that may be spent. That is the act that provides the Federal Government's program of wildlife restoration and protection. It has applied to the States, but because the phraseology of the law is limited to the States, the Territories and possessions have not shared in the program.

This bill has the approval of the Department of the Interior. It provides that not over \$25,000 shall be used in Alaska, nor more than \$10,000 in Hawaii and the possessions. The money, of course, comes from the excise tax on arms and ammunition and, therefore, the program is self-supporting and would not require an appropriation out of the General Treasury.

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

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The citizens of the Territories pay that tax along with the other citizens?

Mr. KING. Yes; indeed. The excise tax on arms and ammunition is collected on the munitions sold in the Territories as well as on the continent. We have been helping to support the program throughout the country without sharing in it to any extent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman has explained the bill very well, and I, therefore, withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937, be amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii, the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of wildlife-restoration projects, as defined in section 2 of this act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized

to apportion to said Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, out of money available for apportionment under this act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding \$25,000 for Alaska, and \$10,000 each for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by this act; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 percent of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the Territories, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina have further business for today?

Mr. FULMER. I have no further business for today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has had the call today. There are other bills on the calendar that the committee has reported out and that are very important, but which have not been called up. For instance, there is the Coffee sugar bill, in which a great many people are interested and upon which the beet-sugar industry is looking for aid during the coming year. This is the Agriculture Committee's day. The rules intend that the committee shall call up all its bills on the calendar. There is not a rule of the House, and the Committee on Rules cannot even bring in a resolution, taking away from a legislative committee the right to call up its bills on the calendar on its Calendar Wednesday. The Agriculture Committee calendar has not been completed today, and the committee has the remainder of the day. Is it in order for any member of the committee to call up a bill reported by the committee in order that the democratic processes of the House shall obtain? That is, can a chairman of a committee thwart the will of a committee and refuse to exhaust the calendar of eligible bills?

The SPEAKER. That matter is not in the hands of the Chair. However, the Chair may state that no member of a committee may call up a bill on Calendar Wednesday unless he has been specifically authorized by the committee to do so. The Chair would not know whether or not the committee has instructed another member of the committee to call up any other bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The one sacred day of all calendar days is Calendar Wednesday. The rights of people of the country repose in these committees. Calendar Wednesday is known as the people's day because no arbitrary power can deprive a committee from the privilege of calling

up its bills on this day. It can only be dispensed with by unanimous consent. Even the leadership of the House cannot take away from a committee the right of the people to have their legislation considered on this day. Now, a majority of the Committee on Agriculture have reported out that sugar bill favorably, and they are asking for its consideration. Is it possible that somebody within that committee which has reported the bill favorably can deny the people their right to have their legislation considered? A rule is not necessary today. If that Coffee sugar bill is not brought up today when there is plenty of time, the fault certainly rests, not with the Speaker, not with the majority leadership, not with the Rules Committee, but with a recalcitrant Committee on Agriculture or the controlling members thereof. Why should the sugar-beet interests be discriminated against in this arbitrary way?

The SPEAKER. The Chair answered the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry some time ago.

The Clerk will call the next committee.

Mr. BLOOM (when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of my committee whether or not an amendment to this bill on page 1, line 6, after the word "shall", to strike out the word "deem" and insert the word "and", is to be accepted.

Mr. BLOOM. That amendment would not be acceptable to the committee because it was voted down in committee.

Mr. JONKMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to object, and I do object.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman objects to the consideration of the bill in the House as in committee?

Mr. JONKMAN. Until I get a chance to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that if objection is heard the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JONKMAN. I want to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is now on the statute books a law that prevents aliens and citizens from departing or entering this country during the time this country is at war. This became the law in 1918, and at the suggestion of several departments of the Government, including the State Department, the Army, the Navy, and the Intelligence Bureau, we have been considering an amendment to the effect that the present law shall become operative whenever the President shall find it necessary and shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

I think I can best explain the measure, Mr. Chairman, by reading a letter or a statement made by Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley, who has been in charge of the Passport Division of the State Department for 25 years. This will give the Committee a very clear idea of what this amendment really seeks to do. The statement is as follows:

Since the outbreak of the present war in Europe the Department of State has from time to time given consideration to the desirability of the modification of the act of May 22, 1918, entitled "An act to prevent in time of war departure from or entry into the United States, contrary to the public safety" in such a manner as to permit the President, at a time such as the present, to prescribe rules and regulations governing the entry into and departure from the United States of all persons, if he deems that the interests of the United States so require. While the entry of aliens into the United States may now be regulated to some extent under the authority of statutes already enacted, there is no provision of law under which citizens of the United States may be required to bear valid passports in order to depart from or enter the United States or under which the departure from the United States of aliens may be controlled. Since the outbreak of the present war it has come to the attention of the Department of State and of other executive departments that there are many persons in and outside of the United States who are directly engaged in espionage and subversive activities in the interests of foreign governments, and others who are engaged in activities inimical to the best interests of the United States who desire to travel from time to time between the United States and foreign countries in connection with their activities, as well as others who desire to leave the United States for the purpose of evading justice.

During the last war, when it is believed a lesser number of persons were engaged in espionage and subversive activities in the United States than is now the case, notwithstanding the fact that the United States is not at war, it was found desirable to enact legislation to provide for the regulation of travel to and from the United States on the part of all persons, citizens as well as aliens. The situation existing throughout the world and the necessity of promoting as far as possible the national defense justify, it is believed, the enactment of legislation providing for the centralization of control over the entry into and departure from the United States of persons of all classes. It is believed that this could be accomplished by the modification of the first paragraph of the act of May 22, 1918, so that the President could issue rules and regulations governing the entry into and departure from the United States of all persons. Since the act of May 22, 1918, was the subject of considerable litigation and consequently has been construed in a number of respects by the courts of the United States, it seems particularly desirable that that act be amended rather than that new

legislation be enacted. The subject has been discussed with the Attorney General and he has expressed an opinion favorable to the reenactment of the act of May 22, 1918, or legislation along the lines of that act.

Section 1 of H. R. 4973 modifies the opening paragraph of section 1 of the act of May 22, 1918, so as to permit the President, under conditions as now exist throughout the world, to prescribe rules and regulations governing the entry into and departure from the United States of all persons, if he deems that the interests of the United States so require.

Section 2 of H. R. 4973 amends section 3 of the act of May 22, 1918, by changing the penalties for violation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder from \$10,000 or 20 years imprisonment, or both, to \$5,000 or 5 years imprisonment, or both. It has not been deemed desirable to retain the severe penalties prescribed by the act of May 22, 1918, since the experience has shown that severe penalties too frequently influence both courts and juries in favor of defendants and result in the miscarriage of justice. Section 2 also amends section 3 of the same act by including aircraft among other vehicles of transportation which may be forfeited to the United States if concerned in any violation of the provisions of the act.

Section 3 of H. R. 4973 amends the act of May 22, 1918, by adding two new sections, Nos. 5 and 6. Section 5 has been added in order to remove any possibility of doubt that even though a permit may be issued abroad to an alien under authority of the proposed legislation he may nevertheless be prevented from entering the United States if upon his arrival in this country he is found to be inadmissible to the United States under any law relating to the entry of aliens into this country. Section 6 has been added in order to make it clear that the revocation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued in pursuance of the bill shall not prevent prosecution for any offense committed or the imposition of any penalties or forfeitures, liability for which was incurred prior to such revocation.

It is not contemplated, should the proposed legislation be enacted into law, to restrict or to prohibit or in any way to impede the legitimate travel of citizens of the United States or the legitimate and necessary entry into or departure from the United States of aliens. The Department of State in nowise discourages travel of American citizens to countries of the Western Hemisphere or the travel of the inhabitants of such countries to the United States. Such travel is considered advantageous not only to the United States but also to all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere in drawing them together more closely in sympathy and understanding, and it is encouraged rather than discouraged. It can therefore be anticipated that any rules or regulations issued under the proposed legislation would be drawn up in such a manner as to avoid undue inconveniences and difficulties in the matter of the departure from and entry into the United States of citizens of the United States and aliens, and that particular regard would be given to the matter of affording every convenience to American citizens who desire to enter Canada or Mexico from the United States and to the citizens of Canada and Mexico who desire to travel in the United States.

I may say that the bill that was enacted in 1918 is exactly the same law. The only difference, in effect, is that we make it operative on the issuance of a proclamation by the President and change the penalty and add the word "aircraft" with respect to the vehicles involved.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman, of course, has been in my district on a great many occasions and I am sure is familiar with the wonderful seashore and summer resort located on Lake Erie, on the Canadian shore, known as Crystal Beach. A number of residents of the city of Buffalo own property at Crystal Beach. Will it be necessary for them to obtain a permit or something of that kind to go over there to visit?

Mr. BLOOM. No; nothing of that kind will be involved. That will be taken care of in the rules and regulations and instead of impeding such travel in any way, it will be facilitated with respect to travel between Canada and the United States.

Mr. BEITER. They will not be held up or have to have a lot of papers, and so forth?

Mr. BLOOM. No; it will be exactly as it is today. This is exactly the same as the law is now. The President may find it necessary to issue a proclamation so as to prevent abuses that are coming up every day. The law will only be effective when such a proclamation is issued and then only under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed. This is all the bill calls for, and it is exactly the same law that we previously had.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Do not all foreign countries have restrictions similar to this in this bill, in time of peace?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I feel that this is needed legislation. It is constructive.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will this in any way suspend or avoid the present immigration laws?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; it has nothing to do with the immigration laws.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But the language here reads more like an immigration bill than a foreign-department bill.

