

Mr. TABER. It is a partisan appeal.

Mr. PATRICK. I am glad the gentleman is joining with me on my potato business, and I am going to invite him to come along with me the next time.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Does not the gentleman feel, in fairness to the House and for the purpose of clarification of his own defense, he should not confuse the air arm of the Navy and the air arm of the Army? In other words, the gentleman from Alabama originally started with the premise of complaint with reference to the reduction of two battleships to one and the allegation that the cut was made because of an air-defense desire, and the Navy and going over to an Army bill.

Mr. PATRICK. That is right.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman should stay with the branch of defense that he originally started to deal with.

Mr. PATRICK. If the gentleman will wait, that will be amply covered, I think.

Mr. DITTER. That may be of value at one place, but it will not have any value in another under our present confusion.

Mr. PATRICK. I will attempt in my 30 minutes to cover the whole thing and the gentleman's point is well taken. But defense is defense. There is much more to be said on it.

The trouble with the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, is that his hindsight is much better than his foresight. He wishes to holler so loud the people of America will be attracted by the noise of today and will not look upon the tracks of yesterday, and I am thankful that it was the Democrats who saw yesterday what the Republican leader sees and is shouting about today.

Remember this came in here as a challenge from the Republicans and as a challenge by Mr. MARTIN, who declared that his love for aviation inspired his and his brethren's vote against the naval appropriations for two additional battleships in 1938, nearly a year before. That is not my doing, understand. So help me, he asked for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want first to ask the gentleman this question. Is it not a fact that at the time these appropriations were made we provided for more airplanes than could be built in that calendar year?

Mr. PATRICK. I guess so. I guess that is true, but that did not mean we should not plan to expand so as to provide proper defense.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I knew the gentleman would be honest and fair in his statement that that is the fact. We provided for more airplanes than you could possibly build that year and, as everybody knew, it would have been very foolish to have gone beyond a certain length of time because airplanes become obsolete so fast that it would be exhibiting very poor judgment.

Mr. PATRICK. I think the gentleman is trying to win on a technicality, trying to steer away from facts.

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

Mr. PATRICK. Not now.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman has quoted me and I think the gentleman should yield.

Mr. PATRICK. I will yield to the gentleman before this is over. I just do not want too much breaking in right here.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman just made a reference to me—

Mr. PATRICK. I told the gentleman I would yield to him in due time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, July 23, 1941, to consider private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

777. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for coast-guard purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3537. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5312. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5386. A bill to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War

to take final action on reports of surveys and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution declaring the existence of a national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 276. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5312; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5387. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. Paul; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FIVERS:

H. R. 5388. A bill for the relief of T. Brooks Alford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5389 (by request): A bill for the relief of Lillian Woodward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5390. A bill for the relief of G. T. Elliott, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 5391. A bill for the relief of Dupont Canning Co.; 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:

1672. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, opposing the proposal to incorporate in the income-tax bill now being drafted the prohibition of separate income-tax returns by husband and wife; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1673. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, opposing proposal to amend the present income-tax law so as to require the filing of joint returns by married persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1674. Also, petition of the community councils requesting the adoption of the Tolson bill (H. R. 1052) permitting employees of the United States who are injured during the performance of duty to receive compensation if they are treated by chiropractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles Owen Rice, director, St. Joseph House of Hospitality, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we ask a blessing upon the Members of this assembly, upon the Chief Executive of the United States. Enlighten and strengthen them so that individually and collectively they may best serve the interests of our beloved country. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 1702. An act for the relief of Mary McCutcheon;
- H. R. 1746. An act for the relief of Charles J. Schay;
- H. R. 2382. An act for the relief of William Cromer;
- H. R. 2855. An act to provide for payment of pension to certain dependent parents notwithstanding remarriage, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 2888. An act for the relief of H. E. Buzby;
- H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Mrs. O. B. Olson;
- H. R. 3367. An act relating to compensation of former employees of the Railway Mail Service in certain positions and reinstated prior to August 14, 1937;
- H. R. 3523. An act for the relief of the Equitable Insurance Alliance, the Fidelity and Guaranty Fire Corporation, and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co.;
- H. R. 3551. An act for the relief of Lillian Korkemas and Rose Grazioli;
- H. R. 3607. An act for the relief of Anton Waytashek;
- H. R. 3801. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Batchelor;
- H. R. 3933. An act to grant the city of Vancouver, Wash., road rights-of-way and a retrocession of jurisdiction thereover;
- H. R. 3943. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Johns;
- H. R. 4210. An act to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers; and
- H. R. 5256. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy, additional shipbuilding, ship repair, and ordnance manufacturing facilities, and for other purposes.

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

- S. 122. An act to amend section 226 of the act of March 4, 1909;
- S. 261. An act relating to the compensation of William J. Muse for services rendered as a clerk in the post office at Mountain City, Tenn.;
- S. 415. An act to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes;
- S. 493. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Frank P. Walden in his individual capacity and as husband and legal representative of the estate of Anice Walden, deceased, and Viola Harp in her individual capacity and as legal guardian of her daughter, Marjorie Gayle Harp, a minor;
- S. 899. An act for the relief of Ernest A. McNabb;
- S. 1055. An act for the relief of Julius Yubasz and Arvid Olson;
- S. 1228. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. B. Tanner;
- S. 1229. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended;
- S. 1266. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman;
- S. 1429. An act for the relief of William Corder;

- S. 1476. An act providing for Federal assistance in eradicating the cattle tick in the Seminole Indian Reservation in Florida;
- S. 1550. An act for the relief of Carl Chalker;
- S. 1570. An act to further amend the acts for promoting the circulation of reading matter among the blind;
- S. 1642. An act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to persons employed at military, air, and naval bases acquired by the United States from foreign countries, and for other purposes;
- S. 1725. An act to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands to the city of Cut Bank, Mont.;
- S. 1731. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; and
- S. 1736. An act to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the British Government, for and on behalf of John Bailey, former stoker of His Majesty's ship *Orion*, in full and final settlement of a claim arising as a consequence of injuries inflicted by John Ittner, United States Navy, at Seattle, Wash., on July 16, 1939.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 1359. An act for the relief of Robert Edward Lee;
- H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others;
- H. R. 1855. An act for the relief of Laura McStay;
- H. R. 2985. An act to prescribe the time basis for computing pay for overtime work performed by laborers in the Railway Mail Service;
- H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.;
- H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer;
- H. R. 3802. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schwan; and
- H. R. 4671. An act to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

- S. 849. An act for the relief of Eben Vaughn Cleaves.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1548) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPENCER, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1580) entitled "An act to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, and Mr. WILLIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1261) entitled "An act to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen cattle in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McFARLAND, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report upon the bill H. R. 3537, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

PROPOSED BRIDGE BETWEEN HUNTERS POINT AND BAY FARM ISLAND, SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 158, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the city of San Francisco, its bay and the territory adjacent thereto, are of the highest strategic importance to any adequate defense of the entire Pacific coast; and

Whereas in recognition of this importance there have been located in or near the city of San Francisco the Presidio Military Reservation, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Mason, the Army transport docks, the United States Risdon naval plant, United States naval dry-docks at Hunters Point, Mare Island Navy Yard, Oakland naval air base, Oakland naval supply base, the United States Army Moffett Air Field, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, and the United States bombardment base; and

Whereas the lessons of modern warfare have demonstrated the necessity of adequate highways between national-defense activities; and

Whereas the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge constitutes the only direct approach by highway to San Francisco from the Oakland-Alameda side of the bay; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is requested to appoint a board consisting of not less than five officers to investigate and report upon the need and feasibility, from the standpoint of the national defense, of constructing a bridge between Hunters Point and Bay Farm Island, such report to include recommendations as to the type, characteristics, and dimensions of such a bridge and highway, the estimated cost, and any other features deemed pertinent, and to be forwarded to the Congress as soon as practicable by the Secretary of the Navy, who is further requested to transmit therewith his recommendations in the premises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand this provides for a simple investigation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, it is a request that the Army and the Navy make a survey and report as to the need for constructing a bridge from Hunters Point, San Francisco, to Farm Bay Island on the easterly side of San Francisco Bay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman that the Navy Department has no objection to making this inquiry. It is highly important from a national-defense standpoint that this be done as early as possible. The survey

should be made as to the feasibility of constructing a bridge at this point. This was brought to our attention by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], and the Naval Affairs Committee has unanimously recommended favorable consideration of this resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "is" and insert the word "are."

Page 2, line 2, after the article "(a)", insert the word "joint."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "five officers" and insert "three Army officers to be appointed by the Secretary of War and three naval officers to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "the" where it appears the second time, insert "Secretary of War and the."

Page 2, line 13, strike out the word "is" and insert the word "are."

Page 2, line 14, strike out the word "his" and insert "their."

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the resolution. I desire at this time to express my appreciation and to thank the distinguished chairman and the able Committee on Naval Affairs for favorably considering this resolution. The approval and support given the proposed low-level bridge at Hunters Point by Chairman VINSON is in keeping with his splendid foresight and vision, which has brought the Navy and naval establishments to their present high state of efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the city of San Francisco, its bay, and territory adjacent thereto are of the highest strategic importance to any adequate defense of the entire Pacific coast. Within this area—the spearhead of the Pacific coast national defense—are many of the principal military establishments of the Pacific coast, including the Presidio Military Reservation, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Mason, the Army transport docks, the United States Risdon naval plant, United States naval drydocks at Hunters Point, Mare Island Navy Yard, Oakland Naval Air Base, Oakland Naval Supply Base, the United States Navy Moffett Air Field, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, and the Hamilton Field United States Air Bombardment Base.

The lessons of modern war have demonstrated the absolute necessity of adequate highways between national-defense activities. The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which is 8 miles long and 200 feet high, constitutes the only direct approach by highway to San Francisco from the Oakland-Alameda or the continental side of the bay.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old and true saying that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link. The weakest link in

the chain of national-defense activities in this area is the positive lack of adequate highways between these national-defense establishments. A low-level bridge, which in fact is a highway between Hunters Point and the east bay shore, will provide this all-important link.

San Francisco Bay, which is 70 miles long and 9 miles wide, is not only the geographical center of the Pacific coast but it is the most important and finest harbor for naval and military purposes on the entire western seaboard. This important fact has been referred to on many occasions by the highest-ranking officials of both the Army and the Navy. Admiral Charles F. Hughes, while Chief of Naval Operations, testified before a committee of Congress that—

San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor of the cities that are on its shores. From its natural advantages and its location San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any extensive campaign in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, San Francisco is the outlet for that vast empire embracing the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, each of which is traversed its length by different large, navigable rivers emptying into San Francisco Bay, and the Livermore, Napa, Sonoma, and Santa Clara Valleys, all rich and profitable land. The immeasurable importance of this empire to national defense is only limited by the adequacy of transportation facilities available.

I trust the resolution will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds may sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRATEGIC HIGHWAYS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 1580, to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. MOTT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in two particulars, and include brief newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENTRANCE OF UNITED STATES INTO EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Holland Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ABSENTEE VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which states that it is the sense of the Congress that all States provide a simplified method of voting by mail for all members of the armed forces of the United States; that the President of the United States, by proclamation, advise the members of our armed forces of their privilege to vote by mail; and that the military and naval authorities of the United States, by every means possible, encourage the members of the armed forces to exercise their rights as citizens by voting.

The object of this resolution is to stimulate and promote interest in the voting privilege accorded to members of our armed forces as American citizens; it will further tend to safeguard their right to exercise a voice in the Government. They particularly need a voice at this time when the President wants to break the agreement and contract made with the draftees and keep them in the service more than their period of 1 year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter printed in the New York Times this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF ATTACKS AND MURDERS BY THE F. B. I.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a bill which I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask the membership of the House to join with me in securing legis-

lation to stop these fiendish attacks and murders all over the country, which are on the increase. My bill provides that whenever there is reason to believe that a felony has been committed resulting in the death, or disappearance, or serious injury to a person, the Federal Bureau of Investigation may assist and cooperate with the local authorities in the investigation of the offense. We know what has happened in Washington within the past 2 months. There have been numerous unexplained murders in the District of Columbia. The murderers have not been found. In my own district a fine young girl was snatched in broad daylight within a few doors of her own house, brutally attacked, and murdered. This young girl enjoyed the highest reputation and was an honor student at the Reading High School. Her parents begged and I did everything in my power to have the F. B. I. come into the investigation. Under the law today the F. B. I. cannot investigate unless kidnaping is suspected. My bill provides that if there is suspicion of a felony the Federal Bureau of Investigation can investigate at once. These abhorrent crimes must be stopped if this country is to be decent and strong.

The following Government figures show the alarming increase in murder and rape cases:

First 3 months of 1940: 736 murders. First 3 months of 1941: 803 murders. (Increase, 15.4 percent.)

First 3 months of 1940: 1,306 rape. First 3 months of 1941: 1,357 rape. (Increase, 5.8 percent.)

Comparing the calendar year 1940 with 1939, there has been an increase of 2½ percent in rape cases and an increase of 3 percent in murder.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech by Assistant District Attorney Anthony B. Dreier.

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

ARMY CAMP AT INDIANTOWN GAP, PA.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure yesterday to be accompanied by 9 or 10 of my colleagues in visiting Indiantown Gap, Pa., where the Twenty-eighth Division of our armed forces is located. It was, indeed, an inspiration to see what has been accomplished in 8 months. There we have a city of about 20,000 inhabitants, with better sanitation, better health facilities, and better health record than any other city of 20,000 or 25,000 in the United States, unless it would be another armed camp.

Now, with reference to the food. One gentleman on this floor some months ago said something about the Army boys not being properly fed. I just want to give you the menu:

WEDNESDAY

Breakfast: Fresh peaches, assorted cereal, fresh milk, fried eggs, fried potatoes, bread and butter, coffee.

Dinner: Veal stew, creamed peas, corn on cob, sliced cucumber salad, bread and butter, cherry pie, coffee.

Supper: Spareribs, fried cabbage, boiled potatoes, corn bread, bread and butter, baked apples, coffee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 965, the fourth-class postmasters' salary bill.

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the McKeesport Daily.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the addresses delivered yesterday, July 22, during the ceremonies dedicating the new wing of the Norwegian Legation in the city of Washington.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative work of the day has been done and after the business on the Speaker's desk has been attended to and after all previous special orders that may have been entered, I be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I hope I will not be compelled to object, because I want to hear the gentleman's speech; I have tried twice to do so—but on tomorrow we have a fairly full legislative program, and I have called a Republican conference for Thursday. I do not like to object, particularly in view of what has happened in the past. I hope that the gentleman from Alabama or any other Members who desire to speak would secure time on other days than tomorrow.

Mr. PATRICK. I am just getting afraid that you gentlemen cannot stand the needle.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Oh, we are ready to stand any kind of a needle.

Mr. PATRICK. The tax bill will be up next week. If you gentlemen are trying to filibuster a poor lone Congressman out of one 30-minute speech—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Oh, no. I am not trying to filibuster anybody.

Mr. PATRICK. I am not giving you any medicine that you gentlemen have not brought on yourselves. I would like to have the 30 minutes for tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, I am going to object to it. I do not want to do it.

Mr. PATRICK. Will we be in session on Friday?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes. Mr. PATRICK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for that time on Friday instead of tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: One to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio speech of my own; and, second, to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from a book by Mr. George B. Galloway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a declaration of sentiments and resolutions adopted by the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to file minority views on the bill (H. R. 146) to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, following the address of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] may be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by A. B. Lee, which appeared in the Coronet magazine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include two short articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, immediately after the 30 minutes employed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], I may be permitted to address the House for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] may on Friday next, after the second address by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

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

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FLANNERY (when the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I call up the bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees.

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 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. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, with Mr. BEAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, for a long time longevity pay for postal employees has been a matter of consideration by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. Under the system that prevails at the present time, and according to the provisions of existing law, clerk employees in the second- and third-class offices receive graduated increases for the first 5 years of service until they reach a maximum of \$2,100. At this figure compensation is frozen, although

they may go on serving 10, 15, 20, 25, or any number of years. There is no provision in the law for increased compensation to reward them for their long service, for their additional experience, for their loyalty, or for any sacrifice they have made in the interest of the Service.

In other branches of the Government, notably in the Army and the Navy, and I believe the Coast Guard, provision is made for increases on account of longevity of service. In most private industry, or in a great many of the outstanding private industries of the Nation, the principle of longevity pay is recognized, and men are given a reward for long, faithful, and loyal service. It is generally recognized that the Post Office Department of the United States is not only one of the most efficient in the Government but one of the most efficient in the world. It is a recognized fact that this efficiency is due to the loyalty and faithful service of these men. It is only fair if we are to maintain the morale and the esprit de corps of the Service that these men have some objective to strive for, some incentive to remain, some reward when they have remained, some recognition of the sacrifice and the service they have given; and it is to right a long-standing wrong that this bill has been introduced.

In brief, the bill provides that at the end of 10 years—recognizing, in the first instance, of course, since their fifth year of service they shall not be eligible for an increase—this provides that at the end of 10 years they shall receive an increase of \$100 and an additional \$100 upon the completion of an additional 5-year period of service thereafter, or in their fifteenth year. This seems to your committee to be only fair, just, and reasonable; certainly not excessive or exorbitant, particularly in this day of rising costs of living, rising wages, and the conditions which prevail in private industry generally, and which offer a great temptation to those in the Government service who can have no hope of improving their economic condition if they remain.

It is felt, however, that this is not a compensation or reward for increased duties, nor is it designed to meet rising costs of living. It is compensation for longevity of service, for faithful and loyal service, over the years, and for no other purposes. It is to reward these men, to maintain their morale, to give them an incentive, and to assist in the general efficiency of the Postal Service.

Mr. Chairman, as the bill was originally introduced, it provided for an increase of \$100 for 5-year periods after 10 years and up to 30 years. The Department felt, however, that the cost was too high, so that we have cut it down to only two steps. The cost has been brought down proportionately to between sixteen and twenty million dollars, approximately. I feel assured in asking for this in view of the fact that the Post Office Department boasted of a surplus last year of \$18,000,000 and expects a surplus for the ensuing year far in excess of that figure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the House that the report comes here as the result

of the unanimous action of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and I trust that the House will see fit to approve the action of the committee, recognize the principle of longevity, and pass this legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask one or two questions to make this a little clearer to me. Suppose an employee has been in the Service now, as of July 1, 1942, let us say 10 years, and he remains in the service during the following year. He gets \$100 a year additional pay; is that correct?

Mr. FLANNERY. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose he remains in service for an additional 5 years and to the point where he has served 15 years. In the sixteenth year, then, he draws how much in addition?

Mr. FLANNERY. An additional \$100.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That will be \$200 additional then?

Mr. FLANNERY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the sixteenth year?

Mr. FLANNERY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that continues for the seventeenth and the eighteenth years?

Mr. FLANNERY. Throughout the length of his service at that rate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Throughout the length of his service. Now, the gentleman made a remark about a \$2,100 limitation. What did he mean by that?

Mr. FLANNERY. They start out as I recall, with \$1,700. They get a hundred dollars for the first year and a hundred dollars for the second year.

Mr. BURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURCH. The clerk hire in the second- and third-class offices begins at \$1,700 and they are given an increase each year for satisfactory service up to \$2,100.

Mr. CRAWFORD. After they reach \$2,100, does this benefit not apply?

Mr. BURCH. No, indeed. It applies to anyone who has been in the Postal Service 10 years. They are then entitled to a hundred dollars annual increase in their salary. Then when they have been in the Service 15 years they are entitled to another hundred dollars and that is as far as it goes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to announce that anyone opposed to the bill is entitled to time. Is any member of the committee opposed to the bill? Does any member of the minority party desire time?

Mr. HARTLEY. I desire time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARTLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot qualify. Is any other member of the minority opposed to the bill?

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] such time as he may desire within reasonable limits.

Mr. HARTLEY. And in turn I yield to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] 5 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before the House with the unanimous approval of the Post Office Committee of the House after long hearings. May I state that it is a nonpartisan measure in view of the fact that it was introduced by a member of the majority, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], and the same bill was introduced by me.

The question the House has to determine is whether a person should be expected to work long and faithfully after reaching the maximum allowed under the present law. Post-office employees now work for 25, 30, or 40 years at the same pay and without any recognition for long and efficient service. The maximum now is \$2,100 after 5 years. This bill provides that after another 5 years of efficient, satisfactory service a bonus for long, efficient service will be offered of \$100 a year. Then again after another 5-year period, or at the end of 15 years' service, another bonus of \$100 per year will be given. This longevity-pay principle is not a new idea. It has been established in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Geodetic Survey, the Public Health Service, and in several branches of the Customs Service of the United States, so that it is not a new idea at all. It has been in operation not only in private industry but in the Government and has worked very successfully.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to give a few reasons why this bonus is not only necessary but desirable. In 1913 there were 301,000 postal employees in the Post Office Department and at that time the revenue was \$266,000,000. In 1940 there were 268,360 post-office employees, a reduction of approximately 40,000, while the post-office revenue increased to \$766,948,000, an increase of 300 percent in the revenue of the Post Office Department in that time while there was actually a decrease in the number of employees that were operating the Post Office Department.

Do you not think that the extra work that has been placed upon these employees and the added efficiency of the Department, together with the increased responsibilities that have been added to the Post Office Department warrant some recognition?

The pay schedule was adopted in 1925 and has not been changed since. The Federal Government today is urging, and, in fact, practically compelling private industry to increase wages because of the increased cost of living. It seems to me, then, that when we ask Uncle Sam to set a good example in this matter by granting these bonuses for long and efficient work in the Post Office Department we are just asking what is reasonable and right.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. I have been a strong advocate of this bill ever since I have been in Congress and am happy to see it come to the floor for consideration, but

I did not like the idea of cutting it back to where it has been cut. It may be a long time before we can get another increase. Can the gentleman explain to us just why the changes were made in the bill? It seems to me that the increase you were proposing to give these employees was no more than sufficient to cope with the increasing cost of living. Now you have reduced it.

Mr. MASON. We agree to that. I did not like it myself, but the committee in order to be unanimous agreed on a compromise which practically cut the cost in half. We understand from the representatives of the post-office employees that they are willing to accept a half loaf if they cannot get the full loaf.

Mr. WILSON. I do not believe you can claim credit that you are rewarding them for effort. You are not. You are merely offering them something that you hope will appease them for the time being. You are not rewarding them for their long and faithful service.

Mr. MASON. Perhaps that is true, but we are establishing the principle of longevity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a brief question?

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

Mr. BEITER. Suppose an employee remains in the Service for a period of 10 years and then for some unknown reason leaves the Service, and after a period rejoins it; what will his salary be? Will this affect his salary?

Mr. FLANNERY. He would not be eligible for this longevity pay by reason of the fact that the service is not continuous.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I pursue my question of a moment ago a little further? Do I correctly understand, then, that the maximum pay will be \$2,300 per year?

Mr. FLANNERY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Instead of \$2,100.

Mr. BURCH. That is the \$2,100 salary classification.

Mr. FLANNERY. In that classification, of course.

Mr. Chairman, in the absence of opposition, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD: MESSRS. EATON, SAUTHOFF, BENDER, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, WILSON, BENNETT, HARTLEY, MCGREGOR, ANGELL, WICKERSHAM, YOUNGDAHL, MURDOCK, HAINES, PLOESER, and ROLPH.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this bill. It is a long-delayed step toward fair and just treatment of a loyal and efficient group of public servants whose financial reward has never been commensurate with the service they have rendered.

No class of our great army of public servants come into such intimate rela-

tions with all our people in their homes, their business, and their individual experiences. I know many post-office employees of all grades. I have attended their conventions and discussed with them their problems. They have earned this small recognition and reward for long and faithful service. They have, in my judgment, earned much more than this bill provides. But under present conditions here and throughout the world this is perhaps the best that can be done for them.

I shall vote for this legislation, strong in the conviction that I am meeting the demands of justice and fair play.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a case of belated justice—even that is an overstatement, because it is not complete justice; it is merely partial justice; and it does nothing in regard to the injustice which has operated against these carriers since 1925.

As the committee report states:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to give the postal employees designated therein a reward for longevity of service, as is now the practice in many other departments of the Government and which is done to a large extent in private industry. Under the prevailing system the compensation of these employees is frozen after 5 years, and although they may continue in the Service with the highest degree of efficiency and loyalty to the Department and their Government for 10, 20, or 30 years, yet under the law there can be no increase or reward for the service beyond the maximum attained after the fifth year.

Reflect on that amazing fact. Under the law as it now stands a post-office employee reaches his limit in salary in 5 years, and from then on he cannot get a dime of increase in pay, no matter how good he is. Pay increases with the increase of years in service have prevailed in other departments of the Government, but not in the case of the post-office employee. This principle has prevailed in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Geodetic Survey, the Public Health Service, and some branches of the Customs Service for a long time. Why has the postal employee been discriminated against? Mainly because he was not organized, and also because the Postal Department has not made a fight for him. But since the earlier days the postal employees have formed two unions, one of which has become affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. They learned that in union there is strength, and as a result of their organizations they now are in a position to state their case and ask for redress.

The postal employees are not asking anything unreasonable or for something to which they are not entitled. All this bill does for the employees who have served the Department faithfully for 10 years is an increase of \$1.90 per week, and every 5 years thereafter an additional increase of \$1.90 per week. That is all. Nothing for the many years of faithful and unremitting toil when they received nothing. If we treated these men fairly and paid them adjusted compensation for the years when they received no increases, this bill would call for many times the amounts set out in H. R. 1057. In fact, in my humble judgment, the amounts herein specified will

not even take care of increased taxes and increased cost of living, for it must be remembered that the carrier must pay for his uniform from head to foot. Nothing is furnished him except his heavy leather mail bag. We can readily understand the wear of such a bag, loaded with books, magazines, newspapers, and letters. Think of the weeks of the holiday season, when these sacks are piled so high that he cannot see over the top. The morning trip averages from 80 to 100 pounds, but under the regulations the carrier does not take more than 50 pounds at one time. You can understand what the rubbing of such a load can and does do to the carrier's coat; a coat that he must buy and pay for, and no matter how carefully and neatly his good wife mends it, no cloth can stand that strenuous service. With the increased cost of cloth and increased cost of everything else, I am satisfied that these men will merely meet the mounting prices with this slight addition, and will in reality have no additional pay.

My time is so limited that I cannot adequately present the case under consideration, but may I point out that in 1913 there were 301,000 post-office employees and the post-office revenue was \$266,000,000. In 1940 there were 268,360 post-office employees, and the post-office revenue was \$766,948,000. In the 27 years from 1913 to 1940 the post-office revenue increased \$500,948,000, but there were 32,000 less employees.

But that is not all. More and more tasks have been turned over to the postal employee in the last few years, the handling of veterans' adjusted-service bonds, social-security registration, unemployment census, registration of aliens, baby bonds, and now defense stamps and defense bonds. In the Government service the courteous, faithful postal employee has been the forgotten man. I am indebted for the above facts to Jerome J. Strauber, public relations counsel, and the splendid leaflet entitled "Postal Telegraph."

I shall vote for this bill, but I regret that the committee saw fit to amend the original bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY]. I share in the disappointment of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks because the committee did not go up all the way to 30 years and also make the bill effective as of the date of passage. Why should this bill be delayed in its effect until July 1, 1942? Have not the delays since 1925 constituted a sufficient waiting period? Why then continue the wrong against these men for another year? Oh, we are told, think of the cost. Yes; I have in mind what it will cost, but I also have in mind that the newspapers of the Nation receive a postage bonus of more than \$86,000,000, and it is now proposed to send books by mail at one-half cent per pound. In other words, the Department and the Congress is ready and willing to subsidize two great industries at the expense of the postal employees. John J. Barrett, president of the U. N. A. P. O. C., pointed out these matters in his News Service of July 3, and I shall support his efforts on the floor of the House.

Consider the postal employee, my friends. Neat in personal appearance, courteous in conduct, temperate in his habits, a faithful servant to the public, a worthy citizen in his community, conscientious in his duties, loyal to his country, he may well challenge comparison with the merits of any other group of citizens in the country.

Let us then unite on this bill, not as a favor but as a matter of justice long past due.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this measure merits the support of every Member of Congress because of its economical importance to the many thousands of postal employees throughout the land. It will in a measure reward these faithful veteran employees who have been neglected for so many years.

The postal employees have had no wage increase since 1925. They are now faced with increased costs of living.

A recent editorial in the Cleveland News came to my attention. I will read this editorial as it expresses far better than any Member of the House could express, the case for the passage of this bill. The editorial follows:

Since April, legislation has been before the Post Office Committee of the House at Washington to increase the wages of postal employees; every member of the committee has indicated informal approval; 121 Members of Congress have testified, at hearings, their support of the bill; yet nothing has been done to bring the bill to enactment.

The bill would give every employee of the Postal Service 5 cents an hour more than the present \$1,700-\$2,100 salary for "regulars" if he has served 10 years and therefore can be said to be an experienced man; and 5 cents an hour additional for each additional 5 years' experience, up to a 25-cent raise for men of 30 years' experience.

Inasmuch as the postal employees have not had a raise since 1925, although former Postmaster General Farley says their efficiency and speed have increased 200 percent in the last 20 years, this bill will not seem very much of a raise to those who know the splendid discipline and spirit of the postal organization. The United States mail does "go through" as nowhere else in the universe.

The only open opposition has been from Postmaster General Walker, who calls the Nation-wide cost of the increases, which he estimated at \$35,000,000, to be excessive. Probably this is the first time in the history of the New Deal that any Cabinet member has declared a \$35,000,000 expenditure excessive, or even bothered to comment on it. The sum is a drop in the bucket of billions being spent for nondefense operations in sociology and reform, to say nothing of the defense spending.

Senators BURTON and TAFT and all five Cleveland Congressmen have endorsed the bill. We suggest they inquire into the cause of the committee's inactivity and seek to get the bill enacted. The Postal Service deserves it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to appear at this time to say a few words in favor of, and to assure the Committee of my support of, H. R. 1057, otherwise known as the longevity bill. I am sure that any lengthy statement of mine would simply add duplication or would probably tell the Committee what it has been hearing from the mouths of numerous other Members of the Congress during the last 2 days.

For that reason I am not going to indulge in any lengthy statement in favor of this proposed measure.

I do, however, feel that I would be remiss in my duty to several worthy constituents if I were not to place before the Committee for consideration a story which is of particular interest and has been to me because I heard it 2 years ago before the longevity bill came into very much prominence, and certainly before it became discussed to any great extent by any group or groups other than the postal employees.

I happened to talk with a good friend of mine back home, he being a man who had worked many years in the post office. He has been on the job many years doing a conscientious duty; he has been very much interested in his work. He started at about \$1,200 a year, as I remember, and he has worked in the post office for a dozen years, yet he told me that he was struggling along on that same salary and had been for a long time supporting a wife and three children. He said that he felt it would be absolutely necessary that some kind of measure or step be taken by the Congress to assure him and countless other postal employees who had been doing a decent, honest, and intelligent job over a long period of time, some kind of graduated scale of wage or salary for the future.

I feel the same as did that man who spoke to me some time ago. He was a postal employee of average ability, but nevertheless he was an honest, hard-working citizen. He was a good man. He had staked his life with the Post Office Department, like thousands upon thousands of other good citizens. He had distinguished himself as a servant of this great Government, and I for one, as a Member of Congress, feel that he and thousands of his fellow workers should be assured some kind of graduated pay scale such as is set forth in H. R. 1057.

Therefore it is my personal hope that the pending bill may be enacted into law.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Chairman of the Committee for offering me time. However, I find no opposition to passage of the bill and shall not take time of the House to discuss the merits of the pending measure. I regard H. R. 1057 as a very meritorious measure and am happy to lend my support in its passage.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with great satisfaction that I arise to say a few words in support of the longevity bill, which will institute in the Postal Service the principle of longevity pay as a reward for long and meritorious service.

In my 13 years' service in the House, I have never seen such a demonstration of enthusiastic support as was evidenced during the hearings on this measure. Nearly one-half of the entire membership of the House gave expression of approval in person or in writing to the committee, the lone dissent coming from the Post Office Department.

This bill was reported out unanimously by our committee with the assurance of wholehearted support from each member. I am proud to have had the honor of seconding the motion of my distinguished colleague and sponsor of this legislation, the Honorable J. HAROLD FLANNERY.

At this point I desire to pay tribute to Mr. FLANNERY for his untiring efforts in behalf of this legislation, efforts that have finally been culminated by its reaching the floor of the House for discussion today.

The measure as presented to the House is a modest compromise of the original proposal. Personally, I would have preferred to see the original bill enacted into law, but recognize that the compromise we have agreed upon is the best that can be obtained for the postal employees at this time. Under the present set-up the Postal Service as far as the letter carrier and clerk are concerned are stymied at a salary of \$2,100 per year regardless of how long they remain in the Service. Conditions of this kind should not be allowed to prevail particularly by the Government of the United States, which should be a model employer and should lead and not follow the economic trend of private industry. Longevity pay is nothing new for it has been observed by private industry for many years, and industry has found that it has been a profitable investment for it has brought about a contented and satisfied personnel, which in many cases has resulted in increased efficiency.

Under the measure proposed today only those employees in the Postal Service with 10 years or more to their credit will benefit. The bill provides for a one-hundred-dollar increase for those having 10 and not more than 15 years of service, and a two-hundred-dollar increase for those having more than 15 years of service, the same to be effective July 1, 1942.

In my opinion this is a modest reward for those servants of the Government whose service to the American people is unsurpassed by any other branch of the Government. I am supporting this measure today on the basis that half a loaf is better than none and hopeful of its enactment and thereby establishing the principle of longevity pay that the law will later be amended to give proper and adequate reward to our worthy postal employees.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to add my support to the provisions included in H. R. 1057, known as the longevity bill, which, to my mind, is a reward for faithful and honest service. This bill is a just and fair reclassification of salaries for postal workers, carrying in its small way a reward for long and faithful service. If enacted, this bill will provide a cushion for the workers to meet the ever-increasing living costs necessitated by defense expense.

May I call the attention of this Congress to the fact that with present conditions in this country unless recognition is given to this group, these employees will be attracted to other work and the public and Government will lose the benefit of their trained service. I think you will agree with me that the Postal Service is one of the most efficient departments of the Government, and there is no doubt but that this efficiency is gained only through years of constant application to duties.

I would respectfully call your attention to the fact that there has been no pay adjustment for postal workers since 1925, and the increase that is asked for in this

bill surely is not too great a reward for the men who, after their first few years of service, have obtained the top in salary scale. This group of workers is of the highest type and certainly is entitled to this recognition.

I hope that this Congress will act favorably on this piece of legislation and bring relief to this great army of loyal and faithful workers.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a meritorious measure and should receive the support of every Member of the House. Personally, I am very happy to support it. I regret, however, that the committee felt that it was desirable to reduce the amount of the appropriation called for in the original bill.

This bill in the main provides for an increase in annual salary of \$100 for postal employees after 10 years of service and \$100 for each 5 years thereafter, not exceeding 20 years, which will thus provide for an increase in salary not exceeding \$500. This provision will be applicable to assistant postmaster, supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, watchmen, messengers, laborers in first- and second-class post offices, employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department rendering not less than 5 hours' service per day, employees of the Motor Vehicle Service, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and Village Delivery Service, rural letter carriers, employees of the Railway Mail Service, employees of the Sea Post Service, clerks at division headquarters of post-office inspectors, and postal employees at the United States Stamped Envelope Agency. In other words, it is intended to cover all classes of postal service.

There have been no general wage increases for postal employees since 1925. The pay received by these faithful servants of the Government is small indeed compared with wages and salaries of employees in private enterprises, as well as in other Government departments. For instance, these employees in the custodial service receive on an average of \$1,260 a year and there are some 16,000 in the Post Office Department. Clerks in the Postal Service begin at \$1,700 and receive an additional increase of \$100 until they reach a maximum grade of \$2,100. Having reached that grade, their status remains frozen for practically an indefinite period of years. The report of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30, 1939, showed that there were 50,651 carriers in the \$1,200 grade.

This recognition of faithful service should not be considered as a salary increase but a reward or recognition of long and faithful service to the Government. The principle involved is not new, as it has been in vogue for many years in private enterprises as well as in other departments of the Federal service, such as personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, Immigration and Naturalization examiners and Customs inspectors. The maximum increase in military service runs as high as 50 percent, whereas the increase for city clerks or carriers under this bill is only 23.8 percent.

The duties performed by these postal employees are arduous and require ability, fidelity, and faithfulness to the Government. The men so employed, as their years of service increase, are met with increased obligations caring for their families and educating their children, and are entitled to some recognition for long and faithful service. This legislation is fair and reasonable; it accords with the general policy of the Federal Government to provide adequately for our employees; it is a belated recognition of faithful service and will help to stabilize a most necessary public service; and it will increase the morale of the personnel, tend toward better efficiency, and help to establish the service as a career for these faithful public servants who are giving their lives to public service.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, one of the foundation stones of the system of private enterprise is the reward for service. Many of our faithful workers have been advanced as years have gone by from the bottom of the ladder to the top. Their compensation has been increased accordingly. In some of our governmental departments we have servants who have performed outstanding services. Especially is this true of the postal workers in the field who are daily providing the citizens of this country with an outstanding service.

The members of this group are outstanding Americans, loyal to the core, and servants of the highest type. Many of them own their own homes and contribute in many ways to the communities in which they live. They gave up some of the most valuable years of their lives working for the Post Office Department in the interests of our citizenship. They are under restrictions and must constantly keep up on new regulations, take periodical examinations, and more or less make a career of their postal duties.

I, therefore, feel that the principle of longevity pay for these workers, as provided for in this bill, is no more than right and just, and a small reward for years of faithful, intelligent, and dependable service.

Although the bill voted out by the committee, which is now under consideration, is not as liberal as the original bill which was introduced, yet it is a start on a plan to reward them for services well performed.