This bill distinctly speaks of a person entering and going. I can understand a person in the United States who wants to go out, and we have reason to keep him here, but how about an alien who has a proper visa from a proper consul, during the time this was enacted into law?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman wants to know how this will affect the alien who has received a proper visa? Mr. Chairman, that is just what we are trying to do. This is what they do. They get a passport or a document of travel, and they come to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes more. They come to the United States. At the same time they get a visa to Mexico. Then on this passport they also have a visa to Cuba or some other country. They have that visa to the United States and the visa to Mexico and the visa to Cuba, then these friendly enemies, or whatever you

may want to call them, come over here, and they have their conference, and they say, "We are going to Mexico, and we are going to hold a conference there," and that is where they make the ball, and they will come back here to shoot it. So they are admitted into Mexico under the visa they have, and also they have a right to go to Cuba and come back to the United States, and they go and arrange all of their work, and they come back from Cuba or Mexico to the United States. Under this proposed bill they cannot do that. That is what we are trying to prevent, and we are trying to prevent our own citizens who are doing the same kind of work. This would prevent a person who is a citizen of the United States, like Fritz Kuhn, or anybody else, from leaving the country if we wanted to keep him here. There are many cases like that. As I say, this is the present law. The only difference is that we are making it operative now, so as to prevent the things from happening that we are trying to prevent from happening. If we can prevent them at this time, whenever the President finds it necessary to issue that proclamation in the interest of the United States, then this law becomes operative today, instead of waiting until we get into war.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Of course, we are not in war at the present time.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. And that law was enacted in time of war?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Does the gentleman realize that we have permitted hundreds and hundreds of our people to go out to other possessions to work, to help to build up defense in those countries, even to England? What protection would they have returning?

Mr. BLOOM. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. They would be stranded in those countries, would they not?

Mr. BLOOM. No; they would not, because the present rules and regulations would cover that. If they are entitled to come into this country, they can come here, and if they are entitled to leave this country they can do it. It is only when the department that has that under control says so that they cannot leave.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. What does the gentleman mean by "entitled to come"?

Mr. BLOOM. Under the rules of travel, under their passport.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. These men go there, and they are in Trinidad, or Bermuda, or Newfoundland, and we will say the President should issue a proclamation of this nature. What would happen to them? They would be stranded.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, I know; but the gentleman is figuring on something that the President would not do.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The act would only operate against those persons who were committing acts of sabotage or doing something inimical to the best interests of the United States, under the act as it was in operation during the World War, and would be in operation today, if this bill were passed.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I am mindful of that law. We do not want to strand these people in those other possessions.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not think the gentleman need worry about that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The very purpose of the changes in this bill are stated by the gentlemen to be in times of the present emergency, restrictions on passports which have previously applied in wartime. On that point all members of the committee are agreed, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] has said, that it is highly commendable legislation. However, I think the attention of the committee should be called to the undeclared changes which have crept into the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain, if he will, for the benefit of the Members, why the language was changed from the wording, which was that the President shall find certain facts, to the present wording, which says that the President shall deem certain facts. I think it would be illuminating to have that explained for the membership of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be glad to explain it, but as my colleague from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] has the dictionary before him and this matter was taken up before the committee, we find there is no difference between the word "deem" and the word "find." There is absolutely no difference between the word "deem" and the word "find." It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. The bill calls for "deem" and one or two Members thought it should be "find." But there is absolutely no difference between "deem" and "find." I will leave it to the members of the Committee to decide.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say the necessity for this legislation, I think, is so convincing that no one who knows the facts back of it would oppose the bill, because all the various agencies of the Government, the F. B. I., the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, the State Department, and all of them, realize that with the present situation existing there must be some clearing house or central place where people coming and going at this time can be checked upon, so as to prevent sabotage and "fifth column" activities. Instances were cited before our committee which showed the necessity for this legislation and the necessity for it now. It should not be postponed.

With reference to the word that my friend is talking about, there was considerable discussion before the committee of the substitution of the word "find" for the word "deem." When that comes up under the 5-minute rule I will take a little time to discuss it more at length. However, I do not care to consume any more time upon that at this time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, as soon as opportunity offers, I am going to ask for 1 hour of debate on this question in order to give an opportunity to certain Members here who wish to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. EATON. For 1 hour?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is entitled to 1 hour and the ranking minority member is entitled to 1 hour, if he desires to use it.

Mr. EATON. I am asking to be recognized for an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized, and he may yield such time as he likes up to 1 hour.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I do not expect we will have protracted debate, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is seized and possessed with certain ideas which he wishes to pass along.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. I hold in my hand a copy of the Code of Laws of the United States of America. Title 22, section 223, the one which this bill purports to amend, reads in the first sentence:

When the United States is at war, if the President shall find that the public safety requires—

Will the gentleman tell us why the word "find" and the word "if" were stricken out of the bill?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question, and, because I am unable to answer it, I want to play safe and keep that word "find" in there. I do not think, if we were to want the person produced who changed the word, that we would find him very quickly.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I understood the gentleman to read that, the law provided that it did not apply unless we were at war?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But this new bill does not say that. This bill says that the President may, if some other countries are at war.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does the gentleman propose to amend this by putting back all the language of the old statute?

Mr. JONKMAN. No; I do not.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well, why not?

Mr. JONKMAN. I will explain that in my statement.

Mr. Chairman, ostensibly the purpose of this amendment is as was stated by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee; in short, to give the President wartime powers that were enjoyed by the wartime administration in 1918 during the war, in the present situation in the present emergency. You might put it that it is desired to give the President wartime powers in peacetime. I do not wish to so put it.

I shall not attempt to answer the question whether we are in war or whether we are not in war. I shall not attempt to answer the question whether we are at peace with the other nations of the world or whether we are not at peace with the other nations of the world. I personally have no objection and I have no quarrel with that change, namely, to change the words "when the United States is at war" to "whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more states." That is ostensibly the purpose of this amendment—to give the President the same powers in this situation, this emergency, that President Wilson had in the wartimes of 1918, to prevent persons from entering into or departing from the United States except under regulations imposed by the President and under penalties imposed by this amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was after war had been declared and we had entered into the war?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes, indeed. That was a wartime power.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that we have already given the President wartime powers?

Mr. JONKMAN. I will come to that in my statement, if I get that far.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I have no quarrel with that; and, if I understood the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee correctly, he stated that is the only change that has been made. In other words, he said the act of 1918 is dormant until we have another war, and that the purpose of this bill is to put it into effect at the present time, although presumably we are not at war. I have no quarrel with that.

However, I want to call your attention to the fact that there have been some further changes made which I deem are very vital changes, because in the same paragraph the present law provides—

That if the President shall find that the public safety requires—

This amendment changes those words to read:

If the President shall deem that the interests of the United States require.

The point I am making here is that we are constantly drifting away from constitutional methods of procedure in

government and proceeding to a government by Executive decree. We have done it, and we are doing it consciously, we are doing it unconsciously, and unless you had your attention called to this I am firm in my belief that you would be doing it unconsciously to an extreme degree if you passed this bill.

There is a lot of difference in whether or not an act is passed in behalf of the public safety or it is passed in behalf of the public interest. I think most of you are aware of the fact that laws passed in the interest of public safety have a paramount sanctity to other laws which are passed merely in the public interest. The public safety is paramount to everything else; and acts of that kind, acts done thereunder, will be sanctioned by the courts because they are done in the name of public safety and in behalf of public safety, which override individual prerogatives and rights, and must, of necessity. But that is not true of the public interest.

In wartime President Wilson had this prerogative only for the purposes of public safety. Here in peacetime we propose to say "whenever it is in the public interest." Every law which is passed, with the exception of private bills, perhaps, is assumed to be in the public interest; but it is not presumed they are passed for, nor necessarily have any connection with, the public safety. It is because this act as it stands now was passed for the public safety that we can give subscription to these powers. But even that I am not going to quarrel with. I am willing to go along with that. I realize that we are in a situation, where we are involved in a program of defense that requires every effort, and that the administration should have the power to keep persons out of the United States who will hurt the public safety and prevent those from departing who might injure public safety. So, as I say, I am willing to go along on that proposition of changing "public safety" to "public interest," although I do not think it is necessary. It is certainly giving the administration far more power in peacetime than the war administration was granted in wartime.

Assuming that we are going to accept "public interest" instead of "public safety," then I go one step further and ask, Why was this word "deem" placed in there instead of "find"?

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. I think it is true that the connotation of the word "deem" is different from the word "find." I would prefer the word "find" now. But does the gentleman think, as a practical matter, that there is any real difference in those two words in this particular statute?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes; I think there is a very vital difference. I would like to put it this way, if the gentleman will permit me: If the substance of constitutional processes is constantly slipping away from us, I am going to do what I can to conserve the form thereof.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. May I ask the gentleman if he would be in favor of the bill provided we put in "find" instead of "deem" and "safety" instead of "interest"? Would he be in favor of the bill then?

Mr. JONKMAN. I certainly would if both were changed, but as a matter of compromise I am willing to let "interest" go. I do not think it is right, I do not think it is necessary, I do not think we should do it, but I consider that word "deem" of far greater importance, if I may answer it that way.

It has been said here that the word "deem" and the word "find" mean the same thing. Mr. Chairman, if they were substantially the same, I would not object. I am not here splitting hairs. However, there is a vital difference between the word "deem" and the word "find."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I was interested in what the Chairman had to say with reference to the fact that this bill did not apply to immigration or to the admission of individuals generally. I call the gentleman's attention to this sentence in the report:

So as to permit the President in time of national emergency to prescribe rules and regulations governing the entry and departure from the United States of all persons if he shall deem that the interests of the United States so require.

If you leave out the word "emergency" or the word "necessity" or the word that you used awhile ago instead of the word "interest"—what was the word?

Mr. JONKMAN. "Safety."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If you leave out those words and leave in "interest," can you not step over and give this sentence its full interpretation and give the President the full authority to say who may come in and who shall go out without regard to any immigration law?