I feel sure that the inauguration of this plan among our postal workers will even inspire greater efforts for the benefit of the public in the future. I, therefore, am happy to support this legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, in justifying this proposed legislation it has been pointed out that the cost of living is going up now, and such a provision would help somewhat to counteract that increased cost. It has also been pointed out that the morale of the public service would be improved by the passage of this measure as an act of justice toward those public servants who now cannot look forward to promotion or increase in pay. While I believe that there would be some help in regard to the increased cost of living, the second basis is more logical to my mind, for we do need to do the right thing by civilian employees as well as by

those who serve in the military branch. It is because I think this measure will do both that I favor it.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 1057, has, I believe, the support of many Members of the Congress who believe in the principle of longevity. It is nothing new and has been before Congress for a number of years. I am not impressed with the argument that postal employees are underpaid. I do not like that argument, nor do I believe that postal employees base their argument on such a premise.

It is nothing more nor less than a reward for service, not a bonus in any sense of the word. You take a postal worker who starts as a clerk at \$1,700 per year and advances in a few years to \$2,100. At that he stops, and he has nothing to look forward to for the balance of his life but a salary that is fixed for him without an incentive for him to stay in the Service and prove himself worthy of promotion. Of course, there are a few exceptions to this, but as a whole that is the picture.

This bill provides that if an employee remains in the Service for 10 years he shall be rewarded for his faithfulness and loyalty and given an increase of \$100 annual salary. That is something to work for and stirs the ambition in the soul of the employee. For an additional 5 years' service, or 15 years' service, he is to be given an additional \$100.

The original bill called for increases each 5 years up until 30 years, so that an employee, after 30 years' service to his Government, is to be rewarded, in part, for his efforts in bringing more efficiency to himself and the Department in the Government profits. It boils down to this one unpleasant truth: That the average and great host of employees have nothing to look forward to after they have reached the maximum amount of salary.

Business enterprises long ago have recognized the value of longevity, and make a practice of rewarding their employees for long service. It has evidently been found profitable to them, and I have no doubt it will be found equally profitable to our Government.

Job security is something every man seeks, but he likes to feel that his loyalty and efforts and efficiency is appreciated and should be recognized. Most postal employees become more valuable with experience, as does an individual in every line of human endeavor. I think this Congress now should adopt the longevity principle in the Postal Service, which many of us know to be one of the very best in the Government. They are, I believe, a group of highly respected individuals throughout the entire Nation, and most loyal workers. The mail must get through, no matter if it is rain or snow, sleet or mud, and ice or high water or excessive heat. You look for the mailman at a certain hour every day, and he is usually on time.

I am not thinking in terms of what it will cost our Government, but rather in building the morale of employees which will eventually contribute much and in the end repay itself.

I believe at this time, when it becomes necessary to build a higher morale among

Government workers, the Congress would be contributing much, not in dollars and cents, but something much more valuable in these days of uncertainty. There has been no salary adjustment for 16 years, and that is a pretty long time to wait for something, do not you think? Let it not be said of us that we are cold and indifferent and not interested in the welfare of our workers, but let us today do something that will reflect credit upon each one of us in the day in which we live.

I have been a member of this Post Office and Post Roads Committee from the day I came to Congress, more than 10 years ago. We have held many hearings before that committee, and I cannot recall any time when there was as much testimony in favor of a bill as we had from the Members of Congress, nor at any time such a large number of our colleagues appearing in favor of a bill. As I recall we had not a single Member oppose it. Believing that they represented the good judgment of this body, I join them in urging the passage of this bill, and I urge each one of you to do likewise.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, it is to be hoped that the Congress will promptly pass this meritorious longevity bill, H. R. 1057, without any unnecessary delay. The very least that this Nation can do for the postal employees who have rendered long, efficient, and faithful service would be to pay the meager reward embodied in this principle of longevity. As a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads it was my pleasure to hear the testimony for and against this bill. The administration, through the Post Office Department, has attempted and is attempting to defeat this legislation on the grounds of economy. Such a ridiculous plea coming from this wasteful group of spenders actually becomes an argument for the bill. Mr. Chairman, faithful service deserves a just reward. There is no more faithful group in the service of the Government than the postal employees.

It has been said that these few millions have not been contemplated in the Budget. I could well reply with the question, What budget? Under the spenders of this Government the Budget is an excuse for legalized plunder and a shield behind which the sound business of the Nation is neglected and destroyed.

As a sound business principle I urge the Members of this House to support and vote for the passage of this bill.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, the postman is almost part of the family. From earliest childhood he is our friend. When he rings the front doorbell each morning, rain or shine, he always has that cheery "hello" which makes the day start off right.

In every branch of industry and in fact in many departments of government faithful service is rewarded by increased compensation. Strangely enough, however, after the first 5 years our friends in the Postal Service labor under fixed salaries with the result that men grow old in the Department without raises in pay.

The salaries paid are much less than for comparable responsibilities in private

industry, and all bill 1057 does is to partially correct this disparity.

I heartily endorse this bill and hope it will pass unanimously.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That assistant postmasters, supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, watchmen, messengers, laborers in first- and second-class post offices, employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department rendering not less than 5 hours' service per day, employees of the Motor Vehicle Service, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and Village Delivery Service, rural letter carriers, employees of the Railway Mail Service, employees of the Sea Post Service, clerks at division headquarters of post-office inspectors, and postal employees at the United States Stamped Envelope Agency, as a reward for continuous service heretofore rendered or to be rendered hereafter, shall be granted \$100 per annum in addition to their base pay as now or hereafter fixed by law upon the completion of 10 years' service; and an additional \$100 per annum upon the completion of every 5-year period of service thereafter: *Provided*, That no credit shall be given for service after the thirtieth year of employment: *Provided further*, That in computing an employee's length of service, credit shall be given for substitute service.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "every" and insert "an additional."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "thirtieth" and insert "fifteenth."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "postmasters of the third and fourth classes."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, the need of some reward for continued meritorious service in our Postal System has been recognized for quite a number of years by forward-looking leaders of postal legislation. When the late Representative Clyde Kelly and Senator MEAD were members of the House Post Office Committee they urged legislative recognition of the principle of longevity pay as long as 12 years ago. They had plans to push such a measure of this kind in 1930, but the economic collapse made it necessary to drop the matter. Now, with an administration which holds progressive economic views for the welfare of the workers, and with no general wage increase for postal employees since 1925, the principle of longevity pay should be established by Congress.

The theory of gradually increasing pay as a reward for length of continuous service is based upon sound economics. It is being used by industrial corporations with successful results. Experience has shown that in the industrial field it not only prevents costly labor turn-over, but, of perhaps even greater importance, it has proven to be a factor in higher efficiency by giving the worker a better prospect for his future. Many enlightened industrial leaders have recognized that gradually increasing pay for satisfactory and efficient work periodically is a scientific and worth-while factor, resulting in increased productivity.

In fact, the Government itself long ago recognized the principle when it established longevity pay in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and in the Coast Guard. The principle was recognized in these military branches of the Government service about 1870; and under present law officers in these organizations receive a 5-percent increase in their pay every 3-year period until it amounts to 50 percent of their base pay. The enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps also receive a 5-percent increase after each period of 4 years until they reach a certain maximum.

The wage scale during the first 8 or 10 years in the Postal Service is fairly satisfactory, due to the law providing for five automatic-promotion grades. After that there comes the realization by many of the efficient workers that there is little or no chance of promotion ahead of them; that their salaries have probably reached the maximum regardless of how long they remain in the Service thereafter. It requires time and experience to turn out a clerk with the required knowledge of distribution of mails, namely, the proper routing for letters, train connections, and so forth. It is to the distinct advantage of the Government to retain experienced employees in the Service.

We may be facing a situation parallel to that which occurred in 1917 and 1918. According to the annual report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, he stated, referring to the Railway Mail Service:

The problem of securing a sufficient number of employees to maintain the distribution service is causing much concern. A large number of women have been employed in terminal railway post offices and in the offices which release male employees for service in the railway post-office cars. From the time war was declared, April 6, 1917, until September 1, 1918, there were 1,617 resignations and 1,666 discontinuances on account of entrance into military and naval service or the postal service in France; a total of 3,283 separations from causes other than deaths, removals, etc. The total number of separations since war was declared is 3,722, or slightly in excess of 21 percent.

The same report shows that among post-office clerks at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1918, there were 4,898 resignations, 399 removals on charges, 3,781 entered military service, or a total of 9,078 in that period. In the following year, at the close of the fiscal year 1919, the total resignations from the Railway Mail Service was 2,421, and that does not include those going in the Army. Those resigning entered other occupations or took advantage of business opportunities which offered increased salaries. Such a situation does not make for economy in the administration of the Service and certainly produces decreased efficiency in the average output per clerk. The average annual turn-over in the civil service prior to the depression period was approximately 10 percent. Undoubtedly the cost to the Government of this turn-over in training new employees and losing experienced personnel would have provided substantial increases in pay.

The bill under consideration involves a principle that has been very generally ac-

cepted by forward-locking employers in industry and in private business, and one that has a very well defined and extensive footing in the public service. The recognition as a basically sound employment policy of granting to employees who maintain proper standards of performance certain additional increments after long-stated periods of total employment on the same job is economically sound.

There cannot be in any organization—business or public—a great number of high positions both in pay and responsibility. The opportunity for advancement financially is like a pyramid, narrowing as it ascends. For that reason all forward-locking employers, not only in the interest of the employees themselves but with a view of maintaining their business, whatever it may be, on the highest degree of efficiency, look to the various methods for maintaining the morale, for reducing the turn-over, and for offering the necessary incentive so as to insure the highest degree of interest in the business as material factors in securing the best quality of output as well as quantity of output.

The proposal which you have before you today involves the addition of an increment of \$100 to these various categories of employees after 10 years' satisfactory service, and another \$100 after an additional 5 years of continuous service. Whatever cost would be involved in the adoption or extension of this principle to the category of employees mentioned in this bill will be greatly absorbed through increased efficiency, both in the quality of the output as well as in its quantity. This bill equalizes the treatment for all employees under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department. This bill is sound, it is consistent, and will inure not only to the benefit of the employees themselves but also to the employer—the United States Government.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain my amendment briefly. In drawing up the bill we overlooked one item. The fact is that there are a good many third- and fourth-class postmasters who are now drawing less money than many of the employees, and we are taking them in under this bill.

At one time I felt I would perhaps offer an amendment to include all the postmasters, but after further investigation I find that the postmasters of the first and second class are drawing reasonable salaries. In view of the fact that the postmasters of the third and fourth class are in a good many instances drawing less than the employees we are including in this bill, I feel it only justice that they be included in this bill.

There are very few who will be affected at the present time. The cost of this amendment at the present time will be perhaps \$500,000 in addition to that already estimated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to support this amendment.

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

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does this amendment extend the advantages to the third- and fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. HENDRICKS. It does.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is exactly correct. Many of these postmasters are getting much less than other Federal employees. I heartily support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is the reason for offering the amendment. I do not believe anyone could possibly object to the justice of the amendment.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this opportunity to express myself briefly in behalf of this bill and to call the attention of the members of the Committee to some facts which have struck me very forcefully in favor of its enactment.

The Detroit Post Office, which has one of the largest personnels of any post office in the United States, is located in my congressional district, and the problems of its numerous employees often come to my attention. Hence, I have taken a special interest in behalf of this proposed legislation. I am convinced, first of all, it is a measure of justice; second, that it is a measure which is vitally necessary at the present time; and third, that it is a measure that is altogether practicable.

It certainly is a just measure to offer at least an expectation, and finally, a realization of reward to those employees who make a life career of service to this country in the Postal Service. A man trained in the Postal Service is not trained as other Government employees are in a way that fits him to seek other employment. The Postal Service is a Government monopoly, and a man who enters it usually makes it a lifetime career if he can find within the Service a reward commensurate with his life's needs. At the present time, after 5 years of service a postal employee has no further monetary rewards to look forward to. He is on a dead-end street as far as any further reward for service is concerned.

Again, this measure is vitally necessary at the present time. I call this fact to the attention of the Committee. In the Detroit Post Office, the postmaster during the fiscal year, which ended June 30, 1919, in order to fill 1,375 vacancies in the post office in Detroit, had to tender 2,180 appointments. He had to call upon 2,180 eligible persons in order to fill 1,375 vacancies. This was at a comparable period to the present time in the history of our country.

We want to make sure by this legislation to retain in Federal service in the postal branch, which, too, is necessary for our national defense and in a vital way is related to other Government services, faithful and trained employees who will perform their duty and use their skill acquired by years of experience in performing a function that is vital to the communications of this country.

Again, this measure is altogether practicable. The cost of the increases estimated to result from the enactment of

this measure will probably be less than the present postal surplus and the rate of surplus is at the present time increasing.

So, for these reasons, because it is just, because it is vitally necessary at the present time, and because it is altogether practicable from an estimation of the cost, I am heartily in favor of the enactment of this proposed legislation.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 12, insert:
"Sec. 2. This act shall take effect July 1, 1942."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF:
On page 2, line 13, strike out "July 1, 1942" and insert: "on and after the passage of this act."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, these postal employees have received no increase since 1925. The committee is now amending this bill so that they will not get an increase until July 1, 1942. If, as has been stated, an injustice has been done to these employees—and I agree with that statement—in not giving them some recognition previous to this time, why increase that injustice by adding another year to it? To my mind that is neither logical nor is it equitable, and for that reason I have offered this amendment, providing that these increases date from the time of the passage of the act.

Let me point out to you, as has been pointed out before, that other Government services have been getting increases during these years that the postal employees have not been recognized. Why continue that injustice further by making it a year longer? I see no justice in that. Let us, therefore, adopt this amendment which treats this bill the same as every other bill is treated, putting it in force and effect after the passage of the act. I trust the committee will support my amendment to the committee amendment.

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

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I want to congratulate the gentleman on offering the amendment. I think his point is well taken, and the amendment is entirely in order.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. This bill has given the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads a great deal of work. The committee considered it very carefully. As everyone knows, the bill was first introduced granting \$100 annual compensation, to be given after 10 years' service, \$100 additional after 15 years' service, \$300 after 20 years' service, \$400 after 25 years' service, and \$500 after 30 years' service. We all believed in the principle of longevity, but on ac-

count of the enormous expense, and in order to establish that principle, the Committee on the Post Office gave several weeks' consideration to the bill. Because the appropriation for the post-office purposes has already been enacted for this fiscal year, and taking various things into consideration and the conditions that confront us, we decided unanimously that it is better and would answer the purpose better to make this bill effective July 1, 1942. I hope the amendment to the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman realizes, as most of us do, that the newspapers and publishing companies are getting a subsidy from the Government to the amount of about \$86,000,000 a year. Why take it out of the postal employees, why not take it away from the Washington Star, the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune that are making millions every year instead of cutting it off the small wages of these men?

Mr. BURCH. If the gentleman will introduce a bill carrying out the purposes he has stated, I promise him, as the acting chairman of the committee, that it will be given consideration. It has nothing to do with this legislation, however.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This bill, of course, does not represent all that the postal employees want or ask for. I have no doubt that it does not represent all that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads would like to put into the bill, but legislation is always a matter of being practical and making necessary compromises. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] is sincere and is doing what he thinks is in the interest of the postal employees, yet I doubt the wisdom of his position. I think we must stick by the committee in this matter. They have studied the matter, and they have had to do the thing which they think is best. I have an idea that they have gone about as far as there is any possibility of getting approval. Therefore I shall support the committee, although the bill does not represent everything that I would like to see done.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. BOREN. I heartily endorse what the gentleman has said, and I think the wisdom of his statement should be given serious consideration in getting this matter promptly disposed of.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, during the last 6 years as chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service it has been my privilege to attend the conventions of postal employees in every section of this Union. I know something about their problems. I know hundreds of them, and I have visited with them in these conventions, have sat down and talked with them by the hour. We have lots of fine people in the Service. It is a terrible thing to think that a man after 5 years of service reaches the end of his possibility as to salary, and this bill is a step toward

remedying that situation, but it costs a lot of money. I believe the committee ought to be supported in the matter, although I personally would like to see them go further.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has always been a friend of the working people.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, I endorse fully what the gentleman has said. I know that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, if the individual members had their individual way in the matter, would have gone much further, but I think this compromise is advisable at this time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I feel sure of that, and I would like to go further myself and put the matter into effect immediately. I would like to see higher salaries than this bill will permit for meritorious service and length of service.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I look at it now, we are proposing to increase the salary more as a matter of morale for postal employees than as a matter of meeting the rising cost of living.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true. The committee is establishing a principle and undertaking to make a small beginning toward adjusting the salary scale.

Mr. MURDOCK. I recognize the wisdom of the gentleman's remarks, and incidentally I would like to say, complimentary to him, that he, too, has been indefatigable in working in the interest of the public employees in every sound and practical way.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman. I want to commend the members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee for the diligent attention they have given to this problem which is so vital to some 300,000 people.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. Why is it that every time a bill comes before the House which is to help some of our own good American citizens whom we all admit are deserving, the cry goes up about money? It is always money. If it were to aid Joseph Stalin, we would not wait until 1942.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think the remarks of the gentleman have anything to do with this subject or contribute anything to the welfare of the Postal Service. We have a bill that has some chance of becoming a law, and we had better stick to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in my experience as a Member of the House of Representatives to find the New Deal concerned about economy. If this bill is good a year from now, it is good now. The cost of living is going up. It is going up now. These men need this additional help today, not a year from now. As my

good friend has so well stated, we need to give these folks some help at this moment.

This is not a campaign speech, because if you will check the record you will find that most of the postal employees do not vote in primaries. They are afraid to vote in primary elections. Some of them are afraid to call their souls their own. Most of them do not now vote in Republican primaries. All of you are aware of that. I have checked the record, and I know pretty much how these gentlemen are treated.

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

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want the record to show that that is a rather broad statement. If the gentleman speaks for his own district, I cannot contradict him, but I certainly know that up my way they vote. I never knew there was any intimidation of post-office employees, whether Republicans were in control, or Democrats. The inference to be drawn from the gentleman's statement is so far-reaching that I cannot permit it to go unchallenged.

Mr. BENDER. I know my friend is a very genial and agreeable person, and I like him very much, but the gentleman must know that in the Postal Service there has been considerable of what he terms as "intimidation." Of course, I would not call it that. Unfortunately, some of these postmasters are autocrats, and sometimes they make conditions unbearable for the men in the Service.

Now, you gentlemen can challenge what I say and it is perfectly all right with me; however, I know it to be true. It was just as true under the previous administration as it is today.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Just for the gentleman's information I am sure that no member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads would oppose this bill going into effect now if that were practicable, but we have recently reported and passed the appropriations for the coming fiscal year, so therefore we put it into effect in 1942, so that the Appropriations Committee could take care of the appropriation. That is the reason we made it 1942 instead of now. We would not be opposed to it otherwise.

Mr. BENDER. We all vote for deficiency bills. As a matter of fact, last week we voted for some five hundred-odd million dollars in a bill that went through here like a cat goes through a dog show, with a handful of Members on the floor. Here we are shedding crocodile tears and talking economy just the moment it affects the best part of the Federal Government service.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GREEN. In that connection, there is nothing to prevent consideration for the additional amount for the next year in some deficiency bill. We could bring it in in one of the deficiency bills. I am heartily in favor of the amendment

which the gentleman is offering. I am in favor of the entire bill, as well as for third- and fourth-class postmasterships.

Mr. BENDER. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is absolutely right.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my hard-working friend.

Mr. WILSON. I just want to confirm the statement of the gentleman from Ohio about some of these clerks being afraid to vote. In my district a postmistress told one of the employees if he did not go to the primary and vote the Democratic ticket he would be fired. He voted in the primary and voted the Republican ticket, and within a few days he was dismissed.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Does not the gentleman feel that there is a universal good feeling on the part of our people for the fine work of the postal employees?

Mr. BENDER. There is no doubt about that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAUTHOFF) there were—ayes 29, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANNERY. 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 Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BEAM, 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. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, 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. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 94]

Baldwin	Harter	Ploeser
Bishop	Heffernan	Plumley
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Randolph
Buckler, Minn.	Hoffman	Rankin, Miss.
Buckley, N. Y.	Holbrook	Rankin, Mont.
Byron	Holmes	Rich
Cannon, Mo.	Jarrett	Rivers
Carter	Jenks, N. H.	Rockefeller
Casey, Mass.	Johns	Romjue
Celler	Johnson, W. Va.	Rutherford
Clevenger	Jones	Sasscer
Cluett	Keefe	Scanlon
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Schaefer, Ill.
Collins	Kleberg	Schuetz
Connery	Kocalkowski	Scott
Cooley	Koppelman	Sheridan
Copeland	Lea	Short
Culkin	McArdle	Sparkman
D'Alesandro	McGranery	Starnes, Ala.
Davis, Ohio	Maas	Stearns, N. H.
Doxey	Maciejewski	Stevenson
Dworshak	Magnuson	Sumner, Ill.
Eberharter	Mansfield	Summers, Tex.
Fish	Marcantonio	Sweeney
Fitzpatrick	May	Taylor
Ford, Leland M.	Murray	Thomas, N. J.
Geyer, Calif.	Nichols	Walter
Gifford	O'Connor	Wene
Gillie	O'Day	White
Gore	O'Hara	Woodruff, Mich.
Grant, Ala.	O'Neal	Young
Hare	Patman	
Harrington	Peterson, Fla.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and thirty-five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTOMATIC PROMOTION FOR CUSTODIAL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I call up the bill (H. R. 2075) to extend to custodial-service employees employed by the Post Office Department certain benefits applicable to postal employees and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every custodial-service employee (other than charmen and charwomen working part time) employed by the Post Office Department shall, at the end of each year's satisfactory service, be promoted to the compensation rate next higher than that of which he is then in receipt until the maximum rate of compensation for the grade to which his position is allocated is reached.

This act shall not be applied so as to reduce the compensation of any custodial-service employee employed by the Post Office Department or so as to result in the dismissal of any such employee.

This act shall take effect July 1, 1941.

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.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF SPECIAL-DELIVERY MESSENGERS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I call up the bill (H. R. 2528) to clarify the employment status of special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940, any person employed as a special-delivery messenger in the Postal Service who actually served in such capacity during not less than 9 months of the preceding fiscal year shall be entitled to the same rights and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave with pay as are regular employees of the Postal Service.

(b) The amount of pay to which any such special-delivery messenger shall be entitled during any leave period shall be determined by multiplying the number of days in such leave (excluding Sundays and holidays) by the average daily compensation of such special-delivery messenger, computed as provided in subsection (c).

(c) At the end of each fiscal year each postmaster employing any special-delivery messenger eligible for the benefits of this act shall compute the average daily compensation of such special-delivery messenger during such fiscal year. Such average daily compensation shall be determined by dividing the total compensation paid to such special-delivery messenger during such fiscal year (excluding any amount paid as compensation during any period of annual or sick leave), by the total number of days such special-delivery messenger actually served during such fiscal year. The average daily compensation so determined shall be used in computing the amount of pay due such special-delivery messenger for any leave period during the succeeding fiscal year. Such compensation for annual or sick leave shall be paid to the special-delivery messenger by the postmaster by whom he is employed, at the end of the regular pay period during which such leave is taken.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Such amounts when appropriated shall be made available to postmasters for the payment of the leave compensation herein provided in the same manner as is provided for the payment of special-delivery messenger fees.

(e) The Postmaster General shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 2. (a) Special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service shall be entitled to all the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in the same manner as is provided in the case of city, rural, and village letter carriers, except that as applied to any special-delivery messenger, the term "basic salary, pay, or compensation" as used in such act shall be deemed to mean the actual compensation of such special-delivery messenger.

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the effective administration of this section.

Sec. 3. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any special-delivery messenger employed for service only during temporary or irregular periods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "the", insert the following: "first- and second-class post offices in the".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAINES: Page 1, line 5, after the words "messenger in the first-", strike out "and second-class" and insert the word "class" after the word "first-" in said line, so that the line as amended will read "special-delivery messenger in the first-class".

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not inclined to enter into any extensive discussion of H. R. 2528 now under consideration excepting to say that it is the same bill which was passed by the House at the close of the last session and which, for want of action, died in the Senate. The strategy employed in the advancement of the bill during this session was reversed after the introduction of H. R. 2528, and we decided to press for adoption the companion bill introduced at my request in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and known as S. 594.

After considerable delay, which was unintentional, the bill was acted upon favorably in the Senate committee and ordered reported out, but it was snagged somewhere along the line, and as yet the Senate has not taken action, although I am assured that action in due course will be forthcoming. The bill was amended in the Senate by adding the words, "first- and second-class post offices in the", preceding the words, "Postal Service" in line 6, which is identical with this bill as amended by the House committee. In my anxiety to bring about at least a degree of emancipation and security to the small band of faithful and productive workers in the Postal Service, known as the special-delivery messengers, I have enlisted the generous aid of the members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House and prompt and positive action was taken. The bill was reported out favorably. We had hoped to obtain its passage under unanimous consent on

Monday, July 21, 1941, but because of the fact that the bill was not on the Legislative Calendar the required length of time it was not eligible for consideration. I was not disheartened because of the confidence I had in the fairness and good judgment of the House membership, knowing that the bill would come up 2 days later on Calendar Wednesday, when the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads would have the call.

I feel I should say just a few words as to the intention of the bill. It has for its purpose the granting of certain minimum benefits to these messenger employees, particularly annual leave, retirement benefits, and the same rights and benefits generally accorded other employees of the Postal Service. It is intended, moreover, once and for all to define the dubious status of the special-delivery messengers and to make them bona fide postal employees. For all practical purposes this is absolutely essential. The special-delivery messengers were kicked about and discriminated against on more than one occasion. For example, after the passage of the Economy Act, the Comptroller General ruled that special-delivery messengers were subject to the 15-percent cut because, under his ruling, they were deemed to be employees.

Sometime later, when the question of the extension of civil-service benefits was considered, the Attorney General ruled that for the purpose of exclusion from benefits, the special-delivery messengers were contractors, and the Post Office Department has gone so far as to say that the special-delivery messengers were employees of the Postmaster, as though the Postmaster were self-sufficient unto himself and conducted a business which was separate and apart from the rest of the Service. I endeavored to have this status clarified by a ruling from my old friend the then Attorney General Frank Murphy. I appealed to him for a reversal of his predecessor's opinion. He informed me in a written opinion that because the messengers were classed alternately as one or the other, as employees or as contractors, on several occasions that the final definition was a matter for the Congress to determine by law. This bill once and for all time will settle that question. The messengers will be bona fide post-office employees within the limitations contained in the bill.

Because of the opposition of my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES] to the inclusion of second-class post offices, I am willing, upon consultation with the representative of the messengers, to agree to an amendment which strikes out the words "second class," and thus limits the classification of employees and of the benefits contained in the bill to messengers employed in first-class post offices. From the statistical data gathered by Mr. HAINES I gain the impression that there will be no harm visited upon the deserving messengers throughout the Nation. Knowing the attitude of Mr. HAINES toward the postal employees generally, and including the messengers, I am confident that he would not offer any amendment which would be

injurious or which would deprive any deserving group or element of the messengers of the benefits which are intended in this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I interpose no objection, and I have informed the acting chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], that the amendment is acceptable to me. I am most anxious that the bill become law at the earliest possible date, and for that reason I am pleased to speed it on its way. Should I find that an error has been made, I feel that it will be easier to correct an error by an amendment to the law than to force a bill through when there is objection based upon some sincere misunderstanding with regard to relatively minor provisions. In this instance a single difference of opinion exists, and on this point, I am frank to confess, I am not sufficiently well informed to combat the arguments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I accept them as factual, as substantial, and, above all else, as not being detrimental to the purpose of the bill.

After more than 8 years of patience and of hard work, this bill, I hope, will become law. There can be no argument advanced against it. The Post Office Department cannot prove that it will cost the Government any substantial or burdensome amount of money, but I say that, cost what it may, these messengers, as loyal and as faithful as any in the Postal Service, and as important to the Service, must be treated on an equality basis. That is the responsibility of Congress. Special-delivery messengers have been the step-children of the Post Office Department and have been treated as such by every administration, including our own, and I am determined that this discrimination and unfairness must be eliminated at the earliest possible date.

Within a short time I hope that the Senate might act upon this bill. Thus we will add to the law the Dingell-Mead bill, a bill to clarify the employment status of the special delivery messengers in the Postal Service, a bill of justice, a bill of emancipation.

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

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a dispatch from a recent issue of the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special orders for tomorrow, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have announced previously this morning that I would object to any request of that kind for tomorrow, because we have a Republican conference. I wonder if the gentleman would not take the time later, or perhaps we can arrange for him to speak on one of the bills that will come up tomorrow.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO PROCEED WITH CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5312) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs what appropriations are authorized in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This bill carries a total authorization of \$245,000,000.

Mr. SABATH. The bill has been reported out by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. I did not have an opportunity to glance over the entire bill, but I observe several provisions in the bill on which I would like to have a little information.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will be a pleasure to advise the gentleman about any item in the bill.

Mr. SABATH. The last paragraph of page 18 provides that there shall be 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract paid to the contractor, exclusive of the fee as determined by the Secretary. What does the gentleman understand by that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Negotiated contracts on all public works authorizations are made on a fixed-fee basis with the fee not exceeding 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but how about the last provision which states, "exclusive of the fee"?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It says:

That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract heretofore entered into under the authority of the above-mentioned act shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

Now, that very language is in every bill that has been passed since the emergency arose.

Mr. SABATH. So there is no limitation on the fees that the Secretary may allow under this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes, of course, because the language says:

Shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract.

Mr. SABATH. Exclusive—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exclusive of the fee. The fee is not taken into consideration in the estimated cost of the contract.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman any information on what these fees have been and what they will be in the future?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As far as the Naval Affairs Committee has been able to ascertain, the architectural fees for calling in outside architects have been running in the neighborhood of from 3 to 4 percent and probably in a few instances they have run as high as 6 percent. In the actual construction by the contractors, as the investigation now carried on by the Naval Affairs Committee so far has disclosed, in nearly every case it has been well below the 6 percent fee.

Mr. SABATH. I would also like a little information as to whether the same system is being applied to the smaller contractors as is being applied to the larger ones in connection with the big contracts? As I understand it, on all smaller contracts, or on those up to \$100,000, regular businesslike bids are demanded and required, but the big contracts that run into the millions of dollars are being let without any bids.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that wherever time is not the essence in the performance of the contract and the construction is not very urgent, then the contract is awarded as the result of competitive bidding. Wherever it is imperative that the work go forward with the least possible delay, why, then, the Department has adopted the policy of having a negotiated contract on a fixed fee basis. In some cases it may be that in the case of small contracts and sub-contractors it is by negotiated contracts, competitive bids, or whatever system it thinks is best to get the article at the earliest possible date.

Mr. SABATH. I would like information from the gentleman on another point. I have been trying to find it in this bill, but I cannot find it because as the gentleman knows I did not have very much time to familiarize myself with the bill. I understand there has been a contract let for advertising in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Iowa for enlisting men amounting to about \$240,000. Why is that necessary and is that provision in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois and to the House that not a single item in this bill relates to advertising. In a hearing yesterday on a personnel matter involving enlistments, it developed that under the authority contained in an appropriation bill, the Secretary of the Navy had made a contract with a distinguished former Congressman from New York, Mr. Barton, who is in the advertising business, in the amount of \$240,000 to carry on an

extensive advertising campaign in the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa. That is all the information the committee has had up to this time, and the contract, I may say, was for \$340,000 instead of \$240,000.

Mr. SABATH. Why is it necessary to advertise in Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa? Can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As stated, that came out in a hearing yesterday in reply to questions asked by our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JACOBSEN]. That subject matter has not been completely explored, but we intend to see if it is essential to recruiting the naval strength to carry on an active, aggressive campaign for recruits. If it is, whether Mr. Barton gets the contract or anybody else gets the contract, it is all right with me. All I want to know is that we are going to get the recruits to man these ships in this hour of emergency.

Mr. SABATH. Why is it necessary to advertise in these three States? Has the money already been authorized?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; that money is always carried in the appropriation bill for enlistments in the Navy. They can use that money in any way that is legitimate and proper to encourage enlistments in the Navy. I may say in that connection that there will soon be before the Committee on Rules an application for a rule on a bill to double the bonus for the boys who reenlist.

Mr. SABATH. I have no objection to that, but may I ask whether the evidence has disclosed that there is a need to advertise in these States because the people in these three States feel they have been discriminated against, and that is the reason many of these boys refuse to enlist?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the State of Iowa stands fourth in recruits, irrespective of its population. In consideration of its population, the State of Iowa has more recruits than any other State in the Union.

Mr. SABATH. Why is it necessary to advertise in that State?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have stated to the gentleman that we became cognizant of that matter only yesterday, and we will make a full inquiry as to the necessity for carrying on an aggressive campaign in those States. It is my understanding that this is a test campaign for recruits, and that if it proves successful it will be extended to all States.

Mr. SABATH. There is no authorization for that in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not one penny in this bill deals with the question of enlistments. It deals only with shore establishments, which are absolutely essential for the operation of the Navy.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The passage of this bill is necessary before we can take up a supplemental appropriation bill which will come up tomorrow. If this bill passes today, the appropriation bill

is expected to pass tomorrow, and then we shall be able to recess until Monday.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely correct.

Mr. SABATH. In connection with the statement of the majority leader, may I not ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if he has not at all times obtained rules even before the ink was dry on the reports that were filed on the bills?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Illinois is absolutely correct. The Committee on Rules has responded most magnanimously to every request the Navy Department and the Committee on Naval Affairs have made with reference to the granting of rules. There has never been the slightest hesitancy on the part of the chairman or any member of the Committee on Rules to giving a rule to make in order the consideration of any naval bill as promptly as we could have a hearing before the committee.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] in the statement that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and all the members of the Committee on Rules have on national-defense matters cooperated completely. However, we have a practical situation confronting us here today. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules will admit that before I suggested that this procedure be employed I conferred with my genial and distinguished friend.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I did not understand the gentleman's unanimous-consent request. I look at this bill and find that it covers everything from cold-storage plants in Alaska to hospitals in Guam, radio stations in China, colleges and schools, and about everything else.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There are 1,200 items in this bill. For 4 days, including all day Saturday, the Committee on Naval Affairs had each one of these items before it separately and went carefully into each and every item in the bill. We have reduced the items in the bill by nearly \$2,000,000. I have already filed before the Committee on Rules an application for a rule. The leadership of the House asked that I submit this unanimous-consent request in order to expedite the consideration of the appropriation bill, and I am making the request.

Mr. MICHENER. The committee has gone into the details of each one of these proposed improvements, I take it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. I hold in my hand a complete break-down, and if any Member wants to know I shall explain everything about any one of these items. If you will examine this report, you will find that probably this is one of the best reports the Committee on Naval Affairs has ever sent to the floor,

because it shows the total amount that has been spent since June 11, 1940, on each one of these items. For instance, in various appropriations we have made heretofore we have appropriated sums of money for Corpus Christi. In this bill is an item for \$8,000,000. We show the total amount that has been spent at Corpus Christi as well as every other place, since the 11th day of June 1940.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman will explain thoroughly the various items in the bill when he gets the privilege of having it considered?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly; when my unanimous-consent request is granted.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman's request was to bring the bill to the floor and pass it by unanimous consent?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. I asked unanimous consent to consider this bill. If the request is granted, then I shall move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, and ask unanimous consent that 1 hour be allowed for general debate, 30 minutes to be controlled by myself and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MICHENER. That is enough.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I understand that the gentleman has had the support and concurrence of the minority in the work he is carrying on to expedite this construction, in view of the urgent need for these establishments?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5312) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be fixed at 1 hour, 30 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Oregon and 30 minutes by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5312) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROBINSON of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he enters into a discussion of the merits of the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I simply want the gentleman to yield in order that I may make this observation. The gentleman knows I felt constrained to reserve the right to object to his unanimous-consent request to take up this bill, and, as I understand, the bill involves an authorization of expenditure of approximately \$245,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. And I am wondering if the gentleman does not believe that under ordinary circumstances the proper procedure would be to go before the Rules Committee and obtain a rule and have the rule adopted by the House in the regular way.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that just as soon as we reported this bill yesterday I filed a resolution asking for a rule for its consideration. I think it probably would have been better to have obtained a rule in the usual way, but in view of the fact that the House leadership is desirous of having this matter considered and also in view of the fact that it is a unanimous report and the leadership is hopeful of taking up the appropriation bill providing the money for these items. In deference to the judgment of the leadership of the House I made the request.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for his answer to my inquiry, and I simply want to make the observation that, while I did not want to object to the bill, I do want to serve notice that I think the bill should have been considered in the regular way.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say to the gentleman that, unless the exigencies of the case demand it, it is far better to go before the Rules Committee, get your rule, debate your rule, and then bring the measure before the House under a rule, but conditions today demanded that I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill, because it is necessary to get the appropriation bill passed before the tax bill comes in.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains 1,200 items and involves an expenditure of \$245,000,000. It becomes necessary to have a bill of this character due to the expansion of the Navy. As you increase the number of ships, in turn, your shore establishments must be expanded, to keep pace with the shipbuilding program, and that is the object of this bill. We are building today some 360 ships of war of different character, and to meet this expansion you have to increase your hospital facilities, your ammunition depots, your radio facilities, and all the other facilities that play a prominent part in

making a navy, and that is all that this bill does.

The bill is recommended by the Budget. It is unanimously reported by the Naval Affairs Committee. On last Wednesday the Naval Affairs Committee called a hearing and commenced its investigation. All day Wednesday, all day Thursday, all day Friday, and until about 4 o'clock Saturday afternoon, and all day Monday witnesses were before the committee. We made them explain and justify every one of these 1,200 items, and I have here a complete break-down of each item, explaining in complete detail how this money is to be spent and the necessity for the expenditure.

In this report, to which I respectfully invite your attention, you will see we have gone one step further than ever before in submitting a report. We not only show how much this bill calls for at the particular place, but we show how much has heretofore been appropriated for that place since July 11, 1940. For instance, at the naval station at Key West, Fla., this bill calls for \$332,000. In addition to that there has already been appropriated at Key West, for shore establishments, \$5,094,200, making a total appropriation for Key West, for shore expansion to meet the expansion of the fleet, \$5,426,200. You can find the same information with respect to every item in the bill. If there is any particular item that any Member wants to know anything about, I will try to find it in the voluminous document I have here and tell him in minute detail what it is all about.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is any shipbuilding provided in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; this is strictly a bill dealing with public works, including the construction of buildings, facilities, and accessories for use in relation to the expansion of the fleet—operating facilities, destroyer and submarine bases, aviation bases, shore stations, fuel-storage facilities, and marine activities. That is all the bill provides. It took us a long time to complete the hearing; and you can rest assured that every item in this bill has been scrutinized far more carefully than the average public-works bills that have been considered during the quarter of a century I have been on the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is to authorize the Navy Department to proceed with the construction of a large number of public-works items. The projects in the bill, when broken down, total items in excess of 1,200. These items are set forth in the tables in the report on this bill. Time will not allow me to go into detail regarding each project.