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no question but what this amendment, if passed, will override the immigration laws. There is no question but what under this amendment the President will have the power to say whether or not the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] goes to South America or does not go.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Would there not be plenty of time after we get into war to give the President the right to set aside all immigration laws?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do feel that the present situation is such as to call for extraordinary powers in the matter of keeping people from coming into or going out of the United States. I do believe that is the situation, whether we are at peace or not. I want to go a long way, but I do not want to go as far as this amendment goes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman distinguish between these two phrases in the original act and in the so-called amendment here? The first is—
when the United States is at war, if the President shall find—

The second is—
whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, the President shall deem—

In what capacity does the President act in the first instance, and in what capacity does he act in the second instance?

Mr. JONKMAN. The word "find" has in modern usage a legal meaning as well as a common usage meaning. I do not know what dictionary the gentleman who referred to the dictionary consulted, but the one at the stand at the Speaker's desk shows a vital distinction between the two words. The word "find" in law means—

to determine and declare an issue of fact by its verdict or decision, as a jury or court.

If the President must find, he can find it on facts. I do not care whether it is an established fact or not, but he must find it on some fact, he must base his finding on some fact. That is the legal and special meaning of the word today.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Passing from that to the word "deem," that is where the President gets his right to use discretion. He does not have to find on facts, he just uses his own judgment. If you use the word "find," however, he has to find some fact, and until he does find some fact he does not find, he just guesses, and that is what "deem" means.

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is this not the distinguishing criterion between the two, that in the first place, under the original act, the President finds with reference to the public safety of the United States, and in the second instance he sits as arbiter between two or more warring states, of whom the United States may not be one?

Mr. JONKMAN. Almost the gentleman persuades me not to give in to that word "interest." I am willing to go a long way, let me repeat. The public interest is so broad that it beggars description or definition. The President could always say he did it in the public interest and find something, but when he must find it based on the public safety, and that is all we considered it could be based on under constitutional principles in 1918, that is a different question.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. As I understand, the word "deem" means to decide or conclude. The word "find" means to decide or conclude, after having made a study or investigation. It is true there is that difference between the two words. However, you cannot go back of the finding, and you cannot challenge it by saying that sufficient consideration has not been given. Therefore, I maintain there is no difference in this particular statute between the words.

Mr. JONKMAN. The finding is based on facts, there is no question about it, in law.

Mr. GWYNNE. But you cannot challenge it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute in order to ask him a question.

Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that if the committee accepts the suggestion of the gentleman and makes the change from "deem" to "find" the gentleman will be through with all his talk and will vote for this bill as is?

Mr. JONKMAN. I think the gentleman is afraid I am being persuaded. I will say, "Yes," I will vote for the bill if that is changed.

Mr. BLOOM. That is just what I wanted to do a long time ago, and the gentleman knows it. All right, I will agree to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York says he will accept this amendment. May I ask the gentleman, when the bill goes to conference will the gentleman insist on keeping the amendment in the bill or will he accept the amendment here for the purpose of getting the bill through the House and then throwing the amendment away as soon as he gets into conference?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I think that is very unfair.

Mr. MICHENER. Why?

Mr. BLOOM. I made a statement, and this is not the first time the statement was made, but I am not in the habit of resorting to tricks to get the gentleman to vote to my way of thinking. I can assure the gentleman that, as far as I am concerned, I am not going to do anything of the kind. I will say, however, that if in conference all the members of the committee of conference feel that we should have the word "deem" instead of "find," I shall naturally have to go along with them, and we can come back to the House again.

I do not know where the gentleman gets his bag of tricks from, but I never thought of such a thing. I think it is very unfair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from New York—

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is going to talk to him?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am talking here. I was just asking the gentleman's attention. Of course, if the gentleman does not care what is going on in the House, all right.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then for the consideration of the other Members of the House, if not for that of the gentleman from New York, nobody was accusing anyone, as I understand, of resorting to

any trick. We all know that when we put provisions in bills they have frequently been stricken in conference. There is no trick about it. It was due, undoubtedly, to force of argument of the other side and that is all we were trying to safeguard. There is no occasion for anyone to be offended. It is a nice day and what is the use of getting mad about anything?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I want to say to the chairman that I appreciate the fact that he has gone along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] and myself in respect of this change, and I have every confidence he will stand pat on his statement and with this language the entire membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee is unanimously in favor of this piece of legislation.

Mr. BLOOM. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JONKMAN. I have answered the gentleman's question affirmatively, but may I say in addition on this word "deem" just to finish my definition of what it means that according to the dictionary at the Speaker's desk it means "to be of opinion, to think, to esteem, to opine, to suppose."

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Since the gentleman has agreed to accept the gentleman's proposed amendment, let me ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman from Michigan think that with this change the President still can modify all the immigration laws if he wants to do so?

Mr. JONKMAN. I will give the gentleman a candid answer to that. I know something about the processes of the executive part of the Government and, especially, the Department of Justice; and, as I said, he needs only a shred of evidence to support his findings. It can be upon a very meager finding, but what I obtain by this is that we are conserving constitutional processes of government instead of going further toward processes of government by Executive decree. It is now up to the executive departments whether they want to use high-handed methods, but the Congress has not authorized them to do so.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Did the gentleman get before the committee any assurance from the State Department as to how they expected to enforce this law?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do not believe I can answer that. I will leave that to the chairman.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I want to be for this bill, but I should hate to vote for the bill this afternoon, when the gentleman tells me that the President, by reason of what we do here this afternoon, is to have authority to change every immigration law.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is without the amendment, I may say to the gentleman—if he merely had to "deem"; but not, in my judgment, when he has to "find."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the House will probably be better satisfied with reference to the necessity of this legislation if they had heard the testimony that was presented before the Foreign Affairs Committee with reference to existing conditions that have brought to the attention of our Government the necessity for this legislation.

I have a statement which was presented to our committee, signed by J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Gen. Sherman Miles, of the Intelligence Division of the War Department, and Capt. H. E. Kirke, of the Office of Naval Intelligence. These three gentlemen represent the intelligence divisions of the Department of Justice, the War Department, and the Navy Department that have had to do with the curbing of subversive activities on the part of our own citizens as well as aliens. It has been brought forcefully to their attention by incidents that have happened and are happening daily, that we must have this legislation, and their statement revealed the necessity for this bill.

The public generally is of the opinion that no one can leave this country without obtaining a passport. This is not correct. There is no law requiring anyone leaving this country to secure a passport. The only reason passports have been obtained has been because most countries to which citizens are going require passports before they can be admitted to such countries, and it is because of the laws of the countries which they are visiting that require passports that passports are secured by our citizens. Under existing law, and without this law, we have no right to prevent anyone from leaving this country at any time he desires to do so.

The evidence before our committee showed two instances, which were cited at that time, that have happened recently, of aliens leaving this country whose departure to foreign countries adversely affected the defense of the United States, but without this bill the Government was powerless to prevent their leaving. It was stated there were a number of incidents occurring in the enforcement of espionage laws which revealed the necessity for this law so they could effectively keep check on parties under suspicion and whose activities stamped them as enemies of our Government.

The sole purpose of this legislation is to give that same power that this Government had during the World War, and have a sort of clearing house where people entering or leaving this country would have to give their reasons why they were going or coming, and where it would be determined whether they were engaged in espionage, and whether their coming in or going out would be inimical to the interests of the United States. It does not affect any other law on the statute books. It is simply in addition to existing law by which anyone at this time, in addition to any other right they may have under any other law, would have to go to the State Department and state

why they were coming in or going out and secure an entrance or exit permit.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am interested in what the gentleman said about what Mr. Hoover said and what others said, but at the same time they are enforcing officers. What does the Secretary of State's office say?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, represented the State Department, and he said that the legislation was needed, and badly needed. The Department of Justice was likewise represented.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I shall not press my inquiry further.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is approved 100 percent, and the only controversy in the committee was whether it should contain the word "deem" or "find." I think it is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. That difference has been adjusted, and the committee is now unanimous.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am somewhat worried about this bill, as to how far it goes. If it goes far enough to suspend our immigration laws, I am against it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It does not.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If it corrects the specific difficulty, I would be in favor of it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It does not touch the immigration laws any more than an appropriation bill does. It says, in addition to all laws, when a person comes in or goes out, he has to clear himself through the State Department. The bill authorizes the President to require restrictions and prohibitions in addition to the immigration and other laws. It does not repeal or weaken these other laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that it is more important than ever before to keep people out of the country who are undesirable, and to keep people in when it is in the interest of the United States Government?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thoroughly agree with that statement, and our entire committee now recommends the passage of this bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. VORYS OF OHIO. I understand the gentleman to say that the whole thing is a matter of the difference between tweedledum and tweedle-deem?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think that is right.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BLOOM. Nor have I, and I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 1 of the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), is amended to read as follows:

"That whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall deem that the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this act be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, it shall, until otherwise ordered by the President or Congress, be unlawful—"

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 6, after the word "shall", strike out the word "deem" and insert the word "find."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Clerk had started to read the second section. I make the point of order that the amendment comes too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet, and the amendment was on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the circumstances, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 1, line 5, after the word "whenever", insert the words "the Congress shall have declared that."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] destroys the whole purpose of the bill. This does not say anything about "whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more states." They may be foreign states. The Congress should not, by resolution, say that a state of war exists between Germany and some other country, or whatever two countries it may be. If it were to apply only to the United States, that would be a different thing, but this bill provides in case of a war between any two countries, whatever the countries may be. So it does not belong in this bill in any way, and would destroy the purpose of the bill completely.