As the Congress is well aware, coincident with the great expansion of our seagoing Navy, we have been engaged in expanding the shore facilities which must support the fleet. In 1938 the Navy Department appointed a board, of which Admiral Hepburn was the senior member, to study the requirements for ade-

quate shore facilities. At that time the naval air program contemplated but 3,000 planes, and the number of ships on the Navy program was very small compared to today. Since the Hepburn Board there has been a steady increase in the size of the Navy. First of all, there was the 11-percent increase. Then there was the 70-percent increase, which we call the two-ocean Navy program. As a result of this enormous expansion, the Navy Department appointed last year another board to make a study of the fundamental requirements of the naval shore establishments and recommend what was needed in the light of these expansions. This board, of which Admiral Green-slade was the senior member, made its report, which was approved on May 14 of this year.

As a result of all this study and the recommendations of these boards, the Navy Department has been authorized to embark upon a program the purpose of which is to keep the development of the shore establishments in step with the growth of the forces afloat.

This bill represents another increment in the program. There are projects for the expansion of navy yards and naval stations, training stations and schools, ordnance shops and ammunition storage, hospitals and dispensaries, naval air stations, Naval Reserve training bases, fuel and supply depots, marine barracks, radio stations, and many others; in other words, every type of shore establishment which is necessary to our defense. In adding to this great shore establishment, however, it is the policy not to allow it to get ahead of the ships and become top-heavy, but rather to have at all times sufficient shore facilities to meet requirements which can be foreseen. As this bill came to the Naval Affairs Committee it contained authorizations for upward of \$245,000,000. Committee amendments have reduced this figure by approximately \$1,200,000. This reduction was not made, however, with the idea of economizing at the expense of national defense. They were made as a result of thorough hearings which revealed certain items which the committee felt, as well as the Navy Department in most instances, that reductions could be made without hurting the project.

A study of the report on this bill will show that there are a number of items, particularly in the section devoted to aviation facilities, which are called deferred. In order that the Congress may fully understand what is being done by the Navy and what their attitude is toward the limits of cost set up in an authorization bill, an explanation of this term "deferred" is in order. The term as used in the report means that those items were part of the original or prior plans for the projects, but that it was found that the funds authorized for a specific development were insufficient to accomplish all the items planned.

When the Navy Department found that it could not do all the work at a station within the cost limit it had a choice of two methods of procedure, without sacrificing the time element. It could go ahead and do all the work

required to make a complete job even though it exceeded the limit of cost. This it could do under the authority of section 8 (a) of the Speed-up Act. The other method was to defer certain items and build only those which would make it possible to get the station into operation in the shortest time, and then come back to Congress for an authorized increase in the cost limit. Many of the authorizations in this bill for naval air stations and some under other categories represent a choice of the latter method. The Naval Affairs Committee feels that section 8 (a) should only be used where the necessity for speed and the need for completing items above the cost limit make it impossible or impracticable for the Navy Department to even take the time to come back to Congress. The Navy Department's way of handling this matter is viewed with approval by the committee.

An explanation is germane at this point as to why these developments could not be completed within the estimated cost. Several factors enter into this. First of all, during the expansion of the Navy, Congress has authorized, in steady increments, an increase in the number of naval airplanes from 3,000 to 15,000. The expansion of shore facilities to support this air force is one of unprecedented magnitude. It has been necessary to proceed rapidly but with a certain amount of caution in the construction of air stations of such great size. There is no previous experience in this country on which to base the exact needs of such a station. It was the part of wisdom to plan these stations conservatively and then add facilities as experience dictated the needs—but not to overreach ourselves. The same is true of many other shore activities, such as ammunition and storage facilities, naval supply depots, and fuel depots.

But in addition to the lack of complete information and experience on which to base accurate estimates of many of these activities there are several other situations in the country today which have a very direct bearing on the cost of public-works construction.

First of all, running throughout this whole program is the demand for speed, and more speed. We all know that speed in construction work costs money. This is so because work is done on a three-shift, 7-day-a-week basis. I do not need to tell you about overtime rates.

Speed also means working regardless of weather conditions. At one public-works project during the past winter the work was kept up under the severest conditions of weather by putting up canvas screens and installing heating elements, and so forth.

Speed also means that highly skilled labor must be thinned out. Men are assigned to classes of work which in normal times they would not be considered capable of doing. Every one of these factors increases both basic costs and overhead.

Another reason for original estimates being exceeded is the rising cost of labor. All over the country we hear of all classes of labor, from skilled workmen down, asking for higher and higher rates of pay. While it is possible to resist requests for

more pay up to a certain point, in the final analysis in this defense program there is nothing left to do but comply with a large part of the demands of labor.

Then there is the price of materials. These have been rising since the fall of 1939 and they are still rising. Many of these materials for Navy public-works projects have to be shipped outside of the continental limits of the United States, and the matter of sea-borne transportation becomes daily a more serious problem.

All these matters have a direct effect on the cost but they cannot be allowed to affect the vital speed factor. Control of cost and of labor are matters requiring the attention of Congress, but we are all agreed, I believe, that nothing shall be allowed to slow down the defense program.

All but five of the projects in this bill are for the purpose of completing, expanding, or improving establishments already authorized. These additions are set forth in the report and are in line with the rest of the program.

I have not undertaken to explain the details of the bill, and there are some features of it which, as you will readily recognize, are of a confidential nature and cannot properly be discussed here. The hearings on this bill were very thorough. Full information concerning the bill is contained in the report, and the Naval Affairs Committee is unanimous in recommending its passage.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think after listening to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs everyone will agree that there is not very much more to be said upon this bill. The bill is necessary in order to meet the requirements of our rapidly expanding Navy, and every one of the 1,200 items in the bill has been thoroughly examined by the committee and found to be justified.

At the present time we have a one-ocean Navy. The program for a two-ocean Navy, which will double the size of the present Navy, is proceeding upon a very fast schedule, and we soon will have this two-ocean Navy. In the meantime, by legislation of this kind, we are undertaking to get the shore-station establishments ready to meet the requirements of this expanded Navy. This bill, for the most part, deals with the implementing and expansion of existing establishments. There are only a few items in it providing for the creation of new establishments. The bill provides for the expansion and improvement of all the shore stations in the United States and in our outlying possessions, including navy yards, fleet bases, submarine and destroyer bases, naval air stations, radio stations, munition depots, magazines, stores, hospitals, dispensaries, and every other naval shore activity.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I appreciate the fact that the committee has gone into these 1,200 items with considerable care. I am not taking the floor to disagree with the amount of any of these items, but I notice one item of approxi-

mately \$1,000,000 for housing enlisted men, recreation facilities, and radio-laboratory facilities at Norfolk, Va. Can the gentleman break that down and tell us what are these items, particularly with regard to the recreational facilities? The point I have in mind is that while recreation is important for our Navy men, our enlisted personnel, yet at a time when we are getting ready to tax the hide off the people of the country to pay for these things I am wondering if we cannot forego such items as recreational facilities.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, we went into the items of recreational facilities not only for this particular station but for all of the stations where, in the opinion of the Navy Department, additional recreational facilities were required. It has been the experience of those in responsible charge of the Navy that adequate recreational facilities at each of these stations are just as necessary in the program of building up an efficient fighting Navy personnel as is any other facility. In fact, it would be impossible in our kind of a Navy to get along without adequate recreational facilities. It is just as necessary to have these as it is to have an adequate supply of food and clothing. It is an indispensable factor in the morale of the Navy. It is a part of the Navy program, and experience has taught us that we can no more neglect it with safety than we can neglect any other part of the program.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, in respect to the question propounded by the gentleman from New York, we should bear in mind that the enlisted man, after he has finished his duty, is entitled to some place for relaxation, some place to see his guests who might come to see him, such as his mother or sister or wife or sweetheart, and he is entitled also to recreational facilities for some diversion from his duties. You cannot keep up the morale of a military establishment if you do not have some place for relaxation when the men are off duty. That is what you have to have at every naval station. Let us take a ship that comes into Norfolk. The man has been on the ship for 6 months; and if he had no recreational facilities, where would he entertain his guests? Would the gentleman have him go out on the streets of Norfolk; would he have him go there to pass his spare time or to see a moving picture? So in every naval establishment it is just as essential for the morale and health as it is, as the gentleman from Oregon has said, for clothing and hospital facilities.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I agree with the distinguished chairman. I am not taking a dog-in-the-manger attitude on this proposition.

Mr. MOTT. I understand perfectly that the gentleman was asking for information, and he is clearly entitled to the information he is seeking.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I would like to have the amount for each item.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have it here. It consists of a bowling alley, a

large hall for motion pictures, a gymnasium floor, lockers, library, and other related facilities. Those things are just as essential to a man serving his country as the uniform he wears.

Mr. MOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I know of no opposition to the bill as a whole or to any of these 1,200 items in it. They were all gone over most carefully with the chiefs of bureaus in open hearing, and those who recommended them were very carefully interrogated upon every item. The committee came to the unanimous conclusion that everything contained in this bill is necessary for our Naval Establishment and that it ought to be authorized at this time.

I trust and I feel sure there will be no opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in a bill embracing such a large expenditure of public money as the one now pending, that the Members should have the benefit of the advice and the information that the Committee on Naval Affairs has been able to get from the leading naval authorities of the country at hearings which we conducted over a period of 5 days, meeting both in the morning and in the afternoon.

As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the committee, has stated, there are about 1,200 items in this measure. During the experience I have had on that committee over a number of years, I have never seen any bill that has been so carefully analyzed as this one. We have been conscious of the fact that every dollar spent in the defense system of this Nation is a dollar that must be raised eventually through our tax system, and we are trying, as we always have endeavored, to justify in every way these recommendations on the part of the committee to the Members of the House.

We must always keep in mind that a year ago this country embarked on a major naval program that within 5 years will treble the size of the American Fleet and increase the personnel from 130,000 men to over a half a million men by 1945. We are going from less than 1,000,000 tons of under-age ships to over 3,000,000 tons of under-age ships in this same period of time.

As we listened to the reports of the naval officials in the various branches of the naval service, this bill was thoroughly explained in every item. I have here a compilation and break-down of every one of these items that we asked the Navy Department to make up, so that we could be even better informed and thus add to the information resulting from questions asked these experts as they appeared before the committee.

This proposed legislation embraces authorization for the expenditure of about \$245,000,000. This will not be the last of our requests for authorizations. In other words, we were told that while this authorization totals about \$245,000,000, eventually the Navy Department, for additional facilities, will be compelled to

ask for over a billion dollars more. In other words, we are trying to approach this problem as we develop the fleet, providing all these facilities as we feel they are needed by the naval establishments.

This measure calls for additional facilities in the different shore stations of the country and our insular possessions, and also extends our radio facilities. It provides for recreational facilities at our various naval stations, and which, in my opinion, are so essential to the morale of our Navy personnel. It also will make possible the expansion of facilities in the various navy yards, in the training stations, and also provides \$1,600,000 to expand the Naval Hospital in the District of Columbia, which is rapidly nearing completion, and which we hope will be put into operation at the end of this year.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, has received the most careful thought and consideration of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I do hope that the Members of the House will have no difficulty in supporting it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I was interested a few moments ago to hear the discussion relative to recreation facilities for the boys in the Navy. Recently I returned from my home. Most of you perhaps know that in my district we have a naval torpedo station, a training station, and a naval hospital. I notice that in the bill coming before the House there are authorizations for these three places, but I failed to notice anything pertaining to recreation for the naval torpedo station.

While I was there I found that for some 1,500 enlisted men who are assigned there and approximately 300 or 400 student officers, there are absolutely no recreational facilities at all on Goat Island, where the torpedo station is located. I found they were also crowded in their sleeping quarters and so lacking in facilities to take care of their clothes that most of the student officers had to hang their clothes on a pipe line strung across one of the rooms. In fact, there was an overflow of clothing, and some of their clothing was hanging in the toilets.

I found further that one little building known as the house that Jack built, a building that was made of salvaged material during the World War by the enlisted men during their recreation periods, has now been condemned, leaving them absolutely without a place to go when they are off duty. Upon inquiry as to just what the men did, some of the commissioned officers who accompanied me on this inspection trip pointed to some of them who were sitting up on a pile of lumber, looking out on the ocean. They told me that was the extent of their recreation.

I sincerely hope that when the Navy Department brings in a request for additional funds that the Committee on Naval Affairs will take into consideration that particular item—namely, recreation for the men at the torpedo station at Newport.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman is also interested in the Quonset Point Naval Air Station, and the Navy Department has made very far-reaching provision for recreational facilities at that station where a large number of men will be quartered from now on.

Mr. FORAND. That is very true. That is true of Quonset. I have no criticism to make there, but I do have criticism in regard to the torpedo station.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes in order to answer the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Georgia would tell me why "the city of New Orleans" was deleted from the bill and "Gulf coast area" inserted instead.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman from Louisiana that the committee's action in doing so should not by any means cause anyone to conclude that the facilities will not be established at New Orleans. In all probability they will be established there, but we felt it was necessary to make a complete survey of the whole coast area before definitely deciding where it should be established.

Mr. HÉBERT. Am I to understand, then, that the Naval Affairs Committee, in changing this language, did not want to limit the selection of this particular site to the city of New Orleans?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. But in all probability it will be placed in the city of New Orleans?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am inclined to think it will be.

Mr. HÉBERT. I should like to make the observation that the city of New Orleans has donated thousands of acres of land to the national-defense program, and in this particular case we stand ready to donate still additional thousands of acres to help this country's national defense.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. New Orleans, of course, is merely living up to her past reputation of being most generous to all national-defense units in that section.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following shore activities by the construction of public works projects, including the construction of buildings, structures, facilities, and accessories for the expansion of fleet operating facilities, destroyer and submarine bases, aeronautic shore stations, supply and fuel storage, Marine Corps activities, ordnance and hospital activities, training and housing facilities, radio communication facilities, research facilities, power supply, service structures, and facilities, including the acquisition of necessary land, at a cost not to exceed the stated amount for each activity or location enumerated, respectively:

- Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C.: Ordnance-shop storehouse and accessories, \$200,000.
- Navy Yard, Mare Island, Calif.: Quarters for officers, \$200,000.
- Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.: Housing for enlisted men, \$250,000.
- Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.: Housing for enlisted men, recreation facilities and radio-laboratory facilities, \$910,000.
- Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Housing for officers and enlisted men, \$675,000.
- Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.: Acquisition of land and development of housing for enlisted men, \$650,000.
- Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Ordnance-storage facilities and housing for enlisted men, \$422,500.
- Naval Station, Guam: Housing for insular guard, \$170,000.
- Naval Station, Key West, Fla.: Housing for enlisted men, laundry- and ammunition-storage facilities, \$332,000.
- Naval Station, Tutuila, Samoa: Additional defense facilities, housing, and water-front development, \$1,305,000.
- Naval operating base, Balboa, C. Z.: Housing for officers, enlisted men, laundry and school facilities, \$900,000.
- Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va.: Fleet-school facilities, magazines, and storage facilities, \$3,335,000.
- Naval Operating Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Dispensary, \$245,000.
- Roosevelt Roads (Vieques), P. R.: Additional development of protected fleet anchorage, including acquisition of land, \$21,970,000.
- Submarine Base, Charlotte Amalie, V. I.: Additional development of submarine facilities, \$2,195,000.
- Submarine Base, Coco Solo, C. Z.: Additional power plant, shore-patrol headquarters, and school facilities, \$885,000.
- Submarine Base, Kodiak, Alaska: Additional submarine-operating facilities, including ammunition-storage facilities, \$3,413,000.
- Submarine Base, Midway Island: Additional submarine-operating facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$4,761,000.
- Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Additional submarine-operating and repair facilities, \$1,715,000.
- Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Additional submarine-operating, repair, and torpedo-storage facilities, \$385,000.
- Submarine Base, Unalaska Area, Alaska: Cold-storage facilities, \$200,000.
- Submarine Base, Wake Island: Submarine-operating and repair facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$4,679,000.
- Destroyer Base, San Diego, Calif.: Fleet-school facilities, quarters for officers, and torpedo storage, \$855,000.
- Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Additional instruction facilities, boat-repair facilities, and acquisition of additional land, \$1,720,000.
- Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.: Additional training facilities, including housing and instruction buildings and accessories, \$5,595,000.
- Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I.: Additional training facilities, including housing and instruction buildings and accessories, \$580,500.
- Naval Training Station, Norfolk, Va.: Quarters for bachelor chief petty officers, \$175,000.
- Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif.: Additional training facilities, including housing and instruction buildings and accessories, \$3,359,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Balboa, C. Z.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$165,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Burns City, Ind.: Additional ammunition- and ordnance-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$10,250,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, S. C.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$747,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Coco Solo, C. Z.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$160,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Fort Mifflin, Pa.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$228,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nev.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$4,439,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Hingham, Mass.: Storehouse and acquisition of land, \$155,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Indian Island, Wash.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, \$1,100,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Iona Island, N. Y.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including acquisition of additional land, \$121,500.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Lake Denmark, N. J.: Storage for ordnance materials, \$645,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Mare Island, Calif.: Ammunition loading and storage and mine-handling facilities, \$595,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$2,316,500.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, Puget Sound, Wash.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$336,000.
- Naval Ammunition Depot, St. Juliens Creek, Va.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$390,000.
- Naval Magazine, Bellevue, D. C.: Ordnance storehouses, \$90,000.
- Naval Magazine, New Orleans, La.: Development of ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and acquisition of land, \$2,300,000.
- Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.: Torpedo-testing facilities, including building and accessories and magazines, \$600,000.
- Naval Torpedo Range, Piney Point, Md.: Improvement of torpedo-testing facilities, including quarters for officers, \$170,000.
- Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va.: Additional storage facilities, \$550,000.
- Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Railroad connection to Fredericksburg, including acquisition of rights-of-way, fire station, post office, and gate house, \$2,060,000.
- Naval Hospital, Balboa, C. Z.: Expansion of hospital facilities, \$250,000.
- Naval Hospital, Charleston, S. C.: Additional ward buildings, \$190,000.
- Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Expansion of hospital facilities, \$450,000.
- Naval Hospital, Guam: Expansion of hospital facilities, \$100,000.
- Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Fla.: Expansion of hospital facilities, \$344,500.
- Naval Hospital, Newport, R. I.: Expansion of hospital facilities and medical-supply storehouse, \$783,000.
- Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va.: Expansion of hospital facilities, \$485,000.
- Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Fla.: Boiler-house and utility building and equipment, \$300,000.
- Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: Expansion of hospital facilities, \$280,000.
- Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, N. H.: Quarters for nurses, \$56,000.
- Naval Hospital, San Diego, Calif.: Expansion of hospital facilities, \$405,000.
- Medical Supply Depot, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Additional medical-supply storage, including acquisition of land, \$600,000.
- Naval Medical Center, Washington (Bethesda), D. C.: Expansion of medical and hospital facilities, \$1,970,000.
- Naval Air Station, Anacostia, D. C.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$125,000.
- Naval Air Station, Banana River, Fla.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$280,000.
- Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, T. H.: Aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$18,605,000.
- Naval Air Station, Cape May, N. J.: Ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$25,000.
- Naval Air Station, Cavite, P. I.: Aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$5,570,000.
- Marine aviation facilities, Charlotte Amalie, V. I.: Ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$576,000.
- Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$8,522,500.
- Naval Air Station, Floyd Bennett Field, N. Y.: Ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$41,000.
- Naval Air Station, Guantanamo, Cuba: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$286,000.
- Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$2,281,100.
- Naval Air Station, Johnston Island: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$1,618,500.
- Naval Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, T. H.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$3,970,000.
- Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$375,000.
- Naval Air Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$3,266,000.
- Naval Air Station, Lahaina Roads, T. H.: Ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$174,500.
- Naval Air Station, Miami, Fla.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$1,222,000.
- Naval Air Station, Midway Island: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$2,820,000.
- Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$2,560,000.
- Naval Air Station, Palmyra Island: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$543,500.
- Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.: Expansion of radio facilities, \$20,000.
- Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$1,030,000.
- Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$560,000.
- Naval Air Station, San Juan, P. R.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$752,000.
- Naval Air Station, San Pedro, Calif.: Radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$75,000.
- Naval Air Station, Seattle, Wash.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$540,000.
- Naval Air Station, Sitka, Alaska: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$2,654,200.
- Naval Air Station, Squantum, Mass.: Ammunition-storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$44,000.
- Naval Air Station, Tongue Point, Oreg.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$450,000.
- Naval Air Station, Tutuila, Samoa: Additional aviation facilities and ammunition storage, including buildings and accessories, \$553,000.
- Naval Air Station, Unalaska, Alaska: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$4,346,000.
- Naval Air Station, Wake Island: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$2,601,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidby Island, Wash.: Aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories and acquisition of land, \$3,790,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Anacostia, D. C.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Atlanta, Ga.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$145,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Dallas, Tex.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$145,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Floyd Bennett Field, N. Y.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Glenview, Ill.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Grosse Ile, Mich.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$150,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Kansas City, Kans.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$170,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Long Beach, Calif.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$1,635,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Minneapolis, Minn.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, New Orleans, La.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$145,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Oakland, Calif.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, Squantum, Mass.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Reserve Aviation Base, St. Louis, Mo.: Additional aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Md.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$140,000.