I therefore hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to my friend.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The purpose of the amendment is to say that whenever Congress shall say that a state of war exists.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Everybody knows that a state of war exists between certain countries now, but Congress would be powerless by a joint resolution to do anything about it. This is a very foolish amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That section 3 of such act of May 22, 1918, is amended to read as follows:

"That any person who shall willfully violate any of the provisions of this act, or of any order or proclamation of the President promulgated, or of any permit, rule, or regulation issued thereunder, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$5,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by like fine or imprisonment, or both; and any vehicle, vessel, or aircraft, together with its or her appurtenances, equipment, tackle, apparel, and furniture, concerned in any such violation, shall be forfeited to the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following section 2, insert section 2a, as follows:

"Sec. 2a. That section 4 of such act of May 22, 1918, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That the term 'United States' as used in this act includes the Canal Zone, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and all territory and waters, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"The word 'person' as used herein shall be deemed to mean any individual, partnership, association, company, or other unincorporated body of individuals, or corporation, or body politic."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That such act of May 22, 1918, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to entitle an alien to whom a permit to enter the United States has been issued to enter the United States, if, upon arrival in the United States, he is found to be inadmissible to the United States under this act or any law relating to the entry of aliens into the United States.

"Sec. 6. The revocation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued in pursuance of this act, shall not prevent prosecution for any offense committed or the imposition of any penalties or forfeitures, liability for which was incurred under this act prior to the revocation of such proclamation, rule, regulation, or order."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 3, following line 17, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. Nothing in this act shall authorize the President by rules and regulations or other methods to permit the entry into the United States of any alien whose entry is prohibited by law."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself. It merely says that by rules, regulations, or other methods the President cannot lift our immigration ban. In other words, the power that this bill gives to the President is to further restrict immigration, and my amendment takes away from him any power to lift our immigration ban.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. Chairman, we have the present act that is now on the statute books and it becomes operative in time of war. It would become operative under this bill at any time that the President shall issue a proclamation. The rules and regulations are to be laid down by him. The present law has been construed by various courts.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to do something to preserve the interests of the United States. An amendment such as this will destroy the whole purpose of the proposition.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman contend this bill should carry authority for the President to lift our immigration restrictions by rule or regulation?

Mr. BLOOM. He has the power to do that now. The act remains exactly as it is now. When he issues a proclamation, he makes certain rules and regulations. He says that the good fellow has a right to come here, the man who has a right to leave may do so and the man who has a right to come back may do so. He makes rules and regulations to preserve our safety and our security.

If you do something else that is going to tie his hands, you do away with the effectiveness of the whole act. The law remains exactly as it is now and there is no change in the present law proposed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I call the gentleman's attention and the attention of the Members to these words on the first page, line 7:

the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise.

That means when the interests of the United States require additional restrictions and prohibitions.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman should not be opposed to my amendment, then.

Mr. EBERHARTER. By no stretch of the imagination could there be anything in this act that would give the President the power to lift any restrictions or prohibitions.

Mr. CURTIS. If that be true, the gentleman should not oppose my amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, again I wish to emphasize that that is the law now, and there is no question about that. The gentleman's amendment is absolutely superfluous, and would, if adopted, destroy what we are trying to do. We are trying to make this law operative at the present time.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 31, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from a New York paper.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein brief excerpts from letters I have received in connection with the plight of the small manufacturers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. George Meaney, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, in the Hotel Astor in New York City last Wednesday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER and Mr. PATMAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I find on looking over my manuscript that I cannot complete it in 30 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—A NON-DEFENSIBLE NATIONAL-DEFENSE, PET PROJECT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is, in this emergency and under the Constitution, my Commander in Chief. As such, though criticized by some for so doing, I have supported him and his foreign policy. I pledge him my loyalty, reserving my rights guaranteed to me by the Constitution.

I am for unity. The country should be united in this crisis.

I agree with the President that the United States will actively resist wherever necessary and with all our resources every attempt by Hitler to extend the Nazi domination to the Western Hemisphere, or to threaten it.

I agree with him that in order to save ourselves and to remain the United States of America we must and should and will resist every Nazi attempt to gain control of the seas.

I am sure I do not know where this may lead us. It is the only position which, as self-respecting, liberty-loving citizens, any of us can take. The question is whether we can maintain it as against those events outside our hemisphere which have written America's destiny for and in spite of us, whatever it

may be. We accept our full responsibility for our own salvation. Let the world take notice and govern itself accordingly.

But, when it comes to playing politics with our internal economy with the obvious intent to take advantage of a situation in order to put across, under duress of the emergency, a pet project under the guise of national defense, loyalty to country comes first, and I will not be a party to such a scheme. I will not help to perpetrate what I consider to be a fraud on the body politic of the United States, one that leads but to disunity in itself and affords an offered opportunity for anyone to challenge the motives, and properly to question the capacities, of our Commander in Chief who, under existing circumstances, seeks to serve a selfish end at his country's expense.

It is unfortunate—and worse than that—that the President should have at this time submitted the St. Lawrence waterway project for the consideration of Congress, for it is obviously unnecessary, inexpedient, and is just what it looks to be, despite the camouflage, a pet project.

From the standpoint of national defense, if not from the standpoint of the need for more power, it is absolutely unjustified.

That is a pet project, the President admits. This is no time for pet projects at the expense of the taxpayer. Our lives are at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the President's message. I am sorry he delivered it. I do not and cannot agree with him in the premises. I regret that he was constrained to send it to Congress at this time. This is no time, nor is it the place, for the Commander in Chief to lay himself open to charges that can be substantiated by his own admissions that this is a pet project he is advocating. His plea in confession and avoidance gets him nowhere. That is paternalism gone mad.

I am opposed to it and to the general proposition. I believe, and always have believed, and always shall believe, that, as Calvin Coolidge said:

A President should not only not be selfish but he ought to avoid the appearance of selfishness.

People are human. They size a man up correctly, and his idiosyncrasies are their measure of the greatness of the man.

Mr. Speaker, on June 2 last the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced H. R. 4927, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, as I have suggested, I am against the proposition because I do not like the subterfuge employed.

In these days when we and the country need every dollar it is almost a crime, under the guise of national defense for the President to urge in support of his pet project, that the farmers and real-estate owners and common citizens of Vermont, and elsewhere, give up their lives, liberty, and property to help put across and over this project which he

did not dare submit as a treaty, as it should be, but has finagled into an agreement.

Abraham Lincoln asked his Secretary of State or War: "If you call the tail of a four-legged sheep a leg, how many legs would the sheep have?"

"Five," said the Secretary.

"Four," said Lincoln, "for calling a tail a leg doesn't make it so."

Calling this St. Lawrence waterway affair an agreement when it is in fact a treaty does not change it at all. It is a treaty. It should have been submitted to the Senate as treaties are required to be submitted by the Constitution.

It is not the question of whether one favors the St. Lawrence waterway or is opposed to it that should give one especial pause at this moment in considering the matter.

Without regard to the merits and demerits of the project I disapprove most heartily, as I have said, this latest attempt of the President, with deliberate purpose and intent to sabotage, evade, and to avoid the mandatory provisions of the Constitution by offering a joint resolution for the consideration of Congress instead of submitting the text of a treaty when, as I have said, as in the present case, an international agreement is involved which, according to my first impression, and as confirmed by what heretofore has happened, in my opinion, should and does require ratification by the Senate.

It smells too much like the attempts to torpedo the Supreme Court, and resembles his "to hell with the Constitution," or words to that effect in re the Guffey coal bill. Every American knows that.

Section 2 of article II of the Constitution prescribes that the President "shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties provided two-thirds of the Senators concur." The decisions of the Supreme Court with respect to what constitutes treaties make interesting reading in view of the submission of this joint resolution, which is clearly and obviously an attempt to avoid the Constitution and the decisions of the Court. The precedents for the joint resolution also are enlightening.

What some people are speaks so loud I cannot hear what they say. The President, apparently realizing that the Senate would not ratify such a treaty as he might selfishly submit, has procured an opinion to the effect that the method he seeks to employ is legal.

As a lawyer, I am not so sure. Because the Attorney General writes that what the President says is the law, does not, under existing circumstances, make it so. I reserve the right after study of it, to agree, or to continue to disagree, as I do now, on first impression, with respect to its legality. Just because the present Attorney General and the Supreme Court, as now constituted, might be expected to find it so to be, it does not follow necessarily that the method is justified. Consequently, it does not convince me. Nor does the fact that Canada is alleged to have acquiesced in the plan. Why not? They would have seven-eighths of the cake. They are going to

eat it. But in fact Canada has not acquiesced, except under duress, if at all.

I live near the border and my Canadian friends tell me that Canada has gone along at the insistence of, and under pressure by and from the President of the United States, with his "or else," or veiled threats as to what might and may happen if they did not and do not acquiesce. Ask somebody from Canada if this is not the fact. It is.

The President was right in his statement. There are those of us who know that the St. Lawrence waterway is a pet project of his, and we realize that rule or ruin he proposes to put it across under the absolutely untenable theory that it would contribute to national defense. That is pure unadulterated bunk. It is a fraud on the public. He might as well have used the general-welfare clause to substantiate his position. It would have been just as nonsensical.

Frozen solidly into the ice for from 4 to 6 months, the ships would be useless, except as targets. The shipyards would have to be closed from 4 to 6 months in 20 to 30 degrees below zero weather. It does not make sense from a national-defense angle.

One who studies the situation cannot fail to appreciate the absolute fallacy of placing the St. Lawrence seaway project under the cloak of national defense. Just where does a navigable channel for open vessels, closed by ice for 6 or 7 months each year fit in with our national-defense scheme? Nowhere. How is the urgent need of more power for the defense and other industries to be served by a project that will not furnish power for 6 or 7 years? Not at all. If the need of power is so urgent, why cannot it be supplied by Fort Peck, Grand Coulee, or Bonneville? It could be. The emergency exists at this moment; it is pressing and is daily becoming more pressing. We are not preparing against an embryonic emergency due several years from now. It is actual and active, and time is of the essence. As a national-defense project this is a perfect fraud on the people.

Then again, and lastly looking at the problem from the long-range point of view, would this undertaking prove to be of substantial benefit as a defense measure? No.