Naval Radio Station, Astoria, Oreg.: Quarters and accessories and services for officer in charge, \$12,500.

Naval Radio Station, Bainbridge Island, Wash.: Quarters for married operators, \$72,000.

Naval Radio Station, Balboa, C. Z.: Utility building and accessories, \$25,000.

Naval Radio Station, Cape May, N. J.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings, towers, and acquisitions of land, \$140,000.

Naval Radio Station, Charlotte Amalie, V. I.: Radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$130,000.

Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Md.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$235,000.

Radio Station, Marine Detachment, Chinwangtao, China: Replacement of operating building, \$5,000.

Naval Radio Station, Chollas Heights, Calif.: Utility building and accessories, \$20,000.

Naval Radio Station, National Airport, David, Panama: Quarters for officer in charge and operators, \$30,000.

Naval Radio Station, Gatun, C. Z.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$200,000.

Naval Radio Station, Guantanamo, Cuba: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$210,000.

Naval Radio Station, Key West, Fla.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$21,000.

Naval Radio Station, Libugon, Guam: Quarters for operators, \$60,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, T. H.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$320,000.

Naval Radio Station, Mare Island, Calif.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$640,000.

Naval Radio Station, New Orleans, La.: Radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$140,000.

Naval Radio Station, Oahu, T. H.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$150,000.

Naval Radio Station, Point Arguello, Calif.: Relocate station, including buildings and accessories, and acquisition of land, \$100,000.

Naval Radio Station, Point Loma, Calif.: Quarters for operators, \$112,000.

Naval Radio Station, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va.: Additional facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$125,000.

Naval Radio Station, Summit, C. Z.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$350,000.

Naval Radio Station, Vaitogi, Samoa: Quarters for officers in charge, \$10,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Bellevue, D. C.: Storehouse and accessories, \$235,000.

Naval Fuel Depot, Melville, P. I.: Acquisition of additional land, \$61,000.

Naval Fuel Depot, Pearl Harbor, T. H.: Development of additional underground fuel storage, \$16,000,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Bayonne, N. J.: Additional development of fleet-supply facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$7,300,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Norfolk, Va.: Additional fleet-supply facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$2,125,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Oakland, Calif.: Additional fleet-supply facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$1,300,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Pearl Harbor, T. H.: Additional fleet-supply facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$6,850,000.

Marine Barracks, Charleston, S. C.: Utility and guard building and accessories, \$90,000.

Marine Barracks, New River, N. C.: Development of landing field for training parachute troops, \$800,000.

Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.: Additional radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000.

Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va.: Additional ammunition-storage facilities, \$58,000.

Marine Barracks, San Diego, Calif.: Quarters for bachelor officers, \$100,000.

Sixth Naval District: Development of fleet-landing facilities, including acquisition of land, \$100,000.

Tenth Naval District: Fleet-fuel and storage facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$800,000.

Thirteenth Naval District: Barracks and officers' quarters, rifle range, \$90,000.

Photographic facilities at various locations: Photographic laboratories, housing, buildings, and accessories, \$1,000,000.

Mobile power-plant units: Development of two mobile power plants, railway mounted, \$2,500,000.

Internal security and passive defense: Development of facilities for internal security and passive defense at naval activities, including buildings, bombproof shelters, and accessories, \$14,500,000.

Reserve storage for gasoline: Development of reserve storage for gasoline at various locations, including buildings and accessories, \$2,500,000.

Fuel storage: Development of storage facilities for fuel, Diesel oil, and gasoline at various locations, including buildings and accessories, \$12,000,000.

Hospital corps training schools: Hospital corps training facilities, at various locations, including buildings and accessories, \$1,440,000.

Expansion of hospital facilities: Expansion of hospital facilities at various locations, including buildings and accessories, \$3,000,000.

The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590-592), as amended, shall be applicable to all public-works and public-utilities projects authorized by this act, regardless of location: *Provided*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract hereafter entered into under the authority of the above-mentioned act shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the

Navy: *Provided further*, That the fact that any contract authorized by this or any other act is entered into without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, or upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis or otherwise without advertising for proposals, shall not be construed to render inapplicable the provisions of the act of March 3, 1931, as amended by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 276 (a)), if such act would otherwise be applicable to such contract.

The provisions of section 8 (a) of the act approved June 28, 1940 (Public. No. 671, 76th Cong.), shall be applicable to naval public-works projects authorized by this and all prior acts.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, but that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pages 1 and 2, strike out all after enacting clause to and including line 4, on page 2, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following shore activities by the construction of the following public works, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, at a cost not to exceed the amount stated after each item enumerated:."

Page 3, line 4, after the word "laundry", delete the dash and insert a comma.

Page 4, line 24, delete the numerals "\$580,500" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$480,500."

Page 5, line 25, strike out the words "and acquisition of land", delete the numerals "\$155,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$80,000."

Page 6, line 1, delete the words "Ammunition Depot" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Magazine."

Page 6, line 23, delete the words "New Orleans, La." and insert in lieu thereof the words "Gulf Coast Area."

Page 7, strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Fire station, post office, and gate house, \$60,000."

"Naval Powder Factory, Indianhead, Md.: Buildings and accessories, \$55,000."

Page 8, line 18, delete the numerals "\$1,970,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$1,680,000."

Page 13, line 17, delete the numerals "\$140,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$40,000."

Page 14, line 2, delete the numerals "\$140,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$132,500."

Page 14, line 24, delete the numerals "\$320,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$296,000."

Page 15, strike out lines 8 to 10, inclusive.

Page 15, after line 19, insert the following new item:

"Marine Aviation Base, Neuse River, N. C.: Radio facilities, including buildings and accessories, \$120,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 16, after line 13, add the following new item:

"Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.: Additional storehouses and accessories at South Boston, \$1,100,000."

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is a rather embarrassing position I am placed in with regard to this item, but I think I am due this much time in consideration of this proposition.

A few pages earlier in the bill you will find an item of \$2,000,000 mentioned to build a railroad from Fredericksburg to Dahlgren. When our committee developed some opposition to the building of this railroad the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] sought opportunity to get this money and take it to Boston. When the committee struck out this proposed railroad then the item for Boston was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], by this amendment which increased \$1,100,000 the sum for Boston. Admiral Moreell opposed this when testifying before our committee. It is a plain horse-swapping proposition. The admiral did not approve it, and I do not think I would be fair to the House or fair to myself if I did not put this information before the Committee at this time. I hope this Committee will strike out this item because it does not have the approval of the Navy Department, and it certainly does have the disapproval of Admiral Moreell who is at the head of this building program.

I do not know whether there was any justification for the building of a \$2,000,000 railroad from Fredericksburg to Dahlgren. They said there was a proving ground at Dahlgren and that they could not get material to it. When we asked him the direct question whether he would advocate or approve the striking out of this \$2,000,000 item and transferring it to Boston he said certainly not, he would not advocate that and would not approve it. For this reason I rise in opposition to this amendment and I think it should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield.
Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I should like a little more information on this item. What need did the testimony show for this item, additional storehouse and accessories at the navy yard, \$1,100,000? It certainly is not small change.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Admiral Moreell said it was down in a lower priority. In other words, we struck \$287,000,000 from this bill. It was \$587,000,000 when we started out and it was cut down \$300,000,000, so there are \$287,000,000 in this bill that went out, like the Boston project.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Does the gentleman feel we can save this million dollars without impairing the naval service?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I do not think we need it. We do not have the testimony here. This thing has been rushed through and the hearings are not printed and are not out so that we can read the testimony. I think the House would be justified in striking this item out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] proves conclusively how thoroughly the Naval Affairs Committee scrutinized every item in this bill. It shows that the Naval Affairs Committee does not do things in a haphazard manner. It shows that we inquire into and have justification for everything we bring before the House.

This item was submitted by the Navy Department to the Budget. Let me go back one step farther. This bill, when submitted by the Navy Department to the Budget, called for an estimated expenditure of some \$500,000,000. It was cut down by the Budget from \$500,000,000 to some \$250,000,000 or \$260,000,000. This item was one that was incorporated in the estimate of \$500,000,000 sent to the Budget.

The following is the justification: It stood No. 4 on the priority list. This item is for the construction of industrial storehouses at South Boston for the storage of material used in connection with the repair and outfitting of naval ships in the Boston area. There were only one or two votes against this, I think by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS].

Wherever the Navy has repair facilities there must be available sufficient storage space for material used in the repair of ships. With the great expansion of repair work now being accomplished in the Boston area the need arises for additional storage facilities, and that is what this item proposes to supply.

This is clearly justified, because the Navy Department sought to obtain it from the Director of the Budget. The Director of the Budget deleted it from the bill, and we put it back in the bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. My colleague from Kentucky said this was opposed, or at least did not have the approval of the admiral in charge of construction.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is not true, because the admiral in presenting a bill can only present that which the Bureau has recommended. No admiral or naval officer can come before a committee of Congress or before the Appropriations Committee and advocate the enactment of any bill unless the Budget has O. K.'d the item. What are we here for? When we get the facts are we not in a position to determine whether or not the item should go in the bill? That is exactly what we did. The Naval Affairs Committee is not here to merely do what the Navy Department says. We still think we are qualified when we have all the facts to determine whether or not an item should go in a bill, whether it is approved or disapproved by the Director of the Budget.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to commend the gentleman and his committee for not being bound by the Budget, and I think he is as well quali-

fied to state the situation in reference to these matters as is the Bureau of the Budget perhaps; but on what ground did the Bureau of the Budget cut out the item?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Bureau of the Budget probably got orders that they could have only a certain amount of money, and then it began to cut out the items that the Bureau of the Budget and the Navy Department thought were the least important. This is not a hodgepodge proposition. You have a Board known as the Shore Station Development Board that fixes the priorities of these various places. One place has a priority over another place, taking into consideration the operation of the floating Navy. This place is so important that this Board has already listed it as No. 4 in priority.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wish the gentleman would tell us what, if anything, Admiral Moreell told the committee about this particular item. I have not noticed anything of that kind in the report so far.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In dealing with the item for Bayonne, N. J., supply depot, \$7,300,000, I suggested to the admiral, would it not be feasible to cut down the item of \$7,300,000 by \$1,100,000. The admiral said, "No," he could not approve that. Then I said, "In view of the fact that we have rejected an item to build a 35-mile railroad from Fredericksburg to Dahlgren, I think we could use that money far more profitably to the Navy by developing this base at Boston."

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what Admiral Moreell said about the need for this establishment in Boston.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They recognize it as an important item. If it were not an important item it would not have such a high priority—No. 4. The supply officer was right there, and he testified, and we did not do it until the supply officer pointed out the urgent necessity for this establishment at Boston.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In answer to my own question as to the need for this supply depot in Boston, the representative of the Supply Corps answered that in his opinion it was a very necessary addition.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Let me say this to the House: Let no man think for one moment that there is a single item in this bill put there by pork-barrel methods. Every item in this bill is justified. Out of the \$7,000,000,000 or \$8,000,000,000 that has been

authorized by Congress, not more than \$5,000,000 has gone to the State of Georgia. So long as I am a member of the committee I propose to see that there is no logrolling or pork barreling by any Member, whether or not he is on the committee. These measures are going to be brought here strictly on their merits. If it so happens that it falls in the district of a member of the committee, good and well.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. There is no member of the committee from that district. As a matter of fact, the South Boston drydock is in the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. No member of the committee is from that district.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. The gentleman wrote the bill and introduced the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. The gentleman did not have this Boston item in it then. The item did not go in the bill until the railroad item was stricken out, and then the gentleman suggested to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and to Admiral Moreell that this Boston item be put in the bill. Admiral Moreell disapproved it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right, because Admiral Moreell is hemmed in, and I am not hemmed in. I would far rather expand this shore establishment at Boston to furnish accommodation for the fleet than go into a wild goose proposition of building a railroad from Fredericksburg, Va., down to Dahlgren, costing \$2,000,000, when we already have the great Potomac River on which we can barge down all our materials.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 16, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25, and insert "Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.; Magazines at Hilton Head Island, \$25,000."

Page 17, line 8, after "acquisition", insert "and acceptance."

Line 14, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$510,000."

Page 17, strike out all of lines 18 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"Internal security at navy yards and naval stations: Development of flood lighting, fencing, booms, nets, protection of services, fire protection, and the like, \$14,500,000."

Page 18, line 3, after "fuel", strike out the comma and insert "and."

Line 4, after "oil", strike out the comma and insert "and gasoline."

Line 9, strike out "Expansion" and insert "Emergency expansion."

Line 10, strike out "Expansion" and insert "emergency expansion."

Line 12, after "\$3,000,000", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Congress, not later than 10 days after the convening of the session on or about the 3d day of January of each year, all expenditures

made for emergency expansion of hospital facilities from funds appropriated pursuant to the authority contained in this act."

Page 19, line 8, after "U. S. C.", insert "Supp. V."

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"Quarters authorized by this act shall be constructed, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, at a unit cost not in excess of the following amounts:

"Permanent construction:
"For commissioned officer, \$10,000.

"For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, \$7,500.

"For enlisted man, \$6,000.

"Temporary construction:
"For commissioned officer, \$7,500.

"For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, \$5,000.

"For enlisted man, \$3,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. 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. ROBINSON of Utah, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5312) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, had directed him to 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.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto 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 gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

A PROGRAM FOR STOPPING LABOR WASTAGE THROUGH WORK ACCIDENTS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there are today labor shortages in over 100 essential defense occupations. In 16 defense occupations there is not a single person registered in any employment office in the United States. These facts, disclosed a few days ago by the Chairman of the Social Security Board, deserve some serious thought about the causes of

and remedies for this situation, keeping in mind that we are only ankle deep in our defense production program, with a lot of wading ahead.

The first thing that should and must be done is to stop labor wastage caused by work accidents. We have always been wasteful of manpower in our ordinary industrial operations. As pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] here on this floor 2 months ago, last year's crop of industrial injuries brought death to 17,000 American workers, left 93,000 other workers with permanent crippling injuries, and temporarily took from their jobs a million and a half workers. Footed up in plain terms of production, these casualties cost one and a half billion man-hours.

Under ordinary conditions this waste, although damaging, is not paralyzing in its effect. But at this time of national peril, when we are straining every effort to get out vital defense materials, such loss of trained manpower is a subject for grave concern and one that calls for remedial action.

It is no longer a buyers' market in respect to skilled work, labor, and services. A contractor working on a Government order today cannot quickly replace the skilled mechanic or operator who is killed or laid up by a work injury. He may canvass employment offices in vain, advertise in the help-wanted columns with no response, and dispatch scout recruiters with no results, in many instances, as pointed out by the Chairman of the Social Security Board.

Almost frantic effort is being made to replenish our supply of trained industrial workers. The Federal Government is liberally subsidizing training programs of different kinds through appropriations made available by Congress. These are essential projects in the furtherance of our defense needs, but while we are thus feeding our national reservoir of trained manpower for defense production, the leakage through accident casualties is not only continuing but alarmingly increasing.

Geared for normal production, industrial management suddenly has been confronted with the expansion of plants, development of new processes, increase in production demands, maintenance of heavily worked equipment, employment of new workers, and other problems created by the emergency.

Just recently I had the opportunity of talking with an old-time employment man about his experience in hiring people in the present emergency. He tells me that in order to fill in the gaps he has to take men off the streets—butchers, bakers, gas-station attendants, streetcar conductors—in fact, anyone who wants to work. While it used to take about 10 days to break in a man, now, because of the exhausted reservoir of easily trained men, it takes approximately 200 hours of instruction before he can turn out a machine operator able to earn his salt. The cost, he figures, is about \$210 per man and does not think that is excessive. The value received from a new employee is about 20 percent at the beginning of his employment and 80 percent at the end. It is difficult to estimate the indirect cost

over and above the \$210 spent in training each of these men, such as additional supervision, increased accident hazard, decreased efficiency among old employees caused by the necessity of giving attention to the new employees. I asked him how much this interruption delayed production. He said:

The scrap is terrific. Our labor turn-over is 250 percent per year. In other words, it is necessary to employ 250 new men each year to keep 100 on the job. To maintain our organization of some 2,500 men, we have to hire 6,250 men per year.

Typical of the problem with which industry is confronted in the employment of new workers and the reemployment of long-idle workers unfamiliar with the hazards of plant operation is a report which recently reached me from a large shipbuilding company in the New England States. This report shows that 36 percent of the total crop of injuries were to workers who had less than 1 year's experience on the job and that 70 percent had had less than 3 years' experience in safety.

These are not isolated examples. In the 2 months which have elapsed since the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, spoke before this House on the subject of labor wastage through work injuries, I have been investigating this production leakage caused through job disabilities and find that the accident rate is up an additional 7 percent, after taking into full account increases in employment. Nor is this increase confined solely to new plants or small factories for the first time confronted with high-pressure production. Here are five recent examples which have just come to my attention:

First. A large steel-products manufacturer with operations in various sections of the United States, an outstanding leader in industrial safety, employing 55,000 workers, reports for the first 4 months of 1941 a 22.7-percent increase in its accident-frequency rate as compared with a similar period in 1940.