The argument advanced is that shipyards should be constructed on the Great Lakes as "a secure haven." It is suggested that such shipyards would not be so exposed to attack as those located on or near the seaboard.

In this era of improvement in air navigation, when the range of aerial fighters and bombers is constantly increasing, who can say that a shipyard located at Cleveland is any more immune from attack than one located at Chester, Pa.? It must be remembered, too, that the 27-foot channel could not be used by battle-ships or cruisers or by any other war vessels of capital proportions.

Consider with what ease, given an invasion from the air, this channel could be put out of commission through the action of bombing planes; or how vulnerable it would be at the hands of the saboteur. The distance from Chicago to

Montreal, for example, is 1,247 miles, and for a considerable part of this distance vessels built in the Great Lakes area would be required to move through narrow, winding channels, flanked with locks, dams, spillways, and sluice gates, all essential to the canal's operation. One bomb from the air, one exploded charge of dynamite, and the canal would be out of business indefinitely, with the vessels of a beleaguered nation lying helplessly and uselessly at anchor a thousand miles or more up a blockaded river. It is scarcely conceivable that reliance would be placed upon so frail a line of defense. It does not make sense.

A NIGHTMARE

From the standpoint of national defense against international aggression the proposition to establish ocean shipbuilding on an inland waterway is too preposterous to require discussion. It centralizes such industry on bodies of water that for 200 years have been free from everything suggesting such a thing.

Then again the expense involved in the original proposition is but a drop in the bucket compared with what it would cost to construct docks, drydocks, shipyards, and necessary auxiliaries to all these.

Once constructed, the everlasting bill for maintenance of these necessary complements to equipment would be a terrible drain on the taxpayers. That is not all. They must be defended. We will have to have forts, fortifications, and aircraft batteries; sailors, soldiers, marines, establish new air bases, and so on ad nauseam.

It is a fantastic dream. It will be a nightmare if the people do not wake up.

Much more might be said against the project and the insidious method employed in attempting to take advantage of the people and to put it over as a national-defense measure; which it absolutely is not.

I say to you that the pet project of the President is unsound financially. From an economic standpoint it is ruinous. From the standpoint of national defense it is not defensible, as such, at any time, but particularly at this time for that it submits us to so many hazards inside and outside, economic, power, and financial fields to which I have heretofore alluded, as to make the indefensible project, as it has been properly characterized, a national menace.

FARMERS LOSERS

It is claimed by the proponents that the St. Lawrence waterway would benefit the farmer by saving him money, by saving him several cents a bushel on the cost of shipment of grain from the "upper lake ports to Montreal and beyond."

It is claimed water transportation would save from 6 to 12 cents a bushel. That is ridiculous, in view of the fact that during the past 10 years the average total charge for moving wheat from the head of the Lakes to Montreal has been only 5½ cents, and the cost of handling grain at Montreal is only three-fourths of a cent a bushel, or a total of a little more than 6 cents for the entire movement from the head of the Lakes to the hold of a ship at Montreal.

SAVINGS ARGUMENT IS FUNNY

The savings suggested would wipe out the present total charge. The savings argument would be funny, if it were not a serious matter for one to use figures so carelessly.

But, conceding that there might be some saving, what would it be and what would it do to the American farmer? We do not have to speculate. We know that in 1929 the railroads reduced the export rates on grain in order to comply with the suggestion of President Hoover, and on the representation that such reduction would stimulate exports of wheat and increase the price received by the American farmer. What happened is a matter of official record. It is a long sad story from the standpoint of the American farmer. Instead of helping to uplift the grain prices, cuts in railroad rates on export shipments did precisely the opposite thing.

The cuts in railroad rates resulted in lower quotations on wheat at Liverpool, and the wheat market at Chicago plunged downward to below the bottommost level ever previously reached. This was in May 1929. Check it in the newspaper stories of early May of that year and in Government statistics covering transportation costs and wheat, if you wish to verify it.

You will find it true. You will also find that from May through to fall during the remainder of the period of reduced rates, as a result of a well-intentioned effort to help maintain wheat prices for the farmers of the United States, it came about that the railroads got less money for hauling the wheat; the farmers got less money not only for the small fraction of the United States crop which was exported, but also for the whole crop, domestic as well as export, since the break in export prices in Liverpool reacted on the Chicago and other United States markets; the Canadian farmers who supply most of the export market got less for their wheat; and the foreign traders and consumers were able to buy wheat at lower prices.

In short, the savings from that experimental reduction in export rates on grain turned out to be losses for everybody on this side of the Atlantic—farmers and railroads alike. Whatever the savings were, they went to the foreign grain traders or the foreign consumers.

And yet, in the face of experience, it is now proposed to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of United States tax money, and some Canadian tax money besides, to force a permanent repetition of the experience.

That is not the only bad effect of the proposal.

The proposed St. Lawrence plan, while intended to reduce the carrying charges for moving grain out, would at the same time and in the same degree reduce charges for moving grain into the United States.

Even with the present 14-foot channel in the St. Lawrence, the movement of grain into the United States is apparent and is a matter of concern.

Now, if, through the bounty of the American taxpayers in building a 27-foot channel, this low-wage, low-cost foreign grain is enabled to come all the way in

low-wage, low-cost foreign shipping, how much higher would we have to put our tariffs to protect the American grain grower?

Why should the American taxpayers be called upon to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, collected from American farmers among others, to make it easier for foreign grain to be brought into the markets of the United States?

SAVINGS FOR WHOM?

Proponents of the project say that the money should be spent in the name of savings in transportation charges. But who would get the savings?

Certainly not the people of the United States.

All they would get would be the privilege of paying the bill.

Certainly not the farmers of the United States who produce the grain. All they would get would be more foreign competition and less money for their grain.

The truth is, that this St. Lawrence waterway is a nonliquidating, debt-increasing, nonprofit proposition that will hang like a lodestone or an indeterminate mortgage on the farms of the nontributary States and others for years and years to come.

THE FARMERS SHOULD HAVE POWER AND LIGHT AND HEAT

Power and light and heat the farmers should have at a reasonable price. All the advantages which go to make life better and happier and more livable they are entitled to, but this plan does not furnish these things at a price commensurate with the cost. It does just the opposite. It sinks the taxpayers in the mire of more money to pay for nothing for them.

The facts are incontrovertible.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] in an able speech on the floor the other day made the following comprehensive and elucidating statement as to alleged agricultural benefits. He said:

WHAT BENEFIT TO AGRICULTURE?

Proponents of the proposed treaty argue that a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway would be a great advantage to agriculture in the Midwest. Let us compare the grain rates by rail of the farmers in the United States with those of Canada in order to get their grain to points on the Great Lakes where they could use the proposed waterway. The following data will serve to illustrate the lower rail cost of transporting the grain of the Canadian farmer to the Lakes.

Let us consider the rate on wheat only for comparable distances. The Canadian farmer, from Winnipeg, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 424 miles, pays a ton rate of \$2.80, while the American farmer will pay, from Yankton, S. Dak., to Duluth, a distance of 424 miles, a ton rate of \$5.30. The Canadian farmer, from Virden, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 604 miles, will pay a ton rate of \$3.66, while the American farmer will pay, from Helena, Ark., to Chicago, a distance of 607 miles, a ton rate of \$7.30. The Canadian farmer, from Grenfell, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 704 miles, a ton rate of \$3.80, while the American farmer will pay, from Oklahoma City to Chicago, a distance of 775 miles, a ton rate of \$7.80. The Canadian farmer, from Rush Lake, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 912 miles, a ton rate of \$4.40, while the American farmer will pay, from Salina, Kans., to Chicago, a distance of 641 miles, a ton rate of \$6.20. The Canadian farmer, from Maple Creek, Canada, to Port

Arthur, a distance of 1,017 miles, a ton rate of \$4.60, while the American farmer will pay, from Helena, Mont., to Duluth, a total of 1,138 miles, a ton rate of \$8.90, or from Twin Falls, Idaho, to Duluth, a total of 1,630 miles, a ton rate of \$12.20. These rates were collected approximately 5 years ago, but we are advised that they are yet relatively and comparatively and substantially the same.

CANADIAN SUBSIDIES

When we take into account the many governmental aids and subsidies given to the Canadian railroads to aid them in the transportation of Canadian grain, the lower wages paid to Canadian railway labor, and the much lower taxes upon the railroads in Canada than on the railroads in this country, it is clearly impossible for American railways to meet Canadian rail rates on grain.

How can a Nebraska farmer pay twice as much per mile as the Canadian farmer to get his wheat to the lake port and then pay an extra 10 cents per hundred pounds tariff at Liverpool, compete with the Canadian farmer? How can a farmer in Nebraska, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, the Dakotas, Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, Tennessee, Missouri, Oklahoma, or Arkansas, carry all of these handicaps and use the St. Lawrence seaway in competition with the farmers of Canada; especially so, when the land in this country is more expensive and the cost of farm labor is higher? How can they compete?

MISSISSIPPI SYSTEM

The hope of the farmer of the Middle West to reach world markets lies not in a seaway through Canada but in low barge service to the Gulf and out to the sea upon the Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, and the Ohio Rivers and their tributaries. These rivers penetrate the wheat fields of the United States and reach the sea through our own country. This is a navigation system that has been developed through projects upon which we have already spent millions of dollars, and which is, in a large measure, completed. We certainly cannot solve the problem by spending hundreds of millions of dollars to bring cheap foreign-flag ships to the wheat fields of our strongest competitor, for in many instances they will bring in import loads that will compete directly with our American farm products, and they naturally will reload with products such as Canadian wheat, which can be bought at a delivered price with which the American farmer cannot compete.