Second. Another key defense company producing heavy electrical equipment reports an increase of 30 percent in its accident-frequency rate for the first 5 months of 1941 as compared with 1940.

Third. The maintenance and mechanical departments of a third large corporation—with 3,000 workers in these two departments alone—shows an accident rate for the first 5 months of 1941 of over 19 serious, lost-time accidents for every million man-hours worked, as compared with a rate of 10 per 1,000,000 man-hours for 1940—an increase of 86 percent.

Fourth. The Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry reports an increase in the number of lost-time injuries in that State 12 percent higher for the first 4 months of 1941 over the average for 1940. Based on figures for the year 1940, this will represent for 1941 9,847 additional lost-time injuries for that State alone unless drastic steps are taken.

Fifth. The Maryland Industrial Accident Commission has just reported for the first 3 months of 1941, a 22 percent increase in the number of accidents in that State as compared with 1940. If

this rate continues 8,278 more Maryland industrial workers will be killed or injured this year.

It is not necessary to have these accidents. If the proper type of accident-control program is put into effect, accidents can be prevented. My investigation revealed firm after firm engaged in defense production going through the same growing pains that cause so much difficulty elsewhere that have not only been able to reduce the accident rate in the face of rapid expansion, but many that have long unbroken records. Here are five industrial concerns engaged in defense production who have had unbroken, long-time safety records:

First. One of the main plants of a large aluminum company in New Jersey which employs 943 men has not experienced a single accident.

Second. The New Jersey plant of a large electrical manufacturing company has operated a total of 1,095 days in which there have been no accidents. This plant has 1,722 employees.

Third. A large locomotive company in Virginia that has 730 employees has been going 1,825 days without an accident.

Fourth. A small steel company of Pennsylvania has 132 employees and has run 1,980 days without an accident.

Fifth. A large corporation producing heavy machinery in New York State with 774 employees has had no accidents for the past 772 days—over 2 years.

These records prove what can be done when management seriously sets about the job of accident prevention. They form a striking contrast to the general picture of mounting manpower loss through work disabilities.

Now, what is being done collectively to control this drag on the country's production? First, the National Safety Council, a Nation-wide, private, non-profit organization is providing an extensive consultation and publications service for its approximately 5,000 industrial members. There are also 51 local safety councils affiliated with the National Safety Council that are effectively personalizing the safety work among National Safety Council members and others in their respective territories. Although performing effective work among their members, the national and local safety councils do not directly reach a large share of industry. Small concerns particularly have seldom affiliated with these voluntary safety organizations.

Next, the State labor departments and industrial commissions are reaching out with a program of enforcement of safety codes and statutes. But only 18 States have detailed safety and health codes; the other 30 either have no requirements at all or cover only a few hazards or industries. All State inspection departments are undermanned and are finding it increasingly difficult to contact individual plants even as frequently as once a year.

Census Bureau figures show that 92 percent of the manufacturing plants in this country employ fewer than 100 persons. In other words, a large segment of American industry is made up of so-called small plants. It is a recognized fact that as a general rule a small enter-

prise is not well sold on effective safety programs and is not likely to be in direct contact with the organized safety movement. It is to these smaller units that the O. P. M. is now awarding hundreds of direct contracts and urging others to concentrate their production on defense subcontracts.

With these facts definitely in mind the Secretary of Labor created in June 1940 a National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in Defense Industries to aid in speeding up the national-defense program by keeping skilled and trained workers off the casualty list. This committee is primarily aimed at the small plant and augments the efforts of the Federal Government Public Contracts Agency, the State safety services, and private safety organizations with a corps of volunteer safety promotion experts who have been recruited from industry. The efforts of these industrial safety men are directed largely toward:

First. Creating interest in safety on the part of management.

Second. Emphasizing the importance of conserving the supply of workers in view of the imminent shortage in many trades.

Third. Assisting management in organizing safety programs, in setting up safety committees, planning safety education and training campaigns, and distributing circulars, posters, and other inspirational material.

Fourth. Making an appraisal, upon request, of plant working conditions and recommendations for the elimination of accident hazards.

These voluntary safety experts are also members of the National Safety Council, and there is a close tie-up between the work of the United States Department of Labor and that of the council.

I have already mentioned some of the agencies and organizations which are pooling their information and resources and concentrating their efforts on the prevention of accidents. Much is already being done and much has been accomplished which in normal times would not demand special interest or action on the part of the Congress. But the record of the past few months indicates that safety effort is not keeping pace with increased industrial production.

What is needed at this time is not new information and research, but a greater distribution and acceptance of the time-tested and proven systems and standards for the correction of factory dangers and unsafe work practices. The development of a plant-safety program, the creation of safety mindedness on the part of supervisors and workers is a management problem. Industrial executives generally need to be made aware of their accident problem and assisted in the details of a program of safety engineering and safety education.

I am therefore calling upon all accident-prevention agencies—public and private—to redouble their efforts to safeguard the lives, limbs, and productivity of the Nation's workers, and particularly to concentrate on industries and areas vital to defense production.

First might be the further development of industry's own voluntary effort,

as centered in the National Safety Council. In commending the Council for its pioneer work in the field of industrial safety, I would like to urge that it further devote its energies to holding accidents in check among its member companies holding defense contracts. I hope that means may be worked out whereby the National Safety Council's splendid technical and educational material may be made available to the estimated 6,000,000 workers who have not yet been reached with a direct safety appeal.

May I urge upon the regulatory agencies—both Federal and State—that they augment and strengthen their important part in the prevention of accidents through the further development of minimum standards, safety codes, and safety rules, and by adding additional qualified factory inspectors where needed to concentrate on those industries which apparently need more than persuasion and salesmanship to correct hazardous and insanitary plant conditions.

May I call upon workers themselves, both individually and collectively, to accept the discipline, restraint, and at times inconvenience needed to safeguard their lives, limbs, earning power, and productivity. I urge that workers inform themselves as to the hazards of their jobs and in every instance find the safest way to do that job and to keep on doing it that way until it becomes a habit. It is only through self-discipline and obedience to safety rules and practices that the worker can make sure that he will continue to stay on the job producing the material and equipment his country needs.

May I stress the part educators and training specialists can play by weaving safety instructions into all their programs of job training and vocational education. A worker trained to do his job efficiently, thoroughly, and well, rarely becomes involved in an accident.

I ask that health agencies, both public and private, concentrate upon health-education programs aimed to inform the worker of occupational disease hazards which may be encountered on his job, and means of protecting himself from disability or reduced efficiency through exposure to industrial poisons or toxic substances; and, further, that these agencies take every necessary step to provide healthful and sanitary surroundings, both in the factory and in the community, devoting their energies to the prevention rather than the cure of health disabilities.

May I urge that national associations, civic bodies, insurance companies, and other groups having divisions or units devoted to the promotion of safety undertake a job of selective education, concentrating upon essential defense plants.

As already pointed out, the Secretary of Labor, anticipating the acute accident problem which confronts us today, created a National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in Defense Industries to devise a Nation-wide distribution system for safety knowledge, and to undertake a program of personalized door-to-door safety service.

Under this plan more than 350 carefully selected safety engineers, experts,

and technicians, holding prominent positions in some of the country's largest and best managed industries, are contributing a part of their time in calling upon defense plants in their own industrial communities. They are talking to top executives explaining the underlying causes of accidents, are helping to set up safety programs where they do not now exist, and are strengthening already going programs. They are making tours of defense plants, giving the management specific recommendations for improvements where accident hazards are found to exist.

This corps of volunteer safety promotion experts hold dollar-a-year appointments as special agents of the United States Department of Labor, and although thousands of man-hours are being donated in this way to the defense program, it has not been possible to contact more than half the Government-contract plants. Furthermore, new and pressing safety problems in their own plants are making it increasingly difficult for these safety experts to take the necessary time to complete their outside assignments. There is definite need for strengthening and buttressing the work of the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower, and I was pleased to note the action taken by this Congress within the last few days in making available to the Department of Labor sufficient funds to employ a small group of full-time field safety consultants so that this activity might keep abreast of a daily increasing problem of labor supply on defense contracts.

I have been assured that this full-time staff will in no way replace the volunteer effort, but, to the contrary, will be so dovetailed in that complete coverage of all Government-contract plants will be assured and the follow-up work so necessary after launching a new safety campaign will be undertaken.

These funds will make available to defense workers more booklets, more pamphlets, more posters, more visual aids so urgently needed at this time to acquaint the new worker with the hazards of his job, and tell him how to keep from getting hurt.

It has been reported to me that a big majority of the industries already contacted under the national committee's plan keep no track of the accident drain upon production schedules, either in terms of economic loss or of wasted manpower. I am hopeful that the appropriate Federal agencies will devise simple accident record-keeping systems so that each defense industry may be apprised of its direct and indirect losses, records which will point out the sore spots within the plant and which, in themselves, will suggest corrective action. Because of the Government's stake in accident prevention as a means to conserving the Nation's manpower and assuring the on-time delivery of defense materials, I urge that these records be so compiled and tabulated that agents of the Government may be able to tell from month to month what progress is being made in the elimination of accidents and so that the Congress may have spot information on this most serious form of industrial waste.

It has been estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that 6,859,000 defense workers will be employed by the end of 1941. Out of this group there will be 1,500,000 new workers. If the present rate of accidents continues during 1941, more than 100,000 of the total 6,500,000 defense workers will have been either permanently or temporarily disabled. Out of the new defense workers, based on this same computation, there will be 30,000 either permanently or temporarily disabled.

Compensation payments and medical expense incident to work injuries are readily insurable. It is even possible, though not usually practicable, for management to insure against damage to equipment and interruption of production due to accidents. But no amount of premium can purchase protection against loss of time in arming ourselves for defense. There is no underwriter ready to issue a policy against the effects of delayed defense. The Nation itself must carry that risk. We can materially reduce it by plugging up at once the seepage of our industrial manpower through work accidents.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, next week, on Monday, we are going to consider a \$3,500,000,000 tax bill, the largest tax bill perhaps this country has ever seen and one carrying the highest rates.

We have authorized in the past few months expenditures of upward of \$30,000,000,000 for national-defense purposes, nearly ten times the amount expected to be raised by this tax bill.

Reliable figures indicate that next year we may run a deficit of \$11,000,000,000.

All these things are necessary to be done, as most of us believe, in view of the present situation that our country faces.

What the future holds in store none of us knows.

To bridge the gap between revenues and expenditures, so far only one general method has been employed, namely, the method of borrowing, and only a very minor portion of that borrowing has taken place through the sale of bonds to individuals or corporations for cash or bank deposits which were actually possessed by those individuals or corporations and transferred by them to the Government. Most of this borrowing—and up to the beginning of this year it represented nearly \$22,000,000,000 of our total Federal public debt—has been done by the process of "selling" interest-bearing bonds to banks in return for demand deposit credits newly created upon their books for the express purpose of buying these bonds.

The public debt of the United States will probably reach and pass \$100,000,000,000 before we are through with this crisis unless some constructive step is taken to prevent it. I believe some such

step is essential if we are to come safely through this critical period.

THE ONE FACTOR ON WHICH TO BUILD—INCREASING PRODUCTION

There is one constructive element of tremendous importance in the present situation. It is the steady and substantial increase in production, exchange, and national income. Upon this dynamic economic factor we have got to build a better and sounder monetary and fiscal structure or the future will be dark indeed.

NEW MONEY SHOULD BE CREATED ONLY BY CONGRESS; GOVERNMENT SHOULD BORROW ONLY ALREADY EXISTING MONEY

How shall we do this? That is the subject of my speech, and my main point is this:

No government any place, anytime, ever should borrow credit created by a private agency. If government is to borrow at all, it should only be because it is believed to be a national necessity to transfer a given amount of already existing money or credit from private hands to those of government. The only time this would be sound public policy would be when all resources, labor, and productive capacity were fully employed and when it was for some reason necessary to reduce consumer expenditures and correspondingly increase governmental expenditures for certain purposes.

This is the only sort of circumstances under which and the only manner in which a sovereign and self-respecting government and one whose people seek to be free to produce should ever borrow at interest.

Let me repeat. Government never should borrow anything but real, honest-to-goodness previously existing money or credit and except where an actual transfer of such previously existing money or credit to government from a private individual takes place the transaction should never be a public-debt transaction but instead an exercise of the fundamental right of the Nation to create its own medium of exchange.

WHEN "BORROWING" IS NOT BORROWING AT ALL

But there is another kind of so-called Government borrowing which is not really borrowing at all. It is, to speak plainly, a process of subsidizing private financiers.

The Government gives a private bank or financial house an interest-bearing obligation of all the people of the Nation and the bank in exchange credits the Government on its books with a demand deposit, created out of thin air, based wholly upon the credit of the Government and its people and secured solely by the bond itself. The sovereign Government has, in such a case, induced a private profit-making agency to create the Nation's money or, more accurately, to monetize the credit of the Nation. As I have said, about \$22,000,000,000 of our present public debt came about in this way.

I do not ask the House to take my word for this. I would like to quote from Mr. Eccles, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Re-

serve System, and what he said in a speech before the Ohio Bankers' Association in 1935, and here it is:

There is no political or economic power more charged with the general or social interest than the power to increase or decrease the supply of money. If the sovereign authority delegates this power to a particular group or class in the community as it has done in large part in this country, it divests itself of a part of its effective sovereignty. * * * The power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof has always been an attribute of a sovereign power. It was one of the first powers given to the Federal Government by the Constitutional Convention. The development of deposit banking, however, introduced into the economy numerous private agencies which have power to create and destroy money without being recognized as creators or destroyers of money by the Government or the people.

Again, from Lewis W. Douglas, who was formerly Director of the Budget, who said in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, in 1935, as follows:

Banks, when they buy Government bonds, rarely pay for them with cash that someone has deposited in the bank. Instead, they create a bookkeeping credit, against which the Government is entitled to draw. * * * In a country in which more than 90 percent of all business is done by the use of checks, there is no essential difference between the creation of bank deposits by fiat and the creation of printing-press money. Bank deposits—not currency—constitute our chief circulating medium.

I do not believe I could quote two people that are better versed on this matter or on the whole more conservatively grounded to prove my point.

Now, why, and under what circumstances, would government resort to a type of borrowing which is resorted to solely for the purpose of getting additional money created?

There are two such circumstances. One is when there is unemployment and a failure of production and a condition where productive capacity is idle which could and would be brought into use if there were a greater demand on the consumer side. The other such circumstance is where there is taking place an increase in actual production of goods and services, which, if the buying power of the dollar is not too drastically changed, requires an additional amount of money or credit in circulation.

It will be readily seen that in both these cases what the Government wants to bring about is not to get money out of somebody else's hands into its own but rather to bring about a net increase in the amount of money in existence and in circulation. And quite rightly so, because, first, the whole economic health of a nation depends, in such cases, on an expansion of purchasing power or money in circulation and because, second, the additional money or credit created will not cause inflation, but in view of increased production—either actually taking place or certain to be brought about by such a policy—will only prevent a serious deflation from causing widespread business failure, loss of farm ownership by thousands of farmers, and devastating unemployment.

Now, especially today, when every honest Member of the House knows we must

make these expenditures for defense, and also knows the existing financial system will break down under the weight of these expenditures; now, above all times, when every resource of our people is being called upon in the national effort; now, when the very possibility of the continuance of human liberty and free government depends upon building a solid foundation under our economic life; now, let us establish one principle, one for the establishment of which millions of patriotic citizens in this country would gladly give their lives.

CENTRAL PRINCIPLE

That principle is this: That whenever sound governmental policy calls for an expansion of money or credit in the Nation, that expansion should never be brought about by borrowing at interest from any private institution, but instead should come about either by direct creation of its own money by the Congress of the Nation itself or else by means of borrowing at no interest from a national central bank belonging to all the people and their Government.

No question of inflation is involved here at all, though the question of avoidance of deflation and the incurrence of an insupportable public debt are both involved. It is altogether a question of what method shall be used to bring about such expansion of money and credit in active circulation as may be desirable. And it must always be remembered that whatever agency does create, money acquires, as Prof. Frederick Soddy, of Oxford University, England, puts it, "a new legal claim by the issuer to anything of equivalent value on the market."

The real basic wrong and evil of the existing situation is described further by Professor Soddy in a recent speech in the following words:

But now I would like to spend a moment on the real nature of money as I see it and the distinction between the genuine and the false. The validity of a money token seems to me to derive from the fact that its possessor presumably in acquiring it gave up value equal to the value of the token—the workman, hours of labor; the manufacturer, goods; the renter, use of a house, land, or money, and so on—and it is this value previously given up voluntarily that the token enables him to obtain again at his own convenience on demand.

Let us consider only one but a truly devastating consequence. Everything got for nothing by the issuer of money has to be foregone voluntarily ever after by the community so long as the money remains in existence and its value is not debased. Nothing else is required to refute the 20,000 inflationary proposals to save the world.

It is altogether this question: When economic conditions require that additional money or credit be put in circulation, it should never be done by adding to the interest-bearing debt nor by borrowing privately created credit. It should always be done by a clear-cut action of the Government itself, utilizing the credit of all the Nation for the benefit of all the Nation.

WHICH IS "PRINTING PRESS MONEY"?

And if the cry of "printing press money" is raised, all I have to say is that we have "printing press money"

now. Federal Reserve notes are not even lawful money. They bear upon their face the promise of the United States Government to redeem them in lawful money, which means they must be, not lawful money but private bank notes—which is indeed the fact. Here is a Government obligation of very far-reaching sort, requiring us to redeem private bank notes in spite of the fact that the Government has shorn itself of its power to create money and the banks have grabbed that power. I ask you, gentlemen, what indeed would the United States Government use to redeem outstanding Federal Reserve notes if it were demanded that it do so? And would it be "printing press money" if the necessary lawful money were created under these circumstances?

Any bank that buys a Government bond can use that bond to secure an issue of Federal Reserve notes if it needs them. It is just a little more roundabout method of securing some "printing press money," and the bankers get the advantage of the interest on the public bonds issued. That is all. No one ever cries "printing press money" about this.

The essential principle to prevent abuse and inflation is, of course, not to overuse the Government's natural and inherent power to create the money or credit of the Nation. The essential thing is to use this power only to the extent that economic circumstances require and justify that it be used in order to maintain the stable buying power of the Nation's money and thus prevent the colossal economic injustices that occur when money fluctuates in value. Such a control would be far simpler and easier to apply than attempts to control an inflation of private bank credit, if it ever got started, for there simply is no way to effectively control an inflation of such private bank credit so long as the banks enjoy the privilege of multiple expansion on the basis of fractional cash reserves.

Now, every year, especially under the present circumstances of the great drive of this defense spending—and indeed throughout American history—we have found an increase from year to year in the capacity of our people in agriculture, business, and industry to create wealth. Throughout our history we have had an average increase of 4 percent in the commercial business of the United States. My contention is that with that increase in the power of our people to produce real goods and services, if we are to maintain a stable buying power in our money, there should be a 4-percent increase in the volume of money in circulation. And my further contention is that since not just one kind of business people in this country, but all kinds of producers are responsible for the increase in production, therefore, all the people of the country should have the benefit of putting into circulation that increased supply of money justified by that increase in production. Therefore, that increase should be brought about by governmental action itself, and should be in the nature of revenue to the Treasury, without the necessity of either levying taxes or borrowing to bring it into existence. This principle is not a principle whereby you can pay all the bills of

government. It is a principle, however, which makes all the difference in the world in the possibility of making both ends meet financially on the one hand and not being able to do it on the other. And it means that to the extent it is found to be necessary and justified that new money should be put into circulation, the Nation will derive the benefit of it.