Mr. Speaker, every farmer in the Middle West producing corn, wheat, oats, rye, or livestock, and every producer of coal, steel, or ore, every railroad, every truck, would be financially hurt by this seaway project. American laborers would be hurt, and we want nothing to do with any project that would make them compete with slave labor or the underprivileged, underpaid laborer of Europe.

POWER—VERMONT NOT A BENEFICIARY

Then, the people, especially those of Vermont, should not be fooled by all the talk about cheap power and light.

The power that is proposed to be generated admittedly will not be available for Vermont farmers. It will be distributed to other areas than Vermont. The map shows that. The statement of the proponents of the project proves it.

More power for upper New York State and Canada at the expense of Vermont farmers and those of other nontributary and nonbeneficiary States—that is the story.

VERMONT IS NOT ON THE POWER OR LIGHT MAP

Vermont is shown to be not on the proposed distribution map for either power or light. Do not take my word for it. Take a look at the map. Read what the most ardent proponents have to say.

They say Vermont is a nontributary State and therefore will not benefit. The map shows it.

It all analyzes down to this, and sugars off in the pan of fact, that Vermont farmers would be paying for a "pig in a poke," or for something that never can or will be delivered to or be of benefit to them.

VERMONT FARMERS ARE LOSERS

The farmers of Vermont and the country will be the losers, measured in dollars and cents and taxes. They will not be beneficiaries.

They will have to pay the bills. They own real estate. It sticks its neck out always. There is the farmer's property always visible when more revenue must be raised. When farmers know and can see what it is all about they are the most reasonable and substantial people in the world. Now is the time when they should open their eyes and should buy no gold brick. They should make it their business not only not to be made suckers, but to obstreperously and orally voice their opposition to any suggestion that somebody can make a Roman holiday at their expense.

The tremendous expense involved in this project will put an invisible, though nonetheless actual, taxable mortgage on them. Real estate always has borne, and always will bear, more than its fair share of taxes for the reason that it is visible and actual. Taxes! taxes! taxes! is the answer to a proposition that by the benefits accorded does not justify even its demonstration.

The benefits are not compensatory; they do not justify or offset the suggested burden to be imposed. To ruin the farmers in order for the Federal Government to subsidize the building of this waterway is impractical nonsense from a national-defense standpoint.

It is worse than a fraud on the American public. It is an economic monstrosity, and has no business to be before Congress or the people at this time of all times.

IS IT ECONOMIC? NO; IT IS AN UNSOUND PROJECT ECONOMICALLY

The report of the joint board of engineers on the St. Lawrence waterway based on a study concerned mainly with the bulk transmission of the St. Lawrence energy available to the United States to either of two load centers, the metropolitan district around New York, and the New England district, in its conclusion finds that—

The project is therefore economically unsound.

You do not believe it? Then look at page 672 of the St. Lawrence Navigation and Power Project, published by the Institute of Economics, the Brookings Institute. See for yourself.

Then again, talking about power, the fact is the records show that there is already adequate potential power in our own rivers and streams—which we, and not the Government, own, if we do not control them—for the development at a reasonable cost, to produce such electrical energy as would be sufficient to supply at a fair figure the demands and the needs of every farm in Vermont and New England.

WASTEFUL EXTRAVAGANCE

The tremendous cost of the St. Lawrence waterway involved in the power development is all out of place. It is a wasteful extravagance, because we do not need more facilities for power development. There are equipped and ready to go unused power plants at Niagara Falls today that can and would furnish such, and all additional electrical power as might be necessary to supply agricultural needs. The fact that these unused plants are idle is the complete and perfect answer to the propaganda involved in the "need for more power" premise. The answer is we do not need the waterway for power purposes, or for national defense involved in the alleged necessity-for-more-power angle, as stated. Aside from all our United States undeveloped power resources, Canada has the undeveloped Gattineau and the equipped, but idle, power plants at Niagara Falls. There is potentially no power shortage in Canada, nor is there actually any shortage now.

NO SHORTAGE THAT CANNOT BE MET

There are no grounds whatsoever on which to base a claim of shortage of power in New York State either, as of now or as of 1942. The present reserve and unused capacity of the existing utility companies of New York State is more than 30 percent above the demand.

There is no power shortage existing here or in Canada in fact, and none that can be contemplated, that could not and cannot be met quickly and at comparatively moderate cost by the erection or installation of steam plants should the occasion arise therefor.

In short, the power-shortage argument is defeated by facts proving "there ain't no such animal."

There are a lot of other things I would like to talk about, but I have talked longer now than I intended to do. However, I do not propose to quit until I say something else that is on my mind concerning the camouflage of necessity for this pet project of the Roosevelt dynasty when it is claimed it will contribute to national defense. That is an erroneous claim, born of a desire to take advantage of a situation and of the people.

MANPOWER SHORTAGE

I am opposed to the project at this time, particularly because there is presently a shortage of manpower, of engineers, of mechanics, and skilled labor. The shortage of equipment, particularly machines and tooling equipment, is pronounced at this moment. There is a shortage of certain materials, and skilled labor will be required to provide synthetic substitutes. You know, as I do, that the raising of money is becoming a serious question, and, with present obligations running into billions, the expenditures of public funds and the consumption of manpower, machines, and material and the use of machinery should at this time be restricted to bona fide national-defense projects.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE NEEDS USED AS A SUBTERFUGE

We should not lose sight of the fact that with the gigantic task of rearming for national defense actually under way

for eventualities that may happen today, tomorrow, next week, or next month, and with a definite indication that if they happen at all they must happen soon, and with the further indication that when they happen it will be in great force, swift and sudden like a bolt of thunder from a clear sky, national-defense projects should be meticulously determined and not confused with projects that could not be completed or in operation for 6 or 7 years—long after national defense and rearmament have ceased to be an emergency. The term "national defense" should not at any time be used as a subterfuge to mislead the public and attain results under the cloak of national defense that are obviously not connected with the present emergency.

Just think of it! The St. Lawrence-Great Lakes navigation and power project contemplates a system of canals, dams, locks, and sluiceways to increase to 27 feet the depth of the St. Lawrence River in Canada and along the border of the United States, deepening the canals and channels connecting the Great Lakes, and installing waterpower plants on the St. Lawrence River which will require not less than 7 years for completion.

Bear in mind also that, aside from the requirements of the democracies, which are intensely urgent and over a wide scope, the United States also urgently requires all types of naval vessels, additional merchant vessels, guns, tanks, planes, munitions, machinery, and machines, as well as raw materials.

Do not overlook the fact that the task of helping the democracies to which this Nation is definitely obligated and the rearming for national defense will absorb all of the men, equipment, material, and money the United States can devote to it.

It is as true as that the sun rises and sets that any effort resulting in the diversion of men, equipment, material, and money from the task of rearming for national defense and for aiding the democracies to a half-baked "brainstorm" such as the St. Lawrence seaway project, would be a serious interference with the task of rearming and assisting the democracies that will undoubtedly result in serious embarrassment, and costly as well as futile sacrifice.

CHEAP TRANSPORTATION TALK A MIASMA

Its proponents say that the St. Lawrence seaway will furnish cheap transportation. For whom? From where? To where? I ask. We may as well ask those questions. We will not get the true answer from the proponents of the seaway. There are now a number of small foreign-flag ships operating on the Great Lakes today via the St. Lawrence River. They are bringing the products of Europe's mines, forests, factories, and agriculture—all produced by cheap labor, which convincingly reminds us that the standard of living of European labor is far below that of American labor.

FOREIGN FLAGS AND FOREIGN LABOR

If the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed with the proposed deeper draft, foreign-flag ocean vessels would, of course, quickly take advantage of this deeper draft and these ships would bring

to America foreign agricultural products to compete with the American farmer and millions of tons of foreign coal to compete with the American miners. Do you want to pay for this? They would bring foreign ore, foreign steel, foreign mill and factory products—all produced by foreign labor at starvation wages—to compete with like American products. American ships will be eliminated from this trade. Is that what you want? They cannot operate in competition with foreign-flag ships which, due to their low scale of wages and other low operating costs, are able to operate under freight rates prohibitive to American operators. That is the picture.

THE VERMONT ANGLE

Mr. Speaker, in common with many others, I labored for a long time under the mistaken notion that the St. Lawrence Waterway might furnish the necessary basis for a valuable connection by way of St. Francis and Lake Champlain that would be of benefit to Vermont. I am now satisfied I was wrong.

I have spent many hours in conferences with those who are both for and against the project. I have studied the arguments and the entire proposition, both old and new. I have consulted officially and unofficially those who are in a position to know the facts with reference to the probability or even possibility of either profit to the people of Vermont generally, or the farmers in particular, or/and to the country at large.

The truth is the burden of expense and cost imposed will be so great and so irreducible as to make any alleged benefits insignificant.

There is no evidence that the project could be made self-sustaining and self-liquidating, and there is every indication that its cost and expense would be a continuing charge against the taxpayers.

MISTAKEN NOTIONS

The people of Vermont should no longer labor under the mistaken notion or misapprehension that the proposed St. Francis-Lake Champlain cut-off that might involve and include Lake Champlain and thereby benefit Vermont municipalities and areas surrounding is even a probability. It is not even a possibility.

The people of the State of Vermont ought also to be advised that the War Department district engineers and the Secretary of War declined to authorize the making of even a superficial survey of the proposed Champlain cut-off to connect with the St. Lawrence waterway, because their preliminary investigations showed that the costs would so greatly exceed any possible benefits to be derived from the project that the expenditure would not and could not be justified. So they did not make the survey.

VERMONT'S CONTRIBUTION NEVER JUSTIFIED

No possible situation can be conceived as ever developing, I am told, that would justify Vermont's contribution to the expense involved. The burden the taxpayers would have to bear would be so tremendously out of proportion as to more than offset for many years to come all the prophesied possible benefits that the proponents suggest might accrue.

Its cost is staggering—a billion to two billion dollars, possibly. The cost will have to be borne proportionately by the farmers and real-estate owners of Vermont and the other noncontributory and nonbeneficiary States that now pay 36 percent of the Federal income. From 64 to 85 percent of the expense incident to the construction of this non-liquidating project will have to be paid proportionately by the farmers of Vermont and others who will derive no benefit whatever therefrom.

It follows, therefore, that Vermonters are not particularly interested in the St. Lawrence waterway because of any alleged benefit to accrue to them from the St. Francis proposed cut-off.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Board opposes the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as indicated by the following major findings of its staff, which made an economic survey:

General conclusion: This economic survey of the St. Lawrence seaway and New York State-Ontario power project¹ conclusively demonstrates the proposed development, considered in its entirety as an undertaking which includes navigation as well as power works, to be unsound. The seaway would be so generally ruinous to American commerce and industry, labor, and capital, that its nationwide deleterious effects would far exceed whatever claimed advantages might redound to certain special interests from the waterway or to New York State and the Province of Ontario from the power plan. The following findings tell why:

The minimum total cost of the whole St. Lawrence project for both the United States and Canada would be \$1,120,588,000. This figure is founded on Government estimates. It is about three times the cost of the Panama Canal.

The St. Lawrence project, on the basis of experience with similar works, probably would cost more than the \$1,120,588,000. A total of \$375,000,000 was spent on the Panama Canal, although it had been estimated to cost only \$160,000,000; the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal cost \$53,000,000 instead of \$16,000,000, and the Suez Canal cost \$80,000,000 instead of \$30,000,000.

At least 85 percent of the United States share of the project's cost would be borne by American taxpayers who would be the victims of unfair discrimination. These taxpayers live in the region which could not be benefited by the St. Lawrence seaway even if claims of proponents were valid.

American labor, transportation, and industry, on the Government's estimates of probable seaway traffic, would lose \$109,647,000 a year. Diversion of business from American transportation systems to foreign carriers, diversion of Canadian export grain movement from the United States and loss to American coal producers account for this figure.

The net loss to the United States would be \$76,595,000 each year on the basis of the Government's estimates of seaway traffic. This sum represents the difference between two factors: One is the loss to established

¹ The project is popularly known simply as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. A more appropriate title, however, is the one used here: The St. Lawrence seaway and the New York State-Ontario power project. The latter is more explanatory because, while the seaway would affect large regions throughout the United States and Canada, the St. Lawrence power development, as planned in the international scheme, would supply hydroelectric energy only to the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

American commerce and industry plus the expense to American taxpayers; the other is the possible rate saving by shipping via the St. Lawrence.

During 42 percent of the year the St. Lawrence seaway could not be fully utilized. The route would be closed because of ice conditions.

The American farmer would not gain from the St. Lawrence seaway. Export grain would be the chief American agricultural product to be shipped through the waterway. Even if a possible maximum saving of 3 cents a bushel were realized, this would be absorbed by the foreign purchaser and vessel owner.

American manufacturers who have cultivated this country's great inland market would be seriously damaged by foreign competition resulting from the St. Lawrence seaway. Alien tramp steamers would dump cheaply produced commodities on this currently protected Great Lakes market.

Foreign tramp ships would have almost exclusive use of the St. Lawrence seaway. American-owned vessels of sufficiently shallow draft to ply the proposed waterway comprise only 5 percent of the world's merchant-ship tonnage.

No route for more profitable trade between American ports would be offered by the St. Lawrence seaway. The location of the St. Lawrence is such that no appreciable coastal or intercoastal commerce would occur.

The St. Lawrence seaway would not carry the volume of traffic nor bring the savings in shipping rates to the exaggerated degree cited by many proponents. They have set the probable tonnage at 11,496,000 and the probable savings at \$45,516,000 annually. The more accurate estimate is 3,873,000 for tonnage and \$8,822,000 for savings.

The net loss each year to American commerce and industry and to the American taxpayer, on the basis of more accurate figures for estimated tonnages and savings, would be \$42,233,000. The United States investment in the St. Lawrence waterway would result in lower earnings and higher taxes.

Maintenance of wholly cordial relations between the United States and Canada might be endangered by the St. Lawrence seaway. Serious questions could arise as to responsibility for defense of the waterway in times of war and as to preservation of water levels in Canadian harbors on the lower St. Lawrence River.

Surrender of United States sovereignty over Lake Michigan would result from any treaty which, like the proposed treaty of 1938, limited the withdrawal of water from the lake at Chicago. It would prevent further development of the Great Lakes-Gulf of Mexico waterway by the United States.

The proposal for restoration of Niagara Falls' beauty and for further power generation there has been inexcusably made contingent on the whole St. Lawrence project: There is no engineering demand for tying up the needed Niagara Falls project with the St. Lawrence development.

The United States would subsidize Canadian power to the extent of \$48,860,000: This figure is reached by taking the minimum cost (\$90,000,000) for the Canadian share of the power, under the least expensive plan yet advanced, and deducting costs strictly chargeable to power (\$41,140,000), under the present plan.

It is perfectly practical to divorce the seaway and power portions of the general St. Lawrence plan: There is no justification for burdening the proposed power development with the unsound seaway proposal.

The amount of power which would be created on the United States side of the river for \$206,065,000 under the present St. Lawrence scheme could be produced for only \$90,000,000 without the navigation project: The St. Lawrence Power Development Commission set \$90,000,000 as a reasonable cost

of power works on the American side of the International Rapids section.

Whatever power benefits might result from the St. Lawrence project would affect only the State of New York and eastern Canada: The St. Lawrence plan does not envision sale of United States power beyond the confines of New York State.

Neither New York City nor western New York is a practical market for St. Lawrence power: Under existing delivery conditions, power from nearer sources is more practical and economical for these areas.

Previous estimates of increased power demand in New York State are too optimistic: The Niagara Frontier Planning Board finds that the demand in 1952 probably will not exceed 21,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Overdevelopment of hydroelectric power is a dangerous policy to pursue. When generating plants are built without an adequate market for the power, the capital charges accumulate to such an extent that the project never pays.

Adequate and economical power potentialities, apart from the St. Lawrence River, exist today in New York State and eastern Canada: Two outstanding examples are the Ottawa River in Canada and Niagara Falls.

Progressive development of Niagara Falls power potentialities independent of the seaway and in step with power needs is the most practical plan: This would eliminate economic hazards to the new developments and to existing plants.

THE VERMONT ATTITUDE

The Senate and House of Representatives of Vermont in legislature assembled adopted the following joint resolution in concurrence:

No. 2929. Joint resolution opposing St. Lawrence waterway project

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that he will propose to the Congress of the United States that it take the necessary action to authorize completion of the St. Lawrence River seaway development as an international project; and

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

Whereas competent authorities have pointed out that the waterway would be ice-bound 5 months of the year; that no provision for tolls is contemplated; that free use of the waterway for foreign shipping would injure New York State and New England economy, ruin our railroads and our seaports on the Atlantic coast; and that the Great Lakes area would be deluged with cheap products of foreign countries to the injury of American industry, labor, and agriculture; and

Whereas during the navigation season the comparatively narrow ship channel of the St. Lawrence would make vessels easy targets of bombers and afford abundant opportunity through sabotage or bombing to destroy the locks and dams in the St. Lawrence, thus gravely interrupting traffic; and

Whereas in view of the existing urgent national-defense production needs it would appear most unwise to divert men, money, materials, and machinery to construct a waterway which would be in disastrous competition with New York State's canal system and New England railroads; and

Whereas the United States should concentrate now upon the construction of airplanes, ships, guns, tanks, and other munitions, and not waste public funds, material resources, and effort on a waterway project against which so many seriously important and valid economic objections have been raised; and

Whereas the President's assertion that the United States "needs this great landlocked sea as a haven in which it will always be to build ships and more ships in order to protect our trade and our shores" has been sharply challenged; and

Whereas it would seem an act of national folly to dissipate labor and resources on a project not vitally necessary and which could not be placed in operation before 1948: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, That the people of the State of Vermont, represented in the General Assembly, therefore affirm their opposition to use of the St. Lawrence River for establishment of a deeper seaway, and hereby record their opposition to the construction of a St. Lawrence River seaway as highly unwarranted in the present national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
President of the Senate.
LEE E. EMERSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved April 9, 1941.

WILLIAM H. WILLIS,
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, the project is economically unsound. From the standpoint of national defense it is indefensible. The methods employed in an undertaking to force the Congress to ratify an agreement made under duress of war reflect no credit on anybody.

THE SPILLWAY FOR TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

And I want to say another thing, Mr. Speaker, and get it out of my system. This St. Lawrence waterway pet project is nothing more or less than a spillway for the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

It is almost impossible for me to believe that a President would go so far to advance the interests of his pet project in times of an emergency such as now confronts us. As an adjunct to national defense, the project is so far separated from the body politic as to have died of its own inanimateness had it not been revived by Presidential inoculation.

President Roosevelt—and nobody in his right mind should envy him his job in this difficult time—has trouble enough. More power to him and more strength to him as he undertakes to remedy a situation which, if not restricted, has potentialities to make national defense impossible. He has problems on his hands which will take all his time and exhaust all his ingenuity and strength without mixing in this issue, which involves one of his pet projects.

The people are fed up with incompetency and with a lot of words. What they want is action. Let the President forget his egocentric monomania. Let him delegate his granted power to men equally if not more competent than he. Let him get it into his head that God never made one man competent to handle alone a situation such as confronts the President.

He has been afraid to delegate power and authority, or, if not afraid, at any rate he has not done so, and that is the clearest demonstration to me that he seems to lack the essential qualities of such an administrator as this country

needs in this emergency. It is time to call a spade a spade.

The present national state of affairs is directly traceable to the failure of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to let go of anything. "L'etat c'est moi" is the Louis XIV curse of this administration. Nobody is to blame but the President. He has assumed and reserved and retained to himself all the power, while he has asked for more all the time, only to demonstrate either his incompetence or indisposition to deal with a situation which he could have avoided but which now confronts us.