WHAT IT WOULD MEAN IF CENTRAL FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS WERE MADE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

But not a single dollar needs to be printed, if that is objected to, in order to apply this principle. There is another method. All that is required is for the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks to be bought by Congress and for those banks to be made truly and actually a central bank of the United States. Then you can continue to use bonds if you want to. And when you find that sound policy demands an expansion of money or credit in circulation the Treasury can issue bonds either interest bearing or noninterest bearing, and it can "sell" them to the central bank for exactly the same sort of credit the private banks now use to buy our public obligations. If the bonds bore interest, then one Government agency, the Treasury, would be paying that interest to another Government agency, the the national central bank, and at the end of each year the profits would come back to the Treasury and the interest paid would be part of them. If the bonds did not bear interest, they would amount simply to receipts given by the Treasury to the central bank to show that the central bank had created credits for the national use.

It is wrong and ridiculous and dangerous for any central bank to be a private institution. As long as they are private institutions they will view their business from the standpoint of the banks who deal in money as a commodity and they will never view it from the standpoint of the general welfare of and sound policies for the Nation. We have heard much about France. But how many Members know that the Bank of France right up to the end of that nation's free existence was a private institution in much the same situation as our Federal Reserve banks. How many Members know that at what may well have been the critical turning point in French history—the period of her severe deflation—the private Bank of France, assuming its role as a completely independent institution, refused to discount the Government's obligations or to provide it with any advances and thus rendered impossible any sort of recovery program.

The world waits and hopes for a free people to demonstrate that they can keep freedom and democracy and also solve the economic problem of this technological age. That problem in one sentence is the problem of getting an expansion of active consumer buying power as fast as increased production takes place. And the medium of exchange of the Nation is the vehicle that must be used to affect this. Our money is the wheels that move goods from producer to consumer.

We must have an answer to debt. And it must begin by the elimination once and

for all of needless public debt, such as I have described.

America's destiny—the future hope of our people depends on our vision, our courage, and willingness to strike at privilege which is unreasonable and unjustifiable on any grounds whatsoever—the usurped privilege of private financial institutions to write upon their books the credit of the whole American people and sell it back to them with usury.

The day we buy the Federal Reserve banks will not be a day on which all our problems will be solved. But it will be the day when we will take into the hands of Congress the one most essential instrument of sound public economic policy—the instrument that will be the answer to the problem of rising public debt and the means of enabling a constant increase in production to take place without either deflation or inflation checking it.

What I am talking about is not the system used in Germany. It is far better than their system. We could only use their system if we had a Gestapo to go around telling people with any available funds whatsoever that they must invest in German Government bonds and if we avoided the public-debt problem simply by keeping its size a secret.

We want a free system.

But it cannot be free until industry becomes the master of finance instead of its servant. I mean that increased production should call into being the financial means of sustaining that production. At present this just does not happen. It would take too long to explain all the reasons for the drastic decline in self-liquidating commercial loans. Suffice it to say that under present circumstances and until we take action such as I am pleading for, an increase in interest-bearing public debt will always have to precede any increase in production of real goods and services. We cannot let such a situation continue indefinitely.

Establish this one principle, gentlemen, and you will cause more dismay in the minds of hostile dictators than you can do with 50,000 airplanes. For you will make democracy and its free economic system a virile, dynamic, unfettered force that can prove itself over and over again superior to any other system.

WHY THIS SPEECH NOW?

It may be that some Members will feel that it is a peculiar thing to be making a speech like this at this time. It is true that under the propulsion of this defense program there is talk about possible inflation of prices. It is also true that as the production of goods is increased in this country and as that production shifts into defense goods, and as possibly the output of consumer goods becomes curtailed, tax measures may have to be undertaken even more far-reaching than we have yet done. But those facts have nothing to do with the basic question that I am discussing, and I say as solemnly as I know how, that if there is one duty we have as a legislative body in this National Government it is the duty of indicating to the people that we can and will establish a nation in which people can consume as they produce, a nation in which there shall be a market at home for what the farmers and the workers and

the businessmen can produce, a nation that can be independent economically, and follow such course as it sees fit to follow. And this principle that I am speaking of is the key to reducing the public debt and becomes even more important as we face the necessity of preventing a period of vast deflation and more widespread farm distress and unemployment than we have ever known before, when this defense period is over.

And now I want to buttress my own argument with a number of quotations from some of the very greatest of the world's thinkers:

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Here is Thomas Jefferson's pointed and devastating description of the strange process of permitting banks to levy against the public credit either by the issuance of bank notes, as in his time, or by creation of demand deposits by expansion on fractional reserves, as in ours. The grim humor of Jefferson's description hardly detracts from the evident folly of the system he describes, and which we at this moment are still permitting to exist in all its essential aspects:

At the time we were funding our national debt, we heard much about "a public debt being a public blessing"; that the stock representing it was a creation of active capital for the alimment of commerce, manufacturers, and agriculture. This paradox was well adapted to the minds of believers in dreams, and the gulls of that size entered bona fide into it. But the art and mystery of banks is a wonderful improvement on that. It is established on the principle that "private debts are a public blessing." That the evidences of those private debts, called bank notes, become active capital, and alimment the whole commerce, manufactures, and agriculture of the United States. Here are a set of people, for instance, who have bestowed on us the great blessing of running in our debt about \$200,000,000, without our knowing who they are, where they are, or what property they have to pay this debt when called on; nay, who have made us so sensible of the blessings of letting them run in our debt, that we have exempted them by law from the repayment of these debts beyond a given proportion (generally estimated at one-third). And to fill up the measure of blessing, instead of paying, they receive an interest on what they owe from those to whom they owe; for all the notes, or evidences of what they owe, which we see in circulation, have been lent to somebody on an interest which is levied again on us through the medium of commerce. And they are so ready still to deal out their liberalities to us that they are now willing to let themselves run in our debt ninety millions more, on our paying them the same premium of 6 or 8 percent interest, and on the same legal exemption from the repayment of more than thirty millions of the debt, when it shall be called for. (From Jefferson's letter to John W. Epps, November 6, 1813, published in the Writings of Thomas Jefferson, edited by H. A. Washington.)

JOHN ADAMS

Jefferson and John Adams, our second President, were on many issues bitter antagonists. But here is what Adams wrote to Jefferson on one occasion:

All the perplexities, confusion, and distress in America arise, not from defects in their constitution or confederation, not from want of honour and virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit,

and circulation. (From p. 447 of vol. 8 of the Works of John Adams, edited by C. F. Adams and published in Boston in 1853.)

John Adams' words are, in my opinion, as true today as they were when he uttered them.

JEFFERSON AGAIN

And returning again to the great Jefferson, here is a forthright statement on his part of precisely the principle for which I am contending here today:

I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a money aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks, and restored to the Government to whom it properly belongs. (From p. 208, vol. 6, of the Ford edition of the writings of Thomas Jefferson, New York, London, 1892, letter to John Taylor.)

DAVID RICARDO

No greater economist and certainly no more firm advocate of a free economic system probably has lived than David Ricardo, of England. In 1824 he wrote as follows:

If the view which I have taken of this subject be a correct one, it appears that the commerce of the country would not be in the least impeded by depriving the Bank of England of the power of issuing paper money, provided an amount of such money, equal to the bank circulation, was issued by government; and that the sole effect of depriving the bank of this privilege would be to transfer the profit which accrues from the interest of the money so issued from the bank to government. (From p. 506 of the Works of David Ricardo, edited by J. R. McCulloch, published in London in 1846.)

Ricardo has here set forth not only the principle but the method that I have advocated this afternoon.

I trust not one Member of the House will question my basic thesis, namely that under the present system private banks do create—and destroy—the medium of exchange of the Nation. But if anyone does doubt it I give you here at the risk of some repetition, five of the most eminent authorities that could possibly be quoted on the matter:

MARRINER S. ECCLES

There is no political or economic power more charged with the general or social interest than the power to increase or decrease the supply of money. If the sovereign authority delegates this power to a particular group or class in the community as it has done in large part in this country, it divests itself of a part of its effective sovereignty. The power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof has always been an attribute of a sovereign power. It was one of the first powers given to the Federal Government by the Constitutional Convention. The development of deposit banking, however, introduced into the economy numerous private agencies which have power to create and destroy money without being recognized as creators or destroyers of money by the Government or the people. (From a speech by Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System before the Ohio Bankers' Association, in 1935.)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF BRITISH TREASURY

Banks lend by creating credit. They create the means of payment out of nothing. (From pp. 20-21, Currency and Credit, by

Ralph M. Hawtrey, Assistant Secretary of British Treasury. Published in London in 1928.)

LEWIS W. DOUGLAS

Banks, when they buy Government bonds, rarely pay for them with cash that someone has deposited in the bank. Instead, they create a bookkeeping credit, against which the Government is entitled to draw. * * * In a country in which more than 90 percent of all business is done by the use of checks, there is no essential difference between the creation of bank deposits by fiat and the creation of printing-press money. Bank deposits, not currency, constitute our chief circulating medium. (From Lewis W. Douglas, former Director of the U. S. Budget, in an article carried by the Atlantic Monthly in 1935.)

PROF. IRVING FISHER

When a bank lends or invests it extends credit, i. e., creates check-book money. When it gets loans paid or sells investments it contracts credit, i. e., destroys check-book money. In normal times such creation and destruction of money roughly balance. But when they do not balance the Nation's money is inflated or deflated and causes a boom or a depression. (From Irving Fisher, professor emeritus of economics at Yale.)

PROF. SUMNER H. SLICHTER

When banks grant credit by creating or adding to deposits subject to check * * * new dollars are created. It is true that the new dollars are not stamped out of gold; they are credit dollars, and they are created by the stroke of the pen rather than by dies and the stamping machines, but their purchasing power is not less than that of the dollars coined at the Government mint. In other words, the principal way in which dollars are created in modern economic society is by borrowing. This means that the number of dollars in existence in any particular time depends upon the willingness and ability of banks to lend. The volume of purchasing power fluctuates with men's state of mind; the growth of pessimism may suddenly throw millions of men out of work, or the growth of confidence may create thousands of jobs overnight. (From pp. 235-236, in Modern Economic Society, by Sumner H. Slichter, professor at Harvard. Published in New York, 1931.)

THOMAS A. EDISON

No American ever lived who was a greater scientist than Thomas A. Edison. And he went straight to the heart of this monetary question when he said:

The only dynamite that works in this country is the dynamite of a sound idea. I think we are getting a sound idea on the money question. The people have an instinct which tells them that something is wrong and that the wrong somehow centers in money.

Don't allow them to confuse you with the cry of "paper money." The danger of paper money is precisely the danger of gold—if you get too much it is no good. There is just one rule for money, and that is to have enough to carry all the legitimate trade that is waiting to move. Too little and too much are both bad. But enough to move trade, enough to prevent stagnation on the one hand, not enough to permit speculation on the other hand, is the proper ratio.

If our Nation can issue a dollar bond it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good makes the bill good also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent interest, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who contribute directly in some useful way. (From pp. 204-207, Thomas A. Edison, by Mary C. Nerney. Published in New York, 1934.)

JOHN R. COMMONS

I have said that whenever economic conditions and the general welfare of the whole Nation require an expansion of the amount of money and credit in circulation, then government should itself create that money or credit. To illustrate this point I have selected the following from Prof. John R. Commons, of Wisconsin University:

The fundamental reason why the share theories of the national monetary income do not account for the alternating booms and depressions is because increasing the share of one class reduces the shares of other classes and does not change the total purchasing power of all classes, whether expended as savings or expended for consumption, furnishes the same employment for labor, barring temporary difficulties of adjustment. In order to increase the purchasing power of labor the unemployed must be put to work by creation of new money, and not by transferring the existing purchasing power of taxpayers to laborers, as Malthus proposed, nor by borrowing money by government, which transfers investments but does not augment them. This new money cannot be created and issued by bankers, either in commercial investment, or central banks, because in a period of depression the margins of profits have disappeared and there are no business borrowers willing to cooperate with bankers in creating the new money. In order to create the consumer demand, on which business depends for sales, the Government itself must create the new money and go completely over the head of the entire banking system by paying it out directly to the unemployed, either as relief or for construction of public works, as it does in times of war. Besides, this new money must also go to the farmers, the business establishments, and practically all enterprises, as well as to wage earners, for it is all of them together that make up the total of consumer demand. (From pp. 589-590, *Institutional Economics*, by John R. Commons; published in New York, 1934.)

CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS

Today, of course, we have the very great increase in production brought about by defense expenditures, which is the other condition under which an expansion of money in circulation is called for and justified—a percentage increase in money in circulation equal to the percentage increase in production—and to this extent our public financing should be done without increase in the public debt.

And in conclusion perhaps a bit of philosophy will do us good and help us to see ourselves and the things we are doing and failing to do in the broad perspective. As Christopher Hollis puts it:

Indeed the historian has to record that in almost every age there was some superstition or other of utter unreason which strangely occupied the minds of men otherwise of activity and vigor. He has to confess that he cannot explain how it was that men once believed in the mystical significance of numbers or in the claims of astrology. We are sometimes ready to congratulate ourselves that our age has outgrown all superstitions. But the historian of the future will, I fancy, reckon in the same class as number worship and astrology and the study of the gizzards of birds the strange superstition that, whenever money is invented a percentage must be paid forever afterward as a propitiation to a banker. It is on that superstition that the whole empire of Mammon is built. (From pp. 211-212 of *The Breakdown of Money*, by Christopher Hollis, New York, 1934.)

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain brief quotations from a number of different speakers.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a certain newspaper article.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial by David Lawrence.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain articles.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 849. An act for the relief of Eben Vaughn Cleaves;

S. 1110. An act to amend section 1118 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against enlistment in the military service of the United States of any person convicted of a felony;

S. 1120. An act for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Central Valley project, and for other purposes;

S. 1200. An act to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work;

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution directing the Comptroller General to readjust the account between the United States and the State of Vermont; and

S. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by suspending section 24b of the National Defense Act and authorizing a more expeditious procedure to vitalize the active list of the Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Thursday, July 24, for consideration of House Resolution 209 and House Concurrent Resolution 36.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

778. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 28, 1941, submitting a report, together with ac-

companying papers, on reexamination of Rock Harbor, Mass., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 17, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

779. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a recommendation for legislation to extend the act of November 30, 1940, relating to sabotage in peacetime to include acts willfully committed with reason to believe that they may injure, interfere with, or obstruct the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

780. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a report prepared jointly by the United States Maritime Commission and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the office of Solicitor General with regards to provisions made under Public Law No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3537. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4047. A bill to grant the status of a quota immigrant to Dr. Wilhelm Wolfgang Krauss; without amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOENSON:

H. R. 5392. A bill to convey certain property to the Southwest Texas State Teachers College; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5393. A bill providing for the furnishing of uniforms and equipment to the guard and master-at-arms forces at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 5394. A bill to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 5395. A bill to amend the National Housing Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5396. A bill to amend subsection 10 of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 596; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 377); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5397. A bill to provide for the protection of the fish-cultural station at Spearfish, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5398. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 5399. A bill establishing a minimum rate of pay for persons enlisted in, inducted into, or called to serve in the land and naval forces of the United States, and granting a monthly allotment to the dependents of said enlistees, inductees, or selectees; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 5400. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law prescribing penalties upon producers of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5401. A bill authorizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation to cooperate with State authorities in the investigation of certain crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., to certain land in the county of Marquette and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THILL:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution declaring that it is the sense of the Congress that all members of the armed forces of the United States be encouraged to vote by mail; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. Res. 277. Resolution to provide for the further expenses for the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 5402. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 5403. A bill for the relief of Cecil Higgenbottom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER:

H. R. 5404. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Ann Hoke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 5405. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Alvin C. York as a colonel in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 5406. A bill to provide for the placing of Frank L. Downey on the retired list of the Army as a captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 5407. A bill for the relief of Ruth Cooke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 5408. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Joseph Falcone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. R. 5409. A bill for the relief of Gwendolyn Anne Olhava and Anthony L. Olhava; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5410. A bill to authorize the presentation to Harry H. Weiss of a Distinguished

Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 5411. A bill for the relief of John M. Montgomery and Carrie E. Montgomery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1675. By Mr. HAINES: Petition signed by Mrs. Milton R. Rimmel, of Gettysburg, Pa., and others in that vicinity, urging Congress to vote for Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1676. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition signed by 37 persons who are parents, relatives, and friends of boys in the Two Hundred and Fifty-first Coast Artillery, National Guard of California, called into active service September 16, 1940, for 1 year of training, and transferred to Hawaii, where they are stationed at the present time, protesting against their being held there longer than 1 year, and also against their being sent to any foreign soil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1677. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Greater New York Industrial Union Council, concerning the passage of Senate bill 1617, to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1678. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the board of governors of the State Bar of California, relative to the proposed legislation to eliminate separate income-tax returns by husband and wife and to require joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1679. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Elgen L. Mapes and 73 other citizens of Gaston, Ore., protesting against the enactment of House bill 3852 or Senate bill 983; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1680. Also, petition signed by W. B. Gieske and 52 other citizens of Yamhill County, Ore., protesting against the enactment of House bill 3852 or Senate bill 983; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1681. Also, petition signed by Ed Rustin and 25 other citizens of Washington County, Ore., protesting against the enactment of House bill 3852 or Senate bill 983; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1682. Also, petition signed by Rev. H. S. Fulton and 19 other citizens of Woodburn, Ore., urging the passage of House bill 2475, a bill to prohibit prostitution within certain distances of military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1683. Also, petition signed by Martha Poole and 30 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the passage of House bill 2475, a bill to prohibit prostitution within certain distances of military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1941

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

O God, our Heavenly Father, who through Thy Son, Jesus Christ, hast given the splendid vision of an ordered world governed by love, and hast taught of a kingdom of justice and peace, in which all men shall dwell together in unity and brotherly love: Look with the tender eyes of Thy mercy upon the holocaust into

which the nations of the earth have been plunged; deal mercifully with those who sacrifice Thy children to the lust for power, wealth, and vengeance, and by Thy Holy Spirit, guide, we beseech Thee, in the restoration of law and order in a disastrously shaken world.

Help us, O Lord, to prepare for that better day to come, in which the angels of light shall subdue the legions of darkness, the ideals of civilization shall triumph over the forces of barbarism, and a world order, establishing fully and adequately the equal rights of all people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, shall supersede the reign of conquest, oppression, and terror, in which Thy little ones are slain. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Him who taught that it is not the will of our Father which is in Heaven, that one of these little ones should perish; Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, July 22, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 22, 1941:

S. 347. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to issue the Navy Expeditionary Medal to certain Army and civilian personnel;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of J. Mae Chambers and Retta E. Hultgren; and

S. 1166. An act for the relief of Daniel Steele.

On July 23, 1941:

S. 851. An act for the relief of Edson E. Downs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4816) to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1580) to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. MOTT were appointed