I am for unity. I am for the President as Commander in Chief, and so are you. But I know God never made any man big enough to do what Franklin D. Roosevelt attempts to do all alone. I am opposed to his attempts to concentrate all power in himself. I do not believe he has any Messianic ability.

God save the United States of America. The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE YOUNGER, PRETTIER NURSE ISSUE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report to the House a matter which has caused me great humiliation and embarrassment. I do not wish to make a point of personal privilege, because this would involve a controversy with newspaper reporters, fellow Members, and the fair sex, but I deem it my duty to report the facts to the House.

Last week I took the floor to speak in favor of the amendment of my colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BOLTON, providing for the training of student nurses as well as the refresher courses and postgraduate courses for former nurses. Due I hope in some small part to my efforts, this meritorious amendment was adopted by the House. In that speech, I pointed out that statistics showed that we did not have a sufficient number of nurses already trained to take care of the present emergency. To my amazement and horror, this was garbled and distorted as follows in the public press:

Representative VORYS (Republican) of Ohio, today advocated more "younger and prettier nurses" for the national-defense program.

A naval air pilot in the last war, VORYS said that World War nurses were not easy on the eye and insisted that the 1941 soldiers are entitled to a bit of glamor when they are sick.

"Do you want 'em younger?" a colleague shouted.

"Yes," answered VORYS.

The reporters' notes and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I made no such statement. I may have mumbled something about the unavailability for this emergency of nurses who were fair, fat, and 40, but I made no cry for younger, prettier nurses nor for glamorous nurses, nor did I slur the beauty of the nurses we had in the World War. The cry for younger, prettier nurses for this emergency came, not from me, but from colleagues on this floor who shouted out interruptions during my speech, confusing the reporters on the floor and in the press gallery—Members who now, when

under fire, have developed a passion for anonymity.

Nevertheless, this newspaper report which went all over the country has caused me to receive many letters, of which the following is a sample:

Mr.: I bet you look like an old goat yourself. I served in the World War, and I still keep my girlish figure and still serving good old Uncle Sam. What do you look like?

This garbled news story was also the occasion for an editorial in the Ohio State Journal, from which I quote:

From several points of view, Congressman JOHN VORYS is absolutely right in urging that an effort be made to select Army nurses with oodles of oomph and great gobs of glamor. * * * with wisps of hair (blond or brunet, whichever you prefer) straying from beneath the cap, and fluttering a saucy challenge in the breeze.

However, the thermometer reading might not be very reliable.

And there might conceivably be a concerted effort on the part of the entire Army to get hospitalized. Also, there might be a tendency to make convalescence last as long as possible.

There are attractive Army nurses in service, and of course there are some who are just average. This is as it should be. Sweethearts and wives back home don't want too much competition.

These misrepresentations of my remarks have done me a double-barreled injustice. First, I am in wrong with the, not older, but shall we say unyounger nurses and ex-nurses of the land; second, I am in wrong with the sweethearts and wives of our trainees, who do not want their loved ones in camp to enjoy poor health.

I am particularly shocked that I should be falsely quoted as saying that World War nurses were not easy on the eyes. The truth is that my memories are the exact opposite of this statement. The beauty and fame of World War nurses were made immortal in songs of '17 and '18 which you all remember:

I don't want to get well;
I don't want to get well;
I'm in love with a beautiful nurse.

Every World War veteran here will remember the other song:

Good night, nurse; tell the doctor I'm no better.

The World War nurse was further made immortal in a whole stanza from the song Mademoiselle from Armentieres, beginning—

The Army nurse is a wonderful nurse,
Parlez-vous?—

And so on. Now, the truth is that the best nurse I ever had was gray-haired and fiftyish, and we all loved her. The truth is that whatever her individual age, shape, looks, or weight, a real nurse, efficient, tireless, thoughtful, and courageous, enduring privation and danger, long hours without rest, under constant pressure from overworked doctors, under the everlasting wheedling, whining, crabbing, kidding, demanding, pleading, coaxing, complaining of the boys under her care—such a nurse, in her trim white uniform against the drab background of a service hospital filled with ornery he-patients, looks like an angel of mercy, a vision of loveliness to every one of them,

for she is the eternal feminine, the sister-sweetheart-mother of us all, looking after her menfolks when they need her.

So I say to the nurses, God bless 'em, for they are women; God bless 'em.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARE, for 2 days, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 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";

F. 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 SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 774. An act 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

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 THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Friday, June 13, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against

Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. (Postponement of meeting of Thursday, June 12, 1941.)

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.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4873, a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

632. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of proposed language for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1942, to permit the Secretary to make and sell microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books and other library materials in the Department (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

633. A letter from the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting suggestions for legislation clarifying the relationship between the office of the Comptroller General and the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

634. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Licking River at Salyersville, Magoffin County, Ky., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

635. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Cold Spring Inlet, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 29, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 262); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

636. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tiffin River and tributaries, Ohio and Michigan, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

637. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of the Intracoastal Waterway between Charleston, S. C., and the St. Johns River, Fla., with a view to determining whether it is advisable to construct an anchorage basin at Buckingham Landing, Mackay Creek, Beaufort County, S. C., at this time, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted October 24, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

638. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted July 11, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

639. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 1, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Meredosia Bay, Ill., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 1, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

640. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Port Watsonville Harbor, Calif., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 11, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

641. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Crystal River, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 28, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

642. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Dugdemona Bayou, La., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5027. A bill to codify title 3 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5028. A bill to provide for fire escapes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 5029. A bill to encourage the consumption of agricultural commodities, promote the general welfare, facilitate the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5030. A bill to provide for the planting of 45,000 acres of guayule in order to make available a domestic source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H. R. 5031. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Pulajane and Moro campaigns, and other uprisings in the Philippine Islands from July 16, 1903, to December 31, 1913, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 5032. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5033. A bill providing that any person holding any civil, elective, or appointive office shall not forfeit the same by reason of military service in the armed forces of the United States in time of national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGEHEE:

H. R. 5034. A bill to suspend the export tax prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a period of 1 year commencing July 1, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 5035. A bill to amend title 29, section 157 of the Code of Laws of the United States, by the addition thereto of section 157 (A) prohibiting those opposed to the Government of the United States from becoming members of any labor organizations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 5036. A bill providing for the acquisition of additional lands for the Nansemond Ordnance Depot, Nansemond County, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MEYER of Maryland:

H. R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis L. Jacobs and Dr. Louis Sachs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGEHEE:

H. R. 5038. A bill for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former special disbursing agent, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Albert Spillman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 5040. A bill for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1366. By Mr. CARTER: Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, memorializing the Congress to take such steps as are necessary to provide that the brush, debris, and other materials in the area to be covered by water from Shasta Dam be removed prior to the time the area is flooded; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1367. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 47, memorializing the Congress to aid in furthering the development of Highway 20; to the Committee on Roads.

1368. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., approving a national-defense program for the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1369. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, favoring the preservation of the cane-sugar refinery industry in the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1370. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of Olga Cochran and other residents of Mount Vernon, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2475, to protect the health and morale of men called for service under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1371. Also, petition of Rev. H. C. Mayhew and other residents of Mount Vernon, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2475, to

protect the health and morale of men called for service under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1372. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, opposing proposed legislation curtailing the cane-sugar refining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1373. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by G. M. MacLafferty and 50 other citizens of Coos County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1374. Also, petition signed by Walter Haffner and 76 other citizens of Columbia County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1375. Also, petition signed by Theresia Robinson and 24 other citizens of Columbia County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1376. Also, petition signed by J. P. Simpson and 40 other citizens of Polk County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1377. Also, petition signed by Peter J. Rennings and 40 other citizens, of Marion County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1378. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of Mrs. Lafern Trainer, of Volborg, Mont., and 17 others, of Custer County, Mont., opposing enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, particularly because those measures would enable a majority of the barbers of the District of Columbia to effect a compulsory observance of a religious day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1379. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the State of California, asking consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relative to the proposed Loma Prieta State Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1380. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, opposing proposed legislation curtailing our cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1381. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of M. E. DeMoss and 55 other citizens, of northern Iowa, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

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

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

O Thou who art our Refuge and our Strength: We thank Thee for the gifts of life, of love, and beauty, betokening the perpetual springtime with which Thou visitest the human soul. And as we lift our eyes and hands to greet Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, bestow on us with balm of light and heavenly dew the grace that comes from Thine own self, with healing in its wings, that we may be drawn from joy to each new opening joy into the realm of full forgetfulness of pain.

So let Thy love for us prevail that even when our vision fails and darkness falls we may find the darkness to be but Thine own enfolding garment. And when our day of life is o'er may the wings of night be unto us as the wings of God, under whose shadow we shall find eternal rest and peace, 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 Wednesday, June 11, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of Harlan F. Stone, of New York, to be Chief Justice of the United States in place of Charles Evans Hughes, retired as of July 1, 1941; of James Francis Byrnes, of South Carolina, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in place of James Clark McReynolds, retired; and of Robert H. Jackson, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in place of Harlan F. Stone, nominated to be Chief Justice of the United States; and also submitting several other nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3782) establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 587. An act to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937; and H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | |
|----------|--------------|----------|
| Adams | Burton | Ellender |
| Aiken | Butler | George |
| Andrews | Byrd | Gerry |
| Bailey | Byrnes | Gillette |
| Ball | Capper | Glass |
| Bankhead | Caraway | Green |
| Bone | Chandler | Guffey |
| Brewster | Chavez | Gurney |
| Bridges | Clark, Idaho | Hayden |
| Brooks | Clark, Mo. | Herring |
| Brown | Connally | Hill |
| Bulow | Danaher | Holman |
| Bunker | Downey | Houston |